

*Updated December 03, 2018*

Question 43: We are aware that CNL has been assessing other 4 SMR Applications. If we submit an application in the near future, will our application be evaluated?

Answer 43: Yes, CNL is evaluating four SMR proposals and we are happy to have received such a positive response to the Invitation. CNL recognizes that various projects proceed at their own pace and thus we remain committed to having an open Invitation process.

Question 42: When is the next intake period?

Answer 42: The SMR Invitation is an open invitation with two intake periods per year. Intake #2 period ends 2019 January and the following intake period (Intake #3) will end in 2019 July.

Question 41: In the Evaluation Question Set, pg. 10 paragraph 1-b-ii) it is stated, that a bilateral security instrument is required 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>). The question is, to what extent is this parameter limiting and which is the suggested way on how to resolve this issue?

Answer 41: A bilateral security instrument is required. If a bilateral security agreement is not in place, the website provides information on alternate solutions that may be possible

---

Question 40: I have been asked to confirm the process for submission of the proposal to site a Demonstration reactor. The invitation and the FAQ's do not seem to address this issue. So presumably, the method is to email to [smr@cnl.ca](mailto:smr@cnl.ca). However, there is a concern that the file may be too large for email.

Answer 40: The identified method is to submit the response to [smr@cnl.ca](mailto:smr@cnl.ca). If the file is too large for e-mail, the proponent may elect to use a data room as identified previously in the Q&A. If there is an alternate method preferred by the proponent please indicate the method so that we may test it functionality.

Question 39: We have noted a recent extension to June 11, 2018 for the first round submissions from the original published plan. We would like to request that this extension be further moved to the end of June (June 29, 2018). The amount of information requested in the invitation is significant and requires careful consideration before finalizing of the submission package across our participating major developers. Should an extension not be possible, we would elect to defer submission until we're able to finalize the package rather than submit prematurely. Would CNL consider a further extension per the above request to June 29, 2018?

Answer 39: CNL regrets that it cannot extend the deadline for the first intake beyond June 11, 2018. CNL reminds potential proponents that responses may be submitted at any time. Submissions made during an intake period will be assessed no later than the next assessment round.

Question 38: Would CNL accept a Data Room (through a service such as WatchDox) as an alternative to providing supporting documents via an appendix?

Answer 38: CNL would accept a Data Room as an alternate to providing supporting documents via an appendix. Should a proponent use a data room the following convention is to be used: The supporting documents are referenced in the correct section of the response and an appendix is provided that contains the link to the Data Room for those documents. Where a Data Room is used both the appendix title in the response and the folder name in the Data Room includes the referring section title. For example: Appendix A: Supporting Documentation for EF1, Financial Information, Successive Assurances and Financial Guarantees.

Question 37: Where can we obtain a copy of the NDA? Is there a CNL contact that should be used for the NDA and what can we expect once we sign the NDA?

Answer 37: The NDA is available on the SMR Invitation website at this link. Once signed, the NDA should be returned to [smr@cnl.ca](mailto:smr@cnl.ca). A signatory for CNL will sign the NDA and a copy will be returned to you for your records.

If you have a current NDA with CNL that you believe covers the information to be provided, please send a copy to CNL at [smr@cnl.ca](mailto:smr@cnl.ca) for verification. CNL will verify the NDA covers the information to be provided and will return a confirmatory e-mail to you for your records.

Question 36: What is the generation capacity (MWe) that can be accommodated at each site?

Answer 36: If the question is meant to ask what generation capacity could CNL use from a demonstration reactor, there may be an opportunity for CNL to purchase power from a demonstration SMR but that is subject to separate negotiations.

If the question is meant to provide information regarding the connection of the CNL sites to the respective distribution grids the following information is available. The Ontario electrical transmission network has both a 115kV and a 230 kV transmission circuit within connection distance of the Chalk River Laboratories site and CRL is connected to the grid via two 115kV lines (one to Rapides Des Joachim and one to Chenaux). The Manitoba electrical transmission network has both a 115kV and a 230 kV transmission circuit within connection distance of the Whiteshell Laboratories site and the WL site is connected to the grid via two 33kV lines (twin supply for redundancy).

The capacity of either system to accept generated electricity into the network is subject to negotiation with the transmission owner.

Question 35: We anticipate that a portion of our submittal in response to the SMR siting invitation will contain proprietary information. Item 11, in the Part 1 instructions, allows for an NDA be signed between the parties. We would like to request that process be started and wonder whether we should develop the document or will CNL do so?

