



## OUR CURRENT REPORT

Cameco began using the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) 4.0 Sustainability Guidelines in our sustainability programming and reporting in 2016. Our reporting shows Cameco's performance on 32 key GRI indicators, as well as two corporate indicators that are unique to the company. This update provides reporting on 2018 data indicators.


Despite weak market conditions, Cameco continues to hold social responsibility, safety of our workforce and the public, and protection of the environment as top priorities.

Please note that as Cameco no longer holds a majority interest in Joint Venture Inkai LLP (JV Inkai), JV Inkai-related data is now considered outside the scope of this report. JV Inkai is owned by Cameco and Joint Stock Company National Atomic Company Kazatomprom. This change to our reporting is reflected throughout the report in many indicators. JV Inkai-related data has not been removed from indicator reporting prior to 2018, but for 2018 and onwards it is no longer included in the report. We have noted this in the report where it is applicable.

Some of the highlights of our 2019 Sustainable Development GRI Index Update ([for 2018 data](#)) include:

- A continued focus on local spending with over 70% procured from local suppliers;
- Sustained high levels of public support in locations where we operate; and
- Strong safety performance at all operations, with the lowest LTI (lost-time injury) frequency rate to date.

We welcome stakeholder feedback on this update at [sustainabledevelopment@cameco.com](mailto:sustainabledevelopment@cameco.com)

 - this icon denotes that JV Inkai-related data is not included for 2018.

## Economic

### EC1 - DIRECT ECONOMIC VALUE

This indicator provides information about Cameco's annual revenue, operating costs, employee wages and benefits, payments to providers of capital, payments to governments, community investments and economic value retained.

|                                  | 2014      | 2015      | 2016      | 2017      | 2018      |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Revenues                         | 2,397,532 | 2,754,378 | 2,431,404 | 2,156,852 | 2,091,661 |
| Operating Costs                  | 1,523,724 | 1,783,222 | 1,734,758 | 1,487,707 | 1,564,285 |
| Employee Wages and Benefits      | 464,021   | 507,767   | 487,349   | 431,559   | 395,220   |
| Payments to Providers of Capital | 236,344   | 227,820   | 228,756   | 227,795   | 144,200   |
| Payments to Government           | 233,716   | 92,758    | 114,669   | 90,830    | 31,027    |
| Community Investments            | 4,279     | 3,794     | 3,520     | 1,476     | 1,838     |
| Economic Value Retained          | -64,552   | 139,017   | -137,648  | -82,515   | -44,909   |

All figures in Canadian dollars (1,000s).



JV Inkai-related data is not included for 2018.

### Revenue by region

(Revenue is attributed to the geographic location based on the location of the entity providing the services)

|               | 2014      | 2015      | 2016      | 2017      | 2018      |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Canada        | 308,327   | 341,568   | 347,536   | 316,611   | 424,079   |
| Germany       | 174,622   | 276,833   | 181,189   | 147,305   | 2,817     |
| Switzerland   |           |           |           |           | 4,038     |
| United States | 1,914,583 | 2,135,977 | 1,902,679 | 1,692,936 | 1,660,727 |
| Totals        | 2,397,532 | 2,754,378 | 2,431,404 | 2,156,852 | 2,091,661 |

## What it means

In 2018, revenue decreased due to a decrease in sales volumes for NUKEM, as a result of the changes to our global marketing organization. Operating costs have increased as a result of the care and maintenance costs associated with the suspension of production at our McArthur River/Key Lake and US ISR operations. Employee wages and benefits were down as a result of a reduced workforce. A reduction in the annual dividend resulted in a reduced payment to shareholders. Finally, payments to government were down as a result of lower tax requirements overall due to reduced profits.

## Note



JV Inkai-related data is not included for 2018.

For more information please see [Cameco's Extractive Sector Transparency Measures Act Annual Report](#)

## EC6 - LOCAL HIRING

This indicator provides information about the number of local employees at our operations in northern Saskatchewan, and the number of senior managers from those local communities. We focus specifically on northern Saskatchewan because it is a remote region where there are few employment options and employees would otherwise be flown in. Most of our other operations are located in larger centres where local hiring is not a critical issue.

|                                    | 2014     | 2015     | 2016     | 2017     | 2018    |
|------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|
| Local employees / total            | 794/1600 | 811/1629 | 704/1438 | 603/1197 | 319/642 |
| % employees from local communities | 49.60%   | 49.80%   | 49.00%   | 50.40%   | 49.70%  |

|  | 2014    | 2015    | 2016    | 2017    | 2018    |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Senior managers from local communities / total senior managers | 2 of 26 | 2 of 24 | 3 of 21 | 1 of 16 | 1 of 10 |
| % senior management from local communities                     | 7.70%   | 8.33%   | 14.28%  | 6.25%   | 10.00%  |

## What it means

Our preference is to hire locally wherever we operate. While our overall local employment numbers decreased in 2018 in northern Saskatchewan as a result of the indeterminate suspension of production at McArthur River and Key Lake, we continue to see almost 50% of our workforce hired from the region.

## Definitions

*Senior manager* – A manager or superintendent level employee.

*Local employee* – To be considered a local employee in northern Saskatchewan, you must be registered as a Resident of Saskatchewan's North (a designation defined and managed by the Saskatchewan government) at the time of hire.

## EC7 - INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICE INVESTMENTS

This indicator provides an overview of Cameco's investments in infrastructure and services for local communities in Canada and the US.

### **a – Needs assessments**

We have not completed a formal infrastructure needs assessment in our local communities.

### **b – Current (or expected) impact of infrastructure and service investments**

Since 2009, Cameco has invested nearly \$10.5 million in support of infrastructure improvement projects in local communities.

## What it means

In 2018, the total value of donations Cameco provided to the communities where we operate reflected reduced revenues. Cameco does not specifically target infrastructure investments, but we receive many requests for investments from local communities to support these types of projects because many of these communities have infrastructure deficits.

We target four areas for support from our community investment fund:

- youth
- health and wellness
- education and literacy
- community development

## About this indicator

The community investments measured and reported on in this indicator are also included in the community investment total in EC1.

For this indicator, we have not included any infrastructure that was built primarily for business purposes but that local communities may also benefit from (i.e. roads). We also do not count any community investment payments provided to communities in northern Saskatchewan with which we have signed collaboration agreements or payments we make to the Six Rivers Trust which are directed to local priorities that may potentially include infrastructure projects.

## EC8 - INDIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT

This indicator provides information about our economic impact on particular geographic areas, including the secondary or indirect impact of Cameco's operations.

### What it means

No relevant economic impact studies were completed in 2018. While Cameco is a significant economic contributor everywhere we operate, both directly through salaries, wages, and local procurement, and indirectly through secondary employment and secondary economic activity, this has been impacted in recent years due to changes in our operations and support functions. These operational changes include the suspension of production at Rabbit Lake and curtailment at the US operations in 2016, the indeterminate suspension of production at our McArthur River/Key Lake operation in 2018, the reduction of the workforce at our northern Saskatchewan operations and at our corporate office, and the changes made to the way our global marketing activities are organized, all of which have had a significant impact on the communities where we operate. These actions are deemed necessary for the long-term health of the company in a uranium market that continues to be weak. Improving operational efficiency is part of our strategy to effectively manage costs and remain competitive, while positioning the company and our stakeholders to benefit as the market improves.

