

*In 2019, following severity mine tailings failures leading to increased interest from stakeholder groups, Cameco provided information on its tailings facilities. This document follows the same format as the 2019 disclosure but provides current information as of Feb 1, 2025.*

Mine Tailings Disclosure Table – Section 1

<p><b>Overview question. Please</b></p> <p><b>a) Provide an overview of your tailings management system, and how you manage risk</b></p> <p><b>b) Confirm whether your approach to tailings management has changed or will change in light of the recent tailings disasters at Brumadinho, Mariana, Mt Polley and others. Have you, for example, reviewed all tailings storage facilities with upstream dam construction, and taken steps necessary to protect local communities and the environment e.g. buttressing, evacuation?</b></p>
<p><i>Overview answer</i></p> <p><i>a) Provide an overview of your tailings management system, and how you manage risk.</i></p> <p>Cameco is a member of the Mining Association of Canada (MAC), and as such has developed an approach to tailings management that aligns with MAC’s Towards Sustainable Mining (TSM), Tailings Management Protocol and Guide to the Management of Tailings Facilities. As a member of MAC, Cameco completes an annual self-assessment of our tailings management program relative to the MAC Tailings Table of Conformance. Furthermore, Cameco retains an independent third party to verify our assessment every three years. External verification was completed in 2024 concluding that Cameco Tailings Management System achieves a Level A- rating.</p> <p>Our formal risk management program includes monitoring of the risks related to tailings facilities, which brings additional rigour and attention to the management of these facilities. Extensive controls are in place to manage the risks, as reflected in the facility specific risk assessments.</p> <p><i>b) Confirm whether your approach to tailings management has changed or will change in light of the recent tailings disasters at Brumadinho, Mariana, Mt Polley and others. Have you, for example, reviewed all tailings storage facilities with upstream dam construction, and taken steps necessary to protect local communities and the environment e.g. buttressing, evacuation?</i></p> <p>While Cameco’s two active tailings facilities are in-pit and hence pose no risk of flow failures, such as those experienced at Brumadinho, Mariana, Mt Polley and others, Cameco has taken a number of steps to strengthen our tailings management practices since 2019. More specifically, for all four of our tailings facilities, we have established an independent tailings review board, completed detailed risk assessments (FMEAs), named a formal Engineer of Record (EOR) for each, improved our monitoring programs, established trigger action response plans, and developed facility specific emergency response plans. In addition, for our two in-active facilities that utilize dams for containment, we have completed Dam Safety Reviews (in both 2020 and 2023), inundation studies, consequence of failure classifications and retained an external EOR.</p>

Mine Tailings Disclosure Table – Section 2		
Rabbit Lake AGTMF		
	Instructions to support completion	
1. "Tailings Dam" Name/identifier	Please identify every tailings storage facility and identify if there are multiple dams (saddle or secondary dams) within that facility. Please provide details of these within question 20.	Rabbit Lake Above Ground Tailings Management Facility (RL AGTMF). Facility consists of 2 dams, the North Dam and South Dam.
2. Location	Please provide Long/Lat coordinates	58°09'49"N, 103°41'30"W
3. Ownership	Please specify: Owned and Operated, Subsidiary, JV, NOJV, as of March 2019	100% Cameco Corporation owned and operated.
4. Status	Please specify: Active, Inactive/Care and Maintenance, Closed etc. We take closed to mean: a closure plan was developed and approved by the relevant local government agency, and key stakeholders were involved in its development; a closed facility means the noted approved closure plan was fully implemented or the closure plan is in the process of being implemented. A facility that is inactive or under C&M is not considered closed until such time a closure plan has been implemented.	Facility is no longer actively utilized for tailings disposal but is currently operated as a waste disposal facility for radiologically-contaminated solid waste. This waste consists of any material that has been used in a production area (mine or mill process area) and could have been exposed to, and hence contaminated with uranium bearing ore. Typically, this could include wood pallets, cardboard, plastic or metal drums, piping, work clothing, etc.
