



Conseil Cris-Québec sur la foresterie
Cree-Québec Forestry Board

2018-2023 STATUS REPORT

Implementation of the Paix des Braves Adapted Forestry Regime

Cree-Québec Forestry Board

Detailed Report

June 2025

Table of Contents

Foreword	3
1. Introduction	3
1.1 Board mandate	3
1.2 Approach.....	3
1.3 Methodology	4
2. Results.....	5
2.1 Tallymen.....	5
2.2 Other stakeholders	7
3. Discussions, Recommendations and Conclusion	19
3.1 Key findings	19
3.2 Discussion	20
3.3 Recommendations.....	21
3.4 Conclusion.....	22
APPENDIX 1 Synthesis of Responses - Group 1 Stakeholders	23
APPENDIX 2 Synthesis of Responses - Group 2 Stakeholders.....	32



Foreword

This status report presents a detailed assessment of implementation of the Adapted Forestry Regime (AFR) provided for in Chapter 3 of the Paix des Braves for the period 2018-2023, discussing the approach, summarizing the results and making recommendations aimed at continuous improvement of AFR implementation. The findings presented synthesize the responses of the various stakeholders interviewed. The report was drafted by the Cree-Québec Forestry Board (CQFB) Secretariat primarily for its members and the stakeholders involved in AFR implementation.

1. Introduction

This *2018-2023 Status Report on Implementation of the Paix des Braves Adapted Forestry Regime* is the fourth report of this kind produced by the Cree-Québec Forestry Board since the Board's creation in 2003. The goal of the exercise is to reflect on progress made by the Québec and Cree Nation governments in their relations and in carrying out activities to implement the Adapted Forestry Regime (AFR).

1.1 Board mandate

The Cree-Québec Forestry Board is responsible for monitoring, reporting on and assessing implementation of Chapter 3 of the *Agreement Concerning a New Relationship Between the Gouvernement du Québec and the Crees of Québec* (Paix des Braves).

In accordance with its mandate, during its 2023-2024 operating year, the Board carried out a fourth review of AFR implementation, covering the period 2018-2023.

1.2 Approach

This report analyzes AFR provisions' effectiveness for achieving the regime's four main objectives:

1. better take into account the Cree traditional way of life
2. allow greater integration of sustainable development concerns
3. ensure participation, in the form of consultation, by the Crees in the various forest development activities planning and management processes, particularly plan finalization and monitoring
4. promote collaboration, in the form of concerted action, by the Cree Nation Government (CNG) and the Eeyou Istchee James Bay Regional Government (EIJBRG) in the forest plan participation process set out in Schedule C-4 of the Paix des Braves Agreement.

This assessment is based on a series of interviews aimed at obtaining stakeholders' views on the achievement of AFR objectives and the effectiveness of the mechanisms developed to implement it. To ensure continuity with the three previous five-year reports, essentially the same questions were used in the interviews. The questionnaires were based on the Monitoring Framework criteria adopted by the



Board and were intended to verify whether existing provisions achieve the AFR objectives mentioned above.

The preceding AFR implementation status report, targeting the period 2013-2018, enabled general recommendations and action priorities based on the following three components to be identified:

- 1. Pursue collaboration and strengthen communication between AFR implementation mechanisms
- 2. Remain open to the AFR adaptations required and step up monitoring aimed at AFR assessment and evolution
- 3. Ensure implementation of the AFR’s economic component.

Questions were also asked about progress made in implementing these recommendations. The last question gathered participants’ suggestions and recommendations for improving the AFR from their viewpoint.

1.3 Methodology

Through its Secretariat, the Board consulted a sampling of the main participants involved in AFR implementation (tallymen, Joint Working Groups (JWG) members and coordinators, Board members, technical advisors, forest industry representatives and MRNF planners who attend the tallymen consultations).

The Board Secretariat contacted stakeholders to interview them using two questionnaires: one adapted to tallymen (Group 1) and one for the other stakeholders (Group 2).

In addition to seeking their observations on implementation of the main AFR-specific adaptations, the questionnaires also sought to quantify stakeholders’ satisfaction vis-à-vis certain themes, asking them to rate success or satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 10. This approach was modified in the tallymen questionnaire to facilitate their assessment of a specific file. Descriptive classes rather than number-based ratings were used, e.g. very satisfied, satisfied, could be improved and dissatisfied.

The tallymen interviews took place between June 4 and July 4, 2024 in the communities affected by the AFR. The Secretariat Analyst, accompanied by an Anthropologist with extensive experience working with Cree tallymen, interviewed the tallymen with the help of the Cree JWG members to facilitate meetings and translation.

The users interviewed had to have had forestry activities planned on their traplines during the period 2018-2023. Tallymen from the communities of Waskaganish and Nemaska were not interviewed because there was little (Nemaska) or no work there during this period.

Sampling of tallymen interviewed

Tallymen’s community of origin	Number of tallymen interviewed / Number of traplines (Chap. 3)
Mistissini	12/31
Nemaska	0/7



Oujé-Bougoumou	5/13
Waskaganish	0/8
Waswanipi	16/62
Total number of interviews	33/121

During the interviews, the tallymen were informed of the objectives of the meetings as well as the CQFB's roles and mandates. As the questions were asked, context and explanations were provided regarding the provisions of Chapter 3.

Finally, the tallymen participated voluntarily and each received financial compensation, as agreed by the Cree-Québec Forestry Board.

The Secretariat Analyst also interviewed the other stakeholders involved in AFR implementation (Group 2). These interviews were conducted via videoconference between December 2023 and May 2024.

