Climate, Nature and Economy Lens (CNEL)

ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE CANADA

|  |
| --- |
| *WITH SUPPLEMENTAL GUIDANCE* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PROPOSAL IDENTIFICATION** | | | | | |
| **Proposal Title:**  **Lead Department:** | | | | | **Date of Template Finalization:** |
| **Lead Branch / Directorate in ECCC:** | | | | **Contact Information:**  Name:  Title:  E-mail: | |
| **Proposal Type:**  **Budget Proposal**  **MC**  **TB Submission**  **Reg. Proposal**  **Other:** | | | | | |
| **Does this proposal represent a sub-component of a broader package:**  Yes  No Unknown  *If answered "Yes," please name the broader package (e.g. MC, horizontal initiative, etc.):* | | | | | |
| **SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL** – *(Maximum 600 words)*   * *What is the proposal's purpose, and/or what does it aim to achieve or accomplish?* * *How does the proposal plan to achieve its objectives?* * *How does the proposal help the Government of Canada deliver on its priorities?* * *If the proposal is made of several distinct components, please provide a brief description of each.*   >   |  | | --- | | If the proposal involves renewed funding for an existing initiative, please include links to any existing and publicly available information currently available on Government of Canada websites. | | | | | | |
| **REQUEST FOR EXEMPTION**   |  | | --- | | As per the Directive, departments and agencies are not required to conduct a CNEL in certain situations. Consult experts within your organization and, where necessary, the SEEA Secretariat at ECCC, when considering whether a given proposal should be exempt. | | | | | | |
| The lead approving this form is **requesting an exemption from completing the CNEL** on the following ground(s):  The proposal is prepared in response to a clear and immediate emergency where time is insufficient to undertake an assessment.   |  | | --- | | Ministers are responsible for determining the existence of an emergency. Emergency situations may include:   * Natural disasters (e.g., wildfire, flooding, ice storm, earthquake, etc.) * Public health emergencies (e.g., infectious disease outbreaks and pandemics) * National security emergency (e.g., bomb or nuclear threats, military attack) * Cyber security incidents * Chemical releases (e.g., oil spills, release of hazardous materials) |   The proposal is prepared as a matter of routine or administrative procedure with a low likelihood of important environmental or economic effects.   |  | | --- | | Departments and agencies are encouraged to develop a list of pre-determined proposal types falling into the category of routine or administrative matters in consultation with the SEEA Secretariat at ECCC.  Examples of types of proposals that may be considered in this category include:   * Governor-in-Council appointments * Decks or aide-mémoires for information * Administrative amendments to legislation or regulations (e.g., updating references, adjusting for translation discrepancies, etc.) * Government responses to Parliament that summarize existing federal policies and programs * Progress or performance reports (e.g., Departmental Plans, Departmental Results Reports, annual reports to Parliament, and status reports) |   The proposal is subject to federal environmental or impact assessment legislation, such as the *Impact Assessment Act* or the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*.   |  | | --- | | A CNEL is not required for proposals already subject to environmental and economic effects assessments under a process conducted under federal environmental or impact assessment legislation. In such circumstances, relevant environmental and economic findings from the legislated process are considered sufficient to meet the requirements of the SEEA process and the findings of the CNEL Reference Template. |   Describe the rationale for the exemption request. *(Maximum 300 words)*  > | | | | | |
| **PRELIMINARY SCREENING**   |  | | --- | | The preliminary screening questions are mandatory. A response should be chosen from the options for each question, and additional textual input may be required based on your responses. The preliminary screening questions determine if more detailed elements of the CNEL must be completed.  Each screening question includes several points to consider, phrased in the form of sub-questions. These points are meant to illustrate key factors to assess in your response but should not be considered an exhaustive list to guide your response. | | | | | | |
| **Question PS-1** | **Could this proposal produce important effects related to greenhouse gases (GHG) and/or impact** [**Canada’s GHG emissions reduction plans or targets**](https://www.canada.ca/en/services/environment/weather/climatechange/climate-plan/climate-plan-overview.html)**?**  **Choose an item:**   Yes  No Undetermined | | | | |
| ***Points to consider when responding to Question PS-1:***   * *Do aspects of the proposal increase or decrease GHG emissions? (Aside from incidental GHG fluctuations associated with small staff increases, travel, regular office, or fieldwork, etc.)* * *Does the proposal contribute to existing federal climate commitments or related goals, such as those communicated in Canada’s latest Emissions Reduction Plan?* * *Notwithstanding anticipated near term effect on emissions, could this proposal result in locking in GHG emissions that run counter to achieving net-zero targets by 2050?* * *Does the proposal include any quantified GHG emission increases or decreases?*   If you respond **YES**:   * Complete sections A-100, A-300 and Part C – Cross-Cutting Considerations   If you respond **NO**:   * Provide a narrative response below that outlines how this proposal will not produce important effects related to GHGs and/or impact Canada’s GHG emissions reduction plans or targets. *(Maximum 200 words)*   >  If you respond **UNDETERMINED**:   * Provide a narrative response for why this question cannot be answered at this time. *(Maximum 200 words)*   > | | | | | |
| **Question PS-2** | | **Could this proposal have an important impact on nature and/or biodiversity?**  **Choose an item:**   Yes  No Undetermined | | | |
| ***Points to consider when responding to Question PS-2:***   * *Will the proposal affect land use and thereby impact biodiversity, species at risk and/or natural carbon sinks?* * *Will the proposal affect positively or negatively the connectivity of protected areas or conservation corridors?* * *Will the proposal contribute to or hinder Canada’s goals for conserved areas?* * *Will the proposal affect positively or negatively ecosystem health (resilience and ability to maintain ecological functions) and resulting ecosystem services?* * *Will the proposal affect in an important manner, positively or negatively, any species listed in Schedule I of the* [*Species at Risk Act*](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/species-risk-act-accord-funding/listing-process/wildlife-schedule-1.html)*?* * *Will the proposal affect positively or negatively migratory birds?*   If you respond **YES**:   * Complete sections A-200, A-300 and Part C – Cross-Cutting Considerations   If you respond **NO**:   * Provide a narrative response below that outlines how this proposal will not have an important impact on nature and/or biodiversity. *(Maximum 200 words)*   >  If you respond **UNDETERMINED**:   * Provide a narrative response for why this question can not be answered at this time. *(Maximum 200 words)*   > | | | | | |
| **Question PS-3** | | **Beyond impacts identified in questions PS-1 and PS-2 pertaining to GHG emissions and biodiversity, could this proposal result in other important environmental effects?**  **Choose an item:**   Yes  No Undetermined | | | |
| ***Points to consider when responding to Question PS-3:***   * *Consult the list of environmental effects in question A-311 to guide your determination* * *Review the following factors in determining whether effects should be considered important:*   + ***Frequency and duration*** *– Will the effect be a one-time-only occurrence? Will it be a short-term or long-term effect?*   + ***Location and magnitude*** *– What is the anticipated scale of the effect? Will it be local, regional, national or international in scope?*   + ***Timing*** *– Is the effect likely to occur at a time when environmental features are more sensitive to disruption, such as wildlife migration or nesting season?*   + ***Risk*** *– Is there a high risk associated with the effect, such as exposure of humans or flora and fauna to contaminants or pollution or a high risk of an accident?*   + ***Irreversibility*** *– Is the effect likely to be irreversible?*   + ***Cumulative nature*** *– Is the effect likely to combine with other effects in the region in a way that could threaten a particular environmental component?*   If you respond **YES**:   * Complete sections A-300 and Part C – Cross-Cutting Considerations   If you respond **NO**:   * Provide a narrative response below that outlines how this proposal will not result in any residual important environmental effect (beyond GHG emissions and biodiversity if responding “YES” to PS-1 and/or PS-2). *(Maximum 200 words)*   >  If you respond **UNDETERMINED**:   * Provide a narrative response for why this question can not be answered at this time. *(Maximum 200 words)*   > | | | | | |
| **Question PS-4** | | **Do current or projected impacts of climate change pose a specific or heightened risk to this proposal achieving its stated objectives?**  **Choose an item:**   Yes  No Undetermined | | | |
| ***Points to consider when responding to Question PS-4:***   * *Have the latest climate projections, including the department climate risk assessment, been considered for this proposal?* * *Could current and projected impacts of climate change affect the health and safety of the people implementing the proposal?* * *Could current and projected impacts of climate change hinder the achievement of the proposal’s intended results, notably for specific groups of peoples who may be disproportionately affected?* * *Does this proposal rely on or create physical infrastructure (roads, buildings, pipelines, telecommunications equipment, etc.) that may be vulnerable to current and projected impacts of climate change? Is this infrastructure built in vulnerable zones (e.g., flood plains, coastal areas, wildland-urban interface)?* * *Could climate change impacts worsen or degrade one or more elements the proposal seeks to maintain or improve?* * *Could climate change impacts affect supply chains or resources on which the proposal depends?*   If you respond **YES**:   * Complete sections A-400 and Part C – Cross-Cutting Considerations   If you respond **NO**:   * Provide a narrative response below that outlines how this proposal does not face a specific or heightened risk to achieving its stated objectives as a result of climate change's current or projected impacts. *(Maximum 200 words)*   >  If you respond **UNDETERMINED**:   * Provide a narrative response for why this question can not be answered at this time. *(Maximum 200 words)*   > | | | | | |
| **Question PS-5** | | **Will this proposal affect, either positively or negatively, climate change adaptation or climate resilience in Canada?**  **Choose an item:**   Yes  No Undetermined | | | |
| ***Points to consider when responding to Question PS-5:***   * *Will this proposal directly or indirectly enhance or hinder the ability of Canadian society and Canada's economy to deal with current and projected climate change effects?* * *Would communities or property owners be in a better/worse position to plan for and/or respond to and recover from heat waves, storms, fires, etc., as a result of this proposal?* * *Will this proposal encourage further location of people, infrastructure or economic activity in areas exposed to climate-related hazards?* * *Would this proposal contribute to physical infrastructure, either public or private, built to withstand increasing environmental extremes, such as wildfires and floods?* * *Would this proposal contribute to natural infrastructure capacity to mitigate natural disasters and other impacts of climate change?* * *Would this proposal advance progress towards any of the targets of the* [*National Adaptation Strategy*](https://www.canada.ca/en/services/environment/weather/climatechange/climate-plan/national-adaptation-strategy.html) *and if so, how? Alternately, could some aspects of the proposal hinder meeting these targets?*   If you respond **YES**:   * Complete sections A-500 and Part C – Cross-Cutting Considerations   If you respond **NO**:   * Provide a narrative response below that outlines how this proposal will not have an important impact on Canada's adaptation and resilience to climate change. *(Maximum 200 words)*   >  If you respond **UNDETERMINED**:   * Provide a narrative response for why this question can not be answered at this time. *(Maximum 200 words)*   > | | | | | |
| **Question PS-6** | | | **Determination of applicability of Strategic Economic Analysis** | | |
| **PS-6.1** | | | **Is this proposal a regulatory proposal subject to the Cabinet Directive on Regulation?**  **Choose an item:**   Yes  No | | |
| If you respond **YES**:   * Do not complete Part B – Strategic Economic Analysis; do not respond to PS-6.2   If you respond **NO**:   * Proceed to PS-6.2 | | | | | |
| **PS-6.2** | | | **Does this proposal, in any year of its implementation, involve net federal spending exceeding $15 million in absolute value?**  **Choose an item:**   Yes  No | | |
| ***Points to consider when responding to Question PS-6.2:***   * *When calculating net federal spending for PS-6.2, exclude any amounts associated with the following:*   + *Accounting treatment changes that affect government or department financial statements*   + *Funding to maintain operational capacity within the public service (e.g., program integrity, Information Technology modernization or other back-office modernization, etc.)*   + *Funding to expand public service policy development or analytical capacity*   + *Litigation settlement payments or negotiating mandates*   + *Funding for international development assistance and contributions to international organizations*   If you respond **YES**:   * Complete Part B – Strategic Economic Analysis and Part C – Cross-Cutting Considerations for the aspects of your proposal associated with non-excluded spending.   If you respond **NO**:   * Do not complete Part B – Strategic Economic Analysis. * If your proposal involves regulatory, legislative, or other rule changes, central agencies may in exceptional circumstances still request a Strategic Economic Analysis. In such cases, please contact the SEEA Secretariat at [ocne-cnel@ec.gc.ca](mailto:ocne-cnel@ec.gc.ca). | | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART A – STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS** | | |