## EC9 - LOCAL SPENDING


This indicator shows the total dollar amount of goods and services procured from local suppliers for Cameco's operating sites.

|                        | 2014          | 2015          | 2016          | 2017          | 2018          |
|------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>Kazakhstan</b>      | (USD)         | (USD)         | (CDN)         | (CDN)         | (CDN)         |
| Total procurement      | \$15,330,067  | \$8,975,450   | \$10,286,189  | \$21,197,921  | N/A           |
| Local procurement      | \$14,837,659  | \$8,250,858   | \$9,370,716   | \$19,107,906  | N/A           |
| % Local procurement    | 97%           | 92%           | 91%           | 90%           | N/A           |
| <b>N. Saskatchewan</b> | (CDN)         | (CDN)         | (CDN)         | (CDN)         | (CDN)         |
| Total procurement      | \$466,883,286 | \$392,905,203 | \$265,667,553 | \$214,796,210 | \$134,462,747 |
| Local procurement      | \$333,493,389 | \$299,965,204 | \$210,965,605 | \$171,957,279 | \$120,261,167 |
| % Local procurement    | 71%           | 76%           | 79%           | 80%           | 89%           |
| <b>Ontario</b>         | (CDN)         | (CDN)         | (CDN)         | (CDN)         | (CDN)         |
| Total procurement      | \$89,808,641  | \$109,445,410 | \$109,247,983 | \$93,608,511  | \$108,819,861 |

|                     | 2014          | 2015          | 2016          | 2017          | 2018          |
|---------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Local procurement   | \$48,749,026  | \$51,480,769  | \$51,737,878  | \$43,458,145  | \$54,811,476  |
| % Local procurement | 54%           | 47%           | 47%           | 46%           | 50%           |
| <b>U.S.</b>         | (USD)         | (USD)         | (CDN)         | (CDN)         | (CDN)         |
| Total procurement   | N/A           | \$36,186,297  | \$22,034,287  | \$9,294,959   | \$6,968,316   |
| Local procurement   | N/A           | \$20,811,775  | \$11,154,100  | \$3,167,431   | \$2,781,252   |
| % Local procurement | N/A           | 58%           | 51%           | 34%           | 40%           |
| <b>Total</b>        |               |               | (CDN)         | (CDN)         | (CDN)         |
| Total procurement   | \$572,021,994 | \$547,512,363 | \$407,236,013 | \$338,897,601 | \$250,250,923 |
| Local procurement   | \$397,080,074 | \$380,508,609 | \$283,228,301 | \$237,690,760 | \$177,853,895 |
| % Local procurement | 69%           | 70%           | 70%           | 70%           | 71%           |

#### Note:

Northern Saskatchewan procurement spend includes services only.

 JV Inkai-related data is not included for 2018.

## What it means

We are committed to using local suppliers wherever we operate. It is a commitment codified in our *procurement of goods and services policy* and exemplified by our spend in northern Saskatchewan where we have procured nearly \$3.2 billion in services from local companies in the last 10 years. While our overall local procurement spend was reduced in 2018 due to a lower capital spend throughout the company as a result of a difficult uranium market, the proportion of spend that went to local contractors remained consistent with previous years.

## Definitions

*Local supplier* – Is defined differently for each of Cameco's operating locations as follows:

*Northern Saskatchewan local supplier* – A company or joint venture that is at least 50% owned by people or communities from the Northern Administrative District.

*Ontario local supplier* – One located in the province of Ontario.

*Kazakhstan local supplier* – A Kazakhstan producer of works and services and Kazakhstan producers of goods which is determined by the Republic of Kazakhstan (RK) Law on subsoil and subsoil usage. A Kazakhstan producer of works and services is defined as citizens of the RK and/or legal entities established in accordance with laws of the RK which are

located within the territory of the RK and engage no less than 95% of citizens of the RK of the total number of employees.

*U.S. local supplier* – A supplier located in the same state as the U.S. mine operations. For Crow Butte operations a local supplier is considered to be a supplier located in the state of Nebraska. For Smith Ranch-Highland operations a local supplier is considered to be a supplier located in the state of Wyoming.

## Environment

### EN3 - ENERGY CONSUMPTION (WITHIN ORGANIZATION)

This indicator presents Cameco's energy consumption in petajoules, including energy consumed as fuel from non-renewable sources and energy consumed as electricity. Energy consumed as fuel from non-renewable sources is calculated by applying a fuel- and region-specific energy content factor to the consumed volume of non-renewable energy sources at Cameco's operations. These energy sources include propane, natural gas, diesel and gasoline. Cameco does not utilize renewable energy sources directly. Energy consumed as electricity is calculated by applying a conversion factor of 0.0036 gigajoules per kilowatt hour (GJ/kwh) to the raw electricity consumption. Cameco does not sell energy as electricity, heating, cooling, or steam. Energy consumed by Cameco in 2018 excludes energy consumed at Joint Venture Inkai LLP as Cameco's ownership interest was adjusted to 40% effective January 1, 2018.

|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| Total fuel consumption from non-renewable sources (PJ) | 3.2  | 3.0  | 2.6  | 2.3  | 1.9  |
| Total electricity consumption (PJ)                     | 2.2  | 2.1  | 2.1  | 1.9  | 1.4  |
| Total energy consumption within the organization (PJ)  | 5.4  | 5.1  | 4.7  | 4.2  | 3.3  |

### What it means

The total energy consumed by Cameco in 2018 was lower than in previous years. Lower energy consumption in 2018 is explained by the change in ownership interest at JV Inkai and the safe, non-producing status of McArthur River and Key Lake.

### EN8 - WATER WITHDRAWAL

This indicator presents the annual volume of water withdrawal in millions of cubic metres (Mm<sup>3</sup>). Cameco withdraws water from surface water, collects groundwater, and also withdraws water from municipal water utilities in the areas where we operate. Rainwater that comes into contact with our operations is collected and stored, and is reflected in our water

withdrawal volumes. Cameco does not withdraw wastewater directly from other organizations. Water withdrawal from our exploration activities is not included.

|                                 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Total intake (Mm <sup>3</sup> ) | 18.9 | 18.3 | 18.8 | 18.2 | 19.7 |

## What it means

In 2018, the volume of water withdrawal was higher than in previous years. This is primarily associated with water management at Key Lake's Deilmann Tailings Management Facility and Gaertner pit.

## MM1 - OPERATIONAL FOOTPRINT

This indicator measures the amount of Cameco's land currently in use and not yet rehabilitated. It does not include land we own/lease that has not been disturbed.

|  | 2014  | 2015  | 2016  | 2017  | 2018  |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <b>Total land disturbed and not yet rehabilitated (hectares)</b> |       |       |       |       |       |
| Year End Total   | 3,361 | 3,654 | 3,719 | 3,733 | 3,190 |
| Additional Land Disturbed  | 155   | 293   | 65    | 14    | -543  |

*This indicator excludes advanced uranium projects (Kintyre, Yeelirrie, Millennium), office structures, exploration activities, operations in which Cameco does not have operational control, or rented facilities that Cameco operates (Cobourg).*

## What it means

There was no additional land developed in 2018, nor was any land officially reclaimed. JV Inkai data was not included for this indicator in 2018, as Cameco no longer holds a majority interest, which accounts for the decline in total land disturbed.