Sampling of other stakeholders interviewed

Other groups interviewed	Number of interviews
Cree JWG members	2/7
Québec JWG members	4/4
Cree Coordinators / Technical Advisors	2/2
Québec Coordinators / Technical Advisors	1/1
Cree-appointed Board members	3/5
Québec-appointed Board members	5/5
Former CQFB Chairman + Executive Director	2/2
Cree forestry industry representatives	1/3
Non-Cree forestry industry representatives	4/6
MRNF planners	4/5
Total number of interviews	28

In both groups, participants could choose not to answer questions they were uncomfortable with. They were assured of the interview process' confidentiality (results presented without revealing the source).

2. Results

Since two different questionnaires were used for the interviews, the results are presented by group: first the tallymen and then party representatives and other stakeholders.

More detailed results can be found in the appendices. The detailed questionnaires are available on request from the Secretariat.

2.1 Tallymen

In the tallymen interviews, it was not easy to get direct answers to questions that were sometimes quite technical for them. When asked to quantify their satisfaction with a point, most tallymen reported events or shared comments related to the subject instead of rating their satisfaction. Most tallymen made interesting observations and expressed concerns about many topics but did not always answer all questions.



Consequently, when the results were compiled, on re-reading the participants' comments, the Analyst estimated their level of satisfaction based on these comments. For example, if, for a given subject, the tallyman expressed only positive comments, the Analyst's interpretation was that this tallyman was very satisfied. Conversely, if the comments were mainly negative, this tallyman was identified as dissatisfied with the measure. Intermediate cases were assessed according to the relative weight, positive or negative, of the comments made.

Although the results obtained using this method are based on the Analyst's interpretation, they show a significant trend that can be corroborated by the observations that come directly from the tallymen. Figures, presented for information purposes in Appendix 1, are not used in the results section. Descriptive classes were used, for the first time, in this status report to assess tallymen's level of satisfaction. The relevance of using them again in future will have to be assessed to determine whether it is the best way to compare the results obtained from one five-year period to another.

The following were the main observations (by theme) emerging from the tallymen interviews. The detailed responses can be consulted in Appendix 1.

Forest management approach

- When asked whether they had noticed differences in forest management approaches, 38% of tallymen questioned felt that the AFR had not evolved in the last five years.
- 22% were of the opinion that the AFR now provides more wildlife protection.
- 25% found that there were more forestry activities during the period, adversely affecting wildlife habitats.
- The tallymen were concerned about the negative impact of forestry activities on wildlife habitat quality: 66% of them cited this as their main concern.
- Regarding the mosaic cutting approach, 53% observed that wildlife leaves the areas after harvesting but returns after a few years. However, 35% found that this approach creates too many cuts and roads, particularly in their forested areas presenting wildlife interest for the Crees (25%).
- One of the main concerns was the high number of roads created, which generate significant cumulative negative impacts on wildlife habitats and traditional activities (59%).
- The tallymen tended to favour natural regeneration over scarification followed by tree planting. 25% of respondents stated they were against scarification but were not against planting, as long as the species planted were the same as those harvested. However, 25% were against all forms of non-commercial silvicultural work (NCSW).

Sites of special interest to the Crees (1%)

- Many of the tallymen (45%) believed that the sites of special interest, primarily moose habitat, are not adequately protected by the AFR.
- 65% rated habitat quality in these areas as "not good" or "could be improved", while 35% of them said "the quality is still there".
- The process that allows tallymen to obtain firewood under the 75-ha provision (s. 3.71) is not really in place:
 - 41% of tallymen mentioned making requests for firewood directly to companies
 - 28% responded that they harvest their firewood on their own, wherever they want
 - 19% said they had not identified 75-ha areas on their trapline.
- The CLUM maps remain underused and are not well known, especially among the new tallymen:
 - 19% reported that they were not used in consultations
 - 34% seemed to be unaware that these maps exist.



- The majority of tallymen (59%) agreed that the 1% areas allow their main sites of interest to be protected.
- Regarding relocation of unregistered biological refuges, 25% of tallymen said they had moved a biological refuge to protect a camp located near a lake or river; 22% reported that they were still waiting for this relocation to happen.
- Concerning riparian areas:
 - 69% of tallymen mentioned that riparian habitats are not sufficiently protected by the AFR and that the 20-m buffer zone is not wide enough
 - 56% reported windfalls when a 20-m strip is left on shore, especially along large lakes, where the wind is stronger.

Maintaining traditional activities

- When asked if the Paix des Braves forestry regime helps maintain traditional activities, 34% of tallymen answered that the Agreement allowed them to continue to practice and teach their traditional way of life.
- 25% mentioned that long-term road maintenance is of great concern because they use these roads to carry out their traditional activities.

Cree participation

- The majority of tallymen (52%) appreciate the consultation process, which allows them to participate in the planning process and gives them an opportunity to express their needs.
- However, 53% mentioned that even if they are listened to, planners and companies still refuse their harmonization requests. They do not have the impression that they can influence forestry planning.
- The process for following up on harmonization requests with tallymen does not appear to be optimal. 19% of tallymen mentioned poor communication regarding follow-up on the status of their harmonization requests.
- Many (38%) said they were not satisfied with the time it takes between the time their requests for harmonization are accepted and the time the work is done in the field.
- When asked about possible improvements so that the Agreement would be more conducive to their traditional way of life, the most popular response (22%) was that the tallymen's advice and knowledge should be respected more.

2.2 Other stakeholders

The structure of this section mirrors the structure of the questionnaire used for the interviews. The bolded points correspond to the questions and their numbering corresponds to the numbering used in the questionnaire. The observations presented are a synthesis of the responses given by the stakeholders interviewed. The tables containing the detailed responses can be consulted in Appendix 2.

From question 5 on, participants were also encouraged to quantify their satisfaction regarding the different subjects by rating it on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 corresponds to a low level of satisfaction or performance and 10 the highest level. The results of these ratings are also presented.