5. Date of initial operation	(date)	Tailings placement occurred from 1975 to 1985.
6. Is the Dam currently operated or closed as per currently approved design?	Yes/No. If 'No', more information can be provided in the answer to Q20	Yes, both the North and South Dams are operated in accordance with the approved design.
7. Raising method	Note: Upstream, Centerline, Modified Centreline, Downstream, Landform, Other.	Both the North and South Dam were constructed using downstream and centreline construction methods.
8.Current Maximum Height	Note: Please disclose in metres	North Dam 23m South Dam 27m
9. Current Tailings Storage Impoundment Volume	Note: (m³ as of Dec 31, 2024)	This facility contains 6.5 million tonnes of tailings. The residual unused capacity is 0.7 million m³.
10. Planned Tailings Storage Impoundment Volume in 5 years' time.	(m³ as planned for January 2030)	The capacity of the impoundment will not be increased in size.
11. Most recent Independent Expert Review	(date) For this question we take 'Independent' to mean a suitably qualified individual or team, external to the Operation, that does not direct the design or construction work for that facility.	Cameco's Independent Tailings Review Board meets annually to review the performance of each tailings facility. The last meeting occurred June 3 to 7, 2024.
12. Do you have full and complete relevant engineering records including design, construction, operation, maintenance and/or closure.	(Yes or No) We take the word "relevant" here to mean that you have all necessary documents to make an informed and substantiated decision on the safety of the dam, be it an old facility, or an acquisition, or legacy site. More information can be provided in your answer to Q20	Cameco has the design, construction, maintenance and operating records for this facility.
13. What is your hazard categorisation of this facility, based on consequence of failure?		The consequence of failure is classified as "High".
14. What guideline do you follow for the classification system?		Canadian Dam Association Guidelines (including the 2023 Environmental Consequence System)
15. Has this facility, at any point in its history, failed to be confirmed or certified as stable, or experienced notable stability concerns, as identified by an independent engineer (even if later certified as stable by the same or a different firm).	(Yes or No) We note that this will depend on factors including local legislation that are not necessarily tied to best practice. As such, and because remedial action may have been taken, a "Yes" answer may not indicate heightened risk. Stability concerns might include toe seepage, dam movement, overtopping, spillway failure, piping etc. If yes, have appropriately designed and reviewed mitigation actions been implemented? We also note that this question does not bear upon the appropriateness of the criteria, but rather the stewardship levels of the facility or the dam. Additional comments/information may be supplied in your answer to Q20.	<p>In 1992, it was determined that both dams would be subject to gully erosion over time, resulting in a loss of stability. Erosion protection of the slope with rock riprap was therefore recommended and implemented.</p> <p>As part of the slope erosion protection design process, it was noted that the upper slope of the North Dam was subject to shallow slope instability in the spring during snow melt. Accordingly, in 1998, the dam was re-graded and protected with a rock riprap layer.</p> <p>Although the South Dam had not experienced the same type of shallow surface failures as the North Dam, in 1999, the overall slope of the South Dam was flattened and a rock riprap layer was placed over the entire slope.</p> <p>Both dams have performed well since remediation was completed, with no indication of the surficial erosion or shallow failures that had occurred prior to remediation.</p>
16. Do you have internal/in house engineering specialist oversight of this facility? Or do you have external engineering support for this purpose?	Note: Answers may be "Both".	Cameco has an external Engineer of Record as well as in-house engineering specialists providing ongoing oversight required.
17. Has a formal analysis of the downstream impact on communities, ecosystems and critical infrastructure in the event of catastrophic failure been undertaken and to reflect final conditions? If so, when did this assessment take place?	Note: Please answer 'yes' or 'no', and if 'yes', provide a date.	Yes, a Dam Breach and Inundation Study was completed in 2020.