| **Section A-100 – Effects on Greenhouse Gas Emissions**  Complete this section if you answered "Yes" to preliminary screening Question PS-1.   |  | | --- | | Climate change mitigation is about reducing GHG emissions from human activities. The 2030 Emissions Reduction Plan under the *Canadian Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act* is a roadmap that outlines a sector-by-sector path for Canada to reach its emissions reduction target of 40 to 45% below 2005 levels by 2030 and put Canada on a path to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050.  This section assesses whether/how the proposal could affect the amount of GHG emitted annually and over time. For the questions below, increases and/or decreases in GHG emissions refers to the difference to future emissions between a status quo scenario and a scenario where the proposal is implemented.  Context for all responses provided here, including any discussion of baseline emission trends, should be included in A-160, the narrative section dedicated to explaining the proposal’s impact on emissions. | | | |
| **A-110 Emission Reductions**   |  | | --- | | This section seeks information on elements of the proposal that could reduce future GHG emissions over what would occur in the absence of the proposal. | | | |
| **A-111** Will some aspects of the proposal generate GHG reductions or increase GHG sequestration compared to the present?  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Yes** | At least some elements of the proposal would lead to a reduction in emissions. Answering “Yes” to this question does not require that the overall proposal result in net GHG reductions when balanced against any GHG increases associated with the proposal, nor that any GHG reductions are necessarily ongoing. For example, a proposal to consolidate several existing federal facilities into a single newly built facility will lead to discrete emissions reductions associated with the carbon footprints of each existing building that is closed even if the carbon footprint of the new facility is unknown. Therefore, the overall net GHG impact of the proposal remains unknown. | | **No** | No part of this proposal reduces emissions or increases sequestration. For example, a proposal to establish a new scientific base in the North, as a new capital asset with related construction and energy needs, is not expected to include components that reduce emission in comparison to a scenario where the base is not built. “No” should also be selected for proposals that only increase emissions, with additional details provided under A-120. | | **Undetermined** | The proposal’s impacts on GHG emissions reduction and sequestration are unknown. |   **A-112** Does the proposal accelerate the timeline of GHG reductions that would occur prior to 2050 under current policies?  **Choose an item:**  This proposal generates new emissions reductions which would not otherwise occur  This proposal accelerates emission reductions that would have occurred at a later date  This proposal generates a mix of new and accelerated emission reductions  This proposal does not generate emission reductions  Undetermined   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **This proposal achieves new emissions reductions which would not otherwise occur** | The proposal delivers emission reductions, which, absent the proposal, would not have occurred by or before 2050. An example would be a proposal to increase the stringency of regulations on the GHG intensity of fuel beyond both current and expected future limits. | | **This proposal accelerates emission reductions that would have occurred at a later date** | The proposal accelerates emissions reductions that would likely have been realized by or before 2050, even without the proposal. An example may be a program to replace oil-burning furnaces in homes. Such a program would advance already-expected emissions reductions as it is assumed most homes would have replaced their oil-burning furnaces by 2050, even without additional federal intervention. | | **This proposal generates a mix of new and accelerated emission reductions** | The proposal involves a combination of the above cases. | | **This proposal does not generate emission reductions** | No emission reductions are expected. | | **Undetermined** | It is unknown whether anticipated emission reductions would or would not have occurred prior to 2050 absent the proposal. |   **A-113** Does this proposal directly support the implementation of any specific elements mentioned in any of Canada's [GHG emissions reduction plans or targets](https://www.canada.ca/en/services/environment/weather/climatechange/climate-plan/climate-plan-overview.html)?  **Choose an item:**  Yes (details to be provided in A-140)  No  Undetermined   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Yes** | This proposal is directly mentioned in or meaningfully supports specific aspects of one or more of Canada’s recent climate plans. For example, a proposal to deliver on clean fuels, as committed to in section 2.1.2 of Canada’s 2030 Emissions Reduction Plan. | | **No** | This proposal is not directly linked to Canada’s climate plans or targets. This would be a proposal that introduces an approach to reducing emissions that was until now not formally covered in Canada’s current GHG emissions reduction plan. | | **Undetermined** | It is not known whether this proposal is linked to specific elements of Canada’s climate plans. | | | |
| **A-120 Emission Increases**   |  | | --- | | This section seeks information on elements of the proposal that could increase future GHG emissions over what these would be in the absence of the proposal. | | | |
| **A-121** Will some aspects of the proposal, excluding government operations, generate new GHG emissions compared to the present? (*select from options below*)  No new GHG emissions  Temporary GHG emission increases (e.g., construction, equipment investments, extraordinary travel, other)  New ongoing GHG emissions  Undetermined   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Please select all options that apply when responding to this question. For example, a proposal to fund a new electrified light rail transit system may have temporary GHG emission increases associated with the construction of physical infrastructure, while reducing GHG emissions over the long run by displacing fossil-fuel powered transportation (with lower or zero carbon intensity). | | | **No new GHG emissions** | This proposal has no elements expected to increase GHG emissions over what they would been if not implemented. | | **Temporary GHG emission increases** | This proposal has elements that will contribute to a temporary increase in emissions (e.g., construction, equipment investments, etc.). For example, a proposal funding light rail transit would temporarily increase emissions through the construction of stations, roadwork, etc. while reducing car/truck usage over the long-term term. | | **New ongoing GHG emissions** | This proposal introduces, expands, or extends any activity or infrastructure that produces GHG emissions. This includes any policies or programs that grow the economy, or a specific sub-sector, in a way that is not compliant with net-zero approaches.  For example, a federal program that supports the economic expansion of a cement facility using traditional technology, leading to an ongoing increase in fossil fuel consumption. | | **Undetermined** | The proposal’s impacts on emissions are unknown. For example, a grants and contributions (G&C) program where the types of projects to be funded would be unknown. |   **A-122** Will government operations / program delivery associated with this proposal produce GHG increases above and beyond those associated with the usual activities of the sponsoring department(s):  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined   |  |  | | --- | --- | | For this question, “government operations” refers to the resources and activities employed directly by federal organizations in achieving the objectives of the proposal. For example, the work of government employees, vehicles (cars, boats, etc.) used to carry out government activities (e.g. site visits, inspections), other equipment in use (e.g. computers, lab equipment), etc. The focus should be on novel changes to departmental operations, either in scope or type, associated with the proposal that will lead to consequential changes in emissions. Detailed consideration of existing or typical government operations activities should not be included. | | | **Yes** | This proposal would increase emissions from government operations above and beyond the usual activities. For example, a proposal aiming to build a new\* government facility (e.g. office building) or increase fleet size (e.g. trucks, marine vessels). Another example may be the creation of a new federal organization or sub-organization entailing a substantial increase in employees, equipment, and/or workspace.  \**Assuming the new facility is not replacing an older facility but is built in addition to any existing facilities and is not built according to net-zero standards.* | | **No** | This proposal would not increase emissions of the federal government above and beyond those associated with the usual activities. For example, requesting funding to continue an existing program, to expand a program in an incremental manner, or to launch a new program similar in scope and activity to the department’s existing programs. | | **Undetermined** | The impact of this proposal on emissions stemming from government operations is unknown. |   **A-123** Will the proposal change land use or land cover in a way that increases GHG emissions:  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Yes** | This proposal would directly or indirectly cause or contribute to land-use change and/or land cover change, resulting in a shift from high-carbon storage land to low-carbon storage land, where there was no such change in land before.  Definitions  “*Land-use change*” refers to the anthropogenic process of transforming the natural landscape.  Land-use change can result in GHG fluxes between the atmosphere and Canada’s managed lands. The following is an illustrative list of land-use changes with a negative impact from a GHG perspective (that also have the biggest biodiversity impacts):   * Forest land to cropland, grassland, or settlement; * Cropland to settlement; * Grassland to settlement or cropland; * Wetland to cropland or settlement; * Perennial crops (e.g. tame grasslands, forage fields, etc.) to annual crops (e.g. corn).   Land-use categories (a-f):   1. “*Forest land*”: all treed areas of 1 hectare or more, with a minimum tree crown cover of 25% and trees of 5 m in height or having the potential to reach this height. 2. *“Cropland”\*:* all land in annual crops, summer fallow and perennial crops. All agricultural land that is not classified as grassland is classified de facto as cropland, including unimproved pastures where the natural vegetation would be forest (i.e. Eastern Canada and most of British Columbia).   “*Annual crops*”: a plant that completes its life cycle within one growing season (e.g. corn).  “*Perennial crops*”: mostly forage, but also including berries, grapes, nursery crops, vegetables, fruit trees and orchards.   1. *“Grassland*”\*: grassland used for agriculture is considered unimproved pasture or rangeland exclusively used for grazing domestic livestock. It occurs only in geographical areas where the grassland would not naturally regrow to forest if abandoned (i.e. natural shortgrass prairies in southern Saskatchewan and Alberta). Vegetated areas that do not meet the definition of forest land or cropland are generally classified as Grassland (i.e. extensive areas of tundra in the Canadian North are considered unmanaged grassland).   *\* Agricultural land can include both cropland and grassland*.   1. “*Wetland*”: areas where permanent or recurrent saturated conditions allow the establishment of vegetation and the development of soils typical of these conditions and that are not already included in the forest land, cropland or grassland categories. Currently, managed lands included in the wetlands category are those where human interventions have directly altered the water table—which include peatlands drained for peat extraction and land flooded for hydroelectric reservoirs. 2. “*Settlement*”: all built-up land, including urban, rural residential, industrial and recreational land; roads, rights-of-way and other transportation infrastructure; and land used for resource exploration, extraction and distribution (mining, oil and gas). 3. “*Other Land*”: this category comprises areas of rock, ice or bare soil, and all land areas that do not fall into any of the other first five categories.   “*Land cover change*” refers to the change in how an area is managed within the same land-use category. Some examples of land cover change include, but are not limited to:   * Selective forestry (forest retains the same use but has a different density due to logging); * Perennial cropland to annual cropland (ranching land to cornfields or soy). | | **No** | The proposal would not directly or indirectly cause or contribute to land-use change and/or land cover change, as defined above. | | **Undetermined** | It is unknown whether the proposal would directly or indirectly cause or contribute to land-use change and/or land cover change, as defined above. | | | |
| **A-130** | **Anticipated Net Effects on GHG Emissions - Qualitative** | |
| **A-131** Considering emissions effects described in sections A-110 and A-120, this proposal is expected to result in the following net changes in GHG emissions in the near term (5-year time horizon) and long term (25-year time horizon):   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **GHG emissions change compared to a scenario in which the proposal does not move forward** | **Net near-term effect**  **(5-year time horizon)** | **Net long-term effect**  **(25-year time horizon)** | | **Direction** | Decrease emissions  Increase emissions  Undetermined net GHG impacts | Decrease emissions  Increase emissions  Undetermined net GHG impacts |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Decrease emissions** | This proposal results in net GHG reductions – i.e., the decrease in emissions is larger than the increase in emissions (if applicable) stemming from this proposal over the relevant time horizon. For example, a proposal funding public transport (e.g. light rail transit) may increase emissions through infrastructure construction but may also deliver an even greater decrease in emissions by reducing the use of cars or buses. Such a proposal could result in net GHG emissions increase in the short term but net GHG emissions decrease over the long term. | | **Increase emissions** | The proposal leads to a net increase in GHG emissions over the relevant time horizon. | | **Undetermined net GHG impacts** | The proposal’s net impacts on GHG emissions are unknown over the relevant time horizon. |   **A-132** If net emission increases are anticipated from this proposal as per A-131, are explicit plans being made to address those? If yes, describe those plans in section A-160.  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No  Not Applicable | | |