1. Key strengths

- The consultation process is well defined and generally works well (54%).
- The Mixedwood Stands Management Strategy has been implemented (46%).
- The diagnostic exercise has improved processes (43%):



- Update of the JWG's internal operating rules
 - Development of guides for managing harmonization measures and conflict resolution
 - Pre-consultations
 - Adaptation of consultation schedule.
- The CNG Forestry Department has been created and the Forestry Monitoring Team is operational (36%).
 - The parties collaborate to move files forward (36%).
 - The Agreement itself is very positive for Cree users when compared to other First Nations (25%).
 - Consultations are a good opportunity to create ties with the Crees and get to know them better (18%).
 - Review and completion of 1% and 25% areas, marked by excellent collaboration between the parties, and the exercise of combined relocation of these sites and the unregistered biological refuges, which began during the period (18%).

2. Key weaknesses

- Strategic provisions and files that have not yet been implemented (64%):
 - Wildlife Habitat Management Directives
 - Woodland caribou recovery plan
 - Economic provisions
 - Forest management collaborative regime negotiations (2012 governance agreement).
- Subjects of a strategic nature, exceeding the scope of the current forest plans, discussed in consultations delay or prevent harmonization (54%):
 - Some Cree JWG members' influence prevents tallymen from expressing themselves freely. Consultations must remain a forum for consulting with tallymen on operational planning. The role of the JWG is to enforce the AFR not to oppose it or go beyond its scope.
- Certain Agreement provisions are still misunderstood or subject to divergent interpretations (43%).
- A governance problem exists among the Crees and within the Agreement mechanisms (chain of command between the CNG/Coordinator/JWG: who makes decisions; who is accountable) (18%).
- Conflict resolution process (land use disputes) delays and sluggishness prevent companies from having access to cutting areas that remain unharmonized (18%).

3. Contextual factors that significantly impacted Agreement implementation

- The COVID-19 pandemic's effects on Agreement implementation have been both positive and negative (50%).
 - Negative: Loss of human contact; difficulty consulting tallymen remotely. Inadequate, ineffective tools for face-to-face meetings. Delays in all files.
 - Positive: Necessary update of technological tools now facilitating remote meetings. Positive impact on timber market, benefiting the regional economy.
- Relational issues and negotiations related to certain files delay implementation of Chapter 3 and undermine credibility and trust (50%).
- Problems in consultation organization result in delays, uncertainty and additional costs (29%):
 - Tallymen absenteeism



- Issues related to planning and compliance with schedules
- JWG member turnover.
- Certain individuals have strong opinions on the AFR implementation provided for in the Agreement, interfere in the consultations process, raise political issues that go beyond the JWG mandate and prevent consultations from running smoothly (21%).
- Lack of Wildlife Habitat Management Directives results in significant uncertainty, delays and additional costs for the industry (18%).
- Leadership changes among the authorities during the period, both on the Cree and Québec sides, changed relations and priorities, causing a setback in AFR implementation (18%).

4. Evolution of forestry management approach over past 20 years

- Ratification and application of the 6th Amendment have made tangible changes possible (57%):
 - Review of sites of special interest to the Crees and unregistered biological refuges
 - Mixedwood Stands Management Strategy
 - Establishment of Cree Quebec Forestry Economic Council (CQFEC).
- Diagnostic project and improvements to consultation and harmonization measure monitoring processes (50%).
- Stakeholders have evolved in the way they work together to implement the AFR. Relations and mutual understanding are better (39%).
- Management techniques have not evolved in the last five years, despite all the possibilities offered by the AFR in this regard (39%).
- Setbacks on some aspects (32%):
 - Longer timelines for harmonization and conflict resolution
 - Pending files that block the process and decrease predictability
 - Work environment during consultations
 - Cree's loss of confidence in the process.

5. Comments on effectiveness of implementation mechanisms

Joint Working Groups (JWGs)

Rating (operate effectively): 66.7%

- There is a problem with certain Cree JWG members who, in wishing to discuss certain topics during consultation meetings, exceed their mandate. The JWGs can inform the tallymen without trying to influence them. They must allow the latter to express themselves and act as facilitators in AFR implementation (68%).
- JWG staff changes and new members who seem less aware of their role (46%).
- The Waswanipi JWG is hardly/not operational (43%).
- Cree and Québec JWG members do not have the same knowledge or the same means at their disposal to carry out their mandate (36%):
 - Training about AFR and forestry context
 - Work organization, task sharing
 - Need to work more with their counterparts.



- Some Cree JWG members are hard to reach, are not very involved or do not devote full-time efforts to their JWG tasks (32%).
- The JWGs are doing their best in a difficult context (29%).
- There has been some progress but there is still much room for improvement (25%).

JWG coordinators

Rating (operate effectively): 73.8%

- The coordinators play an important role vis-à-vis the JWGs, reminding them of the rules, informing them and realigning discussions when necessary. Collaboration between the two coordinators is good (54%).
- They should have more power over the JWGs when they act as mediators. They should be more present at the consultations because they make a real difference in resolving conflicts (50%).
- The Cree coordinator changed during the period. It is very positive to have a Cree in this role (36%).
- On the Québec side, the person is very competent, knows her role well and does a good job (25%).
- The coordinators manage too many files at a time. Many files stagnate (conflict follow-up and resolution, filing of 30-day reports). It often takes a long time to get feedback. It is important to resolve conflicts quickly to limit consequences for all stakeholders (25%).
- The coordinators brought about positive improvements and initiatives during the period (JWG meetings, development of guides and updating internal operating rules) (21%).