Approximately 40% of Cameco's disturbed lands are from our ISR operations, which use a much less invasive process than conventional mines in terms of surface disturbance. Our operations in northern Saskatchewan, which have the largest production capacity, have a very small operational footprint and produce a product that provides very large amounts of energy.

## Definitions



The definition of land disturbed and not yet rehabilitated is dependent on the jurisdiction of the operation as listed below:

- In Saskatchewan, total land disturbed and not yet rehabilitated is accepted by regulators as “Developed” land
- In the United States, total land disturbed and not yet rehabilitated is defined by regulators as “Affected Area”
- For Ontario, total land disturbed is equal to the licensed area of the facility

## EN15 - DIRECT GHG EMISSIONS (BY WEIGHT)

This indicator presents Cameco’s scope 1 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions as kilotonnes of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e). CO<sub>2</sub>e is used to compare the emissions from various GHG sources based on their global warming potential (GWP). Cameco adopted the GWPs published by Environment and Climate Change Canada and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), which reference the GWPs stated in the International Panel on Climate Change’s Fourth Assessment Report.

Cameco’s significant sources of direct GHG emissions include those generated by the consumption of fuel from non-renewable sources and industrial processes. In 2017, we added estimates of Scope 1 GHG emissions from waste and wastewater facilities at our Saskatchewan operations in accordance with technical guidance published by Environment and Climate Change Canada through the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program.

Emissions factors that are country and fuel-specific are used to convert the fossil fuels consumed to GHG emissions in CO<sub>2</sub>e. For our Canadian operations, we have used emission factors published by Environment and Climate Change Canada through the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program. For our US operations, we use the emission factors published by the US EPA in the most recent Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories document.

|   | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|
| <b>Corporate totals of GHG emissions (kilotonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e)</b> |      |      |      |      |      |
| Scope 1 (EN15)  | 198  | 184  | 160  | 143  | 116  |

### What it means

Direct GHG emissions were lower in 2018 as compared with previous years. Lower direct GHG emissions in 2018 are explained by the change in ownership interest at JV Inkai and the safe, non-producing status of McArthur River and Key Lake.

## EN16 - INDIRECT GHG EMISSIONS (BY WEIGHT)

This indicator presents Cameco’s indirect (Scope 2) greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions as kilotonnes of carbon dioxide

equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e). CO<sub>2</sub>e is used to compare the emissions from various GHG sources based on their global warming potential (GWP). Cameco adopted the GWPs published by Environment and Climate Change Canada and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), which reference the GWPs stated in the International Panel on Climate Change's Fourth Assessment Report.

Indirect GHG emissions are calculated by applying a utility or region-specific emission factor to the amount of electricity purchased from that area, which is determined through utility invoices.

|   | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|
| <b>Corporate totals of GHG emissions (kilotonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e)</b> |      |      |      |      |      |
| Scope 2 (EN16)  | 350  | 341  | 323  | 271  | 187  |

## What it means

Indirect GHG emissions were lower in 2018 as compared with previous years. Lower indirect GHG emissions in 2018 are explained by the change in ownership interest at JV Inkai and the safe, non-producing status of McArthur River and Key Lake.

## EN21 - AIR EMISSIONS (BY TYPE AND WEIGHT)

This indicator presents the total air emissions from our Canadian operations of nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub> expressed as NO<sub>2</sub>), sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds, total particulate matter (PM), particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM<sub>10</sub>), particulate matter less than 2.5 microns (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>), uranium (U) and hydrogen fluoride. Air emissions of constituents are presented in kilotonnes except for uranium and hydrogen fluoride that are reported in tonnes. Air emissions from our in situ recovery operations in the United States are not material for this indicator and are not included.

Air emissions of NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, CO, VOCs, PM, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NH<sub>3</sub> are calculated using the guidance provided by Environment and Climate Change Canada through the National Pollutant Release Inventory. The total air emissions for these constituents include air emissions released through point sources such as process stacks, storage and handling, fugitive emissions, and as a result of road dust. Air emissions of uranium and hydrogen fluoride include air emissions released through point sources.

|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| <b>Air emissions (kilotonnes)</b>                                  |      |      |      |      |      |
| Oxides of Nitrogen NO <sub>x</sub> (expressed as NO <sub>2</sub> ) | 0.6  | 0.5  | 0.3  | 0.2  | 0.2  |
| Sulphur Dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> )                                 | 0.3  | 0.1  | 0.2  | 0.3  | 0.0  |

|   | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|
| Carbon Monoxide (CO)                                  | 0.5  | 0.5  | 0.4  | 0.1  | 0.0  |
| Volatile Organic Compounds                            | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.1  | 0.1  | 0.0  |
| Total Particulate Matter                              | 0.8  | 0.8  | 0.6  | 0.5  | 0.4  |
| PM <sub>10</sub> – Particulate Matter <= 10 microns   | 0.3  | 0.3  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  |
| PM <sub>2.5</sub> – Particulate Matter <= 2.5 microns | 0.1  | 0.1  | 0.1  | 0.0  | 0.0  |
| Ammonia (NH <sub>3</sub> )                            | 0.1  | 0.1  | 0.1  | 0.1  | 0.0  |
| Uranium*  | 0.6  | 0.1  | 0.1  | 0.2  | 0.0  |
| Hydrogen Fluoride*                                    | 0.4  | 0.4  | 0.3  | 0.5  | 0.6  |

\*Uranium and hydrogen fluoride are reported in tonnes

## What it means

In 2018, emissions of nitrogen oxides, sulphur dioxide, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, ammonia and uranium were lower than in previous years. Lower air emissions in 2018 are explained by the safe, non-producing status of McArthur River and Key Lake.

## EN22 - WATER DISCHARGE (BY QUALITY AND DESTINATION)

This indicator presents the annual volume of planned water discharge in millions of cubic metres (Mm<sup>3</sup>) by destination (i.e. surface water, municipal treatment facilities, land, evaporation pond, or deep disposal well) and treatment method (i.e. treated by Cameco, treated by municipal authorities, clean, or untreated). Cameco does not re-use water produced by other organizations. The annual volume of water discharged to evaporation from our Smith Ranch Highland operation is not included.

This indicator also includes information about the quality of the water we discharge to surface water bodies, land application via irrigation, and municipal treatment facilities. We report the total amount of certain materials discharged over the year in kilograms (kg). The totals are calculated by multiplying the volume of water discharge by the concentration of the constituent in water. An increase may result from either an increase in water flow or an increase in the constituent concentration in the water.

