



Canadian Nuclear
Laboratories

Laboratoires Nucléaires
Canadiens

Invitation for SMR Demonstration Projects

Part 2: Evaluation Question Set

Revision 0

UNRESTRICTED

© Canadian Nuclear Laboratories

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 1. | INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 2. | EVALUATION CRITERIA..... | 1 |
| 3. | EVALUATION QUESTION SET | 5 |
| 3.1 | GENERAL PROPONENT INFORMATION..... | 5 |
| 3.2 | INTEGRITY AND SECURITY REQUIREMENTS..... | 10 |
| 3.3 | ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL STANDING | 15 |
| 3.4 | TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS | 25 |
| 3.5 | OVERALL COHESIVENESS | 54 |

1. INTRODUCTION

This document outlines the criteria against which responses to the Invitation for an SMR demonstration project (“SMR Project”) will be evaluated. Proponent responses are evaluated against either a pass/fail criterion where the information is provided as requested or is missing from the response, or against a scored and weighted criterion where the information provided is evaluated against a described assessment benchmark. Instructions for responding to the Invitation are provided in Part 1 – Instructions to Proponents. Responses shall be submitted in the template provided in Part 3 – Response Template.

1.1 Disclaimer

It is important that Proponents understand that this evaluation is part of an Invitation in respect of which neither CNL nor AECL has any legal obligation or liability, including without limitation, with respect to how, whether or to what extent it reviews a response or recommends a Proponent or continues with a recommended SMR Project. For clarity, this Invitation is not a procurement process, but rather, a process to help CNL advance its demonstration initiative.

CNL is a contractor of AECL and is not acting as AECL’s agent in issuing this Invitation. CNL may, in its sole discretion, and at any time:

- suspend, revoke, or terminate this Invitation, including CNL’s review of any response to this Invitation, as well as its recommendation of any SMR Project;
- alter, amend or modify the content and requirements of this Invitation and CNL’s consideration/review of any responses received to this Invitation, including revising (a) the schedule(s) associated with the Invitation and review of responses, (b) the requirements and criteria used by CNL in connection therewith, and (c) its recommendation of any SMR Project; and
- decide not to recommend the establishment of any SMR Project(s) whatsoever or decide to recommend the establishment of one or more SMR Project(s) on the basis of criteria or information that is in some or all respects different from, or inconsistent with, those set out in this Invitation.

By submitting a response, Proponents acknowledge and agree to the foregoing and that these conditions form an integral part of the Instructions to Proponents. To the extent that there is any conflict between the content of the Instructions to Proponents and this paragraph, this paragraph shall supersede and govern.

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The decision criteria CNL will use for the responses received under the Invitation are set out below with their respective weightings. This table provides an overview of the criteria and the requirements to meet those criteria at Stages 1 and 2. Details regarding the response requirements and the assessment basis required for Stages 1 and 2 follow in Section 3. Additional criteria and requirements for Stage 3 will be provided to Proponents upon successful completion of Stage 2. **A minimum score of 3 is required to pass each scored and weighted criterion.** Failure to obtain this minimum score will result in a failure to pass the Stage. Under certain circumstances, CNL may elect to put on hold the review and evaluation of one

or more SMR Projects submitted within a given intake period. The selection of which SMR Projects to put on hold will be made based on the scores received through the evaluation process and the overall interests of CNL and AECL.

| Section/Question | Stage 1 | Stage 2 | Max Score Available | Question Weight | Section Weight |
|--|---|---|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Part 1 - General Proponent Information | | | | | N/A |
| G1 - Proponent Entity Details | Mandatory requirement – updated at each phase | | Pass | N/A | |
| G2 - Key Project Partners, Shareholders and Suppliers | Preliminary | Ongoing updates | Pass | N/A | |
| G3 - SMR Project Description Summary | Summary | Ongoing updates | Pass | N/A | |
| Part 2 - Integrity and Security Requirements | | | | | N/A |
| IS1 - National Security Review | Mandatory requirement – updated at each phase | | Pass | N/A | |
| IS2 - Integrity Screening | Mandatory requirement – updated at each phase | | Pass | N/A | |
| Part 3 - Economic and Financial Standing | | | | | 20% |
| EF1 - Financial Information - Successive Assurances and Financial Guarantees | Preliminary financial information of Proponent, including potential funding gaps and requirements | Establishment of increasing financial assurances and financial security | Pass | N/A | |
| EF2 - Conflicts of Interest | Mandatory requirement – updated at each phase | | Pass | N/A | |
| EF3 - Insurance | N/A | Insurance program identified | Pass | N/A | |
| EF4 - Spent Fuel Waste Management: Financial | Statement of intent regarding management of spent fuel wastes and spent fuel waste management cost strategy | Preliminary cost estimate and funding approach | 5 | 35 | |
| EF5 - Non-Spent Fuel Waste Management: Financial | Statement of intent regarding management of non-spent fuel wastes and non-spent fuel waste management cost strategy | Preliminary cost estimate and funding approach | 5 | 35 | |

| Section/Question | Stage 1 | Stage 2 | Max Score Available | Question Weight | Section Weight |
|--|--|--|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| EF6 - Decommissioning: Financial | Statement of intent regarding decommissioning and decommissioning cost strategy | Preliminary cost estimate and funding approach | 5 | 30 | |
| Section Total | | | 15 | 100% | |
| Part 4 - Technical Requirements | | | | | 60% |
| T1 - Benefits to Canada | <p>Scored Requirement – Updated at Each Phase</p> <p>These criteria are stage-gated to allow the Proponent to progress the SMR Project with CNL commensurate with their schedule and the stage of readiness of their SMR Project.</p> <p>The Proponent should address the responses as fully as they are able. Responses will be used towards the pre-qualification into the process (Stage 1), and will be applied towards the due diligence stage (Stage 2) as the completeness of the response permits. Stage 3 criteria and requirements will be provided later to Proponents who successfully complete Stage 2.</p> | | 5 | 25 | |
| T2 - Benefits to CNL | | | 5 | 20 | |
| T3 - Stakeholder Engagement and Corporate Social Responsibility | | | 5 | 15 | |
| T4 - Licensing Approach, Experience and Risks | | | 5 | 5 | |
| T5 - Business Case and Potential for Commercial Deployment Success | | | 5 | 10 | |
| T6 – Schedule | | | 5 | 5 | |
| T7 - Technology Readiness and Feasibility | | | 5 | 5 | |
| T8 - Credible Path to Obtain Fuel | | | Pass | N/A | |
| T9 - Credible Path to Manufacturing and Construction, Construction and Commissioning | | | Pass | n/a | |
| T10 - Management of Spent Fuel Waste: Technical | | | 5 | 5 | |
| T11 - Management of Non-Spent Fuel Wastes: Technical | | | 5 | 5 | |
| T12 - Decommissioning: Technical | | | 5 | 5 | |

| Section/Question | Stage 1 | Stage 2 | Max Score Available | Question Weight | Section Weight |
|--|---|---------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| T13 - Access to All Relevant Intellectual Property | | | Pass | N/A | |
| T14 - Health, Safety, Security, Environment, and Quality | | | Pass | N/A | |
| Section Total | | | 50 | 100% | |
| Part 5 - Overall Cohesiveness of the SMR Project | | | | | 20% |
| O1 - Overall Cohesiveness of the SMR Project | This criterion will be re-assessed at Stages 1 and 2. | | 5 | 100% | |
| Overall Score | | | 100 | | 100% |

3. EVALUATION QUESTION SET

The criteria below will be used for Stages 1 and 2. Greater detail, firmer plans and increasingly detailed cost estimates and financial arrangements are expected at each stage. Where information at Stage 1 can be preliminary and higher-level, by Stage 2 CNL expects to see schedules becoming more detailed, and arrangements in support of the business case becoming more firm with some detailed knowledge of the identity of key suppliers, operators, financial investors and other stakeholders.

3.1 GENERAL PROPONENT INFORMATION

Part 1 comprises of mandatory information to be provided. SMR Projects will not be permitted to move to the next stage if the information is not provided or if the Proponent is unable or unwilling to provide the information. Where a response is incomplete, CNL may provide feedback and seek further information from the Proponent, or may reject the response outright.

Please complete questions G1 to G3. **Note that a maximum page limit of three (3) pages is specified for criterion G3.**

Where a consortium, joint venture, alliance or similar approach is proposed, each consortium member must include General Proponent Information and copies of financial statements as applicable as part of the response package.