18. Is there a) a closure plan in place for this dam, and b) does it include long term monitoring?	Please answer both parts of this question (e.g. Yes and Yes)	There is a closure plan in place for the facility, which will allow for surface water shedding and natural drainage from the facility so that the dams will no longer be acting as containment structures. Once the closure plan is fully implemented and the facility is shown to be stable, the facility will be placed into the provincial institutional control program and the provincial government will accept responsibility for long term monitoring.
19. Have you, or do you plan to assess your tailings facilities against the impact of more regular extreme weather events as a result of climate change, e.g. over the next two years?	(Yes or No)	The facility has been assessed and found to have sufficient capacity to contain the Probable Maximum Precipitation event while maintaining the design freeboard, which exceeds the recommended design storm criteria for the High Consequence structure. This assessment exceeds the predicted changes in precipitation due to climate change, therefore no further assessment are necessary at this time.
20. Any other relevant information and supporting documentation. Please state if you have omitted any other exposure to tailings facilities through any joint ventures you may have.	Note: this may include links to annual report disclosures, further information in the public domain, guidelines or reports etc.	

Key Lake AGTMF

Key Lake AGTMF		
	Instructions to support completion	
1. "Tailings Dam" Name/identifier	Please identify every tailings storage facility and identify if there are multiple dams (saddle or secondary dams) within that facility. Please provide details of these within question 20.	Key Lake Above Ground Tailings Management Facility (KL AGTMF). Facility is enclosed by 4 interconnected dams, the North, East, South and West Embankments.
2. Location	Please provide Long/Lat coordinates	57°12'25"N, 105°42'11"W
3. Ownership	Please specify: Owned and Operated, Subsidiary, JV, NOJV, as of March 2019	Ownership 83% Cameco Corporation, 17% Orano Canada Inc. Operator Cameco Corporation
4. Status	Please specify: Active, Inactive/Care and Maintenance, Closed etc. We take closed to mean: a closure plan was developed and approved by the relevant local government agency, and key stakeholders were involved in its development; a closed facility means the noted approved closure plan was fully implemented or the closure plan is in the process of being implemented. A facility that is inactive or under C&M is not considered closed until such time a closure plan has been implemented.	Facility is no longer utilized for tailings disposal, but is currently operated as a waste disposal facility for radiologically contaminated solid and liquid waste. The waste consists of any material that has been used in a production area (mine or mill process area) and could have been exposed to and hence contaminated with uranium bearing ore.  Typically, this could include wood pallets, cardboard, plastic or metal drums, piping, work clothing, etc. In addition, liquid waste including potentially contaminated water or other process related fluids are disposed of on the AGTMF. Water is decanted off the facility and treated prior to release to the environment.
5. Date of initial operation	(date)	Tailings placement occurred from 1983 to 1996.
6. Is the Dam currently operated or closed as per currently approved design?	Yes/No. If 'No', more information can be provided in the answer to Q20	Yes, the facility is operated in accordance with the approved design.
7. Raising method	Note: Upstream, Centerline, Modified Centreline, Downstream, Landform, Other.	The facility was built in a single stage to its full height prior to the start of tailings deposition.
8.Current Maximum Height	Note: Please disclose in metres	20m
9. Current Tailings Storage Impoundment Volume	Note: (m³ as of Dec 31, 2024)	Tailings storage design impoundment volume is 5.8 million m³.  Approximate Tailings Volume as of 2024 - 4.22 million m³.
10. Planned Tailings Storage Impoundment Volume in 5 years' time.	(m³ as planned for January 2030)	The capacity of the impoundment will not be increased in size.
11. Most recent Independent Expert Review	(date) For this question we take 'Independent' to mean a suitably qualified individual or team, external to the Operation, that does not direct the design or construction work for that facility.	Cameco's Independent Tailings Review Board meets annually to review the performance of each tailings facility. The last meeting occurred June 3 to 7, 2024.
12. Do you have full and complete relevant engineering records including design, construction, operation, maintenance and/or closure.	(Yes or No) We take the word "relevant" here to mean that you have all necessary documents to make an informed and substantiated decision on the safety of the dam, be it an old facility, or an acquisition, or legacy site. More information can be provided in your answer to Q20	Cameco has the design, construction, maintenance and operating records for this facility.