|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| <b>Annual volume (Mm<sup>3</sup>)</b>              |      |      |      |      |      |
| Discharge of clean diverted water to surface water | 5.2  | 5.4  | 5.3  | 5.0  | 5.0  |

|   | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|
| Discharge of water to municipal treatment facilities                | 0.4  | 0.2  | 0.1  | 0.2  | 0.2  |
| Discharge of clean treated water to surface water                   | 11.8 | 11.4 | 12.1 | 11.5 | 13.4 |
| Discharge of clean treated water to land application via irrigation | 0.1  | 0.1  | 0.1  | 0.1  | 0.2  |
| Discharge of water to deep disposal well                            | 1.0  | 0.8  | 0.8  | 0.9  | 0.9  |
| Discharge of water to evaporation pond                              | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.02 |

|   | 2014   | 2015   | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| <b>Discharged to surface water (kg)</b> |        |        |        |        |        |
| Arsenic                                 | 38     | 40     | 54     | 44     | 35     |
| Copper                                  | 39     | 47     | 31     | 25     | 11     |
| Lead                                    | 13     | 10     | 9      | 9      | 15     |
| Molybdenum                              | 1,825  | 1,606  | 1,750  | 1,034  | 916    |
| Nickel                                  | 221    | 165    | 252    | 183    | 418    |
| Radium-226*                             | 206    | 268    | 253    | 276    | 301    |
| Selenium                                | 43     | 40     | 36     | 27     | 27     |
| Total suspended solids                  | 13,957 | 14,344 | 14,090 | 11,437 | 13,266 |
| Uranium                                 | 249    | 303    | 363    | 303    | 180    |
| Zinc                                    | 47     | 27     | 34     | 31     | 38     |

\*Radium-226 is reported in MBq

|  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Discharged to municipal treatment facilities (kg)</b> |   |   |   |   |   |
| Total Uranium  | 8 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 5 |

|   |    |    |    |    |     |
|---|----|----|----|----|-----|
| <b>Treated water discharged to land application via irrigation (kg)</b> |    |    |    |    |     |
| Arsenic   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   |
| Selenium  | 2  | 1  | 2  | 0  | 3   |
| Uranium   | 78 | 39 | 78 | 26 | 158 |

## What it means

### Water discharge quantity

In 2018, the volume of clean treated water discharged to surface water was higher than in previous years. This is primarily associated with increase in dewatering at Key Lake to maintain the water level in the Deilmann Tailings Management Facility and lower the water level in the Gaertner pit. Otherwise, discharge values are within their historical ranges.

### Water discharge quality

In 2018, the quality of the clean treated water discharged to surface water complied with all applicable regulatory limits. Cameco remains focused on improving the quality of our clean treated water discharged to surface water. This focus has involved improvement in our water management practices and treatment technologies, and has resulted in a significant decline in the mass loadings of molybdenum, selenium and uranium in treated water discharged to surface water over the past number of years.

In 2018, the volume of treated water discharged to land application via irrigation increased due to accelerated groundwater restoration activities. As a result, the mass of uranium discharged to land via irrigation also increased. Soil samples in the irrigated areas are taken regularly and remain within the permitted levels.

## EN23 - WASTE

This indicator presents the total amount of non-hazardous, hazardous, and low-level radioactive waste we generate in kilotonnes. Cameco does not generate intermediate or high level radioactive waste.

The total amount of waste generated in each category is separated and presented by disposal method: diverted, landfilled or stored on site. Diverted materials include those that are recycled, reused, incinerated, repurposed or reprocessed. We separate waste into these disposal categories using internal tracking systems that track the inventory of waste on site and the transfer of waste off site. The amount of waste transferred off site is confirmed through information provided by the receiving organization.

|   | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|
| <b>Total waste (kilotonnes)</b>         |      |      |      |      |      |
| Generated                               | 17.6 | 18.1 | 14.2 | 9.1  | 6.5  |
| Diverted                                | 3.4  | 5.2  | 3.0  | 3.0  | 2.1  |
| Landfilled or stored                    | 14.2 | 12.9 | 11.2 | 6.1  | 4.4  |
| Overall rate of diversion (%)           | 19%  | 29%  | 21%  | 33%  | 32%  |
| <b>Non-hazardous waste (kilotonnes)</b> |      |      |      |      |      |

|   | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|
| Generated                                       | 5.2  | 6.4  | 3.9  | 3.2  | 1.8  |
| Diverted  | 2.1  | 3.8  | 1.5  | 1.2  | 0.6  |
| Landfilled or stored                            | 3.1  | 2.6  | 2.4  | 2.0  | 1.3  |
| Rate of diversion (%)                           | 40%  | 59%  | 38%  | 39%  | 30%  |
| <b>Low-level radioactive waste (kilotonnes)</b> |      |      |      |      |      |
| Generated                                       | 12.0 | 11.2 | 9.8  | 5.6  | 4.5  |
| Diverted  | 1.0  | 1.1  | 1.1  | 1.6  | 1.4  |
| Landfilled or stored                            | 11.0 | 10.1 | 8.6  | 4.0  | 3.1  |
| Rate of diversion (%)                           | 8%   | 10%  | 12%  | 28%  | 31%  |
| <b>Hazardous waste (kilotonnes)</b>             |      |      |      |      |      |
| Generated                                       | 0.5  | 0.6  | 0.5  | 0.3  | 0.1  |
| Diverted  | 0.4  | 0.4  | 0.4  | 0.2  | 0.1  |
| Managed via treatment/disposal                  | 0.1  | 0.2  | 0.1  | 0.1  | 0.0  |
| Rate of diversion (%)                           | 82%  | 68%  | 72%  | 67%  | 80%  |

## What it means

Overall, the amount of waste we generated in 2018 was lower than in previous years. This is explained by reduced activity and production at McArthur River and Key Lake, which were held in a safe non-producing state of care and maintenance.

## Definitions

*Non-hazardous waste* – Includes domestic, commercial and industrial materials that become waste, such as plastic, tin, paper and cardboard, tires, metal, wood pallets, kitchen cooking oil and wood.

*Low-level radioactive waste* – Includes industrial materials that have become contaminated with radioactive material and are more radioactive than clearance levels and exemption quantities allow. This type of waste includes industrial materials such as protective equipment, paper, cardboard, equipment, tools, metal, plastic, concrete, sand, sludges, insulation and wood.

*Hazardous waste* – Includes hazardous recyclable materials, and generally means a waste with hazardous properties that may have potential effects to human health or the environment. The hazardous waste we generate includes materials such as used petroleum fuels (oil, diesel, gas), batteries, paint and paint related materials, compressed gas cylinders and light fixtures.

## MM3 - MINE WASTE (OVERBURDEN, ROCK, TAILINGS, SLUDGES)

This indicator provides information about the amount of solid waste generated annually in the form of tailings, water treatment sludge and slime, the net annual change in our unreclaimed waste rock inventory (including mineralized and non-mineralized rock), and the total mine waste generated for each year. We do not disclose any risk assessment associated with this indicator, although all are complete and provided to our regulators.

|   | 2014       | 2015    | 2016     | 2017    | 2018   |
|---|------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|
| <b>Mine waste (tonnes)</b>                        |            |         |          |         |        |
| Annual tailings and process wastes generated      | 667,128    | 595,717 | 292,945  | 181,526 | 25,456 |
| Annual change in unreclaimed waste rock inventory | -1,282,110 | -37,541 | -278,340 | -3,274  | 10,329 |
| Net of wastes created and reclaimed               | -614,982   | 558,176 | 14,605   | 178,252 | 35,785 |

*Note - The 2016 clean waste rock tonnage was restated in the 2018 update to correct an earlier reporting error.*

### What it means

The amount of tailings and process wastes we produce depends primarily on production rates and ore grades. The change in unreclaimed waste rock inventory is the net of new waste produced and existing waste consumed or reclaimed.

Tailings generation rates vary annually based on uranium production and ore grade. Efforts to utilize waste rock as underground backfill, for road construction, and other uses help to minimize the increase in inventory, and in some year's results in a net decrease in inventory. Prior to suspending operations, the Key Lake mill received small quantities of waste rock from McArthur River, which it largely consumed through blending with high grade ore in the milling process.