Answer 35: CNL has initiated the process of preparing an NDA to be executed prior to receiving any response materials. A notification will be mailed when the file is available and potential Proponents will be able to download the NDA from the SMR website.

Question 34: Section T7: response requirement for section a) is unclear. Is the Proponent's statement on the development status of the listed document sufficient? (e.g., Design guides, Design requirements, the Vendor's management systems, etc.)

Answer 34: Section T7 a) should state:

"Stage 1: The response should indicate the state of technical readiness."

CNL's intent is that the Proponent indicate their level of technical readiness at the time of the submission. This is not just a list of documents and their individual status, the information provide should also enable CNL to understand how these documents support technical readiness.

Question 33: Section T5: Can CNL define what is 'the SMR project'? It is confusing whether the response requirement is referring to the demonstration project at Chalk River or the overall business case of the Proponent.

Answer 33: In Section T5 it states "The response should include the outline business case setting out the strategic, economic, commercial, affordability and achievability cases for the SMR project".

In this context "the SMR project" is the demonstration project. Note however, that there is a further request for information to connect the SMR demonstration project to the overall business case of the Proponent.

Question 32: Considering that there are errors in the Evaluation Question Set that need clarification/correction and the information requested by CNL covers very broad topics, would CNL consider extending the first intake submission deadline?

Answer 32: At the request of multiple potential Proponents the first intake period is extended to 2018 June 11.

Question 31: If a Proponent already has a security clearance with a major Canadian utility, would CNL accept that in lieu of CNL security screening?

Answer 31: No, as CNL cannot blanket agree that security requirements for other sites are sufficient.

Question 30: On page 1, the evaluation criteria section states that '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.' This effectively makes all evaluation criteria mandatory. Why are there section and question weights then?

Answer 30: All criteria require a response and in that respect all criteria are mandatory. Using selected weighted and scored criterion provides two benefits:

1. CNL can specifically identify areas where the Proponent's response may require further substance to support the progress of the Proponent's project, and
2. CNL may determine which responses are better positioned for success and may elect to put on hold the review and evaluation of one or more SMR Projects submitted within a given intake period to focus on the response with the greater chance of success as indicated in the Invitation.

Question 29: Section IS1: The section does not describe the submission requirement other than the security screening form. Could you confirm that there is no other submission required under this section?

Answer 29: CNL confirms that for Section IS1 the security screening form is the only submission required under this section.

Question 28: Section IS2: What is the format of the certification? Is a statement and signature of the CEO sufficient? Would CNL provide a certification language?

Answer 28: CNL confirms that there is no specified format for the certification. A statement and the signature of the CEO would suffice.

Question 27: As you know, the requested information is substantial, and in order for us to adequately address all the question, we request a two week extension to the submittal date. Could you please advise whether this is possible?

Answer 27: At the request of multiple potential Proponents the first intake period is extended to 2018 June 11.

Question 26: Aside from these two page limit instructions, are there any other page limit requirements?

Answer 26: The response template provides the page count limits with the technical requirements. Note that the page limits for sections T1 and T2 have been increased to 5 pages each.

Question 25: In the 3.1 instructions, you say a maximum page limit of 3 pages is specified for criterion G3. Section G3 shows the maximum page for this section should be 5. Please clarify.

Answer 25: The correct page count for Section G3 is 5 pages.

Question 24: Is the total submittal page count 130 of which 80 pages should be used for Part 4, Technical Requirements?

Answer 24: This is correct as stated in the Invitation. Note that following the posting of the Invitation CNL has agreed to an increase in the page count for sections T1 and T2 of 3 pages each, leading to an overall page count of 136 pages, 86 of which are to be used for the Technical Requirements.

Question 23: Section EF1: CNL states '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.' What is meant by 'similar approach'? Would this cover a lead company with partners, or a lead company with sub-contractors?

Answer 23: This is meant to cover the example of a lead company with partners.

Question 22: Part 1: Instruction to Proponents section 14 states 'CNL will not release any such information, except to AECL and the Government of Canada as per Section 11, without the permission of the Proponent.' Will these entities abide by the conditions of the NDA? Could CNL confirm that the information will be protected from being subject to ATIA/ATIP?

Answer 22: CNL confirms an NDA will be executed prior to receiving any response materials. Proponents should seek legal advice with regards to ATIP application, however generally speaking commercial proprietary information is not subject to ATIP.