13. What is your hazard categorisation of this facility, based on consequence of failure?		The consequence of failure is classified as "High".
14. What guideline do you follow for the classification system?		Canadian Dam Association Guidelines (including the 2023 Environmental Consequence System).
15. Has this facility, at any point in its history, failed to be confirmed or certified as stable, or experienced notable stability concerns, as identified by an independent engineer (even if later certified as stable by the same or a different firm).	(Yes or No) We note that this will depend on factors including local legislation that are not necessarily tied to best practice. As such, and because remedial action may have been taken, a "Yes" answer may not indicate heightened risk. Stability concerns might include toe seepage, dam movement, overtopping, spillway failure, piping etc. If yes, have appropriately designed and reviewed mitigation actions been implemented? We also note that this question does not bear upon the appropriateness of the criteria, but rather the stewardship levels of the facility or the dam. Additional comments/information may be supplied in your answer to Q20.	No stability concerns have been noted over the life of the facility.
16. Do you have internal/in house engineering specialist oversight of this facility? Or do you have external engineering support for this purpose?	Note: Answers may be "Both".	Cameco has an external Engineer of Record as well as in-house engineering specialists providing ongoing oversight.
17. Has a formal analysis of the downstream impact on communities, ecosystems and critical infrastructure in the event of catastrophic failure been undertaken and to reflect final conditions? If so, when did this assessment take place?	Note: Please answer 'yes' or 'no', and if 'yes', provide a date.	Yes, a dam breach and inundation study was completed in 2020.
18. Is there a) a closure plan in place for this dam, and b) does it include long term monitoring?	Please answer both parts of this question (e.g. Yes and Yes)	There is a closure plan in place for the facility, which will allow for surface water shedding and natural drainage from the facility so that the dams will no longer acting as containment structures. Once the closure plan is fully implemented and the facility is shown to be stable, the facility will be placed into the provincial institutional control program and the provincial government will accept responsibility for long-term monitoring.
19. Have you, or do you plan to assess your tailings facilities against the impact of more regular extreme weather events as a result of climate change, e.g. over the next two years?	(Yes or No)	The facility has sufficient capacity to contain the Probable Maximum Precipitation storm while maintaining the design freeboard, which exceeds the recommended design storm for the High Consequence structure therefore no further assessment is deemed necessary at this time.
20. Any other relevant information and supporting documentation. Please state if you have omitted any other exposure to tailings facilities through any joint ventures you may have.	Note: this may include links to annual report disclosures, further information in the public domain, guidelines or reports etc.	

RLITMF		
	<i>Instructions to support completion</i>	
1. "Tailings Dam" Name/identifier	<i>Please identify every tailings storage facility and identify if there are multiple dams (saddle or secondary dams) within that facility. Please provide details of these within question 20.</i>	Rabbit Lake In-Pit Tailings Management Facility (RLITMF). This tailings facility is contained within a former mine pit and does not utilize any dams for containment.
2. Location	<i>Please provide Long/Lat coordinates</i>	58°11'52"N, 103°42'48"W
3. Ownership	<i>Please specify: Owned and Operated, Subsidiary, JV, NOJV, as of March 2019</i>	100% Cameco Corporation owned and operated.
4. Status	<i>Please specify: Active, Inactive/Care and Maintenance, Closed etc. We take closed to mean: a closure plan was developed and approved by the relevant local government agency, and key stakeholders were involved in its development; a closed facility means the noted approved closure plan was fully implemented or the closure plan is in the process of being implemented. A facility that is inactive or under C&amp;M is not considered closed until such time a closure plan has been implemented.</i>	The Rabbit Lake Operation is currently in care and maintenance; however, the RLITMF is active as a waste disposal facility for water treatment precipitates.
5. Date of initial operation	<i>(date)</i>	First tailings placement occurred in 1984.
6. Is the Dam currently operated or closed as per currently approved design?	<i>Yes/No. If 'No', more information can be provided in the answer to Q20</i>	The facility does not utilize dams.  However, the facility is operating in accordance with the approved design.