Cree-Québec Forestry Board (CQFB)

Rating (operates effectively): 76.5%

- The CQFB should be in closer contact with local stakeholders to inform them about the AFR and ensure that all stakeholders involved clearly understand their role (39%).
- The CQFB fulfills its role and launched many projects during the period (36%).
- The Board is an important forum for bringing parties together and discussing sensitive issues in a neutral environment. Relations between members are good, a lot of mutual respect. They are able to have discussions even if they have opposing views (29%).
- The Board is not a decision-making body and is not sufficiently used to resolve conflict situations. It is hard for members to remain impartial and agree on a common position to influence things (25%).
- Meeting agendas can sometimes be heavy and repetitive. Meetings are generally informative. Documentation, minutes and presentations are lengthy. It would be better to be more concise and reduce meetings to decision-making points (21%).
- 29% of respondents said they had no comment or preferred not to rate the Board because they were not familiar with, or had little connection to, it.

Local integrated land and resource management panels (TGIRTs) on Category II and III lands

Rating (operate effectively): 30.5%

- 57% of respondents thought that the panels are not effective, that they are even a failure. This is because they fail to achieve the objective of concerted action between Jamesians and Crees and because they have not succeeded in agreeing on local forest management objectives (Issues-Solutions), which is their main mandate.
- The panels' importance was poorly communicated; very few Crees participate (43%).



- There is a lack of coordination. Meetings are poorly prepared and the panels' role seems to be poorly understood by the organizers (32%).
- There are too many panels. It's always the same people who sit at each one (25%).
- On Category II lands, there has been no meeting since December 2019. Negotiations between the parties on the collaborative regime influenced the holding of these meetings (25%).

6. Achievement of Agreement objectives

For each of the following sub-questions, respondents were asked to assess the extent to which, from their perspective, they felt that Chapter 3 (Forestry) achieved its objectives over the period. They were also asked to provide a rating from 1 to 10.

A. Allow adaptations to better take into account the Cree traditional way of life

- i. **Trapline as territorial reference unit** Target reached at: 94.23%
 - In addition to comments confirming that the objective is achieved by this measure, 39% of respondents mentioned that the boundaries were determined by the Crees, for the Crees and that compliance is high.
 - However, 7% of respondents reported that there is still confusion about trapline boundaries in management unit (UA) 84-62.
 - The same proportion of respondents (7%) reported problems with defining trapline boundaries. This influences forestry planning and is unresolved at the Cree Trappers' Association (CTA) level.
- ii. **Sites of special interest to the Crees (1%, 25% and biological refuges)** Target reached at: 75%
 - Satisfaction with sites of special interest varies according to the type of site.
 - 61% of stakeholders interviewed said that the tallymen are dissatisfied with management of the 25% areas. Several reasons were given:
 - The tallymen misinterpret the terms and conditions
 - 25% definition was initially poorly communicated to the tallymen when the sites were determined
 - The Crees consider each portion of the 25%, whereas the MRNF considers it as a whole.
 - Regarding the 1%, 46% of respondents indicated that they do the job.
 - Regarding review of the sites, 39% of respondents felt that the objective had been partially achieved:
 - The process was long and unfinished by the end of the period
 - Delays caused planning problems because old and new sites were active in the databases
 - Not all tallymen were able to benefit equally from relocation of unregistered biological refuges.
 - 21% of respondents described the review and relocation exercises as positive because they helped solve longstanding problems and the tallymen were able to protect sensitive areas.
- iii. **Management approach** Target reached at: 69.23%



- Respondents reported that although the terms and conditions are properly applied, it is not always satisfactory for some Cree users (39%). They reported that, regardless of the approach, some tallymen do not want harvesting; it is difficult to reconcile opposing objectives.
- A number of respondents pointed out that the tallymen's requests often clash with mosaic cutting (CMO) (36%).
- 32% also responded that CMO better meets the needs of the Crees, particularly with regard to lower harvesting rates, scattered logging and the periodic return of companies to the territory, which allows roads to be maintained. However, this approach does not take the caribou into account.
- A number of respondents reported that CMO creates many roads and accesses that harm wildlife and habitats (21%).

iv. **Protection of riparian areas**

Target reached at: 65.77%

- The majority of stakeholders indicated that 20-m buffer strips are not sufficient for the tallymen and that tallymen have made numerous requests to widen the buffers as a harmonization measure (68%).
- Many highlighted forest planners' efforts to meet the tallymen's requests when it comes to sensitive areas (32%). They specified that the planners would however refuse requests for systematic expansion and that it was difficult for tallymen to obtain widening in areas with mature forests.
- Others reported that riparian buffer rules and conditions are very well enforced (29%).
- 25% of stakeholders specified that riparian areas are an essential living environment for wildlife and that 20 m is not wide enough to take the needs of land-based wildlife into consideration.
- For some, the rules are too clear-cut and applied wall-to-wall, which prevents creativity in meeting tallymen's needs and requests (14%).
- Others point out that removing partial cutting in the buffer has improved riparian areas (14%).

v. **Development of road access network**

Target reached at: 61.6%

- 39% of respondents said they found it difficult to give a rating since the tallymen are divided on the issue: some want more, others less.
- Many felt that the terms of the Agreement are contradictory in this sense (CMO vs. limiting access) (39%).
- Others pointed to a lack of long-term vision for developing the road network in the region (29%); lack of predictability, which increases costs and uncertainty for the industry.
- 29% mentioned that maintaining road access is now necessary for the Cree way of life and that the issue of long-term road maintenance is an important concern for all.
- Some spoke of unresolved files such as the caribou and roads subject to the government's environmental review process, which prevent access to many logging areas (18%).
- The fact that the numerous road accesses encourage predation, hunting pressure and poaching was also cited (14%).
- Improved interconnections were cited by 14% of stakeholders.
- Tallymen dissatisfaction with harmonization request management was also reported: refused harmonization requests, long implementation timelines, measures poorly carried out in the field (14%).