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|----------------|--|
| G1 - Proponent Entity Details | | | |
| Please provide the following information about the Proponent: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name; • Address; • Town / City; • Postal Code; • Country; • Website (if available); and • Key Contact for the SMR Project (i.e., name, position & contact information). Updates on any changes are required for Stage 2. | N/A | PASS – Stage 1 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided sufficiently describes the Proponent Entity. |
| | | PASS – Stage 2 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), theThe updated information provided sufficiently describes the Proponent Entity. |
| | | FAIL | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided does not sufficiently describe the Proponent Entity. |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|----------------|---|
| Legal Structure of Entity | | | |
| <p>Set out the legal structure of the Proponent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private or Public limited corporation, partnership, joint venture or other special purpose vehicle • Provide the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Date and place of formation; ○ Date of registration and registration number (provide certificates of registration, if applicable); ○ Registered office address; ○ Provide all extra-jurisdictional registrations; ○ Where the Proponent is a member of a consortium, joint venture or other arrangement, provide details of relationship between the parties including, i) leading entity, ii) direct, indirect holdings / shareholding between the parties; and ○ Intention of Proponent for changes to structure for SMR Project, i.e. creation of special purpose vehicle, etc. <p>Updates on any changes are required for Stage 2.</p> | N/A | PASS – Stage 1 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided is sufficient to describe the legal structure and or proposed relationships of the Parties making the application. |
| | | PASS – Stage 2 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the updated information provided is sufficient to describe the legal structure and or proposed relationships of the Parties making the application. |
| | | FAIL | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the Proponent has not provided sufficient relevant information to describe the legal structure and/or proposed relationships of the Parties making the application. |
| Organizational Structure | | | |
| <p>Provide a diagram and statement illustrating the ownership and high-level management structure of the Proponent and its key project partners, affiliated and associated entities, and shareholders that have a controlling interest, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name, nationality and residential address of board of directors / senior management and all major (>20%) shareholders or stakeholders; and • Information describing any parent, guarantors, subsidiaries or affiliated entities. <p>Updates on any changes are required for Stage 2.</p> | N/A | PASS – Stage 1 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided is sufficient. |
| | | PASS – Stage 2 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the updated information provided is sufficient. |
| | | FAIL | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response does not provide sufficient information to describe the organizational structure of the Entity. |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|----------------|---|
| Proponent Information, Formation and History | | | |
| Provide a brief history of the Proponent and/or any key consortium members, as well as information of all associated / affiliated entities that have a controlling interest, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification and details of board of directors / senior management; • Identification and details of major (>20%) shareholders or stakeholders; • Description (name, address and controlling shareholder(s) if a guarantor is not individual) respecting guarantors (if any); • Any changes of ownership over the last 5 years; • Prospective take-over bids, buy-outs; • In respect of Proponent, board of directors / senior management, address any major litigation, material agreements, bankruptcies or pending closures; and • A description of the relevant experience and competences of the Proponent. Updates on any changes are required for Stage 2. | N/A | PASS – Stage 1 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided is sufficient. |
| | | PASS – Stage 2 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the updated information provided is sufficient. |
| | | FAIL | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response does not provide sufficient information, such that it fundamentally undermines confidence in the ability of the Proponent to deliver the SMR Project. |
| G2 - Key Project Partners, Shareholders and Suppliers | | | |
| Stage 1: Provide information about key project partners and any other organizations that provide the following support/input to the SMR Project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant of any regulatory licences at any stage of the SMR Project. • Lead and/or key developers of the reactor technology. • Project manager. | N/A | PASS – Stage 1 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided is sufficient to demonstrate an appropriate structure and credibility of key partners, shareholders and suppliers with sufficient relevant experience and capability to deliver the totality of the SMR Project. |
| | | PASS – Stage 2 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the updated information provided is sufficient to demonstrate an appropriate structure and credibility of key partners, shareholders and suppliers with sufficient relevant experience and capability to deliver the totality of the SMR Project. |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|-------------|---|
| <p>a) For each key project partner please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role and rationale for inclusion of the key project partner; • A description of the relevant experience and competences of the key project partner; and • The information shall be consistent with the Proponents Organizational Structure in Response Requirement G1. <p>Proponents should note that experience provided within this question G2 will be need to be consistent with other questions and criteria as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operator and licensing experience: criterion T4 - Licensing Approach, Experience and Risks • Nuclear reactor design and development: criterion T7- Technology Readiness and Feasibility • Project management: criterion T9 - Credible Path to Manufacturing, Construction and Commissioning • Management of spent fuel and non-spent fuel wastes and decommissioning, T10, T11, and T12, respectfully. <p>b) Canadian partnerships:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide a list of current or anticipated Canadian partners (include location and number of employees); and • Does the proposed structure of the Entity and or its key partners include any relationships with Indigenous communities or organizations, either business, employment or training focused? If so, please provide details (scope, value and conditions). If not, what measures would you undertake to establish such partnerships? | | <p>FAIL</p> | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response does not provided sufficient information to demonstrate an appropriate structure and credibility of key partners, shareholders and suppliers with sufficient relevant experience and capability to deliver the totality of the SMR Project.</p> |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|--|---|
| Stage 2: Provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updates on any changes as applicable; and • Letters of support from the key project partners including information and timescales associated with setting out formal binding agreements. | | | |
| G3 – SMR Project Description Summary | | | |
| Provide a summary of the SMR Project (maximum 5 pages) that includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of the Proponents’ strategic objectives, drivers and outcomes envisaged for the SMR Project • A description of reactor technology, including an overview of the reactor design, including: coolant, fuel type and enrichment, safety systems, waste streams, temperatures, physical size, and thermal and electrical power output; • A description of the overall facility, including the balance of plant and any other buildings or facilities that would be sited; • An overview of the business case, including the target market, opportunities and risks; • A high-level schedule of the SMR Project; and • A high-level overview of costs and financing strategy. • Why the Proponent considers their proposed solution represents a credible technology and approach to a successful SMR project. The SMR Project Description may be revised at the discretion of the Proponent when applying for Stage 2. CNL may request an interview and/or presentation from the Proponent and/or any key project partners at any or all stages. | N/A | PASS – Stage 1 PASS – Stage 2 FAIL | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided demonstrates a credible and deployable SMR technology with associated outline business case. In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the updated information provided demonstrates a credible and deployable SMR technology with associated outline business case. In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response does not provide information that demonstrates a credible and deployable SMR technology with associated outline business case, which fundamentally undermines confidence in the ability of the Proponent to deliver the SMR Project. |

3.2 INTEGRITY AND SECURITY REQUIREMENTS

Please complete questions IS1 to IS2.

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|----------------|--|
| IS1 - National Security Review | | | |
| <p>The Proponent and any person that may at any point in the SMR Project assume a controlling interest in the Proponent, will be subject to national security review.</p> <p>This review requires that the Proponent must be an entity that is incorporated, registered in and have offices in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) a Canadian jurisdiction, or b) a jurisdiction in a country that has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. entered into a nuclear cooperation agreement with Canada; and ii. has a bilateral security instrument with the Government of Canada and (the “Permitted Countries”) such that security requirements respecting the Proponent and Key Personnel can be verified. Countries having a bilateral security instrument with the Government of Canada can be found at the following link: https://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/esc-src/international-eng.html?wbdisable=true#s9. <p>For the purpose of this review, everyone (organizations, bodies corporate, firms, partnerships, associations of persons, parent companies) controls the Proponent if they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) own, directly or indirectly, 50% or more of the voting shares of the Proponent; or (b) have a right or option that is exercisable to own 50% or more of the voting shares of the Proponent, (each a “Key Person” and together “Key Persons”). | N/A | PASS – Stage 1 | The Proponent and its parents and key project partners meet the national security requirements. |
| | | PASS – Stage 2 | The Proponent and its parents and key project partners meet the national security requirements. |
| | | FAIL | The Proponent and/or its parents and/or its key project partners do not meet the national security requirements. |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|----------------------|
| <p>Screening requirements also include, for all directors, officers and individual controlling shareholders, (a) a clear criminal records check, and (b) review of a minimum of five (5) year employment, family and known association history. A factor for this review will be the availability of evidence of nationality or a minimum of five (5) years permanent residence for each such individual in one of the Permitted Countries.</p> <p>Information must be provided as required by CNL to assess security requirements for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the Proponent; and b) senior management and board of directors as well as any person or affiliated persons who, directly or indirectly, hold a controlling interest in the Proponent. <p>Stage 2: CNL requires completion of a security screening form for each individual who is, a director/officer, member of senior management or, directly or indirectly, a controlling shareholder. This form contains permission to perform a criminal record check. This form is not attached as part of this package, and must be obtained by Proponents by emailing smr@cnl.ca.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, all Proponents and Key Persons will be subject to review pursuant to Canada’s nuclear safety, non-proliferation and security considerations. CNL will, in its sole and absolute discretion, consider and determine whether each Respondent meets the national security requirements and is eligible to continue to participate in the process.</p> <p>The Proponent, by submitting a Response, acknowledges its acceptance of the National Security Requirements assessment process and that Canada’s determination resulting from that process is final.</p> | | | |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|----------------|---|
| IS2 – Integrity Screening | | | |
| <p>As this process relates to lands owned by AECL, an integrity screening will be undertaken as follows.</p> <p>CNL shall screen Proponents for integrity starting in Stage 1. Proponents will be required to continue to meet the integrity requirements throughout the process.</p> <p>This screening involves review of each director/officer and member of senior management, and each individual who is, directly or indirectly, a controlling shareholder of the Proponent, for criminal convictions that have not been pardoned respecting charges and convictions of offences in respect of fraud, bribery, corruption and bid rigging, including the following offences, or their equivalent in another country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) paragraph 80(1)(d) (<i>False entry, certificate or return</i>), subsection 80(2) (<i>Fraud against Her Majesty</i>) or section 154.01 (<i>Fraud against Her Majesty</i>) of the <i>Financial Administration Act</i>, or b) section 121 (<i>Frauds on the government and Contractor subscribing to election fund</i>), section 124 (<i>Selling or Purchasing Office</i>), section 380 (<i>Fraud</i>) for fraud committed against Her Majesty or section 418 (<i>Selling defective stores to Her Majesty</i>) of the <i>Criminal Code</i> of Canada, or c) section 119 (Bribery of judicial officers, etc.), section 120 (Bribery of officers), section 346 (Extortion), sections 366 to 368 (Forgery and other offences resembling forgery), section 382 (Fraudulent manipulation of stock exchange transactions), section 382.1 (Prohibited insider trading), section 397 (Falsification of books and documents), section 422 (Criminal breach of contract), section 426 (Secret commissions), section 462.31 (<i>Laundering proceeds of crime</i>) or sections 467.11 to 467.13 (<i>Participation in</i> | N/A | PASS - Stage 1 | The Proponent and its parents and key project partners meet the integrity requirements |
| | | PASS – Stage 2 | The Proponent and its parents and key project partners meet the integrity requirements and the information provided demonstrates appropriate processes and practices for ethical business conduct. |
| | | FAIL | <p>Stage 1: Insufficient information has been provided and/or one or more of the Proponent, its parents and key project partners do not meet the integrity requirements.</p> <p>Stage 2: As per Stage 1, and the response does not include sufficient evidence of ethical business conduct processes and practices.</p> |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|----------------------|
| <p><i>activities of criminal organization</i>) of the Criminal Code of Canada, or</p> <p>d) section 45 (<i>Conspiracies, agreements or arrangements between competitors</i>), 46 (<i>Foreign directives</i>) 47 (<i>Bid rigging</i>), 49 (<i>Agreements or arrangements of federal financial institutions</i>), 52 (<i>False or misleading representation</i>), 53 (<i>Deceptive notice of winning a prize</i>) under the Competition Act, or</p> <p>e) section 239 (<i>False or deceptive statements</i>) of the Income Tax Act, or</p> <p>f) section 327 (<i>False or deceptive statements</i>) of the Excise Tax Act, or</p> <p>g) section 3 (<i>Bribing a foreign public official</i>), section 4 (<i>Accounting</i>) or section 5 (<i>Offence Committed Outside Canada</i>) of the Corruption of Foreign Public Officials Act, or</p> <p>h) section 5 (<i>Trafficking in substance</i>), section 6 (<i>Importing and exporting</i>), or section 7 (<i>Production of substance</i>) of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act.</p> <p>The Proponent certifies that, within 10 years before the date it submits its Response, neither the Proponent nor any of its directors, officers or controlling shareholders have been convicted of an offence or have received a conditional or an absolute discharge in Canada for the offences enumerated above, or under any foreign offence that Canada deems to be of similar constitutive elements to the offences enumerated above.</p> <p>Stage 2: The Proponent shall identify any relevant documentation that covers its ethical business practices including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Codes of Conduct • Anti-corruption/bribery policies <p>The response shall:</p> | | | |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|----------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Summarize how it complies, monitors, reports on such matters, and shall include a copy of such relevant documents as a reference document. Such references shall not be included within the page count.Confirm how such arrangements are commutated and embedded within its supply chain practices; andHow it provides awareness and training within its organization including matters such as 'whistle blowing' policy. | | | |

3.3 ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL STANDING

Part 3 comprises mandatory information, which at Stage 1 may include preliminary arrangements or strategies that are yet to be fully realized. Where the information is preliminary or untested, this should be highlighted. CNL will work with Proponents that have passed the pre-qualification stage to assess their readiness and fiscal and technical capabilities as part of its due diligence for Stage 2.