7. Raising method	<i>Note: Upstream, Centerline, Modified Centreline, Downstream, Landform, Other.</i>	Not applicable. There are no dams, the facility is contained within a former mine pit.
8.Current Maximum Height	<i>Note: Please disclose in metres</i>	Not applicable. There are no dams, the facility is contained within a former mine pit with the tailings contained below the surrounding ground elevation.
9. Current Tailings Storage Impoundment Volume	<i>Note: (m³ as of Dec 31, 2024)</i>	The estimated final capacity of the RLITMF is 8.75 million m³ with tailings to an approved final elevation of 426m. While physical containment exists to support tailings to this elevation within the pit, the pervious surround (an internal drainage system) is currently constructed to elevation 426.2m, allowing tailings placement to 425.2m, which provides a potential impoundment volume of 8.54 million m³.  The current in pit tailings volume is 7.87 million m³ and pond volume is 0.30 million m³ as of September 2024.
10. Planned Tailings Storage Impoundment Volume in 5 years' time.	<i>(m³ as planned for January 2030)</i>	Due to the low tonnage of water treatment precipitates placed in the facility, the rate of consolidation is greater than the deposition rate resulting in a slight decreasing volume annually. It is expected that the contained volume of tailings in five years will be less than 7.87 million m³.  There is currently no scheduled restart date for mining. Under an operating scenario, tailings are typically deposited at a rate of 200,000 to 300,000 m³/ year.
11.Most recent Independent Expert Review	<i>(date) For this question we take 'Independent' to mean a suitably qualified individual or team, external to the Operation, that does not direct the design or construction work for that facility.</i>	Cameco's Independent Tailings Review Board meets annually to review the performance of each tailings facility. The last meeting occurred June 3 to 7, 2024.
12. Do you have full and complete relevant engineering records including design, construction, operation, maintenance and/or closure.	<i>(Yes or No) We take the word "relevant" here to mean that you have all necessary documents to make an informed and substantiated decision on the safety of the dam, be it an old facility, or an acquisition, or legacy site. More information can be provided in your answer to Q20</i>	Cameco has the design, construction, maintenance and operating records for this facility.
13. What is your hazard categorisation of this facility, based on consequence of failure?		Not applicable. There are no dams because the facility is contained within a former mine pit, therefore there is no risk of a flow failure.
14. What guideline do you follow for the classification system?		Not applicable.
15. Has this facility, at any point in its history, failed to be confirmed or certified as stable, or experienced notable stability concerns, as identified by an independent engineer (even if later certified as stable by the same or a different firm).	<i>(Yes or No) We note that this will depend on factors including local legislation that are not necessarily tied to best practice. As such, and because remedial action may have been taken, a "Yes" answer may not indicate heightened risk. Stability concerns might include toe seepage, dam movement, overtopping, spillway failure, piping etc. If yes, have appropriately designed and reviewed mitigation actions been implemented? We also note that this question does not bear upon the appropriateness of the criteria, but rather the stewardship levels of the facility or the dam. Additional comments/information may be supplied in your answer to Q20.</i>	Not applicable. There are no dams, the facility is contained within a former mine pit. There have not been any significant slope stability issues associated with the pit walls and a failure of the pit walls would not cause a loss of physical containment.
16. Do you have internal/in house engineering specialist oversight of this facility? Or do you have external engineering support for this purpose?	<i>Note: Answers may be "Both".</i>	In-house engineering specialist is the Engineer of Record for this facility and provide ongoing oversight.
17. Has a formal analysis of the downstream impact on communities, ecosystems and critical infrastructure in the event of catastrophic failure been undertaken and to reflect final conditions? If so, when did this assessment take place?	<i>Note: Please answer 'yes' or 'no', and if 'yes', provide a date.</i>	Not applicable. There are no dams as the facility is contained within a former mine pit, therefore there is no risk of a flow failure releasing tailings to the downstream environment.