| **A-140** **Compatibility of the Proposal with a Net-Zero Future** | | |
| **A-141** Will the proposal involve new buildings, infrastructure, or other endeavours specifically designed to be "net-zero" in terms of GHG emissions?  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Yes** | The proposal involves or delivers specific, stand-alone elements which are “net-zero” or “net-zero ready,” wherein elements will not, on an ongoing basis, emit GHGs or emissions will be offset through actions such as tree planting or deployment of technologies that can capture carbon before it is released into the air. Proponents can select “Yes” to this question even if only some elements are “net-zero” while other elements may generate GHG emissions and/or if the overall net GHG impact is unknown. | | **No** | This proposal does not involve or deliver any specific, stand-alone elements which are “net-zero” or “net-zero ready,” irrespective of whether the proposal contributes directly or indirectly to Canada’s economy-wide goal of net zero emission by 2050. | | **Undetermined** | The proposal’s association with “net-zero" or “net-zero ready” elements is unknown. |   **A-142** Will the proposal impede emissions reductions in the targeted sector(s) or other sectors:  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Yes** | This proposal impedes emissions reductions elsewhere. While some proposals may not directly lead to changes to GHG emissions, they may have indirect impacts and could impede other actions that are aimed at reducing/removing emissions. For example, a program that relies heavily on air transportation to expand tourism or promote access to healthcare for remote communities may inadvertently hinder efforts to reduce emissions in the transportation sector. | | **No** | This proposal would not impede emissions reductions elsewhere. | | **Undetermined** | It is unknown whether the proposal would impede emissions reductions elsewhere. |   **A-143** Will the proposal directly invest in or otherwise enable or support assets that may be stranded (rendered prematurely unusable) by future emission reduction policies:  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Yes** | Stranded assets are any asset or investment that experiences unanticipated or premature write-downs, devaluations, and/or conversion into a liability. For example, an initiative that induces electric utilities to retrofit their facilities to burn natural gas instead of coal (a higher emitting fuel) may result in near-term emission reductions; however, these new facilities will either need to be abandoned before the end of their productive lifespan (~ 50 years) or significantly upgraded to meet 2050 net-zero objectives. | | **No** | This proposal would not lock-in emissions generating assets. | | **Undetermined** | It is unknown whether the proposal would lock-in emissions generating assets. | | | |
| **A-150 Anticipated Net Effects on GHG Emissions - Quantitative (if applicable)**   |  | | --- | | Only complete section A-150 if your proposal is making quantified claims of reductions and/or increases to GHG emissions. | | | |
| **A-151** Provide the projected cumulative net effect of your proposal on Canada's annual GHG emissions from now until target years 2030 and 2050 respectively. If available, provide also the projected changes to annual emission for these two target years.  ***Please note:***   * *Any proposal lead claiming an effect on annual GHG emissions of more than 0.5 megaton of carbon dioxide equivalent in any year must contact the SEEA Secretariat at ECCC for validation. The GHG modeling team at ECCC, responsible to publish the* [*official GHG emissions projections of the Government of Canada*](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/climate-change/greenhouse-gas-emissions/projections.html)*, will review the claim to ensure its soundness and incrementality to measures already modeled in Canada’s projections.*  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **GHG emissions change compared to a scenario in which the proposal does not move forward** | **Cumulative emission change**  **to 2030** | **Cumulative emission change**  **to 2050** | **Annual emission change - 2030** | **Annual emission change - 2050** | | **GHG emissions changes (in Mt)**  **- for decrease**  **+ for increase** |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | | GHG estimates provided for “Cumulative emission change to 2030” and “Cumulative emission change to 2050” should be a summation of all the annual emissions changes in each year, leading up to and including the year 2030 for the former and 2050 for the latter. GHG estimates provided for “Annual emission change in year 2030” and “Annual emissions change in year 2050” should be the annual impact anticipated in the given year (i.e., annual reduction/increase expected as of 2030 and annual reduction/increase as of 2050). Further context and detail on the timing or trends related to expected GHG reductions / increases can be provided in section A-160 Narrative. |   **A-152** Actual GHG emissions changes may differ from those quantified due to the following factors: (*select any that apply*)  The science / data in this area is not well established  Contingent on factors outside the proposal  Dependent on elements to be designed at a later stage  Assumes the development and deployment of new or unproven technologies  Stems from grants or contributions to third parties  Other (*provide further details in section A-160*)   |  | | --- | | Please select one or more of the above certainty factors to help characterize the quantified emissions provided in A-151, as applicable. If “Other” is selected, please provide further details in A-160. |   **A-153** To support quantification provided in A-151, is a spreadsheet file detailing the calculations provided with this CNEL, e.g., Excel workbook?  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined   |  | | --- | | Please select “Yes” or “No” from the options above to indicate if supporting material used to derive the estimates in A-151 has been provided. If “Yes,” please attach the appropriate material in your submission, along with the CNEL. |     **A-154** Describe the model/tool, methodology and assumptions used to derive the quantitative estimates provided in A-151.  *Maximum 600 words.*  >   |  | | --- | | Where a numerical estimate is provided in either or both time periods under A-151, please provide additional methodological information. Factors to be considered include:   * How are emission changes calculated? * How does the emission scenario associated with the proposal (policy scenario) differ from current GHG projections (baseline scenario)? * Include all relevant information used to estimate energy use and/or emissions. | | | |
| **A-160 Narrative** | | |
| *Explain the proposal's impact on emissions. Refer to the information provided is sections A-110 to A-150 as appropriate.*   * *Does the proposal directly increase / decrease emissions through mandatory measures, enable reductions by building supply chains or infrastructure aligned with net-zero policies,* *or conversely, impede emission reductions through factors such as increased energy consumption or reliance on carbon-intensive processes, or impact emissions by encouraging behavioural change?* * *How would emissions evolve in the sector(s) if this proposal was not approved? If this proposal accelerates GHG emission reductions compared to a baseline, please describe this baseline and discuss the timeframe and the overall impact of those accelerated reductions over that selected baseline.* * *If this proposal is expected to result in net an emission increase, describe any plan this proposal may have to address these new emissions.* * *Maximum 600 words.*   >   |  | | --- | | This section should cover any emission increases or decreases, the direct drivers of each linked to the proposal, as well as the associated timelines and any factors that may contribute to uncertainty regarding the anticipated outcomes.  Input in A-160 should be guided by the sub-questions contained within section A-110 to A-150 and should expand upon and provide context for the responses provided for those sub-questions, where appropriate.  Section A-160 should reflect on whether any anticipated emission reductions will be achieved directly by reducing the intensity or volume of emission-emitting activities; through enabling measures, enhancing supply chains, systems, infrastructure or other measures that will, in turn, support the reduction or replacement of emission-emitting activities; through amplifying existing emission reduction approaches, increasing awareness of or encouraging behaviours and activities that will lead to reduced emissions; or through some combination of these or other approaches. Conversely, this section must also assess whether the proposal has the potential to increase GHG emissions, such as thorough intensifying the volume of emission-emitting activities or indirectly by undermining existing emission reduction strategies.  Where available, context can also be provided on how emissions may be projected to evolve in the targeted sector(s) if the proposal is not approved. Would emissions be expected to increase or decrease in the absence of the proposed interventions? Are other policies and programs already working to reduce emissions in these areas? How would the proposal interact with existing programs or influence pre-existing emission trends?  Context can also be provided on how the proposal’s impacts may differ between 2030 and 2050. Will maximum impact be achieved by or before 2030 and be maintained thereafter? Will the proposal’s impact(s) grow between 2030 and 2050? Will a desire to achieve targeted GHG reductions for 2030 (i.e., a reduction of 40% to 45% across Canada’s economy) contribute to or impede the achievement of the 2050 goal of a net-zero Canadian economy? In some cases, a proposal may accelerate already-expected GHG reductions without changing the annual emissions for 2030 or 2050. For example, a new federal program may cut a certain emission source in half by 2035 rather than the previously expected date of 2045. In such cases, the cumulative reductions over time should be emphasized over the corresponding time horizon rather than focusing only on the impacts in 2030 and 2050.  Examples to consider when preparing input to section A-160:  **Example: Affordable Housing**  A proposal that seeks to build new affordable housing intended to operate beyond 2050 may propose to use furnaces that can only burn natural gas, which would reduce emissions in the short term compared to an oil-based heating system, aligning with Canada’s 2030 goals but would still generate a certain level of emissions, making it challenging to align with Canada’s 2050 net-zero target. However, if the buildings are designed to be “net-zero ready,” with furnaces compatible with biogas or hydrogen once the external infrastructure is available to supply such fuels, this can be considered a concrete path to net-zero emissions and would thus have a positive impact towards achieving net-zero emissions by 2050.  **Example: Policies on Sustainable Finance**  Sustainable finance policies that seek to incorporate climate considerations throughout financial decision-making can mobilize private sector financing towards Canada’s climate objectives. While sustainable finance policies may not directly lead to emissions reductions, they can enable and accelerate progress towards Canada’s 2030 and 2050 emissions targets.  **Example: Fuel Switching and Building Standards**  Practices that increase efficiency, such as fuel switching, i.e. the adoption of less carbon-intensive fuels, may have merit in some cases, but caution is needed to determine their impacts on Canada’s 2030 and 2050 emission targets. For example, switching fuels (such as burning natural gas instead of coal to generate electricity) could have a positive impact on the 2030 target but would require offsetting measures to meet net-zero 2050 objectives. Similarly, a proposal that increases the efficiency of existing practices or technologies is likely to have a positive impact on the 2030 target but a negative impact on the 2050 target. However, a proposal that induces the adoption of non-emitting sources of energy (such as solar, wind or green hydrogen) is likely to have a positive impact on both 2030 and 2050 targets. Moreover, energy efficiency practices or technologies used in conjunction with low or non-emitting energy may also have a positive impact on the 2050 target as they can help support the transition away from fossil fuels by reducing demand. | | | |
| **Section A-200 – Effects on Biodiversity**  Complete this section if you answered "Yes" to preliminary screening Question PS-2   |  | | --- | | This section summarizes both the positive and potentially adverse impacts the proposal might exert on biodiversity. It also promotes establishing links to [Canada's 2030 Nature Strategy](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/biodiversity/canada-2030-nature-strategy.html). | | | |
| **A-210 Identification of Positive and Negative Effects on Nature and Biodiversity** | | |