Question 21: Part 1: Instruction to Proponents page 8 states that 'the Proponent agrees that it grants CNL an irrevocable, perpetual, royalty-free, worldwide licence to use the Response Materials for its internal use.' The invitation would be best answered by information that an applicant keeps in strictest confidence. Thus, we request that the license be modified as follows: 'the Proponent agrees that it grants CNL an irrevocable, perpetual, royalty-free, worldwide licence to use the Response Materials for its internal use for the sole purpose of evaluating the Proponent's response to the Invitation.' Would CNL accept this restriction?

Answer 21: CNL does not accept this restrictions. Internal use only by CNL is believed to be sufficient to address all confidentiality issues.

Question 20: Part 1: Instruction to Proponents page 8 states that 'Any proprietary information provided in the Response Materials will be governed by one or more Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDA).' Could CNL confirm that the existing agreements with an applicant provide adequate NDA or should we sign an additional specific NDA?

Answer 20: CNL confirms an NDA will be executed prior to receiving any response materials.

Question 19: Section T13: If there is no IP that is not the property of the Proponent or key project partners', then would it suffice to provide a statement?

Answer 19: CNL confirms that a statement detailing the Proponent's ownership of the IP is sufficient.

Question 18: Section T6: CNL is asking for the schedule that is "fully costed and resourced for: the completion of any R&D activities, the completion of design activities, and the completion of licensing submissions". How does CNL expect a Proponent to demonstrate this?

Answer 18: There are several Project Management tools that allow this to be shown; for example CNL uses Primavera P6 as their preferred scheduling/resourcing tool. The use of other tools or a spreadsheet/table format would acceptable. The intent is to show that a robust foundation has been established for the project.

Question 17: Section T1, Benefits to Canada, and Section T2, Benefits to CNL, are significant response sections but only given 2 pages page limit per section. Could CNL confirm the page limits for these sections?

Answer 17: After review CNL has reset the pages limits for sections T1 and T2 to 5 pages each. This increases the overall response page limit to 136 pages.

Question 16: Is a cover letter required/recommended for the submission?

Answer 16: A cover letter is not required for the submission. Use of a cover letter is the choice of the Proponent.

Question 15: The Response Template has a cover page with signature blocks. Could you confirm that these are for CNL internal use?

Answer 15: The signature blocks on the Response Template cover page are not intended for CNL use. The cover page provides a template for the cover page of the Proponent's response.

Question 14: Q: Several areas in the application, such as spent fuel, nuclear waste and decommissioning, are already part of the existing regulatory oversight established by Government of Canada independent to the CNL process. How are we to interpret the CNL request for information? No project will be able to progress without securing the approvals required from CNSC or other government entities. It appears that CNL is using these items as gatekeeper criteria (requiring a score of at least 3 to proceed). Does this mean that CNL is imposing additional approval requirements in the areas? If so, should we interpret this as part of the GoC requirements in these areas?

Would CNL drop these submission requirements from scoring as they are covered by regulation and statutes? Alternately would CNL accept a certification statement from a Proponent that these requirements will be met?

Answer 14: The Invitation is an open process and thus Proponents may have varying levels of experience and understanding in many areas of the lifecycle of a nuclear reactor. The requested information is intended to ascertain that a proponent is cognizant of the all of the issues and complexities associated with these activities and is fully prepared to assume the financial liabilities associated with spent fuel, nuclear waste and facility decommissioning. The information requested is not intended to determine acceptability from a regulatory perspective as that is for the CNSC to determine.

Question 13: Section T4: CNL's assessment benchmark on percent completion of provided lists. It is quite unclear what that means and how would they judge percent completion unless the evaluator already know what such lists would include. If that is the case, why does CNL request an applicant to provide this list?

Answer 13: CNL may potentially be assessing applicants from across the world therefore CNL is determining an applicant's understanding of the Canadian Regulatory framework. The request for list of Regulatory Documents and other Federal legislation is intended to ascertain that a proponent is cognizant of the broad regulatory environment to which an SMR demonstration reactor would be subject in Canada. Percentage complete will be judged against known a regulatory environment to evaluate the proponent's level of preparedness.

Question 12: Section T4: It is unclear what is asked for in the request for "A list of Regulatory Documents and other Federal legislation...". The terms used in the request (i.e., "Regulatory Documents", "legislation", "regulations") each have specific and different meanings. For example, the list of "regulations pertaining to the design, construction, operation,..." is a subset of the few and well known NSCA Regulations. Some further clarification on this request would be appreciated.