18. Is there a) a closure plan in place for this dam, and b) does it include long term monitoring?	<i>Please answer both parts of this question (e.g. Yes and Yes)</i>	Yes, there is a closure plan in place for this facility. Once fully closed, the facility will be placed into the provincial institutional control program and the provincial government will accept responsibility for long-term monitoring.
19. Have you, or do you plan to assess your tailings facilities against the impact of more regular extreme weather events as a result of climate change, e.g. over the next two years?	<i>(Yes or No)</i>	As an in-pit facility, extreme precipitation events do not pose risk to tailings containment.
20. Any other relevant information and supporting documentation. Please state if you have omitted any other exposure to tailings facilities through any joint ventures you may have.	<i>Note: this may include links to annual report disclosures, further information in the public domain, guidelines or reports etc.</i>	The RLITMF's design utilizes an existing mine pit to provide physical containment below grade, eliminating the risks associated with dam failures. In addition, the facility utilizes the pervious surround design concept to allow full containment of tailings water during operation and minimize post decommissioning groundwater flow through the tailings, minimizing the impact to the downstream environment.  The operational and post decommissioning environmental performance of the facility was fully assessed through the Rabbit Lake Solution Processing Project Environmental Assessment (2008) which concluded that the facility is not likely to cause a significant adverse environmental effect.

DTMF		
	<i>Instructions to support completion</i>	
1. "Tailings Dam" Name/identifier	<i>Please identify every tailings storage facility and identify if there are multiple dams (saddle or secondary dams) within that facility. Please provide details of these within question 20.</i>	Dielmann Tailings Management Facility (DTMF). This tailings facility is contained within a former mine pit and does not utilize any dams for containment.
2. Location	<i>Please provide Long/Lat coordinates</i>	57°12'30"N, 105°37'48"W
3. Ownership	<i>Please specify: Owned and Operated, Subsidiary, JV, NOJV, as of March 2019</i>	Ownership 83% Cameco Corporation, 17% Orano Canada Inc.  Operator Cameco Corporation.
4. Status	<i>Please specify: Active, Inactive/Care and Maintenance, Closed etc. We take closed to mean: a closure plan was developed and approved by the relevant local government agency, and key stakeholders were involved in its development; a closed facility means the noted approved closure plan was fully implemented or the closure plan is in the process of being implemented. A facility that is inactive or under C&amp;M is not considered closed until such time a closure plan has been implemented.</i>	The Key Lake Operation resumed operations in 2022 from being in care and maintenance. The DTMF is active as the waste disposal facility for the milling operation tailings.
5. Date of initial operation	<i>(date)</i>	First tailings placement occurred in 1996.
6. Is the Dam currently operated or closed as per currently approved design?	<i>Yes/No. If 'No', more information can be provided in the answer to Q20</i>	The facility does not utilize dams.  However, the facility is operating in accordance with the approved design.
7. Raising method	<i>Note: Upstream, Centerline, Modified Centreline, Downstream, Landform, Other.</i>	Not applicable. There are no dams, the facility is contained within a former mine pit.
8.Current Maximum Height	<i>Note: Please disclose in metres</i>	Not applicable. There are no dams, the facility is contained within a former mine pit with the tailings contained below the surrounding ground elevation.
9. Current Tailings Storage Impoundment Volume	<i>Note: (m³ as of Dec 31, 2024)</i>	The approved final tailings elevation within the DTMF is elevation 505m, which provides  24.1 million m³ of tailings capacity.  Solids (tailings and sand) volume was 9.62 million m³, as of August 2024.
10. Planned Tailings Storage Impoundment Volume in 5 years' time.	<i>(m³ as planned for January 2030)</i>	There are no plans to increase the final tailing height within the DTMF beyond 505m.  The tailings accumulation rate is typically between 200,000 to 400,000 m³/year.  The planned water level will increase to elevation 507m over the next 2 years, increasing the volume of water within the pit by 1.0 million m³.