| **A-211** The proposal could enable the following positive effects on nature and biodiversity:  Increase conserved areas or marine areas in Canada   |  | | --- | | Conserved areas include protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs). Protected areas include national/provincial/territorial parks, Indigenous protected areas, national wildlife areas, migratory bird sanctuaries and marine protected areas. OECMs are areas that do not meet the formal definition of protected area but are managed in a way that conserves biodiversity over the long term. Examples of OECMs can include: Indigenous territories, watersheds or resource management areas, and areas with restricted access, such as those used by the military.  Canada has set a target to conserve 25% of its lands and oceans by 2025 and 30% of each by 2030. |   Improve connectivity of protected areas or conservation corridors   |  | | --- | | Ecological/conservation corridors are areas of land and water that aim to maintain or restore ecological connectivity. They do this by allowing species to move and natural processes to flow freely across large landscapes. Ecological/conservation corridors complement protected and conserved areas. |   Strengthen ecosystem health   |  | | --- | | The proposal drives improvement in the condition and/or functioning of ecosystem services. Ecosystem services can be defined as direct and indirect contributions of ecosystems to human well-being and have an impact on human survival and quality of life.  This includes:   * provisioning – the ability of humans to obtain products from ecosystems, such as food, water, and resources (wood, oil, etc.); * regulating – benefits from the natural processes and functioning of ecosystems, such as climate regulation, flood regulation, pollination, water purification, wetland maintenance, etc.; * enhancing culture – non-material benefits that people can obtain from ecosystems, such as spiritual and/or intellectual development, recreation, aesthetic values; and, * supporting – services that relate to habitat functioning itself, such as photosynthesis, the water cycle, and the nutrient cycle, which influence human survival. |   Support management or recovery of one or many species listed in the [*Species at Risk Act*](https://species-registry.canada.ca/index-en.html#/species?sortBy=commonNameSort&sortDirection=asc&pageSize=10)   |  | | --- | | Please visit [Species at risk – Canada.ca](https://www.canada.ca/en/services/environment/wildlife-plants-species/species-risk.html) for more information regarding the species at risk public registry and the Pan-Canadian approach to species at risk. |   Positive effect on migratory birds or their habitat   |  | | --- | | Please visit [Migratory bird conservation – Canada.ca](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/migratory-bird-conservation.html) for more information regarding regions and strategies and programs and partnerships. |   Other positive effects   |  | | --- | | Describe these effects in A-220. |   **A-212** The proposal could potentially harm nature or biodiversity through:  Contributing to increased rate or extent of land use or land cover change, or landscape or marine habitat fragmentation   |  | | --- | | The proposal would directly or indirectly cause or contribute to ***l****and-use change* and/or *land cover change* where there was no such change in land before. \*   * “*Land-use change*” refers to the anthropogenic process of transforming the natural landscape. * “*Land cover change*” refers to the change in how an area is being managed within the same land-use category.   *\* Please refer to the definitions and land-use categories provided earlier at question A-123 for more detailed information.*  Land-use change resulting in the loss of natural land can affect the environment and result in population declines in wildlife species. For example, loss of natural areas such as forests or wetlands can disrupt the ecosystem services that support human wellbeing, resulting in a decline in air and water quality, an increase in air and water temperatures and an increased risk of flooding. As cities grow outward, urban expansion often encroaches on surrounding areas, including agricultural land, forests and other natural areas. When cropland is lost to urban growth, there can be additional pressure to convert natural areas to cropland to increase agricultural capacity.  “*Landscape fragmentation*” refers to the physical disintegration of continuous habitats into smaller units or patches, most often caused by urban or transport network expansion. Landscape fragmentation includes the severance of ecological/conservation corridors, impairing ecological connectivity and harming protected and conserved areas.  “*Marine habitat fragmentation*” refers to the physical disintegration of continuous sea-based habitats into smaller units or patches. Marine habitat fragmentation can be caused by but is not limited to drilling or mining, dredging, destructive anchoring, removal of corals, and/or land reclamation. |   Weaken ecosystem resilience and ability to produce ecosystem services such as carbon sequestration, flood control and pollination   |  | | --- | | Consult instructions under A-211 for definition and descriptions of some key types of ecosystem service. |   Deterioration of ecosystem health, including introduction of invasive species or pollution   |  | | --- | | The degradation of the health and/or functioning of any of the natural processes related to ecosystem services, in addition, but not limited to, the introduction of invasive species. Invasive species are non-native species introduced to a new ecosystem through climate change and/or anthropogenic action. Invasive species may displace native species and compete with them for resources, degrade habitat, introduce diseases, and breed with native species to form hybrids. |   Impeding management or recovery of one or many species listed in the [*Species at Risk Act*](https://species-registry.canada.ca/index-en.html#/species?sortBy=commonNameSort&sortDirection=asc&pageSize=10)   |  | | --- | | Please visit [Species at risk – Canada.ca](https://www.canada.ca/en/services/environment/wildlife-plants-species/species-risk.html) for more information regarding the species at risk public registry and pan-Canadian approach to species at risk. |   Negatively affecting migratory birds or their habitat   |  | | --- | | Please visit [Migratory bird conservation – Canada.ca](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/migratory-bird-conservation.html) for more information regarding regions and strategies and programs and partnerships. |   Other negative effects (described in A-220)   |  | | --- | | Describe these effects in A-220. | | | |
| **A-220 Narrative** | | |
| * *Explain the proposal’s potential effects, positive or negative, on nature and biodiversity, including, if applicable, how it supports* Canada’s 2030 Nature Strategy*.* * *Maximum 600 words.*   >   |  | | --- | | Please explain the potential positive and negative effects of the proposal on nature and biodiversity, making reference to the responses given in sections A-211 and A-212. Describe, if applicable, how the proposal supports Canada’s 2030 Nature Strategy*.* Refer also to the question prompts in A-220 of the SEEA to help guide your response.  As a starting point, analysts may wish to make a list of the key features of their proposal, including the proposal’s location(s), proposed activities and outcomes, the timeframe or lifespan of the proposal, and targeted clients or populations. Being clear on these features of the proposal can help orient thinking around relevant positive and negative effects on nature and biodiversity. | | | |
| **Section A-300 – Environmental Effects**  Complete this section if you answered "Yes" to preliminary screening Question PS-1 and/or PS-2 and/or PS-3   |  | | --- | | While GHG emissions and biodiversity and nature are two important areas of consideration for environmental impacts, proposals can have a broad range of environmental impacts outside of those areas that also merit consideration and planning.  The questions in this section serve to assess whether the proposal will include measures to enhance positive environmental effects or measures to mitigate negative environmental effects (“improving effects”). It also assesses whether the proposal will have the potential to cause negative environmental effects (“deteriorating effects”). Consideration of environmental effects should include the following factors as outlined and defined in Question PS-3: frequency and duration; location and magnitude; timing; risk; irreversibility; and cumulative nature. | | | |
| **A-310 Overview of Environmental Effects** | | |
| **A-311** Select the relevant areas of effects, positive (improving) or negative (deteriorating), under which this proposal could have an important impact on the environment, including those with limited certainty. You may add additional areas of effects as appropriate- these should be reflected in your narrative answers in this section. An unchecked row indicates no identifiable effect.   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Environmental topics** | Improving effect | | Deteriorating effect | | | **Climate Change** | |  | |  | | Emission of greenhouse gases   |  | | --- | | The production of gases that trap heat in the atmosphere. | | |  | |  | | Capture and sequestration of greenhouse gases   |  | | --- | | The capture and/or removal of greenhouse gases. | | |  | |  | | Reducing potency of GHG emissions (e.g. combustion of methane to carbon dioxide)   |  | | --- | | Decreasing the concentration of greenhouse gas emissions. | | |  | |  | | Albedo Effect   |  | | --- | | The ability of a surface to reflect sunlight. Darker surfaces reflect less sunlight and contribute to temperature rise. For example, an open lake or snow-free landscape will capture and retain more heat than its snow/ice-covered counterpart. | | |  | |  | | **Nature and Biodiversity** | |  | |  | | Effects on species at risk   |  | | --- | | Effects on any extirpated, endangered or threatened species or a species of special concern. | | |  | |  | | General effects on wildlife   |  | | --- | | General effects on a species, subspecies, variety or geographically or genetically distinct population of animal, plant or other organism, other than a bacterium or virus, that is wild by nature and   1. is native to Canada; or 2. has extended its range into Canada without human intervention and has been present in Canada for at least 50 years. | | |  | |  | | Invasive species   |  | | --- | | Species that have become established in areas outside their natural range. Invasive species harm biodiversity by:   * displacing native species and competing with them for resources; * degrading habitat; * introducing diseases; and * breeding with native species to form hybrids. | | |  | |  | | Migratory birds   |  | | --- | | Birds that make regular seasonal movement, often north and south, along a flyway, between breeding and wintering grounds. | | |  | |  | | Wetlands   |  | | --- | | Areas submerged or permeated by water – either permanently or temporarily – and are characterized by plants adapted to saturated soil conditions. Wetlands include fresh and saltwater marshes, wooded swamps, bogs, seasonally flooded forest, sloughs – any land area that can keep water long enough to let wetland plants and soils develop. | | |  | |  | | Landscape fragmentation/habitat loss   |  | | --- | | Landscape fragmentation refers to the physical disintegration of continuous habitats into smaller units or patches, most often caused by urban or transport network expansion. Landscape fragmentation includes the severance of ecological/conservation corridors, impairing ecological connectivity and harming protected and conserved areas. | | |  | |  | | Cumulative environmental effects   |  | | --- | | The combined effects from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future activities and natural processes. These are effects that are likely to combine with other effects in a way that could threaten a particular environmental component. | | |  | |  | | **Human health and well-being** | |  | |  | | Environmental changes that affect an identifiable community   |  | | --- | | Effects resulting from environmental changes that impact a group of people with a shared identity or interest that has the capacity to act or express itself as a collective. An identifiable community may be territorial, organizational, or a community of interest.   * "*Territorial communities*" have governing bodies exercising local or regional jurisdiction (e.g., members of First Nations who reside on reserve lands). * "*Organizational communities*" have explicit mandates and formal leadership (e.g., a regional Inuit association or a friendship centre serving an urban Indigenous community). * "*Communities of interest*" may be formed by individuals or organizations who come together for a common purpose or undertaking. Communities of interest are informal communities whose boundaries and leadership may be fluid and less well-defined. | | |  | |  | | Exposure to harmful substances (e.g., toxic chemicals)   |  | | --- | | A substance that is entering or may enter the environment in a quantity or concentration or under conditions that:   1. have or may have an immediate or long-term harmful effect on the environment or its biological diversity; 2. constitute or may constitute a danger to the environment on which life depends; or 3. constitute or may constitute a danger in Canada to human life or health. | | |  | |  | | Exposure to climate or natural disaster risks   |  | | --- | | Physical risks associated with the impacts from climate change or natural hazards exacerbated by the effects of climate change. | | |  | |  | | Other human health effects   |  | | --- | | Other changes in health resulting from exposure to the effects of the actions or outcomes of the proposal. | | |  | |  | | **Human activity** | |  | |  | | Circularity and recycling   |  | | --- | | The way we extract, use, and dispose of resources. Circularity is a principle that aims to retain and recover as much value as possible from resources by reusing, repairing, refurbishing, remanufacturing, repurposing, or recycling products and materials. | | |  | |  | | Energy efficiency   |  | | --- | | How effectively energy is being used for a given purpose. | | |  | |  | | Energy use   |  | | --- | | The sum of energy consumption by end-users. | | |  | |  | | Material efficiency   |  | | --- | | Decreasing the amount of a particular material needed to produce a specific product. | | |  | |  | | Material use   |  | | --- | | The sum of consumption of materials by end-users. | | |  | |  | | Waste generation   |  | | --- | | Any non-hazardous or hazardous material that is produced and then discarded and managed at recycling facilities or disposal sites. | | |  | |  | | **Pollution** | |  | |  | | Noise   |  | | --- | | Any unwanted or disturbing sound that affects the health and well-being of humans and other organisms. | | |  | |  | | Air   |  | | --- | | The contamination of the indoor or outdoor environment by any chemical, physical or biological agent that modifies the natural characteristics of the atmosphere. | | |  | |  | | Water   |  | | --- | | The release of harmful substances (such as chemicals or microorganisms) into lakes, streams, rivers, estuaries, and oceans to the point where the substances interfere with beneficial use of the water or with the natural functioning of ecosystems. | | |  | |  | | Soil   |  | | --- | | The presence of a chemical or substance out of place or present in a soil at higher than normal concentration that has adverse effects on any organism. | | |  | |  | | **Greening Government** | |  | |  | | Environmental footprint of GoC operations   |  | | --- | | The effects that any Government of Canada operations have on the environment. | | |  | |  | | Environmental performance of procured goods and services   |  | | --- | | The sustainability of a good or service relative to a comparable good or service of approximate equal cost and utility. | | |  | |  | | **Other(s)** | |  | |  | | > | |  | |  | | > | |  | |  | | | |