Please provide the information requested in EF1 to EF6. Gaps should be discussed, including potential solutions and timelines.

Where a consortium, joint venture, alliance or similar approach is proposed, each consortium member must include copies of financial statements as applicable as part of the response package.

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|----------------|---|
| EF1 - Financial Information - Successive Assurances and Financial Guarantees | | | |
| SMR Project Costs | | | |
| <p><i>Stage 1: SMR Project costs, financial arrangements, gaps and challenges.</i></p> <p>a) Provide a comprehensive financial summary that demonstrates sufficient knowledge of the entire life cycle costs of the SMR Project, as well as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of the intended financing model; • An acknowledgement that the project financing must be sufficient to return the site to an agreed original state at any point in the SMR Project should the SMR Project be abandoned; and • Identification of any key project partners, shareholders (>20%), investors and stakeholders in the SMR Project and an overview of the arrangements with those investors, if available. • Any key assumption or risks associated with financing of the SMR Project. | N/A | PASS – Stage 1 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided gives confidence that the life cycle costs are understood, as there is an appropriate proposed funding model to support the SMR project without risk or liability to CNL including a clear understanding any funding gaps or challenges that may currently exist. |
| | | PASS - Stage 2 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided gives confidence that the life cycle costs are understood, and that there is a sufficient plan in place with reasonable likelihood of achieving the funding without risk or liability to CNL. Furthermore, the Proponent has demonstrated it can achieve sufficient financial stability required to deliver the scope of the SMR Project according to the proposed SMR Project schedule. |
| | | FAIL | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response does not provide sufficient information, such that it undermines confidence in the ability of the Proponent to deliver the SMR Project and/or demonstrates that the Proponent does not understand the life cycle costs, and/or the Proponent does not demonstrate sufficient financial stability. |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|----------------------|
| <p>b) Financial Gaps and Challenges: This section is collected for information only in Stage 1 and will not be used as part of the evaluation. Gaps in financing will not impact the results of Stage 1 evaluation, but may limit movement through Stage 2. CNL encourages all Proponents, including those who require support, to respond. This is very important information for CNL. Information should be provided regarding funding gaps, and if additional outside funding sources or support are required. Possible areas of supports include: policy; legislative; regulatory; liability; financial (e.g. power purchase agreement, support for licencing costs, support for first-of-a-kind costs, support to for waste management and decommissioning costs, etc.). Please consider the following questions in your response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What level of additional funding would allow your SMR Project to proceed? How much of this required funding do you estimate would be available from third parties. Would there still be a gap to be filled? • How would the availability of additional outside funding amend your business case, schedule, etc.? • Discuss any funding gaps that may exist with respect to waste management liabilities, decommissioning liabilities, and support through the regulatory process. • For the various types of support listed, identify those that are likely to enable you to secure further third party (i.e. non-Government) sources of funding/financing. • Identify access to capital that is not reflected in the financial statements or other information provided. | | | |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|-------|----------------------|
| <p>If this information is provided elsewhere in the response, for example, in response to T5, the response here may reference to that information.</p> <p><i>Stage 2: SMR Project costs, financial arrangements, gaps and challenges.</i> Updates must be provided to the information provided in the Stage 1 response. This criterion will be reassessed based on those updates according to the assessment benchmark provided opposite.</p> <p><i>Stage 2: Financial health and stability</i> Note: there is no Stage 1 requirement for this sub-criterion. At Stage 2 the response should provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audited financial statements for the last three (3) years, (where available); or where not available, financial statements for the last three (3) years, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Prepared by the Proponent’s outside accounting firm; or ○ Prepared in-house (if no external statements have been prepared). ○ In all cases, the accounts shall include the balance sheet, the statement of retained earnings, the cash flow statement, the income statement and any notes to the statements. • Certification from the Chief Financial Officer or an authorized signing officer of the Proponent that the financial information provided is complete and accurate, including disclosure of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Any material existing or potential claims, litigation or proceedings against the Proponent. In the event that there are material existing or potential claims, litigation or proceedings, the Proponent is requested to | | | |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|----------------------|
| <p>describe how such potential damages will be supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Confirmation that there is no material adverse change that is not otherwise disclosed in the financial information. ○ Confirmation of no material off-balance sheet financing arrangements not reflected in information already provided. ● Profit and loss projections and cash flow forecasts over the years of the SMR Project, including all assumptions behind these projection statements. A greater level of detail should be provided for the cash flow projections for the first two years of the SMR Project. ● For entities debt-rated by a credit rating agency, a copy of the most recent credit rating report (including credit warnings produced since the publication of said report) from each agency that rates the Proponent’s debt, or confirmation that no such ratings exist. <p>All of the documents provided in support of responses to <i>Stage 2: Financial health and stability</i> are excluded from the page limit.</p> | | | |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|----------------|---|
| EF2 - Conflicts of Interest | | | |
| <p>CNL recognizes that its agreements with AECL and management arrangement through Canadian National Energy Alliance (hereinafter “CNEA”), which is comprised of CH2M HILL Canada Limited / Jacobs Engineering Group Inc., Fluor Government Group – Canada, Inc., Atkins Energy Canada Group Limited and SNC-Lavalin Inc., could potentially cause conflicts of interest. CNL does not consider this to represent a factor that would disqualify a Proponent, but does require assurance of robust arrangements in place to manage such conflicts. A full list of affiliated companies can be found on CNL’s Vendor Portal. http://www.cnl.ca/en/home/vendor_portal/references.aspx</p> | | | |
| <p>a) Identify any key shareholders, partners, contractors, vendors or suppliers that include CNEA affiliates; and b) Identify any key personnel of the Proponent that currently or within five (5) years have held positions with a CNL or CNEA affiliate.</p> <p>If any potential conflict of interest is identified, please provide detailed arrangements of how such conflict would be managed to maintain the integrity of the application process and any subsequent agreements.</p> | N/A | PASS – Stage 1 | There are no conflicts of interest, or in the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided represents a robust proposal for maintaining information barriers and gives confidence in managing any potential conflicts of interest. |
| | | PASS – Stage 2 | As per Stage 1. |
| | | FAIL | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), sufficient information has not been provided or the information provided does not demonstrate a robust proposal for maintaining sufficient internal partitions and/or give confidence in managing any potential conflicts of interest. |
| EF3 – Insurance | | | |
| <p>Provide details of any proposed or existing insurance program for each stage of the SMR Project development including:</p> <p>a) Type of insurances; b) Level of coverage; c) Proposed insurer, brokers or underwriters; and d) A brief rationale for the insurances provided under the program.</p> <p>At Stage 2 updates on the intended insurance program should be provided.</p> | N/A | PASS- Stage 1 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided presents a sound strategy for the intended insurance program. |
| | | PASS- Stage 2 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the updated information provided presents a sound plan for insurance coverage. |
| | | FAIL | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response does not provide sufficient information, such that it fundamentally undermines confidence in the ability of the Proponent to put in place appropriate insurance coverage. |
| EF4 – Spent Fuel Waste Management: Financial | | | |
| <p>The intention of this criterion is to understand the costs and financing of the costs associated with spent fuel waste. The strategies/plans to store and dispose of that waste shall be addressed in criterion T10.</p> <p>Stage 1: The response should include:</p> | 35 | 5 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information which: Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates that the Proponent has a well-developed and sound strategy to address those costs, including any evidence of where it has managed such previous similar liabilities and cost (if available); and |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|-------|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy in which the Proponent intends to cover the costs of management and disposal of spent fuel wastes, that includes how will those funds be managed, and how the funds will be governed to ensure that they are available when needed. • A statement confirming the intent to take full responsibility for all spent fuel costs associated with the SMR Project from a complete life cycle point of view. <p>Stage 2: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any updates to the Statement of Intent provided in Stage 1. • Preliminary cost estimates for spent fuel waste management and disposal throughout the life cycle of the SMR Project. • Updates to strategy provided in the Stage 1 response, as applicable, in which the Proponent describes how it intends to cover the costs of management and disposal of spent fuel wastes, how the funds will be managed and invested, and how the funds will be governed to ensure that they are available when needed. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The statement of intent is provided and it states the Proponent intends to cover all costs. <p>Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates that the Proponent has reasonable and well justified cost estimates for spent fuel waste management and disposal throughout the life cycle of the SMR Project; and • Demonstrates that the Proponent has a sound plan for addressing the costs of spent fuel waste management and disposal; and commensurate with the stage of SMR Project development; and • Updates to statement of intent are provided if required |
| | | 3 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information which:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates that the Proponent has an understanding of spent fuel waste management costs and a basic and reasonable strategy to address those costs; and • The statement of intent is provided with recognized gaps in covering costs. <p>Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes a cost estimate for spent fuel waste management and disposal throughout the life cycle of the SMR Project, but these cost estimates may be partial, insufficiently justified or have some gaps at this time; and/or • Demonstrates that the Proponent has a reasonable plan for addressing the costs of spent fuel waste management and disposal commensurate with the stage of SMR Project development; and • Updates to statement of intent are provided if required. |
| | | 1 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information which:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates that the Proponent does not have an adequate strategy to address those costs; and/or |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The statement of intent cannot be provided at the time of the application. <p>Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates that the Proponent either has no cost estimates for spent fuel waste management and disposal, or cost estimates are materially incomplete, not credible or reasonably justified; and/or • Demonstrates that the Proponent has either no plan or an insufficient plan for addressing the costs of spent fuel waste management and disposal; and • The statement of intent is no longer valid and updates were not provided. |
| EF5 – Non-Spent Fuel Waste Management: Financial | | | |
| <p>The intention of this criterion is to understand the costs and financing of the costs associated with non-spent fuel waste. The Proponent’s strategies/plans to store and dispose of that waste shall be addressed in criterion T11.</p> <p>This criterion considers all non-spent fuel wastes, i.e. low-, intermediate- and high-level wastes.</p> <p>Stage 1: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy by which the Proponent intends to cover the costs of management and disposal of non-spent fuel wastes, how will those funds be managed, and how will those funds be governed to ensure that they are available when needed. • A statement confirming the intent to take full responsibility for the costs of all non-spent fuel waste management associated with the SMR Project from a complete life cycle point of view. <p>Stage 2: The response should include:</p> | 35 | 5 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information which:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates that the Proponent has a well-developed and sound strategy to address those costs including any evidence of where it has managed such previous similar costs (if available); and • The statement of intent is provided and it states the Proponent intends to cover all costs. <p>Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates that the Proponent has reasonable and well justified cost estimates for waste management and disposal of non-fuel wastes throughout the life cycle of the SMR Project; and • Demonstrates that the Proponent has a sound plan for addressing the costs of management and disposal of non-spent fuel wastes commensurate with the stage of SMR Project development; and • Updates to statement of intent are provided. |
| | | 3 | <p>The response provides information which:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|-------|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any updates to the Statement of Intent provided in Stage 1. • Preliminary cost estimates for waste management and disposal throughout the life cycle of the SMR Project for all levels of non-fuel waste. • Information on how the costs of non-spent fuel waste management and disposal will be met, including an explanation of how spent fuel waste management and disposal will be funded. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates that the Proponent has an understanding of the costs associated with the of management and disposal of non-spent fuel wastes and has a basic and reasonable strategy to address those costs; and • The statement of intent is provided with recognized gaps in covering costs. <p>Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes a cost estimate for waste management and disposal of non-fuel wastes throughout the life cycle of the SMR Project, but these cost estimates may be partial, insufficiently justified or have some gaps; • Demonstrates that the Proponent has a reasonable plan for addressing the costs of waste management and disposal of non-fuel wastes commensurate with the stage of SMR Project development; and, • Updates to statement of intent are provided. |
| | | 1 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information which:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates that the Proponent has not adequately considered the costs of management and disposal of non-spent fuel wastes and does not have an adequate strategy to address those costs; and/or • The statement of intent cannot be provided at the time of the application. <p>Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates that the Proponent either has no cost estimates for waste management and disposal of non-fuel wastes or cost estimates that are materially incomplete, are not credible; not well justified and/or • Demonstrates that the Proponent either has no plan or an insufficient plan for addressing the costs of waste management and disposal of non-fuel wastes; and/or • The statement of intent is no longer valid and updates were not provided. |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|-------|--|
| EF6 - Decommissioning: Financial | | | |
| <p>The intention of this criterion is to understand the costs and financing of the costs associated with decommissioning and site remediation. The strategies/plans to decommission the facility and remediate the site are addressed in criterion T12.</p> <p>Stage 1: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The strategy by which the costs of decommissioning and site remediation are intended to be covered, how will those funds be managed, and how will those funds be governed to ensure that they are available when needed. A statement confirming the intent to take full responsibility for all decommissioning, site remediation and disposal costs associated with the SMR Project from a complete life cycle point of view. <p>Stage 2: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any updates to the Statement of Intent provided in Stage 1. A preliminary cost estimate decommissioning the reactor building and support facilities. Information on how the costs of decommissioning and disposal will be met by the SMR Project, including an explanation of how decommissioning and disposal of the reactor will be funded. | 30 | 5 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information which:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates that the Proponent has a well-developed and sound strategy to address those costs including any evidence of where it has managed such previous similar costs (if available); and The statement of intent is provided and it states the Proponent intends to cover all costs. <p>Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates that the Proponent has reasonable and well justified cost estimates for decommissioning the reactor and support facilities; and Demonstrates that the Proponent has a sound plan for addressing the costs of decommissioning commensurate with the stage of SMR Project development; and, Updates to statement of intent are provided. |
| | | 3 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information which:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates that the Proponent has an understanding of the costs associated with decommissioning and has a basic and reasonable strategy to address those costs; and, The statement of intent is provided with recognized gaps in covering costs. <p>Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes a cost estimate for decommissioning, but these cost estimates may be partial, insufficiently justified or have some gaps; and Demonstrates that the Proponent has a reasonable plan for addressing the costs of decommissioning commensurate with the stage of SMR Project development; and, Updates to statement of intent are provided |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|----------------------|-----------|-------|--|
| | | 1 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information which:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates that the Proponent does not have an adequate strategy to address those costs; and/or• The statement of intent cannot be provided at the time of the application. <p>Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates that the Proponent either has no cost estimates for decommissioning or cost estimates that are materially incomplete are not credible, or reasonably justified ; and/or• Demonstrates that the Proponent either has no plan or an insufficient plan for addressing the costs of decommissioning; and/or• The statement of intent is no longer valid and updates were not provided. |