B. Allow greater integration of sustainable development concerns



- i. **Economic development of Cree communities** Target reached at: 64%
- Respondents' most frequent comment on this subject was that the potential is there but that it is currently underused (46%).
 - Stakeholders reported that much of the funding under the Agreement returns to the communities (32%).
 - Others noted that, in principle, the volumes granted should create benefits for the Crees but that the benefits are not optimized (29%). Some reasons were mentioned, such as unequal distribution of volumes between the communities and high operating costs of the volumes granted.
 - The new possibility of dedicating 15% of the NCSW budget reserved for the Crees to economic development is positive (25%).
 - 18% emphasized that the file is moving forward. Although there have not yet been many concrete actions, there is an improvement compared to the previous period.
 - 18% spoke of the Waswanipi plant's reopening during the period as a positive step in the community's economic development.
- ii. **Job creation and maintenance (Crees and Jamesians)** Target reached at: 52%
- The majority of stakeholders reported that numerous initiatives by the industry to hire Crees have had little success (54%). The reasons given were varied: jobs are not very attractive or poorly adapted to the Cree culture, less competitive salaries, fewer benefits.
 - 25% said that the profits went to only a few individuals, often front companies, but that few Cree actually work in forestry.
 - Faced with the fact that few Crees work in forestry, some respondents proposed strengthening ties between the industry and the communities (21%).
 - Others pointed out that tallymen sometimes ask to work during the consultations, but do not know who to contact. There are few opportunities for them (18%).
- iii. **Forest sector viability in the region** Target reached at: 67%
- 21% of respondents said the Agreement creates a certain security and predictability in terms of access to volumes (compared to the road blockades that have occurred).
 - 18% reported that the sector is doing well. Forestry is the main economic activity generating wealth in the region. Projects and partnerships developed by the industry to keep investments in the region were also mentioned.
 - 18% noted that the pandemic had a positive effect on the timber market, which has benefited the region.
 - 18% talked about unresolved files that could impact annual allowable cut (AAC) (harmonization issues, wildlife management directives, decline in social acceptability). These issues create uncertainty and could jeopardize the sector's viability.
- iv. **Consideration of all land users** Target reached at: 56%
- The majority of stakeholders said that Chapter 3 is to the advantage of the Crees and that the Jamesians are not considered much in it (57%).



- A certain percentage pointed out that the TGIRTs and public consultations exist for better representation of the Jamesians (32%).
- Others specified that even if the TGIRTs give allow the Jamesians to express themselves, ultimately the tallyman has the last word (21%).
- A number of respondents commented on the files that caused discontent among the Jamesians, who no longer feel at home (moratorium on leases, closure of hunting zone 17) (21%).

v. Biodiversity protection

Target reached at: 71.92%

- The majority of respondents were of the opinion that existing strategies and provisions help protect biodiversity (57%). The Mixedwood Stands Management Strategy, woodland caribou plan, sustainable forest management regulation (RADF), new protected areas and biological refuges were mentioned.
- Some stakeholders specified that the AFR's objective is to protect forest and wildlife productivity not biodiversity (18%).
- 14% of stakeholders noted that there is room for improvement, particularly for vulnerable species.
- A few commented that although harvesting is more evenly spread out than in the rest of the province, it is unclear whether the AFR is effective in protecting biodiversity. More studies are needed on the subject as well as improvements in terms of follow-up (11%).

vi. Integrity of ecosystems of importance to the Crees

Target reached at: 70%

- The majority of stakeholders noted that the AFR was developed with particular attention to these ecosystems (54%). Implementation of the Mixedwood Stands Management strategy during the period further contributed to this.
- 36% of respondents indicated that harmonization with tallymen, by going beyond the terms of the Agreement, makes it possible to protect sensitive habitats affected by forestry activities.
- 32% pointed out that habitat integrity is compromised by files awaiting completion, such as the caribou plan and Wildlife Habitat Management Directives.
- A number also stressed the importance of questioning the tallymen to find out about their sensitive and important areas for wildlife (32%).
- Tallymen's dissatisfaction with habitat quality in their 25% areas was also mentioned (18%).
- 18% found that even if the AFR is applied to the letter, from the tallymen's viewpoint, it is insufficient for preserving habitat integrity.

vii. Increasing knowledge about the territory

Target reached at: 72.92%

- Half of the stakeholders felt that knowledge about the territory's forests was considerable. The period was marked by many analysis and knowledge acquisition projects.
- 29% of respondents cited the consultations as a place for knowledge sharing between the tallymen, industry and planners.
- Other stakeholders also spoke of the tallymen's extensive knowledge about their trapline (29%). They are seen as the custodians of traditional knowledge and perceive changes in the environment. This is very useful in the context of climate change but is not sufficiently taken into consideration by stakeholders.



- A number of stakeholders mentioned that, compared to southern forests, the Nord-du-Québec region lacks habitat-related surveys and studies (21%).
- Some people mentioned development of projects incorporating Cree knowledge during the period (14%).

C. Ensure participation, in the form of consultation, by the Crees in the various forest development activities planning and management processes

i. Effectiveness of the consultation and conflict resolution processes Target reached at: 68.15%.