| **A-320 Narrative** | | |
| **A-321** Describe the potential outcomes (direct and indirect) of the proposal and how they are expected to interact with the environment: *Explain the potential positive and negative environmental effects of the proposal. Consider potential cumulative effects due to interaction with other proposals or activities. (Maximum 400 words)*  >   |  | | --- | | Use the insights gained from A-311 to inform your response to A-321. If A-311 indicates an improving effect on a specific environmental topic, explain here how the proposal positively influences the environment, addressing the corresponding environmental topic. Conversely, if A-311 reveals deteriorating effects, use this section to explain how the proposal will negatively impact this aspect of the environment. Consider cumulative effects by examining interactions with other proposals or activities. When addressing multiple selected topics, please outline each topic individually, potentially grouping overlapping information for clarity. |   **A-322** Identify the anticipated environmental risks or benefits of not implementing the proposal*:* *Risks could include that the status quo and its associated problems continue, or negative conditions develop or worsen. Benefits could include* *not causing environmental damage considered unavoidable from the implementation of the proposal. (Maximum 300 words)*  >   |  | | --- | | If failure to implement the proposal poses risks to the environment, describe the potential negative consequences associated with maintaining the status quo or allowing existing problems to persist and potentially worsen. Use specific examples to illustrate these risks and highlight the urgency for proposal implementation. Alternatively, if applicable, describe how not proceeding with the proposal could avoid environmental damage that might otherwise be considered unavoidable, providing evidence to support the claims. |   **A-323** Identify measures planned to mitigate negative and enhance positive environmental effects. *Also, consider what additional measures could be taken to improve positive effects further. (Maximum 300 words)*  >   |  | | --- | | Use the insights gained from A-311 and the detailed analysis in A-321 to inform your response to A-323. If A-321 reveals deteriorating effects, provide details of any planned mitigation strategies. When A-321 indicates improving effects, expand on how the proposal plans to enhance them. Include any additional measures which may not currently be planned but could reasonably be introduced to further enhance those improving effects. Describe how measures aimed at mitigating negative and/or enhancing positive environmental effects align with environmental regulations, best practices, and current Government of Canada policies, if applicable. Where possible, provide examples and evidence to support the feasibility and effectiveness of these measures. |   **A-324**What follow-up and monitoring measures will be undertaken to track the environmental effects? *Include when the follow-up will occur and how the follow-up will be implemented and reported. When appropriate, it is encouraged to use existing mechanisms for monitoring and follow-up.* *(Maximum 200 words)*  >   |  | | --- | | The proposal should consider the need for follow-up measures to monitor the environmental effects of the proposal throughout its implementation. Outline the specific follow-up and monitoring measures planned to track the anticipated impacts of the proposal on the environment, as detailed in A-311 and A-321. Specify when follow-up activities will occur, emphasizing key milestones or intervals. Discuss the methodology for implementing and reporting on follow-up measures. Build upon and make use of existing performance management and reporting mechanisms when feasible and applicable, including environmental monitoring from previously established reporting. Detail any adaptive management strategies to respond to monitoring outcomes. This could involve adjustments to the proposal or additional mitigation measures in response to the observed environmental effects. | | | |
| **Section A-400 – Climate Change Impacts on the Proposal and Adaptation Solutions**  Complete this section if you answered "Yes" to preliminary screening Question PS-4.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Warming in Canada is, on average, about double the level of global warming. Northern Canada has warmed and will continue to warm at even more than double the global rate. Canada’s warming climate is driving an increase in the frequency and severity of extreme weather events, such as extreme heat, flooding, and wildfires. Additionally, rising temperatures will drive longer-term changes in the climate, such as permafrost thaw in the North and sea-level changes on the coasts. These impacts are already affecting the economy, communities, human health and well-being, and the environment.  Further warming and associated impacts will occur regardless of whether emissions immediately start to decline. It is therefore necessary that Canada not only mitigate climate change but also adapt and build resilience to the present and future impacts of climate change. Accelerating progress on adaptation through rapid and deliberate plans and actions is vital for Canada’s economic, social, and environmental well-being.  The following guidance is intended to support users in conducting the qualitative assessment of expected climate change impacts, namely:   * Identifying the relevant climate change hazards and impacts (A-410); * Assessing the proposal’s vulnerability and exposure to climate change (A-420); and * Identifying adaptation solutions to avoid or reduce the impacts of climate change on the proposal (A-430).   Throughout section A-400, analysts should build a logical narrative, making connections between climate change hazards which are relevant to the proposal, how these hazards may pose a risk to the proposal or groups of people associated with the proposal (i.e., the vulnerability and exposure of the proposal), and what adaptation solutions have been integrated into the design and implementation of the proposal to respond to/address such risks.  Proposals should identify relevant climate impacts and integrate long-term and evidence-based adaptive solutions to enhance climate resilience, to the extent possible. Proposals that do not consider climate change risks, reinforce the non-resilient status quo, or undermine resilience (i.e., are maladaptive) could lead to continued or increased risk from climate change impacts, diminished performance and greater long-term costs going forward.  The list below provides examples of climate-related hazards. For more information on climate hazards and Canada’s current and future climate change impacts, analysts are encouraged to consult the [Canada in a Changing Climate reports](https://changingclimate.ca/) and the [Canada’s Top Climate Change Risks report](https://cca-reports.ca/reports/prioritizing-climate-change-risks/).  Below is a non-exhaustive list of examples of important climate change hazards in Canada:   * Extreme heat and heat waves * Changing water levels and flows * Drought * Increased storm water runoff * Flooding * Wildfires * Air quality degradation * Coastal erosion * Storm surges * Reduced ice cover * Reduced glacier cover * Permafrost degradation * Spread of invasive and/or disease-causing species   The table below provides a non-exhaustive list of examples of adaptation solutions.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Type of adaptation solutions** | **Examples** | | Grey (built) infrastructure | * Retrofitting buildings (e.g. strengthening roofs to reduce damage from high winds) * Elevating infrastructure (e.g. raising electrical transformers above flood levels) * Flood protection infrastructure (e.g., dykes, levees, seawalls, etc.) | | Nature-based solutions and green infrastructure | * Restoration of rivers and floodplains * Connectivity of ecological networks * Green roofs | | Technological measures | * Weather monitoring and forecasting * Remote sensing | | Regulatory and planning instruments | * Establishing climate-informed national codes and standards * Updating building codes * Land use planning (e.g. restricting development in areas exposed to flooding or wildfires) * Emergency mitigation, preparedness planning | | Information and awareness raising | * Early warning systems | | | | |
| **A-410 Identification of Potential Climate Hazards that Could Impact the Success of the Proposal** | | |
| **A-411** The proposal faces a specific or heightened risk from the followingclimate impacts(s) and hazard(s):   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Current** | **Future** | | Extreme heat and heatwaves  Drought  Flooding  Coastal erosion  Storm surges  Extreme weather events  Wildfires  Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | Extreme heat and heatwaves  Drought  Flooding  Coastal erosion  Storm surges  Extreme weather events  Wildfires  Other (specify):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |   **A-412** The proposal is likely to encounter the climate effect(s) identified in A-411:  In all regions of Canada  or  In one or more specific regions (*select all that apply*):  Atlantic Provinces (Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick)  Quebec  Ontario  Prairies (Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta)  British Columbia  Northern Canada (Nunavut, Northwest Territories, Yukon Territory) | | |
| **A-420 Identification of the Proposal’s Climate Change Risks**   |  | | --- | | Refer to the climate change hazards identified in A-410 to identify areas of risk that the proposal may face. The proposal should consider vulnerability and exposure to climate hazards consistent with the expected life of the proposal – and the proposal’s long-term implications – for the area(s) that the proposal will serve. The climate change risk assessment completed by your department, as per the Greening Government Strategy, should be consulted to assist in identifying the risks relevant to your proposal. | | | |
| **A-421** Current or projected climate change impacts may significantly delay or impede government operations related to the delivery of the proposal:  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined   |  |  | | --- | --- | | This question is seeking to identify specific cases where climate change impacts could delay or impede government operations required to deliver the proposal. In this context, government operations should be understood to include federal employees, facilities, vehicles, and equipment necessary to establish or deliver any element of the proposal. | | | **Yes** | Government operations necessary to deliver this proposal are subject to negative climate change risks. For example, federal programs in northern regions may be negatively impacted if government airfields are degraded by permafrost thaw. Other examples may include federal search and rescue support programs subject to increased incidence of climate-change driven extreme weather, or federal facilities subject to specific increased risk of floods or wildfires. | | **No** | Government operations associated with this proposal are not subject to any specific climate change-driven risk factors. | | **Undetermined** | The potential impacts of climate change on government operations associated with this proposal are unknown. |   **A-422** Current or projected climate change impacts may damage new or existing physical infrastructure associated with the proposal:  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined   |  |  | | --- | --- | | This question seeks to identify specific cases where the negative impacts of climate change could damage the physical infrastructure associated with the proposal. In this context, physical infrastructure should be understood to include buildings, roads, bridges, railroads, powerlines, ports, and any equipment necessary to establish or deliver any element of the proposal. | | | **Yes** | Climate change impacts may damage new or existing physical infrastructure associated with the proposal. | | **No** | Climate change impacts will not damage new or existing physical infrastructure associated with the proposal. | | **Undetermined** | The potential impacts of climate change on new or existing physical infrastructure associated with this proposal are unknown. |   **A-423** Current or projected climate change impacts may affect the health and safety of the people implementing the proposal:  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Yes** | Climate change impacts may worsen existing health (physical, mental, or overall well-being) and may put the safety of the people implementing the proposal at risk. | | **No** | The health (physical, mental, or overall well-being) and safety of the people implementing the proposal will not be affected by climate change impacts. | | **Undetermined** | The potential impacts of climate change on the health and safety of the people implementing the proposal are unknown. |   **A-424** Current or projected climate change impacts are expected to disproportionately hinder the effectiveness of the proposal for certain groups of people:  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Yes** | Climate change will impact the effectiveness of the proposal in a way that results in different effects on different groups of people affected or targeted by the proposal. An example would be a federal program to support and upgrade infrastructure at airports across Canada that may have to account for the more pronounced impact of climate change on airports in the North, affecting in a disproportional way the people relying on these airports. | | **No** | Climate change impacts for this proposal are unlikely to have a disproportionate effect on the proposal's effectiveness for different groups of people affected or targeted by the proposal. | | **Undetermined** | It is unknown whether climate change will have disproportionate effects among different groups of people affected or targeted by the proposal. |   **A-425** If you responded “Yes” to at least one question from A-421 to A-424, are these risks reflected in findings from your departmental climate change risk assessment?  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Yes** | The risks identified for this proposal in questions A-421 to A-424 reflect the findings of a climate change risk assessment completed by your department, as per the Greening Government Strategy. | | **No** | The risks identified for this proposal in questions A-421 to A-424 are not informed by the findings of a climate change risk assessment completed by your department | | **Undetermined** | Choose this option if it is unknown whether a climate change risk assessment has been completed by your department. | | | |