3.4 TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

Evaluation of technical requirements will demonstrate to CNL that the Proponent, along with key project partners, has the appropriate technology, experience, knowledge, capabilities, capacity and appropriate arrangements to deliver the SMR Project.

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|---|
| T1 - Benefits to Canada | | | |
| As the SMR is to be sited on Crown land, the SMR Project must have substantial benefit to Canada and to Canadians. | | | |
| <p>The response shall set out an initial benefit realization plan and any relevant benefits that the SMR technology is envisioned to provide to Canada and Canadians. The response may refer to the SMR demonstration project and/or the commercial deployment phase, and should also describe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimates of the value the SMR Project will have in Canada vs. internationally expressed as a percentage; • What potential end user(s) in Canada been identified? If so, explain how they be engaged in the SMR Project to ensure market preparedness? If not, please provide further details on any near term activities to engage end users. • How will this SMR Project will contribute to the development of the Canadian supply chain? (both for the demonstration unit itself and in the broader business operations including international opportunities) The response shall consider the full extent of the supply chain including small, medium and local businesses. • Projections for economic benefits to Canada including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ anticipated number of jobs to be created, ○ anticipated capital investments, ○ research and development expenditures. ○ Socio economic contribution to local communities including direct and indirect benefits | 25 | 5 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information that displays a thorough plan that could provide significant benefits to Canada from both an economic and social perspective and a comprehensive understanding of the environment in which they will be operating. |
| | | 3 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information that demonstrates an understanding and willingness to undertake measures to provide enhanced benefits to Canada from both a social and economic perspective including a generally good understanding of the environment in which they would be operating. |
| | | 1 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides limited information of the benefits to Canada, or a clear understanding of the environment in which they would be operating. |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|----------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a brief explanation of how such benefits have been derived • Describe any plans relating to a Canadian export strategy? Include estimates for the size of the export market and any relevant research undertaken that supports your strategy. • How will this SMR Project enhance Canada’s international competitiveness? • How will this technology advance Canadian scientific capabilities? • What is the potential for development of intellectual property to the benefit of Canada? • Describe how this SMR Project supports Canada’s climate change and sustainability objectives? • Describe any other benefits to Canada. • Identify any particular benefits envisaged with Indigenous communities consistent with the current or anticipated Canadian partners, and partnerships with Indigenous communities or other organizations provided in response to criterion G2. <p>The benefits plan may include both qualitative and quantitative benefits and shall identify not only the benefit, but also a brief explanation of how such benefits will be derived and any key enabling activities to support realizing such benefits.</p> <p>At Stage 2, updates should be provided to the information provided in the Stage 1 response demonstrating further development and refinement of the Benefits Realization Plan. This criterion will be reassessed based on those updates according to the same assessment benchmark provided opposite.</p> | | | |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|---|
| T2 - Benefits to CNL | | | |
| The SMR Project must be good for CNL and contribute to CNL's purpose, mission and vision. ¹ | | | |
| <p>The response should describe the benefits that the SMR Project is envisioned to provide to CNL, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the SMR Project will contribute to CNL's vision: <i>Canadian Nuclear Laboratories is a world-class, sustainable national nuclear laboratory delivering science and technology structured to meet current, and adapt to changing, Canadian federal, global commercial, and public priorities in four program areas: Energy, Health, Environment, and Safety & Security.</i> • Any contracts that are anticipated to be placed with CNL, for example, for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Research and development (R&D). ○ Use of support services ○ Any other potential revenue streams • Potential for new S&T facilities / capabilities at CNL such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fuel fabrication; ○ Training facilities; and ○ Ancillary S&T facilities that use SMR outputs (e.g. heat). • Any other financial or non-financial benefits that you anticipate your SMR Project will bring to CNL. <p>At Stage 2, updates should be provided to the information provided in the Stage 1 response. This criterion will be reassessed based on those updates according to the same assessment benchmark provided opposite.</p> | 20 | 5 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information that displays comprehensive and credible benefits to CNL. |
| | | 3 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information that displays benefit to CNL. |
| | | 1 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides limited information to demonstrate benefits to CNL. |

¹ These can be found in Canadian Nuclear Laboratories, "2016-2026 10-Year Integrated Plan Summary", CRL-502000-PLA, Rev. 0, April 2017, available at www.cnl.ca