The relatively small increase in waste volume is largely due to the transition to care and maintenance for the Key Lake mill and McArthur River mine in 2018. Tailings wastes produced in 2018 primarily consisted of water treatment precipitates, which are typically low density and produce a small annual tonnage. Shutdown of the Key Lake mill also decreased the amount of waste rock consumed in the blending process, which led to the net increase in 2018.

Note that surveys conducted in 2018 led to an overall change in waste rock volume and tonnage inventory, but that these changes were not included in the annual change in waste rock numbers as no material was actually removed or added to these stockpiles in 2018.

## EN24 - SIGNIFICANT INCIDENTS (TOTAL NUMBER AND VOLUME)

This indicator provides information about the number of significant environmental incidents. We determine significance based on the incident’s actual or potential environmental impact, or by the level of regulatory and public concern about it.

For significant incidents, we report the total quantity of material released and any associated impacts.

|              | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Total number | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |
| Quantity     | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |

## What it means

Cameco has been focused on minimizing environmental incidents for many years, and has used the number of environmental incidents as the main measure for determining environmental performance related to employee and officer compensation. Beginning in 2016, the corporate environmental objective was transitioned from an incident-based measure to one based on significant environmental aspects. However, there is an overriding compensation target that affects employee and executive compensation if we sustain a significant environmental incident.

## Definitions

*Significant environmental incident* – Any environmental incident that results in moderate or significant environmental impacts or current and future remediation costs of greater than \$1 million, or has reasonable potential to result in significant negative impact on the company’s reputation with our major stakeholders.

## EN29 - SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL FINES

This indicator provides information on the number of “significant environmental fines” that we received for non-compliance with environmental laws and regulations, as well as the total number of “non-monetary sanctions.” It does not include significant environmental fines or non-monetary sanctions that are in the appeals process or imposed through national or international dispute resolution mechanisms.

|                                 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Significant environmental fines | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |
| Non-monetary sanctions          | 3    | 0    | 2    | 9    | 0    |

## What it means



Cameco did not receive any significant environmental fines or non-monetary sanctions in 2018.

## Definitions

*Significant environmental fine* – Fines that exceed CDN \$100,000 paid by Cameco or a controlled subsidiary in Canada or the US to a government authority for non-compliance with environmental laws or regulations.

*Non-monetary sanctions* – An administrative or judicial sanction levied against Cameco or a controlled subsidiary for non-compliance with environmental laws and regulations. Non-monetary sanctions include, but are not limited to, formal actions issued by regulatory authorities at the level of notices of violation or notices of contravention or above, pursuant to a graduated enforcement regime.

## Social: Labour Practices and Decent Work

### LA1 - HIRING AND TURNOVER (BY AGE GROUP, GENDER)

This indicator provides information about our annual rates of hiring and turnover, and the total number of employees who are hired or leave the organization, by gender and age group.

|             | New hires | Year end | Rate   | Turnover | Year end | Rate   |
|-------------|-----------|----------|--------|----------|----------|--------|
| <b>2014</b> |           |          |        |          |          |        |
| Male        | 124       | 2,481    | 5.00%  | 208      | 2,481    | 8.38%  |
| Female      | 49        | 724      | 6.77%  | 70       | 724      | 9.67%  |
| Up to 35    | 85        | 865      | 9.83%  | 92       | 865      | 10.64% |
| 36-55       | 87        | 1,822    | 4.77%  | 113      | 1,822    | 6.20%  |
| 56+         | 1         | 518      | 0.19%  | 73       | 518      | 14.09% |
| Total       | 173       | 3,205    | 5.40%  | 278      | 3,205    | 8.67%  |
| <b>2015</b> |           |          |        |          |          |        |
| Male        | 147       | 2,485    | 5.92%  | 157      | 2,485    | 6.32%  |
| Female      | 43        | 736      | 5.84%  | 55       | 736      | 7.47%  |
| Up to 35    | 92        | 835      | 11.02% | 66       | 835      | 7.90%  |
| 36-55       | 86        | 1,827    | 4.71%  | 76       | 1,827    | 4.16%  |
| 56+         | 12        | 559      | 2.15%  | 70       | 559      | 12.52% |

|             | New hires | Year end | Rate  | Turnover | Year end | Rate   |
|-------------|-----------|----------|-------|----------|----------|--------|
| Total       | 190       | 3,221    | 5.90% | 212      | 3,221    | 6.58%  |
| <b>2016</b> |           |          |       |          |          |        |
| Male        | 43        | 2,210    | 1.95% | 361      | 2,210    | 16.33% |
| Female      | 14        | 672      | 2.08% | 104      | 672      | 15.48% |
| Up to 35    | 29        | 664      | 4.37% | 126      | 664      | 18.98% |
| 36-55       | 26        | 1,661    | 1.57% | 209      | 1,661    | 12.58% |
| 56+         | 2         | 557      | 0.36% | 130      | 557      | 23.34% |
| Total       | 57        | 2,882    | 1.98% | 465      | 2,882    | 16.13% |
| <b>2017</b> |           |          |       |          |          |        |
| Male        | 57        | 1,973    | 2.89% | 277      | 1,973    | 14.04% |
| Female      | 17        | 588      | 2.89% | 94       | 588      | 15.99% |
| Up to 35    | 26        | 519      | 5.01% | 77       | 519      | 14.84% |
| 36-55       | 40        | 1,505    | 2.66% | 164      | 1,505    | 10.90% |
| 56+         | 8         | 510      | 1.57% | 130      | 510      | 25.59% |
| Total       | 74        | 2,561    | 2.89% | 371      | 2,561    | 14.49% |
| <b>2018</b> |           |          |       |          |          |        |
| Male        | 50        | 1,372    | 3.64% | 605      | 1,372    | 44.10% |
| Female      | 14        | 477      | 2.94% | 132      | 477      | 27.67% |
| Up to 35    | 23        | 337      | 6.82% | 155      | 337      | 45.99% |
| 36-55       | 37        | 1,183    | 3.13% | 379      | 1,183    | 32.04% |
| 56+         | 4         | 329      | 1.22% | 203      | 329      | 61.70% |
| Total       | 64        | 1,849    | 3.46% | 737      | 1,849    | 39.86% |

Figures are as of December 31 each year. For this indicator, we do not include temporary or casual employees.



JV Inkai-related data is not included for 2018.

## What it means

The turnover rate reflects continued poor market conditions. The company made permanent workforce reductions in 2018 when production at the McArthur River and Key Lake operations was indeterminately suspended. This has resulted in a 28% reduction in workforce from 2017.

## Definitions

*Turnover* – The number of employees who resign, are dismissed or retire while employed by Cameco each year.

Note:

We do not provide any regional breakdowns on this information at this time.

## MM4 - STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS (OVER ONE WEEK IN DURATION)

This indicator provides information on the number of strikes and lockouts at our unionized sites in any given year that are over one week in duration.

|                                 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Number of strikes over 1 week   | 1    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |
| Number of lock-outs over 1 week | 1    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |

## What it means

There were no strikes or lockouts at any of our unionized operations in 2018, including Key Lake, McArthur River, Cameco Fuel Manufacturing or the Port Hope conversion facility.

## Definitions

*Strike* – A strike is a collective action by employees to stop or curtail work.