11.Most recent Independent Expert Review	<i>(date) For this question we take 'Independent' to mean a suitably qualified individual or team, external to the Operation, that does not direct the design or construction work for that facility.</i>	Cameco's Independent Tailings Review Board meets annually to review the performance of each tailings facility. The last meeting occurred June 3 to 7, 2024.
12. Do you have full and complete relevant engineering records including design, construction, operation, maintenance and/or closure.	<i>(Yes or No) We take the word "relevant" here to mean that you have all necessary documents to make an informed and substantiated decision on the safety of the dam, be it an old facility, or an acquisition, or legacy site. More information can be provided in your answer to Q20</i>	Cameco has the design, construction, maintenance and operating records for this facility.
13. What is your hazard categorisation of this facility, based on consequence of failure?		Not applicable. There are no dams because the facility is contained within a former mine pit, therefore there is no risk of a flow failure.
14. What guideline do you follow for the classification system?		Not applicable.
15. Has this facility, at any point in its history, failed to be confirmed or certified as stable, or experienced notable stability concerns, as identified by an independent engineer (even if later certified as stable by the same or a different firm).	<i>(Yes or No) We note that this will depend on factors including local legislation that are not necessarily tied to best practice. As such, and because remedial action may have been taken, a "Yes" answer may not indicate heightened risk. Stability concerns might include toe seepage, dam movement, overtopping, spillway failure, piping etc. If yes, have appropriately designed and reviewed mitigation actions been implemented? We also note that this question does not bear upon the appropriateness of the criteria, but rather the stewardship levels of the facility or the dam. Additional comments/information may be supplied in your answer to Q20.</i>	There are no dams associated with this facility and there is no risk of loss of containment due to pit wall slope stability. The facility has experienced pit wall slope stability issues between 2002 and 2009 during planned flooding of the pit. Initially, slope stability was managed through water level control. After extensive technical studies, a major slope stabilization project was completed from 2010 through 2012. Since completion of this project, no major slope incidents have occurred.
16. Do you have internal/in house engineering specialist oversight of this facility? Or do you have external engineering support for this purpose?	<i>Note: Answers may be "Both".</i>	Cameco has an external Engineer of Record as well as in-house engineering specialists provide ongoing oversight.
17. Has a formal analysis of the downstream impact on communities, ecosystems and critical infrastructure in the event of catastrophic failure been undertaken and to reflect final conditions? If so, when did this assessment take place?	<i>Note: Please answer 'yes' or 'no', and if 'yes', provide a date.</i>	Not applicable. There are no dams as the facility is contained within a former mine pit, therefore there is no risk of a flow failure releasing tailings to the downstream environment.
18. Is there a) a closure plan in place for this dam, and b) does it include long term monitoring?	<i>Please answer both parts of this question (e.g. Yes and Yes)</i>	Yes, there is a closure plan in place for this facility. Once fully closed, the facility will be placed into the provincial institutional control program and the provincial government will accept responsibility for long-term monitoring.
19. Have you, or do you plan to assess your tailings facilities against the impact of more regular extreme weather events as a result of climate change, e.g. over the next two years?	<i>(Yes or No)</i>	As an in-pit facility, extreme precipitation events do not pose risk to tailings containment.
20. Any other relevant information and supporting documentation. Please state if you have omitted any other exposure to tailings facilities through any joint ventures you may have.	<i>Note: this may include links to annual report disclosures, further information in the public domain, guidelines or reports etc.</i>	The DTMF's design utilizes an existing mine pit to provide physical containment below grade, eliminating the risks associated with dam failures. In addition, the facility utilized the pervious surround design concept, to allow full containment of tailings water during operation and minimize post decommissioning groundwater flow through the tailings, minimizing the impact to the downstream environment.  The operational and post decommissioning environmental performance of the facility was assessed through the Key Lake Extension Project Environmental Assessment (2013). The assessment included assessing the cumulative impact of all waste rock and tailings facilities at this site which concluded that the facility is not likely to cause a significant adverse environmental effect.