Answer 12: CNL may potentially be assessing applicants from across the world therefore CNL is determining an applicant's understanding of the Canadian Regulatory framework. The request for list of Regulatory Documents and other Federal legislation is intended to ascertain that a proponent is cognizant of the broad regulatory environment to which an SMR demonstration reactor would be subject in Canada.

Question 11: Section T6: CNL is asking for "High-level activities and milestones". Is it asking for a detailed Gantt chart or a summary description?

Answer 11: In Stage 1, CNL is asking for high level information. The detailed tasks required to meet the schedule are not required. The information may be provided as a GANTT chart, as a figure or in table form. In Stage 2, CNL is looking for an updated overview schedule that includes milestones. This information is best presented as a GANTT chart.

Question 10: Section T14: Please confirm that the supporting documents such as the Proponent's safety policy, the safety record and the current safety statistics, etc. are excluded from the page limits. Also please clarify the format requirement for the safety record and statistics.

Answer 10: CNL confirms that for a Stage 2 response, documentation provided as supporting evidence of the Proponent's safety policy, the safety record and current safety statistics of the Proponent and any key partners that will be licence applicants is excluded from the page count.

Question 9: Section T6: The risk register is a very large document. Please confirm whether CNL is requesting the Proponent to share the summary of the risk or if requesting the actual risk register to be provided. If the latter, confirm if it is excluded from the page limit.

Answer 9: At Stage 1, CNL is requesting a summary of the risk register that covers the life cycle of the Proponent's SMR project. At Stage 2, CNL is requesting a more detailed risk register that covers the life cycle of the Proponent's SMR project. For a Stage 2 response, the detailed risk register is excluded from the page limits.

Question 8: Section T3 requests a significant amount of information while the maximum page limit is 2. Could CNL confirm the page limit?

Answer 8: The page limit for Section T3 is confirmed at 2 pages.

Question 7: Do we submit the security screening forms directly to the Security Group at CNL or should we submit them with the site application?

Answer 7: Security screening forms should be submitted directly to the Security Group at CNL. The Security Group contact information is provided with the forms. CNL reminds Proponent's that they are to identify a single contact to interface with the Security Group at CNL.

Question 6: Section T4: Could you confirm that the stage 2 supporting documents (e.g., agreements between parties, "documentation", etc.) are also excluded from the page count?

Answer 6: The Stage 2 evaluation criteria calls for:

1. Documentation that shows that the parties involved are in agreement with these roles and responsibilities.
2. Documentation that clearly identifies the plans for conducting an Environmental Assessment, the Environmental Risk Assessment and the Site Selection Threat and Risk Assessment.

Documentation in support of these two items are excluded from the page count for Section T4.

Question 5: Section T3: Could support evidence of relevant stakeholder engagement and CSR programs provided outside of the page counts?

Answer 5: The Section T3 evaluation criteria states:

1. The response shall provide supporting evidence of prior experience in Stakeholder Management in a similar and relevant context.

2. The response shall clearly set out relevant responsible business policies and practices in support of these requirements (Corporate Social responsibility) as well as evidence of its prior experience in a similar and relevant context.

Documentation provided as evidence in support of these two items are excluded from the page count for Section T3.

Question 4: What are all of the CNL/AECL sites under consideration for the deployment of an SMR?

Answer 4: Many factors are considered in the choice of a demonstration site, including proponent preference, regulatory approval, and community and stakeholder engagement levels. While there are a number of AECL sites managed by CNL, Chalk River Laboratories and Whiteshell Laboratories are the two main sites with both sites well supported with infrastructure services. Other AECL sites may be considered if there is a compelling reason to do so for particular projects.

Question 3: Submission of supporting documents: How are these submitted? Shall we include them as an appendix or separate files? Should they be referenced as attachments in the main text?

Answer 3: The preference is for supporting documents to be included as an appendix with a reference in the correct section of the response and ensuring that the appendix title includes the referring section title. For example:

Appendix A: Supporting Documents for EF1, Financial Information, Successive Assurances and Financial Guarantees

Question 2: Page counts: There are several supporting document deliverables such as the certificate of registration. Are these excluded from the total page count?

Answer 2: Where CNL has requested specific supporting documents these are excluded from the page count.

Question 1: We are preparing the SMR site application form for Stage 2 clearance. Could you send the security screening form?

Answer 1: Please email requests to [smr@cnl.ca](mailto:smr@cnl.ca) and the security screening form will be sent directly to the requester.