Section 1 (1) of the Canadian Labour Relations Act, 1995 defines a strike as a cessation of work, a refusal to work or to continue to work by employees in combination or in concert or in accordance with a common understanding, or a slow-down or other concerted activity on the part of employees designed to restrict or limit output.

*Lockout* – A lockout occurs when an employer closes a workplace, suspends work or refuses to continue employing a number of employees during a labour dispute.

Section 1 (1) of the Canadian Labour Relations Act, 1995 defines a lockout as the closing of a place of employment, a suspension of work or a refusal by an employer to continue to employ a number of employees, with a view to compel or induce the employees, or to aid another employer to compel or induce that employer's employees, to refrain from

exercising any rights or privileges under this Act or to agree to provisions or changes in provisions respecting terms or conditions of employment or the rights, privileges or duties of the employer, an employers' organization, the trade union, or the employees.

## LA5 - HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEES

This indicator shows the number and percentage of Cameco's workers who are represented by formal management-worker occupational health and safety (OHS) committees. These committees help monitor and advise on occupational health and safety programs.

|  | 2014  | 2015  | 2016  | 2017  | 2018  |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Total workers                                | 3,324 | 3,348 | 2,963 | 2,620 | 1,897 |
| Workers represented by joint committees      | 3,324 | 3,348 | 2,963 | 2,620 | 1,897 |
| % of workers represented in joint committees | 100%  | 100%  | 100%  | 100%  | 100%  |

*Figures are as of December 31 each year.*

### What it means

All of Cameco's employees (regular, temporary and casual) are represented by OHS committees. These committees operate at both the site level and at our corporate offices.

Beginning in 2018, JV Inkai data will no longer be reported in this indicator, because Cameco no longer has a majority interest in JV Inkai and is out of scope of the report. There was no change to the overall percentage of workers represented by a health and safety committee. All operations reported within this indicator are in jurisdictions where such a committee is required by regulation.

## LA6 - INJURY FREQUENCY, MISSED WORK

This indicator provides information about Cameco's rates of absenteeism, lost-time injuries (LTI) and work-related fatalities. For lost-time injuries and fatalities, we include both employees and contractors in our numbers. Minor updates to the LTI rate may be made to previous years on occasion if past injuries are reclassified as the worker's condition changes, e.g. a minor injury worsens, resulting in lost time at a later date.

We do not report absentee rates for Australia or Kazakhstan (historical). Absentee rates also do not include contractors to Cameco.

|                        | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Absentee rate (%)      | 3.59 | 3.56 | 3.43 | 3.82 | 3.31 |
| LTI rate (per 200,000) | 0.17 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.12 | 0.09 |
| # of fatalities        | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |

## What it means

Cameco has a strong safety culture. The LTI frequency continues to follow a stable declining trend over time, with 2018 results being the lowest value to date. There are currently two operations, Blind River and Crow Butte that have in excess of 10 years without an LTI.

## Definitions

*Lost-time injury* – A work-related injury requiring professional medical assessment and treatment, and where the employee is not able to return to work for their next scheduled shift. If there is uncertainty whether the lost-time injury is work related, Cameco sites must use the workers compensation decision to accept or deny the claim as the decision criteria. Regulatory acceptance of the lost-time injury claim requires the site to count the injury as work-related.

*Lost-time injury rate* – Based on the total number of lost-time injuries, you can compute the incidence rate using the following formula: lost-time injury rate = # of LTI cases x (200,000 hours/annual hours worked).

## Note

At this time, Cameco only reports this information at a global level.



JV Inkai-related data is not included for 2018.

## LA11 - PERFORMANCE AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT REVIEWS (BY GENDER)

This indicator provides information about the percentage of employees who receive formal performance appraisals and career development reviews.

**In 2018, 100% of Cameco's non-unionized employees received formal performance appraisals and career development reviews. Cameco's unionized employees, who make up 26% of our male staff and 15% of our female staff, do not undergo formal performance reviews.**

## What it means

Cameco uses a performance management program called "Core" which is guided by the following key principles:

meaningful conversations around results and behaviours; alignment of employee priorities to corporate objectives; continual improvement; and feedback directed to employee's growth and development.

As of 2018 all non-unionized employees strive for a minimum of four conversations per year and are encouraged to have more meaningful conversations throughout the year based on continual feedback.

## Definitions

*Performance review* – A formal meeting between an employee and his or her supervisor to review and discuss the employee's performance against goals and expectations established at the start of the year by employees and supervisors.

## LA12 - WORKFORCE DIVERSITY

This indicator provides information on our workplace diversity, including the number and percentage of women, Indigenous peoples, visible minorities and persons with disabilities in our workforce.

|                           | 2014          | 2015          | 2016          | 2017          | 2018          |
|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| # of employees            | 3,074         | 3,106         | 2,726         | 2,475         | 1,802         |
| Women                     | 723<br>23.52% | 733<br>23.60% | 659<br>24.17% | 578<br>23.35% | 466<br>25.86% |
| Indigenous                | 780<br>25.37% | 792<br>25.50% | 684<br>25.09% | 590<br>23.84% | 326<br>18.09% |
| Visible Minority          | 140<br>4.55%  | 138<br>4.44%  | 123<br>4.51%  | 119<br>4.81%  | 97<br>5.38%   |
| Persons with Disabilities | 63<br>2.05%   | 60<br>1.93%   | 51<br>1.87%   | 43<br>1.74%   | 28<br>1.55%   |

*Figures are as of December 31 each year. This indicator only includes employees from our Canadian operations (including temporary and casual), as other jurisdictions are not (at this time) required to collect or maintain diversity information on employees.*

## What it means

In 2018, we moved forward with our workforce diversity plan with a focus on education and awareness. We continued to deliver the "Expect Respect" program which provides employees with the training and resources to maintain a respectful workplace. Mandatory, corporate-wide unconscious bias training was piloted in 2018 and then delivered broadly in 2019.

## Definitions

*Indigenous peoples* – this term is used as an equivalent to the federally legislated definition of aboriginal peoples under Canada’s Employment Equity legislation. The legislation defines an aboriginal person as a North American Indian or a member of a First Nation, a Metis or Inuit. North American Indians or members of a First Nation include status, treaty or registered Indians, as well as non-status and non-registered Indians.

*Visible minority* – A person declared as visible minority are persons, other than aboriginal persons, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour, regardless of birthplace.

*Persons with disabilities* – Persons who have a long-term or recurring physical, mental, sensory, psychiatric or learning impairment who:

- Consider themselves to be disadvantaged in employment by reason of that impairment
- Believe that an employer or potential employer is likely to consider them to be disadvantaged in employment by reason of that impairment
- Persons whose functional limitations owing to their impairment have been accommodated in their current job or workplace

## Social: Human Rights

### HR8 - DISPUTES RELATED TO INDIGENOUS RIGHTS

This indicator provides information about the total number of incidents registered through formal means related to Indigenous rights.

|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| # of incidents registered through formal means | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1    |

### What it means

Cameco has a long history working with Indigenous groups wherever we operate, exemplified by the numerous mutually beneficial agreements we have with Indigenous peoples in Australia and Canada.

In 2018, an Indigenous group filed 14 contentions with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) regarding the final environmental assessment for the application to amend the Marsland Expansion Area licence with respect to Cameco Resources' Crow Butte operation.