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|---|
| T3 – Stakeholder Engagement and Corporate Social Responsibility | | | |
| Engagement of Indigenous communities and stakeholders, including surrounding communities, local governments, businesses and civil society bodies is of critical importance to CNL, and to the success of the SMR Project. | | | |
| <p>a) <i>Stakeholder engagement</i></p> <p>Stage 1: The response should provide the proposed strategy on how the Proponent, or the key project partner who will be the licence applicant, will work with CNL to engage all stakeholders including: surrounding communities, regional and local governments, businesses, and, provincial and federal governments. The strategy also needs to describe how the Proponent, or the key project partner who will be the licence applicant, will engage with Indigenous communities. The engagement strategy should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider any Policy or Process documentation to be used by the Proponent including clear goals and expectations for Stakeholder Management. • Provide transparency and clear communications • Recognize the importance of local stakeholders, and engagement with Indigenous peoples. • Engage stakeholders in a manner that will be supportive of CNL’s brand and respectful of CNL’s long established relationships. • Align communications activities with CNL to ensure consistency in messaging and maintain the integrity and respect CNL has established with stakeholders • Conduct public interactions in a manner that supports CNL’s broader operations and objectives, both socially and economically. • Demonstrate the ability to balance opposing interests and agenda of different stakeholder groups. | 15 | 5 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A proposed stakeholder strategy demonstrates a thorough and comprehensive understanding of the stakeholder environment in which the Proponent, or the key project partner who will be the licence applicant, will be working • The strategy and proposed approach is consistent with good industry practices for effective stakeholder engagement and management. • A corporate social responsibility description that provides a clear and strong vision and/or program in support of sustainable corporate social responsibility including a description of how the Proponent, or the relevant key project partner, will address the protection and/or enhancement of the natural and socio-economic environment. • Robust supporting evidence of relevant stakeholder engagement and CSR programs have been clearly demonstrated. <p>Stage 2: As per Stage 1, based on more developed and refined strategy and approach commensurate with the stage of the SMR Project.</p> |
| | | 3 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A proposed stakeholder strategy that demonstrates an appropriate understanding with limited gaps in the understanding of the stakeholder environment in which the Proponent, or the key project partner who will be the licence applicant, will be working. • The strategy and proposed approach is broadly consistent with good industry practices for effective stakeholder engagement and management. |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|--|
| <p>In support of the credibility of the strategy, the response shall provide supporting evidence of prior experience in Stakeholder Management in a similar and relevant context. The response shall also describe the outcomes of such stakeholder engagement including any lessons learned and how these may be applied to the SMR Project</p> <p>Stage 2: Responses should provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any updates to the information provided in Stage 1. • Any planned engagement activities in the next 6 months. <p>b) <i>Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)</i></p> <p>Stage 1: The response should include the vision and or program in support of their corporate social responsibility undertakings including a description of how the Proponent, or the relevant key project partner, will address the protection and/or enhancement of the natural and socio-economic environment in which they operate in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>The response shall clearly set out relevant responsible business policies and practices in support of these requirements as well as evidence of its prior experience in a similar and relevant context. The response shall also describe the outcomes of its approach to CSR including any lessons learned and how these may be applied to the SMR Project</p> <p>Stage 2: The response should provide any updates and refinement to the information provided in Stage 1.</p> | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A corporate social responsibility description with a rough vision and/or program in support of corporate social responsibility including a description of how the Proponent, or the relevant key project partner, will address the protection and/or enhancement of the natural and socio-economic environment. • Some relevant supporting evidence of relevant stakeholder engagement and CSR programs has been provided. <p>Stage 2: As per Stage 1, based on more developed and refined Strategy and Approach.</p> <p>1</p> <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A proposed stakeholder strategy that does not recognize or demonstrate a clear understanding of the stakeholder environment in which the Proponent, or the key project partner who will be the licence applicant, will be working • The strategy and proposed approach is not aligned with good industry practices for effective stakeholder engagement and management and/or contains omissions or inconsistencies in the proponents approach • A corporate social responsibility description that does not outline a vision and/or program in support of corporate social responsibility and/or no description of how the Proponent, or the relevant key project partner, will address the protection and/or enhancement of the natural and socio-economic environment. • Limited or no supporting evidence of relevant stakeholder engagement and CSR programs has been provided. <p>Stage 2: As per Stage 1, and/or the planned engagement activities are inappropriate or inadequate for the stage of the SMR Project.</p> |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|---|
| T4 – Licensing Approach, Experience and Risks | | | |
| It is important for CNL to secure confidence in a Proponent’s, or the relevant key project partner’s, ability to meet the requirements of the Nuclear Safety and Control Act and the associated regulations and that the Proponent, or relevant key project partner, will be able to attain the required licences throughout the complete SMR Project life cycle. | | | |
| <p>a) <i>Licensing Approach and Experience:</i> Stage 1: The response should provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear documentation on who will be the licence applicant at various stages of the SMR Project life cycle. The roles and responsibilities for all parties that will obtain a licence should be clear and documented. • Documentation that clearly identifies the strategy for conducting an Environmental Assessment, the Environmental Risk Assessment and the Site Selection Threat and Risk Assessment. • A list of Regulatory Documents and other Federal legislation that the Proponent, or the key project partner that will be the licence applicant, has identified to which their SMR Project will be subject. This list should include inter alia: all regulations pertaining to the design, construction, operation and decommissioning of a nuclear reactor facility, transportation of radioactive material, safeguards, environmental, etc. | 5 | 5 | <p>Stage 1: In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides a clear and comprehensive strategy and sufficient information for CNL to be confident that the Proponent, or relevant key project partner, understands the Canadian regulatory process and requirements, has a reasonable approach and understands and is managing risks associated with licensing</p> <p>Stage 2: In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides sufficient information for CNL to be confident that the Proponent, or relevant key project partner, understands the Canadian regulatory process and requirements, has a reasonable approach, has people with experience operating nuclear reactors, and understands and is managing risks associated with licensing.</p> <p>The following examples are provided to indicate what the evaluator(s) may take into consideration to award a score of 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provided lists are >80% complete • The SMR Project is employing experts that are familiar with Canadian Regulatory environment – senior team member(s) have >10 years of experience licensing nuclear facilities in Canada • Licensing experience outside Canada – limited experience >5 years • The proposed operator currently holds or can demonstrate the ability to hold, a licence to operate a nuclear reactor facility in Canada • Updates on pre-licensing engagements have been provided, if applicable. |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|-------------------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Proponent, or relevant key project partner, has an understanding of the regulatory regime in Canada. This may be experience of the Proponent or key project partners, or externally contracted subject matter experts; • Information, as applicable, regarding the experience of the Proponent, or relevant key project partner, in any other licensing regimes in which they have previously worked, e.g. US, UK, France, etc.; and • Information regarding whether the proposed operator currently holds a licence to operate a nuclear facility, and if so, what type of licence and where. <p>The experience of the Key Partner that is to be the reactor operator, which was provided in response to criterion G2 b), will be included in the evaluation of this criterion.</p> <p>Stage 2: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any updates to the information provided in Stage 1. • Documentation that shows that the parties involved are in agreement with these roles and responsibilities. • Documentation that clearly identifies the plans for conducting an Environmental Assessment, the Environmental Risk Assessment and the Site Selection Threat and Risk Assessment. • Status and results, if available, of the Proponent’s (or the key project partner that will be the licence applicant) pre-licensing engagements with the CNSC, as described in REGDOC-3.5.1, Licensing Process for Class I Nuclear Facilities and Uranium Mines and Mills, version 2. <p>The list of regulatory documents and other federal or provincial legislation provided in support of this criterion is excluded from the page limit.</p> | | <p>3</p> <p>1</p> | <p>Stage 1: In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides a generally well-developed strategy and information for CNL to have reasonable confidence that the Proponent, or relevant key project partner, understands the Canadian regulatory process and requirements, and understands and is managing risks associated with licensing.</p> <p>Stage 2: In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides some information for CNL to have some level of confidence that the Proponent, or relevant key project partner, understands the Canadian regulatory process and requirements, has experience operating nuclear reactors, and understands and is managing risks associated with licensing.</p> <p>The following examples are provided to indicate what the evaluator(s) may take into consideration to award a score of 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provided lists are 60-80% complete • The SMR Project is employing experts that are familiar with Canadian Regulatory environment – senior team member(s) have 5-10 years of licensing for nuclear facilities • There is some licensing experience outside of Canada (<3 years) • The proposed operator currently does not hold a licence to operate a nuclear reactor facility in Canada but does hold a licence outside of Canada <p>Stage 1: In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides insufficient information for CNL to have confidence that the Proponent, or relevant key project partner, understands the Canadian regulatory process and requirements, and/or understands and is managing risks associated with licensing. The response contains omissions or a material omission that would undermine confidence in the proponent approach.</p> <p>Stage 2: In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides insufficient information for CNL to have confidence that the Proponent, or relevant key project partner, understands the Canadian regulatory process and requirements, and the proposed operator has very limited or no experience operating nuclear reactors. The response provides insufficient information for</p> |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|--|
| <p>b) <i>Licensing Risks</i></p> <p>Stage 1: The response should include a licensing risk matrix or equivalent that identifies the issues that have been identified and that pose a licensing risk and how these risks are being managed.</p> <p>Stage 2: Responses should include updates as applicable to the information provided in Stage 1.</p> | | | <p>CNL to have any confidence that the risks associated with licensing are understood and/or being managed.</p> <p>The following examples are provided to indicate what the evaluator(s) may take into consideration to award a score of 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provided lists are <60% complete • The SMR Project is employing experts that are familiar with Canadian Regulatory environment – senior team member(s) have <5 years of licensing for nuclear facilities • Licensing experience outside Canada – very limited experience <3 years |
| T5 - Business Case and Potential for Commercial Deployment Success | | | |
| CNL requires confidence that the SMR Project has a strong business case and that the technology has a strong potential for success when deployed commercially, both nationally and Internationally. | | | |
| <p>The response should include outline business case setting out the strategic, economic, commercial, affordability and achievability cases for the SMR project, which includes:</p> <p>a) A market analysis showing the potential for commercial deployment of this technology, both in Canada and in potential export markets. The response may reference material in T1 as appropriate</p> <p>b) A high-level cost estimate for the SMR Project including where available:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Costs for fuel, refuelling ii. The capital cost to build all facilities iii. Expected operation program and costs, expected staffing level. <p>c) Any proposals or future plans to restructure, partner or enter into arrangements with third parties in order to execute commercialization of the SMR technology.</p> <p>d) A description of business risks</p> <p>e) A description of business opportunities</p> <p>f) Projected revenue streams, if applicable.</p> <p>g) Any initial evaluation of return on investment and payback periods.</p> | 10 | 5 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information that is sufficient to determine that there is a very strong chance of commercial viability |
| | | 3 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information that is sufficient to determine that there is a good chance of commercial viability. |
| | | 1 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information that is insufficient to determine that there will be commercial viability. |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|-------|--|
| <p>h) Any further benefits not captured in T1 and T2.</p> <p>At Stage 2 the response should include the status of any negotiations with any potential customers of products from the SMR demonstration project and the business case shall move from outline to being a more developed case.</p> <p>At Stage 2, updates should be provided to the information provided in the Stage 1 response. This criterion will be reassessed based on those updates according to the same assessment benchmark provided opposite.</p> | | | |
| T6 - Schedule | | | |
| CNL requires confidence that the SMR Project has identified all the necessary activities and has a well-defined scope and schedule for the SMR Project. | | | |
| <p>Stage 1: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A schedule overview with milestones for the life cycle of the SMR. This schedule: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should include the submission of the first licensing package (Project Description and schedule of submissions for the Licence to Prepare Site) within eighteen (18) months of completion of Stage 2. ○ Should also include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Major project phases such as: R&D, design, site preparation, construction, | 5 | 5 | <p>Stage 1: In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response contains sufficient information for CNL to understand the SMR Project schedule and risks, the schedule meets CNL’s timeline requirements regarding durations of inactivity on the SMR site and the submission of the first licensing package.</p> <p>Stage 2: In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response: contains sufficient information for CNL to understand the SMR Project schedule and risks; confirms the schedule submitted in Stage 1 if applicable; provides evidence that the R&D activities, the completion of design activities, and the completion of licensing submissions are fully costed and resourced; and the schedule meets CNL’s timeline requirements regarding durations of inactivity on the SMR site and the submission of the first licensing package.</p> |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|---|
| <p>cold and hot commissioning, operation, decommissioning and abandonment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High-level activities and milestones for the completion of any R&D activities. ▪ High-level activities and milestones for the completion of design activities. ▪ High-level activities and milestones for the completion of licensing submissions ▪ Conform with CNSC nominal licensing schedules^[1]. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should not include any large gaps (> 1 year), before first operation, of inactivity on the site that are not attributable to waiting for regulatory decisions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The risk register for the life cycle of the SMR Project, including major project phases such as: R&D, design, site preparation, construction, cold and hot | | 3 | <p>Stage 1: In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response contains some information for CNL to understand the SMR Project schedule and risks; however, there is missing information and/or the timeline for submission of the first licensing submission is between 18 and 24 months following the completion of Stage 2 and/or the schedule includes some gaps (> 1 year) of inactivity on the site that are not attributable to waiting for regulatory decisions.</p> <p>Stage 2: In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response: contains some information for CNL to understand the SMR Project schedule and risks; confirms with minor discrepancies or slippages the schedule submitted in Stage 1 if applicable; provides some evidence that the R&D activities, the completion of design activities, and the completion of licensing submissions are fully costed and resourced; however, there is missing information and/or the timeline for submission of the first licensing submission is between 18 and 24 months following the completion of Stage 2 and/or the schedule includes some gaps (> 1 year) of inactivity on the site that are not attributable to waiting for regulatory decisions.</p> |