| **A-430 Identification of Adaptation Solutions**   |  | | --- | | This section aims to assess the climate resilience of the proposal (i.e. if the analysis has considered and incorporated measures to account for and build resilience to climate change impacts). | | | |
| **A-431** Adaptation solutions to avoid or reduce the impacts of climate change on the proposal are integrated in the design and implementation of the proposal:  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Yes** | The proposal includes specific measures or design features intended to account for and protect against negative impacts of climate change. An example may be a federal infrastructure grant program that requires recipients to identify and design for climate change hazards such as flooding and wildfire. | | **No** | While negative potential climate change effects have been identified in question A-410, no specific measures have been incorporated to address them. | | **Undetermined** | While negative potential climate change impacts have been identified in question A-410, it is unknown whether specific measures will be introduced to address them. |   **A-432** If you responded “Yes” to A-431, are these adaptation solutions reflecting findings from your departmental climate change risk assessment?  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Yes** | The adaptation solutions identified for this proposal reflect the findings of a climate change risk assessment completed by your department, as per the Greening Government Strategy. | | **No** | The adaptation solutions identified for this proposal are not informed by a climate change risk assessment completed by your department | | **Undetermined** | Choose this option if it is unknown whether a climate change risk assessment has been completed by your department. | | | |
| **A-440 Narrative** | | |
| Describe how the proposal may be vulnerable to climate change impacts as well as any actions taken to adapt to such impacts, referring to the information provided above. *(Maximum 300 words)*   * *Consider using climate data sources available from the* [*Canadian Centre for Climate Services*](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/climate-change/canadian-centre-climate-services/display-download.html) *and other climate data portals*. *Describe the uncertainties, if any, related to the climate data consulted to complete this assessment.* * *Note any findings of relevant climate change risk assessments, Indigenous Traditional Knowledge, or other resources consulted to answer this question.* * *Consider adaptation solutions to mitigate the climate change impacts on the proposal, referring to the information provided in section A-430, and how these solutions align with your departmental climate change risk assessment, if applicable. Consider what additional measures could be taken to avoid maladaptation. If applicable, provide a sound rationale for why no adaptation solutions were identified.*   >   |  | | --- | | Please explain the relevant impacts of climate change on the proposal, referring to the responses given in section A-410. This narrative should cover the climate change hazards that may affect delivery of the proposal, the proposal’s vulnerability to the impacts of climate change, and any adaptation solutions that have been or could be incorporated into the design and implementation of the proposal. Refer also to the question prompts in A-440 to help guide your response.  As a starting point, analysts may wish to make a list of the key features of their proposal, including the proposal’s location(s), proposed activities and outcomes, the timeframe or lifespan of the proposal, and targeted clients or populations. Being clear on these features of the proposal can help orient thinking around relevant climate change hazards and impacts.  For each key feature of the proposal, there may be one or more climate hazard that affects the outcomes and delivery of the proposal, each with its own set of consequences and proposed adaptation solution.  If adaptation solutions were integrated into the design or execution of the proposal (response to A-430), please describe them. If adaptation solutions were not integrated, please explain why. | | | |
| **Section A-500 –** **Effects on Canada’s Climate Resilience**  Complete this section if you answered "Yes" to preliminary screening Question PS-5   |  | | --- | | Resilience refers to the capacity of a system (e.g., community, organization, natural environment) to anticipate, prevent, withstand, respond to, and recover from a climate change related disruption or impact.  Examples to consider when preparing input to section A-500:  **Example: Disaster Relief Fund**  As climate change is leading to more frequent extreme weather events, it will be important to enhance the climate resilience of communities. A disaster relief fund that helps homeowners rebuild following a flood, could include a condition to rebuild away from areas prone to floods, such as floodplains, or install flood prevention measures. This further builds fiscal resilience to reduce the risk of future disaster relief funding resulting from increasingly frequent extreme weather events. This proposal would select “results in programs or policies that enhance resilience to climate change hazards and impacts” in response to question A-511, as the proposed policy would enhance resilience to the impacts of climate change in high-risk areas like flood plains by avoiding development in those areas.  **Example: Broader Public Access to Flood Maps**  A proposal that seeks to ensure Canadians have access to comprehensive flood mapping may not directly improve Canada’s resiliency or adaptability to the impacts of climate change but would allow Canadians to account for flooding risks associated with climate change when deciding where to build housing, commercial real estate, or infrastructure (if the updated flood maps are designed with inclusion of future projected impacts of climate change within their projections and not solely historical data). | | | |
| **A-510 Impact on Canada’s Resilience and Adaptation** | | |
| **A-511** The proposal results in programs or policies that:  Implement direct measures to increase Canada's resilience to climate change   |  | | --- | | The proposal would directly enhance Canada’s resilience to climate change impacts. |   Support enabling measures to increase Canada’s resilience to climate change   |  | | --- | | The proposal would support other policies or programs directly strengthening Canada’s resilience to climate change. |   Decrease Canada’s resilience to climate change   |  | | --- | | This proposal would increase the likelihood or severity of climate related impacts on all or part of Canada's infrastructure, economy, or society. This could be through the introduction of a new project, initiative, or economic activity that is particularly vulnerable to climate impacts. This could also be through reinvesting in existing vulnerable infrastructure or economic activity without addressing apparent climate risks. This may also be the introduction of a policy that undermines existing levels of climate resilience, for example by lowering requirements for climate-damage insurance, lowering the redundancy requirements for interprovincial power or telecommunications infrastructure, or removing a prohibition on development in a flood or fire zone. |   **A-512** This proposal may contribute to advancing the goals, objectives or targets of one or more of the five [systems of the National Adaptation Strategy (NAS)](https://www.canada.ca/en/services/environment/weather/climatechange/climate-plan/national-adaptation-strategy/full-strategy.html#toc7):   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Disaster resilience |  | Nature and biodiversity |  | Economy and workers | |  | Health and well-being |  | Infrastructure |  |  |      |  |  | | --- | --- | | **NAS systems** | **Goals** | | Disaster resilience | Communities and all people living in Canada are better prepared to prevent, mitigate, respond to, and recover from the hazards, risks and consequences of disasters linked to the changing climate; the well-being and livelihoods of people living in Canada are better protected; and overall disaster risks have been reduced, particularly for vulnerable sectors, regions, and populations at greater risk. | | Health and well-being | The health of all people in Canada is safeguarded and supported by a climate-resilient and adaptive health sector that has robust and agile systems and services that account for and support the diverse components of well-being. | | Nature and biodiversity | Biodiversity loss has been halted and reversed, and nature has fully recovered, allowing for natural and human adaptation, where ecosystems and communities are thriving together in a changing climate, with human systems existing in close connection with natural systems. | | Infrastructure | All infrastructure systems in Canada are climate-resilient and undergo continuous adaptation to adjust for future impacts to deliver reliable, equitable, and sustainable services to all of society. | | Economy and workers | Canada’s economy is structured to anticipate, manage, adapt, and respond to climate change impacts and to actively advance new and inclusive opportunities within a changing climate, particularly for communities at greater risk, Indigenous Peoples, and vulnerable economic sectors. |   **A-513** This proposal’s impact on Canada’s adaptation and resilience may have a differentiated and disproportionate effect on specific groups of people:  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Yes** | The proposal’s impact on Canada’s resilience to climate change will affect certain groups of people more than others. For example, a proposal to invest in all-weather access roads to remote and northern communities would deliver specific benefits to those typically underserved populations. | | **No** | No differentiated and disproportionate effects are expected across specific groups of Canadians. | | **Undetermined** | While impacts on Canada’s resilience to climate change have been identified, it is unknown whether they have differentiated and disproportionate impacts on specific groups of people. | | | |
| **A-520 Narrative** | |  |
| Describe the proposal’s impacts on Canada's adaptation and resilience, referring to the information provided above. (Maximum 300 words)   * *Explain how the proposal will increase or decrease Canada’s adaptation and resilience to climate change. Consider natural or built infrastructure that protects Canadians from climate-related disasters; developing building codes to increase the resilience of buildings and infrastructure; addressing the effects of climate change on the health and safety of Canadians; supporting northern and coastal regions that are particularly vulnerable to climate change, etc.* * *If applicable, consider how the proposal contributes to or hampers the* [*National Adaptation Strategy*](https://www.canada.ca/en/services/environment/weather/climatechange/climate-plan/national-adaptation-strategy/full-strategy.html)*, including* [*the Action Plan of the Government of Canada in the Strategy*](https://www.canada.ca/en/services/environment/weather/climatechange/climate-plan/national-adaptation-strategy/action-plan.html#toc14)*.* * *Explain how the proposal’s effects on Canada’s adaptation and resilience may affect different groups of people.* * *Describe whether and how the proposal's effects on Canada’s adaptation and resilience would be monitored and reported, including when the reporting would occur. When appropriate, monitoring and follow-up are encouraged to use existing mechanisms.*   >   |  | | --- | | Please explain the responses given for A-511, A-512, and A-513. Refer also to the question prompts in A-520 to help guide your response. | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **PART B: STRATEGIC ECONOMIC ANALYSIS**  Complete this section only if it is required based on your answers to PS-6. |
| **B-100 Qualitative Economic Impacts** |
| ***PLEASE READ BEFORE PROCEEDING***  Complete the online [Qualitative Economic Analysis Tool](https://can01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fforms.office.com%2FPages%2FResponsePage.aspx%3Fid%3DtobRyKv6-0OYwBig36ZawZzoiCCVO1lPgytepi2h5qhURFJVUVEwWkFKTEdXVjRYMTA4OUlYSzhORyQlQCN0PWcu&data=05%7C02%7Cjean-francois.lachance%40ec.gc.ca%7Cdc74093dce4f4beaf6a508dc2cd7c697%7C740c5fd36e8b41769cc9454dbe4e62c4%7C0%7C0%7C638434552466697917%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=C%2Fk%2FUcsfQ%2BK0kVaqUOjdPTlxW%2B4CHmcyUthUDHOm9AI%3D&reserved=0) for each sub-element of your proposal that continues to have positive net-federal spending (in absolute value) after deducting amounts associated with the excluded categories listed in PS-6.2. You may group sub-elements when they warrant the same responses to the Qualitative Economic Analysis Tool’s interview questions. Consult the tool for details.  The tool will send you an email with the qualitative economic analysis results and your answers to the tool’s questions. Transcribe the results into the tables below, as applicable, and attach the email(s) to this template when submitting it. |