- The majority of stakeholders agreed that processes are well-defined and working well (64%).
- Although the consultation process is clear and well-defined, 57% find that it is easy to derail, e.g. certain individuals fail to comply with the process, political subjects take up time in consultations.
- A number of people mentioned that significant improvements were made during the period, especially with regard to the conflict resolution process (32%).
- Others found that it takes a long time to arrive at a harmonized plan (32%).
- 29% noted that there are marked differences between communities in terms of the mechanisms' effectiveness and processes' implementation.
- 29% of stakeholders commented on how long conflict resolution takes; it seems unreasonable to them.
- Some respondents wanted to point out that the process of involving First Nations is the only one of its kind in the world (21%).
- 18% noted that issues of understanding the AFR remain, hindering the optimal conduct of the process. Examples cited include JWG members being little or not aware of their roles, or tallymen not knowing their rights or not understanding what is presented to them.

ii. Recognition of tallymen's stewardship of the land Target reached at: 78.52%

- Half of the stakeholders mentioned that the AFR is based on recognizing tallymen as stewards and that they play a key role.
- However, 46% of stakeholders reported problems with designating tallymen (after a death, if tallyman is absent, in the event of family conflicts, the complex case of MU 84-62, difficulty obtaining an up-to-date list from the CTA).
- Tallyman recognition is sometimes undermined when Cree JWG members interfere with consultations or prevent tallymen from speaking out for political reasons (36%).
- 25% commented that the consultations allow tallymen to make their needs known.
- Some said that the power is really in the hands of the tallymen, since their refusal of plans puts forestry activities on hold (25%).

iii. Contribution to Cree institution governance Target reached at: 72.61%

- A majority of people noted that the Agreement has greatly helped the Crees adopt means to organize themselves and that the Crees are more autonomous and involved in the files, e.g. establishment of CNG Forestry Department and its Forestry Monitoring Team (57%).
- 54% spoke of great improvements and progress made during the period.



- However, 36% indicated that there is still room for improvement, particularly in terms of communications, task sharing and work structure and organization.
- A few people pointed out that the chain of command still fluctuates within the Agreement's Cree mechanisms (CNG and coordinator vs. JWG and Cree communities) (29%).

iv. **Development of individual and institutional capacities**

Target reached at: 71.36%

- 57% of stakeholders indicated that increasing numbers of Crees are studying and working in forestry. Specialized positions have been created by developing institutions (CNG, Forestry Department, JWGs).
- However, a large proportion believe that training is necessary for developing individual capacities and standardizing the knowledge the stakeholders involved possess (57%).
- A number of people said that they had already noticed an improvement in the development of individual capacities through training sessions that took place during the period (39%).

D. Promote collaboration, in the form of concerted action, by the CNG and the EIJBRC in the forest plan participation process set out in Schedule C-4 (Chapter 3) of the Paix des Braves

i. **Participation and representation in TGIRTs (Category II and III lands)**

Target reached at: 33.68%

- 79% of respondents noted that significant efforts have been made to try to reach the Crees but they do not participate much on the panels; they have other forums for expressing their concerns.
- 21% of stakeholders emphasized that the same people are always present at the panels, resulting in fatigue, disinterest.
- Some pointed out that the panels fail to achieve the goal of concerted action, since the Crees and Jamesians do not sit on the same panel (11%).
- Others noted that few ties exist between the AFR and the TGIRTs and that we have little control over their actions (11%).

ii. **Application of concerted action within the TGIRTs (Cat. II and III lands)**

Target reached at: 34.67%

- A number of people pointed out that the Issues-Solutions have not yet been determined (39%).
- Others said that the mechanism is not effective due to lack of leadership and lack of participants' preparation (32%).
- 25% are of the opinion that not enough people attend to actually call it concerted action.

iii. **TGIRT work taken into account in forest planning**

- For this criterion, 68% of those questioned had no comment. As the Issues-Solutions have not yet been determined, this criterion is currently difficult to apply.
- There was also no rating given.
- Some people wished to mention that once the Issues-Solutions are agreed on by the TGIRTs, they will be integrated into forest planning (11%).

Main challenges to be met and suggestions with regard to TGIRTs



- The panels must be grouped together for genuine “concerted action” between the Crees and Jamesians (36%).
- Ensure increased Cree participation (36%).
- The authorities need to make the TGIRTs’ role and importance known to regain credibility and interest in them (32%).
- Ensure that the TGIRTs’ mandate is known to all to avoid losing focus and to target the main objective (29%).

7. 2013-2018 status report follow-up

With this question, the Secretariat wanted to return to the main recommendations identified in the 2013-2018 status report by asking stakeholders how they would qualify progress made on these action priorities over the last five years.

A. Pursue collaboration and strengthen communication between AFR implementation mechanisms

Progress rating: 71.25%

- The majority of stakeholders agreed that collaboration has improved. They noted that some recommendations were incorporated during the period (tools for JWG, harmonization measure monitoring system and information sharing among stakeholders) (79%).
- However, 54% thought that although there have been improvements during the period, there is still a long way to go, mainly in terms of communication, especially on the Cree side.
- 36% pointed out that creation of the Forestry Department at the CNG has helped considerably in this regard.
- 32% mentioned that training with basic technology is needed.
- 29% said that although many new tools have been developed, they are not always used, complied with or clearly understood. In addition, they are overly technical.
- 25% said that staff changes have hindered strengthening collaboration and communication.

B. Remain open to the AFR adaptations required and step up monitoring aimed at AFR assessment and evolution

Progress rating: 52%

- The majority of respondents stated that some adaptations should have been implemented long ago, e.g. caribou plan, Wildlife Habitat Management Directives and monitoring-related provisions (75%). They also noted that in the context of climate change, known best practices should be implemented but that it is difficult to get the legal context to evolve.
- A number of respondents mentioned that files are moving forward and that considerable effort is being made by the parties but that concrete results take a long time (54%).
- Some stakeholders indicated that while some aspects have progressed, such as the Mixedwood Stands Management Strategy, few major changes are perceptible (50%).
- The need to clarify and analyze provisions when the parties disagree (25%, riparian buffers, scarification, 2nd CMO pass) was highlighted by 36% of stakeholders.
- 21% of people said that delays in files such as the Wildlife Habitat Management Directives are extremely costly, thereby causing of the significant delays at all levels.