^[1] For example, as described in Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, “Licensing Process for Class I Nuclear Facilities and Uranium Mines and Mills”, REGDOC-3.5.1, version 2, May 2017.

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|-------|--|
| <p>commissioning, operation, decommissioning and abandonment.</p> <p>Stage 2: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An updated overview schedule with milestones for the life cycle of the SMR. This schedule: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should confirm the ability to meet the requirement of submission of the first licensing package (Project Description and schedule of submissions for the Licence to Prepare Site) within eighteen (18) months of the completion of Stage 2. ○ Should not include any large gaps (> 1 year) of inactivity on the site that are not attributable to waiting for regulatory decisions. ○ Should confirm the timing of the major project phases such as: R&D, design, site preparation, construction, cold and hot commissioning, operation, decommissioning and abandonment that were provided in Stage 1, if applicable. ○ Should be fully costed and resourced for: the completion of any R&D activities, the completion of design activities, and the completion of licensing submissions • An updated risk register for the life cycle of the SMR Project, including major project phases such as: R&D, design, site preparation, construction, cold and hot commissioning, operation, decommissioning and abandonment. The risk register should also provide: detailed risks for the R&D, design and licensing activities and any risks considered that may reside with CNL and/or AECL. | | 1 | <p>Stage 1: In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response does not contain sufficient information for CNL to understand the SMR Project schedule and risks; and/or considerable information is missing; and/or the timeline for submission of the first licensing submission is greater than 24 months following the completion of Stage 2; and/or the schedule includes gaps (> 1 year) of inactivity on the site that are not attributable to waiting for regulatory decisions.</p> <p>Stage 2: In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response: does not contain sufficient information for CNL to understand the SMR Project schedule and risks; and/or contains major unexplained discrepancies or slippages with respect to schedule submitted in Stage 1 if applicable; and/or provides insufficient evidence that the R&D activities, the completion of design activities, and the completion of licensing submissions are fully costed and resourced; and/or considerable information is missing; and/or the timeline for submission of the first licensing submission is greater than 24 months following the completion of Stage 2; and/or the schedule includes gaps (> 1 year) of inactivity on the site that are not attributable to waiting for regulatory decisions.</p> |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|----------|---|
| T7 – Technology Readiness and Feasibility | | | |
| <p>The following section is to demonstrate that the SMR design has completed the conceptual design stage that provides confidence in support of subsequent stages. This section is also to enable CNL to secure a reasonable expectation that the SMR is technically feasible commensurate with the stage of SMR Project development, and that the Proponent, or relevant key project partner, understands the design-related Safety and Control Areas.</p> | | | |
| <p>a) <i>Technology Readiness:</i> SMR Projects should be at a moderate to advanced state of readiness, to ensure that the SMR Projects will be able to proceed as licences are obtained. Stage 1: The response should the state of technical readiness. The following excerpt from <i>GD-385: Pre-licensing Review of a Vendor's Reactor Design</i>, which will be used as guide to assess the level of technical readiness: <i>“at a minimum, made reasonable progress in the basic engineering phase of the design...this means that the basic architecture of systems important to safety has been laid out following the vendor's reactor design guides and design requirements. The following documents should be approaching a state of completion, such that the vendor is ready to proceed with the detailed design phase in preparation for a utility's submission of a construction licence application:</i></p> | <p>5</p> | <p>5</p> | <p>Stage 1: In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains sufficient information for CNL to understand the level of technical readiness, and the SMR Project is at a level of technical readiness equivalent to or beyond that outlined opposite, and/or • Provides sufficient information to conclude that the SMR Project is highly likely to be technically feasible commensurate with the stage of project development, and/or • Contains a strategy to satisfy the regulatory requirements and guidance for the SCAs identified opposite and shows that thought has been applied to each of these areas. <p>Stage 2: In the opinion of the evaluator(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The updates to the state of technical readiness have been provided and are commensurate with the SMR Project schedule, and/or • The response is sufficient to conclude that the SMR Project is highly likely technically feasible commensurate with the stage of project development, and/or • The response contains a planned approach to satisfy the regulatory requirements and guidance for the SCAs identified opposite and shows that thought has been applied to each of these areas. |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Design guides that contain design philosophies, safety philosophies and rules that designers must follow when performing their design work, including safety requirements such as applicable codes and standards.</i> • <i>Design requirements for systems important to safety that establish such aspects as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Minimum performance requirements and reliability targets; and</i> ○ <i>Reflect significant progress made in any safety-related research and development.</i> • <i>the vendor’s overall management system as it applies to the design of the proposed plant’s (or small reactor’s) structures, systems and components</i> • <i>Design and safety analysis representative of a preliminary safety analysis report.”</i> <p>Stage 2: The response should include any update regarding the increase in technical readiness.</p> <p>b) <i>Technology Feasibility</i></p> <p>Stage 1: The response should include the following as applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual design report. Basic Design documents may also be provided if available ², or equivalent • An investor’s prospectus, if available | | 3 | <p>Stage 1: In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains some information for CNL to understand the level of readiness and the SMR Project is at a level of readiness equivalent to that outlined opposite, and/or • Provides information that is sufficient to conclude that the SMR Project is likely to be technically feasible commensurate with the stage of project development, and/or • Contains a strategy to satisfy the regulatory requirements and guidance for the SCAs identified opposite, but limited information is presented on how these will be achieved <p>Stage 2: In the opinion of the evaluator(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The updates to the state of technical readiness have been provided and are commensurate with the SMR Project schedule, and/or • The response provides information that is sufficient to conclude that the SMR Project is likely to be technically feasible commensurate with the stage of project development, and/or • The response contains a planned approach to satisfy the regulatory requirements and guidance for the SCAs identified opposite, but limited information is presented on how these will be achieved |
| | | 1 | <p>Stage 1: In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains insufficient information for CNL to understand the level of readiness and/or the SMR Project has not reached an appropriate level of readiness, and/or • Is insufficient to find that the SMR Project is technically feasible commensurate with the stage of project development, and/or • Provides insufficient information for CNL to understand the strategy to satisfy the regulatory requirements and guidance for the SCAs listed opposite. |

² Conceptual Design and Basic Design are as per the definition and descriptions in Appendix B of International Atomic Energy Agency, “Terms for Describing New, Advanced Nuclear Power Plants”, IAEA-TECDOC-936, Vienna, Austria, April 1997.