| **B-110** **Local Economic Impacts**  For each element (or group of elements) of your proposal that involves a local focus (if any), transcribe the local results from the online Qualitative Economic Analysis Tool email into the table below. Include also the names of the implicated proposal elements and the affected regions. You may add more rows as needed.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Item / Measure** | **Region(s) Implicated** | **Short-term Impact** | **Long-term Impact** | | *Item 1* | *Region 1* | *Enter Result* | *Enter Result* | | *Item 2* | *Region 2* | *Enter Result* | *Enter Result* |   **B-120** **Sectoral Economic Impacts**  For each element (or group of elements) of your proposal that involves a sector focus (if any), transcribe the sector results from the online Qualitative Economic Analysis Tool email into the table below. Include also the names of the implicated proposal elements and the affected sectors. You may add more rows as needed.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Item / Measure** | **Sector(s) Implicated** | **Short-term Impact** | **Long-term Impact** | | *Item 1* | *​​*Choose an item. | *Enter Result* | *Enter Result* | | *Item 2* | Choose an item. | *Enter Result* | *Enter Result* |   **B-130** **National Economic Impacts**  For each element (or group of elements) of your proposal, transcribe the National results from the online Qualitative Economic Analysis Tool email into the table below. Include also the names of the proposal elements along with the results. You may add more rows as needed.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Item / Measure** | **Short-term Impact** | **Long-term Impact** | | *Item 1* | *Enter Result* | *Enter Result* | | *Item 2* | *Enter Result* | *Enter Result* |   **B-140** (Optional) Please explain any expected economic impacts of the project not captured by the Qualitative Economic Analysis Tool.  *Note: Departmental and externally sourced quantitative estimates of economic impacts (such as job numbers) should not be provided in the CNEL template. You may only provide qualitative narratives explaining any important economic mechanisms or transmission channels through which your proposal is expected to impact the Canadian economy.*   |  | | --- | | *(Maximum 600 words)* | |
| **B-200 Quantitative Economic Impact Assessment (For Large Proposals)** |
| **B-210** After deducting amounts associated with the excluded categories listed under PS-6.2, does this proposal, in any year of its implementation, involve net federal spending exceeding $150 million in absolute value?  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No  If you answered YES to the question above, a quantitative assessment of economic impacts needs to be prepared by the Department of Finance. Please contact the SEEA Secretariat to arrange for a quantitative assessment of economic impacts by contacting the Secretariat at [ocne-cnel@ec.gc.ca](mailto:ocne-cnel@ec.gc.ca)  Include the following documents in your email to the Secretariat:   * A funding table detailing the annual spending profile (cash basis) for each major sub-element of the proposal * This template, including the description (to be filled out below) of: a) who will be the ultimate recipient of funding; b) approximately how much each recipient group would receive; and c) what recipients are expected to use this funding for.  |  | | --- | | **Description of funding recipients and activities for each proposal sub-element**  [Element 1 Name]: [Description]  [Element 2 Name]: [Description]  … |   **B-220** Results of Quantitative Economic Assessment  If your proposal required quantitative economic analysis, record below the following results from the Department of Finance’s modelling:  *Employment*   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Average annual employment impact over the 5 years after initial implementation |  | | Snapshot employment impact 10 years after initial implementation |  | | Average annual cost per job over the 10 years after initial implementation |  |   *Gross Domestic Product (GDP)*   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Average annual real GDP impact over the first 5 years of implementation |  | | Snapshot real GDP impact 10 years after initial implementation |  | | Cumulative real GDP multiplier over the 10 years after initial implementation |  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PART C – CROSS-CUTTING CONSIDERATIONS**  Complete this part if you answered "Yes" to any of the preliminary screening questions.   |  | | --- | | This part of the CNEL covers multifaceted issues intersecting with the strategic environmental analysis (Part A) and the strategic economic analysis (Part B). Part C is mandatory if any portions of Part A or Part B were applicable as per the responses to the preliminary screening questions. | |
| **C-100 –** **Indigenous Rights Considerations** |
| **C-110** Identify as applicable and describe the positive and negative impacts that this proposal has on Indigenous Peoples, and their lands and traditional territories, and any consultation obligations arising from implications on potential or established Aboriginal or treaty rights. Consider implications from the [*United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act* Action Plan](https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/declaration/ap-pa/ah/index.html). Where relevant, consider the results of any co-development initiatives undertaken on environmental or socio-economic aspects of the proposal. *(Maximum 300 words)*  > |
| **C-200 – Indigenous Climate Leadership** |
| |  | | --- | | The following questions only pertain to proposals that involve climate policy and federal climate funding.  This section assesses how the proposal supports Indigenous interests and the advancement of Indigenous leadership in climate action, the transition to a net-zero economy, and the responsible stewardship of lands and waters.  The advancement of Indigenous Climate Leadership can take many forms, including distinctions-based approaches, meaningful co-development/engagement, inclusive program governance, dedicated Indigenous carve-outs/set-asides, support for applicants, funding terms and conditions that recognize and respect Indigenous realities, etc.  Canada’s Strengthened Climate Plan (SCP) made significant commitments to “work with First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples to co-develop decision-making guidance that will ensure all of Canada’s future climate actions help advance Indigenous climate self-determination, and incorporating inclusiveness-by-design principles in all of Canada’s climate actions.” (SCP, 2020).  The Indigenous Climate Leadership Decision-Making Guidance has been developed in partnership with First Nations, Inuit, and Métis, and provides specific guidance to all departments for designing federal climate programs – whether targeted, non-targeted, or national – in a way that will orient programming towards the above stated objectives. Practically, in program design, this means:   * + Removing/avoiding unintentional biases that restrict Indigenous eligibility and access to funding;   + Respecting and promoting distinct priorities and governance structures, and supporting and growing knowledge, leadership and decision-making by Indigenous Peoples for Indigenous Peoples; and,   + Progressively moving towards the transfer of programming to Indigenous Peoples.   The Decision-making Guidance can be found here: [Decision-Making Guidance](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/climate-change/indigenous-partnership/decision-making-guidance.html) |   **C-210** Does the proposal include measures that have the potential to positively or negatively impact Indigenous Peoples, including their lands and traditional territories?  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No  **C-211** If you responded “yes” to question C-210, please identify all of the overarching design principles, as described in the [Indigenous Climate Leadership Decision-Making Guidance](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/climate-change/indigenous-partnership/decision-making-guidance.html), that have been integrated into this proposal:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Overarching Design Principles** | | |  | Design Principle 1 – Self-determination | |  | Design Principle 2 – Distinctions-based Approach | |  | Design Principle 3 – Meaningful Co-development, Engagement and Information Sharing | |  | Design Principle 4 – Indigenous Knowledge Systems |   **C-212** For any design principles identified under question C-211, please describe how these principles have been integrated and what engagement processes were undertaken with Indigenous Peoples. *(Maximum 300 words)*  >  **C-220** Does the proposal establish, renew or modify a transfer payments program (as described in the [Policy on Transfer Payments](https://www.tbs-sct.canada.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=13525), under section 7 of the *Financial Administration Act*)?  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No  **C-221** If you responded “yes” to question C-220, please identify all of the design principles for funding programs, as described in the [Indigenous Climate Leadership Decision-Making Guidance](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/climate-change/indigenous-partnership/decision-making-guidance.html), that have been integrated into the proposal:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Funding Programming Design Principles** | | |  | Design Principle 5 – Inclusive Governance | |  | Design Principle 6 – Inclusive Evaluations and Audits | |  | Design Principle 7 – Flexible Application Timelines and Processes | |  | Design Principle 8 – Funding Terms and Conditions that Recognize and Respect Indigenous Realities | |  | Design Principle 9 – Dedicated Indigenous Funding under Non-Targeted and National Programs | |  | Design Principle 10 – Support for Applicants/Recipients Throughout the Application and Reporting Stages | |  | Design Principle 11 – Strengthened Federal Coordination of Project Funding to be More Indigenous/Community-focused |   **C-222** For any design principles identified under question C-221, please describe how these principles have been integrated and what engagement processes were undertaken with Indigenous Peoples. *(Maximum 300 words)*  >  **C-223** If you responded “yes” to question C-220 and have not identified “Design Principle 9 – Dedicated Indigenous Funding under Non-Targeted and National Programs” under C-221, please explain why. *(Maximum 200 words)*  >  **C-230** If you responded “yes” to questions C-210 and/or C-220 but did not integrate any of the eleven design principles of the [Indigenous Climate Leadership Decision-Making Guidance](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/climate-change/indigenous-partnership/decision-making-guidance.html) tabulated in questions C-211 and C-221, please explain why. *(Maximum 300 words)*  > |
| **C-300 – Federal Sustainable Development Strategy** |
| **C-310**  Do any of the environmental or economic impacts of the proposal identified in previous sections of the CNEL contribute, positively or negatively, to the goals and targets of the [Federal Sustainable Development Strategy](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/climate-change/federal-sustainable-development-strategy.html). *(Maximum 300 words)*  >   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | In this question, explain how the results of the CNEL demonstrate the proposal's alignment with, support for, or hindrance to the goals or targets of the FSDS, where applicable. Aspects of the proposal outside the scope of the CNEL should not be included in your response.  The 2022 to 2026 Federal Sustainable Development Strategy (FSDS) brings sustainable development goals, targets, short-term milestones, and implementation strategies from across the Government of Canada together in one place. It provides a whole-of-government view of priorities and actions to advance sustainable development in 101 federal organizations.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **FSDS Goal** | **Target** | | **Goal 1:** Reduce Poverty in Canada in all its Forms | * By 2030, reduce the poverty rate by 50% from its 2015 level | | **Goal 2:** Support a Healthier and More Sustainable Food System | * By 2030, support improvement in the environmental performance of the agriculture sector by achieving a score of 71 or higher for the Index of Agri-Environmental Sustainability | | **Goal 3:** Support Mental Health and Adopt Healthy Behaviors | * By March 2027, reduce the percentage of Canadians (aged 15+) with a mental disorder who have expressed that they have an unmet care need to 22% at most * By March 2035, at most 5% of Canadians (aged 15+) are current cigarette smokers | | **Goal 4:** Promote Knowledge and Skills for Sustainable Development | * By March 31, 2026, regulated child care fees will be reduced to $10 a day, on average, everywhere outside of Quebec * By December 2025, Canada’s pool of science talent grows by 175,000 science, technology, engineering, and mathematics graduates * By 2025, Canada’s Average Relative Citation in natural sciences and engineering ranks within the top 10 of OECD countries, increasing from a ranking of 18 in 2020 | | **Goal 5:** Champion Gender Equality | * By 2026, at least 37% of employees in the environmental and clean technology sector are women * By 2026, reduce self-reported rates of intimate partner violence by up to 5% | | **Goal 6:** Ensure Clean and Safe Water for All Canadians | * By 2027, action plans are in place to advance restoration and protection of major lakes and rivers in Canada * By March 31, 2026, 97% of Indigenous Services Canada-funded First Nations public drinking water systems produce treated water meeting prescribed bacteriological standards in the Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality * By March 2030, 85% of wastewater systems on reserves achieve effluent quality standards * By December 2040, 100% of wastewater systems achieve effluent quality standards | | **Goal 7:** Increase Canadians’ Access to Clean Energy | * By 2030, 90% and in the long term 100% of Canada’s electricity is generated from renewable and non-emitting sources * By 2030, 600 petajoules of total annual energy savings will be achieved as a result of adoption of energy efficiency codes, standards and practices from a baseline savings of 20.0 petajoules in 2017 to 2018 * By 2030, increase Canada’s capacity to produce clean fuels by 10% over 2021 levels | | **Goal 8:** Encourage Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth in Canada | * By 2026, there are at least 245,000 jobs in the cleantech products sector, an increase from 2019 * By 2030, ensure that 100% of Canadians have access to broadband speeds of at least 50 Mbps download and 10 Mbps upload | | **Goal 9:** Foster Innovation and Green Infrastructure in Canada | * By 2030 and each year thereafter until 2026, 30% of Sustainable Development Technology Canada’s portfolio of SD Tech Fund-supported technologies are commercialized annually * By March 31, 2026, 34,500 new electric