Six of the 14 contentions related to Indigenous rights infringement, including failure to include the results of a cultural survey; failure to discuss or demonstrate lawful federal jurisdiction and authority over Crow Butte’s activities; failure to obtain the consent of the specified Indigenous group as required by treaty and international law; failure to meet applicable legal requirements regarding protection of historical, cultural and spiritual resources; failure to meet applicable legal

requirements regarding protection of historical, cultural and spiritual resources by reason of the failure to involve or consult the specified Indigenous group as required by federal and international law; and failure to take the requisite “hard look” at environmental justice impacts. The NRC did not admit any of these six contentions.

## MM5 - PROXIMITY TO INDIGENOUS TERRITORIES

This indicator provides information about the number of Cameco sites on (or adjacent to) Indigenous territories, as well as the percentage of formal agreements in relation to the overall number of our operating sites that are on or adjacent to an Indigenous territory.

Sites on or adjacent to Indigenous territories:

- Four sites in northern Saskatchewan are on traditional territory (all of these operations have formal agreements in place with local Indigenous communities)
- One operating Cameco site in Ontario is adjacent to Indigenous lands (this operation does not have a formal agreement in place)

### What it means

In northern Saskatchewan, Cameco has entered into five formal agreements with Indigenous communities that cover the four sites we have on traditional territory. All of these agreements provide Indigenous communities with workforce and business development opportunities, dedicated community engagement programs, community investment monies and mechanisms to collaborate around environmental stewardship.

| Agreement  | Participants   | What is involved   |
|--|--|--|
| Collaboration Agreements (CAs)<br>(2012, 2013, 2016, 2017) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lac La Ronge Indian Band</li> <li>• The communities of the Athabasca Basin (including Hatchet Lake, Black Lake and Fond du Lac Denesuline First Nations, along with four northern municipalities)</li> <li>• English River First Nation (EFRN)</li> <li>• the Northern Village of Pinehouse and the Metis Local situated there</li> </ul> | The agreements codify the relationships we've had in these communities for over 25 years and reaffirm our commitment as partners in employment, business development and community investment. They also provide a more predictable model of funding over the long term so communities will have greater ability to plan for community investment initiatives. The long-term nature of the agreements also means more opportunity in the form of jobs through business contracts defined in the agreements, and calls for an increase in workforce development initiatives such as scholarships and training |



| Agreement                      | Participants  | What is involved   |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Participation Agreement (2014) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cameco, Orano (except for the Lac La Ronge Indian Band agreement to which Orano is not a party)</li> <li>• Southend and Kinoosao First Nations, which are part of the Peter Ballantyne Cree Nation</li> <li>• Thakotitan Economic Development Corporation</li> <li>• Cameco</li> </ul> | <p>opportunities.</p> <p>Provides assistance to Southend to increase its business and workforce capacity and start to make more meaningful inroads into the mining industry.</p> |

Though not considered here as “formal agreements,” Cameco also has:

- Several trappers’ compensation agreements with trappers in northern Saskatchewan who continue to trap on or near our operating sites. These agreements encourage trappers to continue trapping, provide them with a yearly cash distribution, and, for some, an allotment of oil and/or gasoline
- A signed memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Mississauga First Nation in relation to Cameco’s Blind River refinery in Ontario. The MOU commits the parties to work together towards mutual gain, and focuses primarily on socio-economic development projects related to youth, education, health and wellness, and community development

## Definitions

*Adjacent* – The tenure boundaries of an applicable Cameco operating site are physically contiguous with the boundaries of an Indigenous territory.

*Indigenous territory* – can mean two things:

- Indigenous lands – Land in relation to which Indigenous peoples hold or formally claim title or an equivalent interest (e.g. “reserve” land in Canada). This may include areas where ownership is claimed by multiple parties
- Traditional territory – Land on which Indigenous peoples (a) historically exercised traditional activities (e.g. hunting, fishing, trapping or gathering) and (b) still do today

## Society

### SO1 - COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

This indicator provides information about the number and percentage of Cameco operations in Canada and the US that have local community engagement activities, impact assessments and development programs.

## Community engagement activities

This includes various local community engagement activities that we carry out in relation to our 'supportive communities' measure of success. This would include activities such as community visits, community meetings, events, digital information (website and social media), investments, print publications, presentations and others.

|   | 2014  | 2015  | 2016  | 2017  | 2018 |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| Number of operations with community engagement activities | 10/10 | 10/10 | 10/10 | 10/10 | 9/9  |
| % of operations with community engagement activities      | 100%  | 100%  | 100%  | 100%  | 100% |

## Impact assessments

These are socio-economic impact assessments conducted by operations either to meet requirements for environmental impact assessments and/or for standalone local economic impact assessments. They are conducted as required and span an extended timeframe, often over several years.

|  | 2014  | 2015  | 2016  | 2017  | 2018 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| Number of operations with impact assessments | 10/10 | 10/10 | 10/10 | 10/10 | 9/9  |
| % of operations with impact assessments      | 100%  | 100%  | 100%  | 100%  | 100% |

## Development programs

Community development programs are formalized programs or agreements developed with local communities, groups and/or organizations, such as impact management agreements and/or memorandums of understanding. These are developed as required and may span an extended timeframe, often over several years.

|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| Number of operations with development programs | 8/10 | 8/10 | 8/10 | 8/10 | 7/9  |
| % of operations with development programs      | 80%  | 80%  | 80%  | 80%  | 78%  |

## What it means

Community engagement is an important aspect of operational activities across our sites and is a central component of Cameco's five pillar strategy and all the agreements we have with Indigenous communities.

## Note



JV Inkai-related data is not included for 2018.

The data regarding operations with impact assessments was restated in 2018 to correct an earlier reporting error. All of Cameco's operations have a socio-economic impact assessment.

## MM6 - DISPUTES RELATED TO LAND USE AND CUSTOMARY RIGHTS

This indicator provides information about significant disputes relating to the land use and customary rights of local or Indigenous peoples where we operate.

In 2018, an Indigenous group filed 14 contentions with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) regarding the final environmental assessment for the application to amend the Marsland Expansion Area licence with respect to Cameco Resources' Crow Butte operation.

Six of the 14 contentions related to Indigenous rights infringement, including failure to include the results of a cultural survey; failure to discuss or demonstrate lawful federal jurisdiction and authority over Crow Butte's activities; failure to obtain the consent of the specified Indigenous group as required by treaty and international law; failure to meet applicable legal requirements regarding protection of historical, cultural and spiritual resources; failure to meet applicable legal requirements regarding protection of historical, cultural and spiritual resources by reason of the failure to involve or consult the specified Indigenous group as required by federal and international law; and failure to take the requisite "hard look" at environmental justice impacts. The NRC did not admit any of these six contentions.

### What it means

We respect the rights of Indigenous peoples, and we invest considerable time in building relationships with local communities through our various engagement activities, including working with communities and traditional land users to understand local land use.

### Definitions

*Significant disputes* – Disputes that have been elevated to:

- A legal proceeding
- A formal objection filed with the applicable regulator
- A blockade or other form of civil disobedience

- The need to use a dispute resolution mechanism included in an agreement between the community and Cameco

## MM7 - USE OF GRIEVANCE MECHANISMS

This indicator looks at the extent to which local communities or Indigenous groups used grievance mechanisms to resolve disputes relating to land use and customary rights, and the status or outcome of those processes.