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|-------|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A listing of previous reactors of similar technology or design • An indication of the volume and relevance of available operational experience (OPEX) • A description of major design changes with respect to previous reactors • A description of the technical review process, including the identification of any technical advisors, that is being used to result in a technically sound reactor and plant design • If the SMR reactor technology proposed in this SMR Project has completed any phase of the CNSC’s Vendor Design Review process, then the response should include, for each VDR phase that has been completed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A description of the review conducted of the VDR output report by the CNSC, and ○ Explanations of any key issues that were identified by the CNSC in the CNSC’s report, and ○ The plan to address and/or disposition all of the CNSC’s findings identified through the VDR process • If the Proponent or relevant key project partner has not completed, entered, and/or does not intend to enter VDR, then the response should include an explanation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How the design meets the CNSC requirements, and ○ The plan to address any outstanding design requirements, and ○ The plans to have the design requirements verified by an independent knowledgeable individual/organization | | | <p>Stage 2: In the opinion of the evaluator(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The updates to the state of technical readiness have not been provided, and/or deviate significantly from the SMR Project schedule, and/or • The SMR Project is not technically feasible commensurate with the stage of project development, and/or • Provide insufficient information for CNL to understand the plans to satisfy the regulatory requirements and guidance for the SCAs listed opposite |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|----------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If available, results, of any external independent assessment. This should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A description of the review conducted, and ○ Explanations of any key issues that were identified, and ○ The plan to address and/or disposition all of the findings <p>The conceptual design report and basic design documents or equivalent are excluded from the page limit. The investor’s prospectus is excluded from the page limit.</p> <p>Additional documents such as Basic and Detailed Design reports shall be provided when they are available.</p> <p>Proponents are encouraged to provide the VDR reports authored by the CNSC, and these reports are excluded from the page limit.</p> <p>c) <i>Readiness of the Design to Meet Canadian Requirements:</i> CNL wants to understand where Proponents believe their SMR Project is with respect to obtaining the required licences and how they intend to meet the requirements.</p> <p>Stage 1: The response should include: the strategy for how the Proponent, or the key project partner that will be the licence applicant, intends to address: the Nuclear Safety and Control Act (NCSA), the applicable regulatory requirements and guidance, and any other applicable federal and provincial acts and regulations, through the lens of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operation performance • Safety analysis • Physical design • Fitness for service | | | |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|---|---|
| <p>Stage 2: The response should include: the planned approach for how the Proponent, or the key project partner that will be the licence applicant, intends to address: the Nuclear Safety And Control Act (NCSA), the applicable regulatory requirements and guidance, and any other applicable federal and provincial acts and regulations, through the lenses listed above, including identification of the person(s) responsible.</p> <p>CNL reserves the right to convene a panel of internal and/or external experts to review the SMR design at any stage.</p> <p>The Proponent, and/or key project partners, will be required to participate in these panel reviews at their own expense.</p> <p>At Stage 2, updates should be provided to the information provided in the Stage 1 response. This criterion will be reassessed based on those updates according to the same assessment benchmark provided opposite.</p> <p>The Proponent, or the appropriate key project partner, is encouraged to complete Stage 1 and Stage 2 of the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission’s pre-licensing vendor design review (VDR).</p> | | | |
| T8 - Credible Path to Obtain Fuel | | | |
| CNL requires information regarding the path to fuel the reactor. | | | |
| <p>Stage 1: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy whereby the fuel is intended to be sourced, including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the source of the fuel ○ the country of origin of the fuel, if the fuel is intended to be imported from a foreign country ○ the state of readiness of fuel manufacture/fuel fabrication facilities | N/A | <p>PASS Stage 1</p> <p>PASS Stage 2</p> <p>Fail</p> | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided presents a sound strategy to obtain the fuel for the SMR Project.</p> <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided presents a sound plan, supported by documentation, to obtain the fuel for the SMR Project.</p> <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided does not present a credible path to obtain the fuel, and/or insufficient information was provided.</p> |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|--------------------|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ how the fuel will be transported to site, addressing any gaps in transport, such as if new transport packages will be needed <p>Stage 2: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plans for the first reactor core load, and plans for the remainder of the operational life including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the source of the fuel ○ the country of origin of the fuel, if the fuel is intended to be imported from a foreign country ○ the state of readiness of fuel manufacture/fuel fabrication facilities ○ how the fuel will be transported to site, addressing any gaps in transport, such as if new transport packages will be needed • Documentation from the owner of the source of the fuel that they intend to provide the fuel | | | |
| T9 - Credible Path to Manufacturing, Construction and Commissioning | | | |
| It is important for CNL to understand the approaches and methodologies in respect of delivering the required services, and how the approach contributes to managing/mitigating risks, and enhancing CNL performance objectives. Additionally it is important to understand what services will need to be provided at the selected site. | | | |
| <p>Many SMR developers intend to use innovative approaches to the manufacturing, construction and commissioning of the units that are not currently employed by the nuclear industry. The experience of the key project partner that is to be the project manager, which was provided in response to criterion G2 b), will be included in the evaluation of this criterion.</p> <p>Stage 1: The response should include:</p> | N/A | PASS Stage 1 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided presents a sound strategy to manufacture, construct and commission the SMR Project. |
| | | PASS Stage 2 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided presents a sound plan to manufacture, construct and commission the SMR Project. |
| | | FAIL | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided does not present a sound plan to manufacture, construct and commission the SMR Project, and/or insufficient information was provided to make that determination. |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|----------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The supply chain strategy including: key vendors and suppliers of major equipment and balance of plant key parts, for the procurement, manufacturing, construction and commissioning activities for the SMR • A copy of the supply chain policy (if available, excluded from page count) • The key subcontractors for any part or parts of the SMR Project (including use of associates or affiliates) and provide the following minimum information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The name of key any subcontractors (if known); and ○ The type of work that each key subcontractor will be responsible. • A description of their approach to potentially manage and report on matters of supplier diversity to CNL including, small and medium sized enterprises, local businesses (in Renfrew and Pontiac Counties, and the Ottawa Valley), and Indigenous businesses in Canada. • Estimates on to the level of readiness of the various facilities to be used in the manufacturing and construction of the SMR • Information on required services and utilities needed to support the SMR during construction, commissioning, operation and decommissioning phases of the SMR Project. <p>Stage 2: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updates to the supply chain strategy and planned approach to procurement, manufacturing, construction and commissioning the SMR. The strategy shall also describe the approach to engagement and selection of its supply chain. | | | |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|-------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated estimates on to the level of readiness of the various facilities to be used in the manufacturing and construction of the SMR. Updated information on required services and utilities needed to support the SMR during construction, commissioning, operation and decommissioning phases of the SMR Project | | | |
| T10 – Management of Spent Fuel Waste: Technical | | | |
| CNL requires confidence and confirmation of a credible plan that accounts for holistic management and disposal of all spent fuel generated during the life cycle of the reactor. | | | |
| <p>The intention of this criterion is to understand the spent fuel waste that will be generated and the strategies/plans to store and dispose of that waste. The costs and financing of the costs associated with spent fuel waste shall be addressed in criterion EF4.</p> <p>Stage 1: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A spent fuel strategy that is clearly defined and achievable, and is capable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators. The strategy should outline how licensing requirements are intended to be met for management of spent fuel, including interim storage and disposal. This strategy should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-disposal storage, short-term and intermediate, and Ultimate disposal (and/or recycling, as applicable) of spent fuel wastes. A description of the spent fuel that is expected to be generated by the SMR, e.g. characteristics and amounts. | 5 | 5 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information which:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outlines the approach for spent fuel waste management that includes all spent fuel produced throughout the life cycle of the reactor; Demonstrates that the strategy for the management and disposal of spent fuel waste is realistic, clearly defined and achievable, and is capable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators and, Includes short-term, interim and final disposal of the spent fuel, as applicable. <p>Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contains a sound plan for the management and disposal of spent fuel waste that is realistic, clearly defined and achievable, and is capable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a sound plan for the interim storage of waste a sound plan for disposition of the waste |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|-------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience of the Proponent or relevant key project partner with respect to management and disposal of spent fuel wastes. This response may reference the response to G2 as applicable. <p>Stage 2: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Any updates from the Stage 1 response, as applicable. ○ A plan that is clearly defined and achievable, and is capable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators. The plan should outline the waste management approach for all spent fuel that will be generated during the life cycle of the reactor. This plan should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pre-disposal storage, short-term and intermediate, and ▪ Ultimate disposal (and/or recycling, as applicable) of spent fuel wastes. | | 3 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information which:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlines the approach for spent fuel waste management that includes all spent fuel produced throughout the life cycle of the reactor, but contains some gaps and/or further work that still needs to be addressed; and • Demonstrates that the strategy for the management and disposal of spent fuel waste is realistic, clearly defined and achievable, and is capable of being undertaken in a way which is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators. Any technology or other gaps in the strategy are identified with plans to remedy such gaps in a timely fashion. In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the gaps are reasonable commensurate with the stage of development of the SMR Project. <p>Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains a reasonable plan for the management and disposal of spent fuel waste that is realistic, clearly defined and achievable, and is capable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators. Any technology or other gaps in the plans are identified and plans to remedy such gaps in a timely fashion are set out. In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the gaps are reasonable commensurate with the stage of development of the SMR Project. <p>The plan includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a reasonable plan for the interim storage of waste ○ a reasonable plan for disposition of the waste |
| | | 1 | <p>Stage 1: In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not consider all spent fuel waste generated during the life cycle of the reactor; and/or |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|----------------------|-----------|-------|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains strategies for the management and disposal of spent fuel waste that are unrealistic, ill-defined or unachievable, and are incapable of being undertaken in a way which is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators; and/or • Contains strategies with technology or other gaps that have not been adequately identified and /or do not have adequate plans to remedy such gaps in a timely fashion; and/or • Contains large gaps, that, in the opinion of the evaluator(s), are not commensurate with the stage of development of the SMR Project, or gaps that are not identified as areas of future work. <p>Stage 2: In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information in which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only a basic description of a generic waste management approach is provided; and/or • The plan does not consider interim storage and/or final disposition; and/or • Plans for the management and disposal of spent fuel waste are unrealistic, ill-defined or unachievable, and are incapable of being undertaken in a way which is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators; and/or • The plans contain technology or other gaps that have not been adequately identified and /or do not have adequate plans to remedy such gaps in a timely fashion; and/or • The plan contains large gaps, that, in the opinion of the evaluator(s), are not commensurate with the stage of development of the SMR Project, or gaps that are not identified as areas of future work. |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|-------|---|
| T11 – Management of Non-Spent Fuel Waste: Technical | | | |
| CNL requires confidence and confirmation of a credible plan that accounts for holistic management of all generated wastes as a result of construction and operation of an SMR. | | | |
| <p>The intention of this criterion is to understand the non-spent fuel wastes that will be generated and the strategies/plans to store and dispose of that waste. The costs and financing of the costs associated with non-spent fuel wastes shall be addressed in criterion EF5.</p> <p>Stage 1: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategy that is clearly defined and achievable, and is capable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators. This strategy should outline how the licensing requirements for management of non-spent fuel wastes are intended to be met, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ short-term, interim and final disposal of the waste as applicable ○ wastes produced during construction, operation and decommissioning • Experience of the Proponent or relevant key project partner with respect to management and disposal of non-spent fuel wastes. This response may reference the response to G2 as applicable. <p>Stage 2: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan that is clearly defined and achievable, and is capable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators. This plan should outline: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the waste management approach, | 5 | 5 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information which:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlines the approach for waste management that includes all types of non-spent fuel waste produced throughout the life cycle of the reactor; • Demonstrates that the strategy for the management and disposal of non-spent fuel waste is realistic, clearly defined and achievable, and is capable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators; • Includes short-term, interim and final disposal of the waste, as applicable; and, • Includes wastes produced during construction, operation and decommissioning. <p>Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains a sound plan for the management of all non-spent fuel wastes that is realistic, clearly defined and achievable, and is capable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a sound plan for the short-term and interim storage of waste ○ a sound plan for disposition of the waste; and • Accounts for all types of non-spent fuel waste, including high-level waste, intermediate-level waste, low-level waste, industrial waste, and any other waste products that will be produced through the construction, operation and decommissioning of the reactor. |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|---|
| <p>○ how the licensing requirement for management of non-spent fuel wastes are intended to be met.</p> <p>The plan should include all types of non-spent fuel waste, including high-level waste, intermediate-level waste, low-level waste, industrial waste, and any other waste products that will be produced through the construction, operation and decommissioning of the reactor.</p> <p>This plan should outline how licensing requirements are intended to be met for management of short-term, interim and final disposal of the waste as applicable.</p> | | 3 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information which:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlines the approach for the management of all non-spent fuel wastes that includes all spent fuel produced throughout the life cycle of the reactor, but identifies some gaps and work that still needs to be addressed; and • Demonstrates that the strategies for the management and disposal of non-spent fuel waste are realistic, clearly defined and achievable, and are capable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators. Any technology or other gaps in the plans have been identified and plans to remedy such gaps in a timely fashion have been set out. <p>Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains a reasonable plan for the management of all non-spent fuel wastes that is realistic, clearly defined and achievable, and is capable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators. Any technology or other gaps in the plans are be identified and plans to remedy such gaps in a timely fashion have been be set out. In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the gaps are reasonable commensurate with the stage of development of the SMR Project. The plan includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a reasonable plan for the interim storage of the wastes ○ a reasonable plan for disposition of the wastes; and • Outlines the approach for waste management that includes all types of non-spent fuel waste produced throughout the life cycle of the reactor, but contains some gaps and work that still needs to be addressed. |
| | | 1 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information which:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not consider all non-spent fuel wastes generated during the life cycle of the reactor; and/or |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|----------------------|-----------|-------|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains strategies for the management of all non-spent fuel wastes that are unrealistic, ill-defined or unachievable, and are incapable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators. The plans contain technology or other gaps that have not been adequately identified and /or do not have adequate plans to remedy such gaps in a timely fashion; and/or • Contains large gaps or gaps, that in the opinion of the evaluator(s), are not commensurate with the stage of development of the SMR Project, or gaps that are not identified as areas of future work. <p>Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only a basic description of a generic waste management approach is provided; and/or • The plan does not consider interim storage and/or final disposition; and/or • The response contains plans for the management and disposal of non-spent fuel wastes that are unrealistic, ill-defined or unachievable, and are incapable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators. The plans contain technology or other gaps that have not been adequately identified and /or do not have adequate plans to remedy such gaps in a timely fashion; and/or • The response contains large gaps, that, in the opinion of the evaluator(s), are not commensurate with the stage of development of the SMR Project, or gaps that are not identified as areas of future work. |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|-------|---|
| T12 - Decommissioning: Technical | | | |
| CNL requires confidence and confirmation of a credible plan that accounts for the decommissioning of the SMR at the end of life. | | | |
| <p>The intention of this criterion is to understand how the facility is intended to be decommissioned and the site remediated. The costs and financing of the costs associated with decommissioning and site remediation are addressed in criterion EF6.</p> <p>Stage 1: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategy that is clearly defined and achievable, and is capable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators. This strategy should outline how licensing requirements are intended to be met for decommissioning the facility and remediating the site at end of life. • A description of how decommissioning is being incorporated into the design process of the reactor. • Experience of the Proponent or relevant key project partner with respect to decommissioning and site remediation. This response may reference the response to G2 as applicable. <p>Stage 2: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updates from the Stage 1 response, as applicable. | 5 | 5 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information that:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates that the strategies for the decommissioning and remediation of the site are realistic, clearly defined and achievable, and are capable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators; and • Describes a reasonable approach to incorporating decommissioning into the design process of the reactor. <p>Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates that the plans for the decommissioning and remediation of the site are realistic, clearly defined and achievable, and are capable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators; • Includes a plan of how the reactor will be decommissioned and the site will be remediated that supports the cost estimates provided in EF9, including a schedule, and supporting benchmarked data for estimates and schedule; and • Demonstrates how decommissioning is being integrated into the design process and provides evidence of how it has been applied to impact design decisions. |
| | | 3 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information which:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates that the strategies for the decommissioning and remediation of the site are realistic, clearly defined and achievable, and are capable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators. Any technology or other gaps in the plans |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|-------|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan that is clearly defined and achievable, and is capable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators. This plan should outline how licensing requirements are intended to be met for decommissioning the facility and remediating the site at end of life. • The plan of how the reactor will be decommissioned and the site will be remediated should support the cost estimates provided in EF9, including a schedule and supporting benchmarked data for estimates and schedule. • Evidence of how decommissioning has been incorporated into the design process of the reactor, e.g. any design changes that were made, or design features that were introduced to enable decommissioning. | | | <p>have been identified and plans to remedy such gaps in a timely fashion have been set out; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes in a satisfactory way, how decommissioning is being incorporated into the design process of the reactor. <p>Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates that the plans for the decommissioning of the site are realistic, clearly defined and achievable, and are capable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators. Any technology or other gaps in the plans have been identified and plans to remedy such gaps in a timely fashion have been set out; and • Provides some evidence that decommissioning is integrated into the design process |
| | | 1 | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response provides information which:</p> <p>Stage 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains strategies for the decommissioning and remediation of the site that are unrealistic, ill-defined or unachievable, or are incapable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators. The plans contain technology or other gaps that have not been adequately identified and /or do not have adequate plans to remedy such gaps in a timely fashion; and/or • Contains large gaps or gaps, that, in the opinion of the evaluator(s), are not commensurate with the stage of development of the SMR Project, or gaps that are not identified as areas of future work; and/or • Does not describe how decommissioning is being incorporated into the design process of the reactor, and/or, in the opinion of the evaluator, this is inadequate. |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|----------------------|---|
| | | | Stage 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only a basic description of a generic approach to decommissioning and site remediation is provided; and/or • Does not provide any description or evidence that decommissioning is being incorporated into the design process of the reactor; and/or • Contains plans for the decommissioning and remediation of the site that are unrealistic, ill-defined or unachievable, and are incapable of being undertaken in a way that is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the relevant safety, security and environmental regulators. The plans contain technology or other gaps that have not been adequately identified and /or do not have adequate plans to remedy such gaps in a timely fashion; and/or • Contains large gaps, that, in the opinion of the evaluator(s), are not commensurate with the stage of development of the SMR Project, or gaps that are not identified as areas of future work. |
| T13 - Access to all Relevant Intellectual Property | | | |
| Many SMR designs currently under development are based on previous designs. CNL requires confidence that the Proponent has considered and adequately addressed all intellectual property aspects, and has the rights to the intellectual property they will use during the SMR Project. | | | |
| If the SMR Project uses any intellectual property of corporations that are not the property of the Proponent or key project partners, information should be provided listing what those elements are, and that the SMR Project has the rights to use that intellectual property. If those rights have not yet been secured, the strategy to obtain those rights should be provided. | N/A | PASS – Stage 1 | The SMR Project does not use any intellectual property that is not owned by the Proponent or key project partners, or, in the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided presents a sound strategy to secure the rights to any required the intellectual property. |
| | | PASS – Stage 2 | The SMR Project does not use any intellectual property that is not owned by the Proponent or key project partners, or, in the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided presents a sound strategy to secure the rights to any required the intellectual property. |
| | | FAIL | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response does not include sufficient information to demonstrate that licences to all required intellectual property can be obtained. |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|---|---|
| T14 –Health, Safety, Security, Environment and Quality | | | |
| Proponents, or the key project partner that will be the licence applicant, will be required to satisfy the Nuclear Safety and Control Act (NCSA), any other applicable federal and provincial acts and regulations as part of the licence applications. This criterion provides early information to CNL regarding the Proponent’s, or the key project partner that will be the licence applicant’s, approach to satisfy those laws and regulations. | | | |
| <p>Stage 1: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy for how the Proponent, or the key project partner that will be the licence applicant, intends to address: the Nuclear Safety And Control Act, any other applicable federal and provincial acts and regulations, through the lenses of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Management System Framework ○ Human Performance Management ○ Environmental Protection ○ Radiation Protection ○ Emergency Management and Fire Protection ○ Security (including cyber security) ○ Safeguards and non-proliferation ○ Conventional Health and Safety ○ Packaging and Transport • The strategy to ensure quality, including obtaining certification of various aspects of their quality programs. The scope of the quality program should ensure that all other activities meet the appropriate quality assurance. For example, design, construction and procurement will meet appropriate quality assurance for all aspects of the SMR Project, e.g. construction, commissioning and operation. <p>Stage 2: The response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Proponent’s safety policy, the safety record and current safety statistics of the Proponent and any key partners that will be licence applicants; • The plans for how the Proponent, or the key project partner that will be the licence applicant, intends to | N/A | <p>PASS Stage 1</p> <p>PASS Stage 2</p> <p>Fail</p> | <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided presents a sound strategy for the execution of the health, safety, security, environment and quality aspects of the SMR Project.</p> <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the information provided presents sound and detailed plans for the execution of the health, safety, security, environment and quality aspects of the SMR Project.</p> <p>In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the response does not include sufficient information, such that it fundamentally undermines confidence in the ability of the Proponent to deliver the SMR Project and/or the information provided does not present a sound strategy for the execution of the health, safety, security, environment and quality aspects of the SMR Project.</p> |