C. Ensure implementation of the AFR's economic component

Progress rating: 52%

- A number of people noted that the CQFEC has been set up but that few actions or benefits have been noted to date. The organization has no budget or human resources at its disposal (43%).
- Many called this file “stagnant” and said that, despite the efforts made, few results were noted during the period (43%).
- 36% said that economic levers and political will exist but that it was difficult to gauge Cree interest and work in forestry or in industry work does not always suit Cree workers.
- A number of respondents indicated that it was hard to know, since the indicators for assessing economic benefits for the Crees were not yet in place (32%).

8. Stakeholder recommendations for improving Chapter 3 implementation in future

Stakeholders made many interesting, relevant recommendations (See Appendix 2 for full details). The following were reported most often:

- Improve consultations, making them more effective: calendar planning, compliance with schedules, fighting absenteeism, presentation of silvicultural work at same time as harvesting blocks (50%).
- Work remains to be done on training and developing JWG expertise (knowledge about the territory, mandates and roles, AFR, tallymen's needs) (50%).
- Work must continue on communication and collaboration between stakeholders, particularly for field and harmonization measure monitoring (39%).
- The parties need to settle strategic files (caribou, Directives, collaborative regime) in order to restore predictability and regain credibility regarding the parties' ability to implement the AFR (39%).
- The 6th Amendment must be publicized to all stakeholders and to the Cree communities. A neutral body is needed to publicize the AFR's successes and restore forestry's credibility and social acceptability (32%).
- All stakeholders should receive training about the AFR, not just the JWGs (planners and industry representatives) (32%).
- Find a way to reduce conflict resolution timelines (sometimes several years). This creates uncertainty for the industry (32%).
- Exclude political topics from consultations, remain focused on forestry planning and tallymen's requests (32%).



3. Discussions, Recommendations and Conclusion

3.1 Key findings

The previous status report on AFR implementation, which targeted the period 2013-2018, identified three main recommendations and action priorities for AFR stakeholders to tackle:

1. Pursue collaboration and strengthen communication between AFR implementation mechanisms
 2. Remain open to AFR adaptations required and step up monitoring aimed at AFR assessment and evolution
 3. Ensure implementation of the AFR's economic component.
- An initial observation is that the 2018-2023 status report's results are a logical continuation of its predecessor's. The main issues emerging are more or less the same.
- The parties' implementation of Chapter 3 continued to move forward during the period.
- A number of key elements are considered very positive:
- Formalization of the 6th Amendment has allowed numerous changes to materialize.
 - The consultation process is appreciated, clear and well-defined.
 - Creation of the Forestry Department within the CNG.
 - Implementation of the Mixedwood Stands Management Strategy.
 - The parties' effective collaboration allowed files to move forward during the period.
 - Implementation of a number of projects and initiatives aimed at improving processes.
- However, a significant number of political issues increasingly impacted AFR implementation and jeopardized the effective operation and progress observed. Many unresolved cases continued to pile up during the period, affecting the work environment between party stakeholders and impacting Cree confidence in the process.

The main pending files are:

- Wildlife Habitat Management Directives
 - Woodland caribou recovery plan
 - Agreement governing implementation of the collaborative forest management regime
 - Implementation of economic provisions
- Significant delays in implementing the Wildlife Habitat Management Directives is the main factor affecting every stage of AFR implementation, from pre-consultation to management activities in the field:

- This situation amplifies a majority of tallymen's negative perception of forest activities' impact on areas of wildlife interest and the insufficient protection of riparian buffers, which also represent wildlife habitats that are essential for maintaining Cree traditional activities.
 - The situation creates disappointment and frustration and gives the tallymen the impression that their needs at each of these stages are not taken into account.
 - This situation also has a direct effect on the JWG members, who have to deal with this dissatisfaction, which, in turn, creates a spiral of discontent and demands.
 - In addition, it significantly affects relations between stakeholders.
 - Finally, the forest industry must deal with unpredictability, which affects the cost of supply.
- Another major factor that negatively influences AFR implementation is stakeholders' very understanding of it. Divergent interpretations remain with regard to certain AFR provisions. Also, some stakeholders lack knowledge about the AFR, forestry concepts and the Cree traditional way of life.
- A number of long-standing problems persist, at various levels, in relation to the consultations:
- Meeting organization, compliance with schedules, absenteeism
 - Tallymen dissatisfaction with their level of influence on planning. Refusal of their requests, particularly those concerning roads, 25% and riparian buffers. Lack of follow-up on the status of their requests and the quality of their implementation by companies remain issues
 - Lengthy timelines involved in harmonization and conflict resolution
 - Political issues that compromise the consultation process.
- Communications, information sharing and information management remain a challenge for some Cree stakeholders.
- Additional knowledge and studies are needed to better understand certain aspects that still cause dissatisfaction or misunderstanding (forestry activities' impact on wildlife habitats, 2nd mosaic cutting pass, importance of riparian buffers, impact of silvicultural work, etc.). The context of climate change forces us to further question the ability of current management approaches to deal with these upheavals.

3.2 Discussion

The purpose of conducting a five-year assessment is to measure and assess changes in the perceptions of Cree users, collaborators and partners involved in implementing the provisions of Chapter 3 of the Paix des Braves. The status report also aims to report significant changes and improvements that occurred during this period.

The results and findings presented here are similar to those of the 2013-2018 status report. However, before presenting recommendations, it is important to raise questions directed at the CQFB members and party authorities.