vehicle chargers and 25 hydrogen refueling stations are completed where Canadians, live, work, and play, including in public places, on-street, at multi-unit residential buildings, rural and remote locations and the workplace * By March 31, 2027, contribute to the deployment of 50,000 new zero-emission vehicle chargers and refueling stations * By fiscal year 2027 to 2028, the federal share of the value of green infrastructure projects approved under the Investing in Canada Plan will reach $27.6 billion | | **Goal 10:** Advance Reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples and Take Action on Inequality | * Between 2023 and 2026, and every year on an ongoing basis, develop and table annual progress reports on implementing the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act* * Each year, the federal public service meets or surpasses the workforce availability for women, Indigenous persons, persons with a disability, and members of a visible minority | | **Goal 11:** Improve Access to Affordable Housing, Clean Air, Transportation, Parks, and Green Spaces, as well as Cultural Heritage in Canada | * By 2028, reduce chronic homelessness by 50% * By 2028, reduce or eliminate housing needs for 530,000 households * By 2030, 22% of commuters use public transit or active transportation * Increase the percentage of the population across Canada living in areas where air pollutant concentrations are less than or equal to the Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards from 60% in 2005 to 85% in 2030 * Design national urban parks as part of a network, with a target of up to 6 new national urban parks by 2026 and a total of 15 new national urban parks by 2030 * By 2026, support at least 23.7 million visitors annually to Parks Canada places | | **Goal 12:** Reduce Waste and Transition to Zero-Emission Vehicles | * By 2030, the amount of single-use plastics that is entering the environment as pollution will be reduced by 5% and that is reduced by 5% and that is sent to landfill by 3% * Reduce the amount of waste Canadians send to disposal from a baseline of 699 kilograms per person in 2014 to 490 kilograms per person by 2030 (a 30% reduction); and to 350 kilograms per person by 2040 (a 50% reduction) * For the 2030 model year, at least 60% of new light-duty vehicle sales are zero-emission vehicles, and 100% of vehicle sales will be zero-emission vehicles for the 2035 model year * Aim is to have 35% of medium- and heavy-duty vehicles sales being zero-emission by 2030 and 100% by 2040 for a subset of vehicle types based on feasibility * By 2030, the Government of Canada will divert from landfill at least 75% by weight of nonhazardous operational waste * By 2030, the Government of Canada will divert from landfill at least 90% by weight of all construction and demolition waste * The Government of Canada’s procurement of goods and services will be net-zero emissions by 2050, to aid the transition to a net-zero, circular economy | | **Goal 13:** Take Action on Climate Change and its Impacts | * Achieve 40 to 45% greenhouse gas emission reductions below 2005 levels by 2030, and achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 * The Government of Canada will transition to net-zero carbon operations for facilities and conventional fleets by 2050 * The Government of Canada will transition to net-zero carbon national safety and security fleet operations by 2050 * The Government of Canada will transition to climate resilient operations by 2050 | | **Goal 14:** Conserve and Protect Canada’s Oceans | * Conserve 25% of marine and coastal areas by 2025, and 30% by 2030, in support of the commitment to work to halt and reverse nature loss by 2030 in Canada, and achieve a full recovery for nature by 2050 * By 2026, at least 55% of Canada’s key fish stocks are in the Cautious and Healthy zone | | **Goal 15:** Protect and Recover Species, Conserve Canadian Biodiversity | * Between 2023 and 2026, Canada’s sustainable wood supply level (guided by sustainable forest management policies to reflect the current unique social, environmental and economic characteristics of managed forests), exceeds the annual timber harvests * Conserve 25% of Canada’s land and inland waters by 2025, working toward 30% by 2030, from 12.5% recognized as conserved as of the end of 2020, in support of the commitment to work to halt and reverse nature loss by 2030 in Canada, and achieve a full recovery for nature by 2050 * By 2026, increase the percentage of species at risk listed under federal law that exhibit population trends that are consistent with recovery strategies and management plans to 60%, from a baseline of 42% in 2019 * By 2030, increase the percentage of migratory bird species whose population sizes fall within an acceptable range—neither too low nor too high—to 70% from 57% in 2016 | | **Goal 16:** Promote a Fair and Accessible Justice System, Enforce Environmental Laws, and Manage Impacts | * By 2030, at least 70% of Canadians think the criminal justice system is fair and accessible to all people * By March 31, 2026, ensure that 100% of Environment and Climate Change Canada laws, regulations, and enforceable instruments have completed risk classifications | | **Goal 17:** Strengthen Partnerships to Promote Global Action on Sustainable Development | * By 2026, implement Canada’s climate finance commitment of $5.3 billion with at least 40% of funding going toward climate adaptation and at least 20% to projects that leverage nature-based climate solutions and projects that contribute biodiversity co-benefits |   For more information on the FSDS, see [The Federal Sustainable Development Strategy](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/climate-change/federal-sustainable-development-strategy.html). | |
| **C-400 – Public Perspectives** |
| **C-410**Describe known or anticipated public perspectives on the environmental impacts of this proposal, as captured in part A*. Consulting with the public may offer insight into the potential for environmental effects as well as baseline conditions. Results of previous consultations can be considered. Information for this section may be drawn from the consultation section of the proposal. (Maximum 300 words)*  >   |  | | --- | | Reference any consultations undertaken during the development of the proposal, acknowledging perspectives from potentially affected individuals and other stakeholders. Provide detail on the methodologies used in these consultations, emphasizing how they were designed. Draw insights from the consultation section of the proposal, integrating relevant information to support your response. If there are known concerns, expectations, or suggestions from the consultations regarding environmental effects, ensure they are highlighted and addressed in this section. When referencing results from previous consultations, ensure relevance to the current proposal and discuss how these findings inform this proposal. | |
| **C-500 – Fossil Fuels Subsidy**   |  | | --- | | Consult the [*Inefficient Fossil Fuel Subsidies Government of Canada – Self-Review Assessment Framework*](https://www.canada.ca/en/services/environment/weather/climatechange/climate-plan/inefficient-fossil-fuel-subsidies/assessment-framework.html)*,* for the latest guidance and definitions to use in answering these questions. | |
| **C-510** Will the proposal introduce or continue a [***fossil fuels subsidy***](https://www.canada.ca/en/services/environment/weather/climatechange/climate-plan/inefficient-fossil-fuel-subsidies/assessment-framework.html#toc1):  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined  **C-511** If the response to C-510 is "Yes”, does this subsidy qualify as "[efficient](https://www.canada.ca/en/services/environment/weather/climatechange/climate-plan/inefficient-fossil-fuel-subsidies/assessment-framework.html#toc1)" according to the principles of the *Inefficient Fossil Fuel Subsidies Government of Canada – Self-Review Assessment Framework?*  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined |
| **C-600 – Implications for Sustainable Jobs** |
| **C-610** Does some aspect of the proposal facilitate or promote the creation of sustainable jobs in the transition to a net-zero, climate resilient economy, either directly or indirectly?  **Choose an item:**  Yes – this proposal facilitates or promotes the creation of sustainable jobs (direct or indirect)  No – this proposal has no impact on the creation of sustainable jobs  Undetermined  **C-611** If you responded “yes” to C-610, please provide a brief outline the sustainable jobs implications, including the timeframe of job creation, if available (i.e. 0-2 years, 3-5 years, 5+ years), and any metrics to track? *(Maximum 300 words)*  >   |  | | --- | | A sustainable job means any job that is compatible with Canada’s pathway to achieving a net-zero-emissions and climate-resilient future and that reflects the concept of decent work, namely work — including a job in which the worker is represented by a trade union that has entered into a collective agreement — that can support the worker and their family over time and that includes elements such as fair income, job security, social protection and social dialogue. |   **C-620** Does the proposal include any element or consider support for workers and/or communities in the transition to a net-zero, climate resilient economy (e.g., skills development, training, social supports)?  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined  **C-621** If you responded “yes” to C-620, select the applicable type(s) of support from the table below:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Skills development and/or training |  | Support for workers | |  | Social measures |  | Support for communities |   **C-630** Does the proposal consider and seek to uphold the sustainable jobs guiding principles contained in the preamble of the [Canadian Sustainable Jobs Act](https://can01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.parl.ca%2Fdocumentviewer%2Fen%2F44-1%2Fbill%2FC-50%2Fsecond-reading&data=05%7C02%7CJean-Francois.Lachance%40ec.gc.ca%7C6822e55a77f24518019608dc1922d08a%7C740c5fd36e8b41769cc9454dbe4e62c4%7C0%7C0%7C638412884508559867%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=sTKI2AkPp9LTiEOGckTO1Tib%2FX6kG8J699FPDS87sIM%3D&reserved=0)?  **Choose an item:**  Yes  No Undetermined  **C-631** If you responded “yes” to C-630, provide a short narrative describing how it upholds the principles. *(Maximum 300 words)*  >   |  | | --- | | The Government of Canada’s approach to building a net-zero economy is guided by the following principles:  (a) adequate, informed and ongoing dialogue on a labour force and people-centered sustainable jobs approach should engage relevant stakeholders and partners, including through social dialogue, to build strong social consensus in the shift to a net-zero economy;  (b) policies and programs in support of sustainable jobs should   1. support the creation of decent work, meaning good-paying, high-quality jobs — including jobs in which workers are represented by a trade union that has entered into a collective agreement — as well as job security, social protection and social dialogue, 2. recognize local and regional needs, 3. account for the cultural values, strengths and potential of workers and communities, 4. provide an environment in which enterprises, workers, investors and consumers can contribute to achieving sustainable and inclusive economies and societies, and 5. advance the well-being of workers and communities, as well as the achievement of Canada’s nationally determined contribution communicated in accordance with the Paris Agreement;   (c) a sustainable jobs approach should be inclusive and address barriers to employment with an emphasis on encouraging the creation of employment opportunities for groups underrepresented in the labour market, including women, persons with disabilities, Indigenous peoples, Black and other racialized individuals, 2SLGBTQI+ and other equity-seeking groups; and  (d) international cooperation should foster strengthened global efforts to advance the creation of sustainable jobs and ensure a level playing field and inform Canadian approaches to support workers and communities in the shift to a net-zero economy; | |

|  |
| --- |
| **SUMMARY** |
| This summary serves as foundation to reporting on the findings of this mandatory assessment within the proposal document itself, such as budget proposal, memorandum to Cabinet, Treasury Board submission, or regulatory impact analysis statement (environmental analysis only).  The summary should include, for assessments that detected an important effect in the preliminary screening questions:   * Key findings from Part A (if any of the following elements were completed): * Effects on greenhouse gas emissions (question PS-1 and section A-100) * Effects on biodiversity (question PS-2 and section A-200) * Other environmental effects (PS-3 and section A-300) * Climate change impacts on the proposal and adaptation solutions (question PS-4 and section A-400) * Effects on Canada’s climate resilience (question PS-5 and section A-500). * Key findings from Part B (when this applies), including:   + Qualitative economic assessment results as determined with the Qualitative Economic Assessment Tool   + When applicable, acknowledgment that the proposal is subject to quantitative assessment by Finance Canada – or – the key results of that quantitative assessment if received. * Key findings from Part C (when this applies), including substantive findings on:   + Implications with respect to Indigenous Peoples rights and Indigenous Climate Leadership * Effects on the goals and targets of the Federal Sustainable Development Strategy   + Public perspective on the environmental aspects of the proposal   + Implications with the inefficient fossil fuel subsidies framework   + Support for Sustainable Jobs.   For assessments that did not detect any important effect at the preliminary screening questions or requested an exemption, a short summary is still required to describe the disposition of the assessment.   |  | | --- | | > | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **APPROVALS** | | | |
| **Proposal Title:** | | | |
| **Approval order** | **Name** | **Date** | **Signature** |
| **Executive Head, SEEA Secretariat**  *Signature signifies that the assessment has adhered to the requirements of the Cabinet Directive on Strategic Environmental and Economic Assessment consistent with ECCC’s departmental policy.* | Jeffrey Heynen |  |  |
| **Lead Branch Assistant Deputy Minister**  *Signature indicates approval of this Climate, Nature and Economy Lens.* |  |  |  |
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