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|---|-----------|-------|----------------------|
| <p>address: the Nuclear Safety And Control Act (NCSA), any other applicable federal and provincial acts and regulations, including the identification of the persons responsible, through the lenses of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Management System Framework ○ Human Performance Management ○ Environmental Protection ○ Radiation Protection ○ Emergency Management and Fire Protection ○ Security (including cyber security) ○ Safeguards and non-proliferation ○ Conventional Health and Safety ○ Packaging and Transport <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plans to ensure quality, including obtaining certification of various aspects of their quality programs. The scope of the quality program should ensure that all other activities meet the appropriate quality assurance. For example, design, construction and procurement will meet appropriate quality assurance for all aspects of the SMR Project, e.g. construction, commissioning and operation. <p>Evaluation of this criterion may include safety records of any key project partners that are available to CNL through international safety organizations.</p> | | | |

3.5 OVERALL COHESIVENESS

In addition to assessing the individual criteria in the above sections, CNL will also review the entire response as a whole for overall cohesiveness.

No additional information is required for this criterion.

| Response Requirement | Weighting | Score | Assessment Benchmark |
|--|-----------|-------|---|
| O1 – Overall Cohesiveness of the SMR Project | | | |
| Taking the totality of the responses to all criteria into account, CNL will evaluate the overall cohesiveness and credibility of the SMR Project. | | | |
| In addition to the evaluation of the individual criteria described above, CNL will perform an overview assessment that looks at the entire SMR Project and the interactions and interfaces between the responses to the individual criteria to evaluate the overall cohesiveness and credibility of the SMR Project. CNL will re-assess this criterion at Stage 2. No information is to be provided with respect to this criterion. CNL will perform this evaluation using the information provided in response to the other criteria. | 100 | 5 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the proposed SMR Project is cohesive and credible when judged as a whole, and all criteria responses adequately consider the impacts of the other criteria. |
| | | 3 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), the SMR Project is generally credible and feasible, but in some instances, responses to some criteria do not align. |
| | | 1 | In the opinion of the evaluator(s), there are large misalignments between responses to criteria. |