Other

Other		
	Instructions to support completion	Other - see question 20.
1. "Tailings Dam" Name/identifier	Please identify every tailings storage facility and identify if there are multiple dams (saddle or secondary dams) within that facility. Please provide details of these within question 20.	
2. Location	Please provide Long/Lat coordinates	
3. Ownership	Please specify: Owned and Operated, Subsidiary, JV, NOJV, as of March 2019	
4. Status	Please specify: Active, Inactive/Care and Maintenance, Closed etc. We take closed to mean: a closure plan was developed and approved by the relevant local government agency, and key stakeholders were involved in its development; a closed facility means the noted approved closure plan was fully implemented or the closure plan is in the process of being implemented. A facility that is inactive or under C&M is not considered closed until such time a closure plan has been implemented.	
5. Date of initial operation	(date)	
6. Is the Dam currently operated or closed as per currently approved design?	Yes/No. If 'No', more information can be provided in the answer to Q20	
7. Raising method	Note: Upstream, Centerline, Modified Centreline, Downstream, Landform, Other.	
8.Current Maximum Height	Note: Please disclose in metres	
9. Current Tailings Storage Impoundment Volume	Note: (m³ as of Dec 31, 2024)	
10. Planned Tailings Storage Impoundment Volume in 5 years' time.	(m³ as planned for January 2030)	
11.Most recent Independent Expert Review	(date) For this question we take 'Independent' to mean a suitably qualified individual or team, external to the Operation, that does not direct the design or construction work for that facility.	
12. Do you have full and complete relevant engineering records including design, construction, operation, maintenance and/or closure.	(Yes or No) We take the word "relevant" here to mean that you have all necessary documents to make an informed and substantiated decision on the safety of the dam, be it an old facility, or an acquisition, or legacy site. More information can be provided in your answer to Q20	
13. What is your hazard categorisation of this facility, based on consequence of failure?		
14. What guideline do you follow for the classification system?		
15. Has this facility, at any point in its history, failed to be confirmed or certified as stable, or experienced notable stability concerns, as identified by an independent engineer (even if later certified as stable by the same or a different firm).	(Yes or No) We note that this will depend on factors including local legislation that are not necessarily tied to best practice. As such, and because remedial action may have been taken, a "Yes" answer may not indicate heightened risk. Stability concerns might include toe seepage, dam movement, overtopping, spillway failure, piping etc. If yes, have appropriately designed and reviewed mitigation actions been implemented? We also note that this question does not bear upon the appropriateness of the criteria, but rather the stewardship levels of the facility or the dam. Additional comments/information may be supplied in your answer to Q20.	
16. Do you have internal/in house engineering specialist oversight of this facility? Or do you have external engineering support for this purpose?	Note: Answers may be "Both".	
17. Has a formal analysis of the downstream impact on communities, ecosystems and critical infrastructure in the event of catastrophic failure been undertaken and to reflect final conditions? If so, when did this assessment take place?	Note: Please answer 'yes' or 'no', and if 'yes', provide a date.	
18. Is there a) a closure plan in place for this dam, and b) does it include long term monitoring?	Please answer both parts of this question (e.g. Yes and Yes)	
19. Have you, or do you plan to assess your tailings facilities against the impact of more regular extreme weather events as a result of climate change, e.g. over the next two years?	(Yes or No)	
20. Any other relevant information and supporting documentation. Please state if you have omitted any other exposure to tailings facilities through any joint ventures you may have.	Note: this may include links to annual report disclosures, further information in the public domain, guidelines or reports etc.	Uranium ore from the Cigar Lake Operation (ownership Cameco Corporation (54.547%), Orano Canada Inc. (40.453%), and TEPCO Resources Inc. (5%)) is toll milled at McClean Lake (ownership Denison (22.5%) Orano Canada (70.0%) and OURD Co Ltd. (7.5%)). Tailings resulting from Cigar Lake ore are deposited in the JEB Tailings management facility, which is operated by Orano Canada and owned by the McClean Lake Joint Venture.