Enclosure 3: A Risk-Based Approach to Describing Potential Effects

No.	Definition of Effects Risk Rating	Key Considerations Informing Judgement[1]	Outcome[2] Scenarios
[1]	No effect anticipated	No known or reasonable effect pathway between project and VC, based on project documentation, and IAAC experience or the opinion of expert reviewers.	• Reviewers may identify the effect in their comments on a draft Initial Project Description (dIPD) or Initial Project Description (IPD). • Reviewers may provide a rationale for why the effect may not need to be included in the Summary of Issues (SOI) and/or draft Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (TISGs). • Reviewers may note a conditional risk characterization and instruct the Agency to seek clarification from the proponent to confirm risk characterization.
[2]	Anticipated effect may be detectable, but is negligible, without mitigation.	Evidence demonstrates that the anticipated effect is within the normal range of variability.	• Reviewers should identify the effect in their comments on a dIPD or IPD, and provide rationale for identification of the effect. • Reviewers may provide instructions for how the proponent would build confidence in project documentation: o during the pre-planning phase: in a subsequent IPD; or o during the planning phase: in the Detailed Project Description (DPD). • Reviewers may note a conditional risk characterization and instruct the Agency to seek clarification from the proponent to confirm risk characterization. • Agency would include the effect in the SOI. • Agency may include the effect in the draft TISGs with tightly scoped information requirements; or exclude the effect from the draft TISGs, with rationale for the exclusion.
[3]	Anticipated residual effect may be detectable, but is negligible, after application of well-understood mitigation measures.	Evidence demonstrates that anticipated residual effects are within the normal range of variability, following implementation of well understood mitigation measures	• Reviewers should identify the effect in their comments on a dIPD or IPD, and provide a rationale for identification. • Reviewers should provide instructions for how the proponent would build confidence in project documentation o during the pre-planning phase: in a subsequent IPD; or o during the planning phase: in the Detailed Project Description (DPD). • Reviewers may note a conditional risk characterization and instruct the Agency to seek clarification from the proponent to confirm risk characterization. • Agency would include the effect in the SOI. • Agency may include the effect in the draft TISGs with tightly scoped information requirements, with rationale; or exclude the effect from the draft TISGs, with rationale for the exclusion.
[4]	Anticipated residual effect is non-negligible after well- understood mitigation, or may require mitigation measures that are not well understood.	Evidence demonstrates that anticipated residual effects may exceed the normal range of variability, following implementation of well understood mitigation measures; or, lack of evidence regarding effectiveness of mitigation measures. May require follow-up program measures to verify predictions	• Reviewers should identify the effect in their comments on a dIPD or IPD, and provide a rationale for identification. • Reviewers should provide instructions for how the proponent would build confidence in project documentation o during the pre-planning phase: in a subsequent IPD; or o during the planning phase: in the Detailed Project Description (DPD). • Reviewers may note a conditional risk characterization and instruct the Agency to seek clarification from the proponent to confirm risk characterization. • Agency would include the effect in the SOI. • Agency would include the effect in the draft TISGs with focussed information requirements, which would be retained in the TISGs.
[5]	Anticipated effect would require substantial interventions as mitigation measures.	Evidence demonstrates that residual effects are expected or would require implementation of complex mitigation measures of uncertain effectiveness or feasibility. May require follow-up program measures to verify predictions.	• Reviewers should identify the effect in their comments on a dIPD or IPD, and provide a rationale for identification. • Reviewers should provide instructions for how the proponent would build confidence in project documentation o during the pre-planning phase: in a subsequent IPD; or o during the planning phase: in the Detailed Project Description (DPD). • Reviewers may note a conditional risk characterization and instruct the Agency to seek clarification from the proponent to confirm risk characterization. • Agency would include the effect in the SOI. • Agency would include the effect in the draft TISGs with detailed information requirements, which would be retained in the TISGs.
[6]	Effects are novel or not known	Reasonable theoretical pathway for effects but no previous assessment or experience on which to rate effects.	• Reviewers should identify the effect in their comments on a dIPD or IPD, and provide a rationale for identification. • Reviewers should provide instructions for how the proponent would build confidence in project documentation o during the pre-planning phase: in a subsequent IPD; or o during the planning phase: in the Detailed Project Description (DPD). • Reviewers may note a conditional risk characterization and instruct that the Agency seek clarification from the proponent to confirm risk characterization. • Agency would include the effect in the SOI • Agency would include the effect in the draft TISGs with detailed information requirements, which would be retained in the TISGs.

[1] Evidence: Federal Expert Advice, IAAC experience based on previous EAs; Indigenous knowledge; Community Knowledge; input from Provincial Ministries and Municipalities, Relevant Regional Studies, and Strategic and regional Assessments; and Information provided in the detailed project description.

[2] After analyzing additional risk-assessment considerations: Potential for cumulative effects; Impacts on rights of Indigenous peoples or other knowledge or concerns of Indigenous participants; Level of public concern; and jurisdictional considerations