In 2018, a concern was raised by a local trapper in relation to exploration activities on one of Cameco's projects in the Athabasca Basin. Cameco addressed the trapper's concerns by way of a confidential arrangement.

### What it means

Local communities and Indigenous peoples have several grievance mechanisms available to them, and Cameco is committed to working with local people to resolve concerns as they are raised in a mutually beneficial manner.

## MM10 - OPERATIONS WITH PRELIMINARY DECOMMISSIONING PLANS

This indicator looks at the number of operations Cameco has with preliminary decommissioning plans, as well as the financial provisions attached to those plans for reclamation activities.

|       | Preliminary Decommissioning plan | Total estimated future decommissioning and reclamation costs |
|-------|----------------------------------|--|
| Total | 9 of 9 (100%)                    | \$1,157  |

*All figures in Canadian dollars (1,000s).*

This indicator does not include advanced uranium projects (Kintyre, Yeelirrie, and Millennium), office structures, exploration activities, operations in which Cameco does not have operational control, or rented facilities that Cameco operates.

### What it means

All of Cameco's operations have preliminary decommissioning plans with adequate funding attached.

### Definitions

*Preliminary Decommissioning plan* – Conceptual plan that describes the activities required after the operating life of a facility to reclaim the site to defined final end-state objectives. It includes an associated cost estimate for labour,

materials, equipment, waste management, environmental assessment, monitoring and administration to carry out the plan. The amount of detail in these decommissioning plans depends on the mine life remaining. Regulators review our conceptual decommissioning plans on a regular basis. As a site approaches or goes into decommissioning, a final decommissioning plan is created, which usually requires regulatory approval. This can result in further regulatory process, as well as additional requirements, costs and financial assurances.

## S07 - COMPETITION LAW COMPLIANCE

This indicator provides information about legal actions initiated against Cameco under national or international law designed to regulate anti-competitive behaviour and address anti-trust or monopoly practices.

This includes information about pending or completed actions and the outcomes of pending or completed actions, including any decisions or judgments.

*There were no legal actions initiated against Cameco related to anti-competitive behaviour during the reporting period.*

### What it means

Cameco is committed to compliance with competition and anti-trust laws everywhere we operate.

## S08 - SIGNIFICANT FINES (NON-COMPLIANCE)

This indicator provides information about administrative or judicial fines and non-monetary sanctions levied against Cameco for failure to comply with laws and regulations, including:

- National, sub-national, regional and local regulations
- International declarations, conventions or treaties

This includes the total monetary value of significant fines and the number of non-monetary sanctions. It does not include fines or non-monetary sanctions related to environmental or labelling regulations, transportation matters and fines or sanctions we are in the process of appealing.

|                                  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016        | 2017 | 2018 |
|----------------------------------|------|------|-------------|------|------|
| # of sanctions                   | 0    | 0    | 0           | 0    | 0    |
| Value of significant fines (USD) | 0    | 0    | \$1,251,908 | 0    | 0    |
| # of significant fines           | 0    | 0    | 2           | 0    | 0    |

## What it means

Cameco received no significant administrative or judicial fines and non-monetary sanctions, which are not currently under appeal, for failure to comply with laws and regulations in 2018.

## Definitions

*Significant fine* – Fines that exceed CDN \$100,000 paid by Cameco or a controlled subsidiary in Canada, the US, or Europe to a government authority for non-compliance with government laws or regulations, other than environmental laws and regulations.

*Non-monetary sanction* – An administrative or judicial sanction levied against Cameco or a controlled subsidiary for non-compliance with laws and regulations that results in either (i) a Level IV or V incident under Cameco's corrective action process standard; or (ii) a criminal conviction for Cameco or one of its controlled subsidiaries.

## Product Responsibility

### PR4 - LABELLING NON-COMPLIANCE

This indicator provides information about Cameco's compliance with dangerous goods labelling requirements defined by transport regulations and reported to regulatory agencies or identified in internal or regulatory agency inspection reports that resulted in a fine, penalty or warning.

|   | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|
| # of incidents reported to or identified by regulatory agencies (total) | 5    | 0    | 3    | 5    | 1    |
| Resulting in a fine   | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |
| Resulting in a warning  | 2    | 0    | 3    | 5    | 1    |

## What it means

In 2018 Cameco received a labelling non-compliance, which resulted in a warning but no fine.

## Definitions

*Labeling non-compliance* – The types of information that must be correctly presented on our product labels are:

- Radioactive category labels
- Subsidiary labels

- Proper shipping name
- UN number – a number issued by the United Nations which is used to quickly identify dangerous substances for emergency response, handling and storage during transport
- VRI code (international vehicle registration code – *when applicable*)
- Name of consignor/consignee
- Weight of package
- Type of package and placards

## PR9 - SANCTIONS (PRODUCT NON-COMPLIANCE)

This indicator provides information about monetary fines imposed by regulatory agencies for non-compliance with laws and regulations related to providing products and services (transportation and customs related fines) in Canada, the US and Australia.

### What it means

*Cameco did not receive any sanctions for product non-compliance in 2018.>*

### Definitions

*Provision of products* – Transportation of products, on or off-site.

## Cameco Indicators

### CA1 - POLLING (PUBLIC SUPPORT)

This indicator provides information about the level of public support for Cameco's operations in Saskatchewan, northern Saskatchewan, Ontario and the U.S.

|                         | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|-------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| <b>Public support %</b> |      |      |      |      |      |
| Saskatchewan            | 79   | 86   | 81   | 82   | 80   |
| Northern SK             | 79   | 81   | 77   | 73   | 82   |
| Port Hope, Ontario      | 84   | 88   | 89   | 86   | 85   |

|                      | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Blind River, Ontario | N/A  | N/A  | N/A  | N/A  | 97   |
| Nebraska             | 70   | 62   | 73   | N/A  | N/A  |
| Wyoming              | 87   | 91   | 88   | N/A  | N/A  |

## What it means

Cameco's operations continue to see strong support from the communities where we operate, despite the impacts of a depressed uranium market. Due to the continued shutdown of our U.S. operations, we did not conduct polling in those areas in 2017 or 2018. Polling in Blind River is infrequently conducted, but was completed in 2018.

## CA2 - AVERAGE RADIATION DOSE TO WORKERS

This indicator provides information about the average radiation dose to workers at our mining and milling and fuel services divisions in Saskatchewan, Ontario and the US.

|                           | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Avg. radiation dose (mSv) | 0.85 | 0.86 | 0.75 | 0.64 | 0.49 |

## What it means

Our average radiation dose to workers remains consistently low, at under 1 millisievert (mSv). By comparison, typical natural background radiation doses to the public are 2–3 mSv per year. Cameco rates are far below the maximum annual dose limit of 50 mSv and 100 mSv over a five-year dosimetry block permitted by regulators (note that the US sites only have an annual limit, and no long-term limit in their regulations).

Due to changes to corporate structure, doses from JV Inkai are excluded from the summary beginning in 2018. In 2018, the dose average dropped due to the reduction in activities at McArthur River and Key Lake. This number would be expected to increase with a return to full production at these sites.

## Note

The values in the table represent the arithmetic average dose of all employees and contractors at our operations. Another metric used in our annual regulatory report is the full-time equivalent average, which normalizes the doses to a standard work year of 2,000 hours. Both are valid metrics.