In the absence of the major changes that were expected, it is clear that the results obtained show a recurring pattern compared to those reported in the 2013–2018 Assessment. Such recurrence should lead the Board



and parties to adopt ambitious, result-oriented work plans. It is imperative to act with new vision when the status quo undermines the mechanisms' effective operation and jeopardizes previous years' hard-won gains.

3.3 Recommendations

Since the issues identified in the previous status report remain valid, the following four recommendations advocate an approach aimed at continuous improvement:

1. Ensure completion of the Wildlife Habitat Management Directives being developed:
 - a. Continue efforts to finalize the Wildlife Habitat Management Directives
 - b. Promote a common understanding of the Directives and clarify each party's expectations with regard to them
 - c. Finalize a draft version that can resolve the tallymen's dissatisfaction about maintaining wildlife habitats.
2. Strengthen communication and collaboration between AFR implementation mechanisms:
 - a. Continue to improve the forest plan consultation and harmonization measure monitoring processes by completing implementation of the diagnostic project action plan
 - b. Continue to develop individual capacities and expertise among the Crees, especially Cree JWG members
 - c. Work to reduce the time it takes to resolve conflicts and harmonize usages (foresters and Cree land use) in the forest plan consultation context
 - d. Ensure that all AFR implementation stakeholders have the data, resources and training their role requires, both with regard to the AFR and the Cree traditional way of life. If need be, develop training adapted to stakeholders' needs
 - e. In 2025-2026, have the Secretariat, together with the parties, organize meetings with the Cree communities, Cree users and all stakeholders involved in AFR implementation in order to present, among others, the provisions of the 6th Amendment to the Paix des Braves, the results of the 2018-2023 status report and the knowledge files whose results will then be known (characterization of areas of wildlife interest for all communities, development of a moose habitat quality index and its evolution in Agreement territory since 2002, development of indicators of forest sector economic benefits for the Crees).
3. Continue the monitoring, analysis and knowledge acquisition projects initiated by the implementation mechanisms:
 - a. Continue analyses on subjects that raise questions and dissatisfaction among the stakeholders interviewed (impact of forestry activities, including non-commercial silvicultural work, wildlife habitat quality, 2nd mosaic cutting pass, impact of fires and climate change on forests and wildlife habitats, protection of riparian buffers and the cumulative impact of forest roads)
 - b. Continue projects under way and implement existing recommendations



- c. Strengthen AFR-related monitoring processes in the field and the parties' collaboration with regard to this monitoring (harmonization measures, forest and wildlife monitoring)
- d. Adapt the Board's annual action plan and communication plan based on the results of the current status report. Have the Board's new strategic plan reflect the report's recommendations.

4. Continue implementation of the AFR's economic component:

- a. Facilitate networking between the Agreement's economic stakeholders (CQFEC, the territory's forestry companies, Cree enterprises, the Cree communities, CQFB) in order to implement actions resulting in potential job opportunities and partnership contracts in forest management activities
- b. Complete implementation of monitoring indicators in order to be able to assess economic benefits for the Crees.

3.4 Conclusion

The desired changes are under way. A number of current projects should be finalized in the coming years and will serve as benchmarks for future action. We are confident that the parties will be able to capitalize on this progress by instituting a critical mass of improvements that will enable better AFR implementation.

In 2027, the Paix des Braves will be 25 years old (corresponding to the first half of this 50-year Agreement). This will provide an interesting opportunity to mobilize Cree users and all stakeholders associated with AFR implementation to achieve the changes expected.



APPENDIX 1 Synthesis of Responses - Group 1 Stakeholders

A) General issues, forest management approach

A1. Over the last five years, have you noticed any differences in the management approach compared to the one applied previously, especially in the 25%?

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>No difference over the last five years</i>	12	38
<i>More protection for wildlife and for the 25% in the last five years (smaller cuts, more partial cuts)</i>	7	22
<i>Some trees were cut down a long time ago (more than 20 years) but regrowth is still weak</i>	5	16
<i>There were more forestry activities in the last five years than before</i>	5	16
<i>They cut more than what was on the plan</i>	4	13
<i>It was worse in the last five years</i>	3	9
<i>Moose don't eat regrowth; they seem leaner than before</i>	2	6
<i>Other</i>	2	6
<i>Unanswered</i>	5	16

A2. What is your main concern with respect to the way forestry is carried out on your trapline, especially in the 25%?

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>Protecting big game and moose habitat</i>	21	66
<i>Forestry activities affect all wildlife</i>	15	47
<i>Tallymen want to minimize cutting in the 25% area</i>	7	22
<i>Piles of debris left behind after cutting are a problem</i>	6	19
<i>The 25% were first introduced as protected areas, which is not the case, as forestry activities in these areas do not meet the objectives</i>	6	19
<i>Cutblocks are not clean: oil spills near water bodies, garbage left behind, tall tree stumps</i>	4	13
<i>Limiting access to the territory</i>	3	9
<i>His father wanted these mountains/areas to be protected</i>	3	9
<i>Regrowth and planting are all conifers, not food for animals, which need hardwoods</i>	3	9
<i>Protection of small game habitat as well</i>	3	9
<i>Lack of wildlife habitat management directives</i>	2	6
<i>Protecting fish habitat (forestry impacts water quality)</i>	2	6
<i>Other</i>	5	16
<i>Unanswered</i>	5	16



A3. Scientists see the management approach applied to the territory (mosaic cutting) as favourable for moose but, for various reasons, unfavourable for caribou. How do you see this management approach issue?

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>Wild animals leave when cutting occurs but come back (a few years after cutting)</i>	17	53
<i>Too much cutting in the 25% areas and traplines</i>	5	16
<i>Mosaic cutting creates regrowth, which is good for moose and hares</i>	5	16
<i>Mosaic cutting is better than cutting everything down like before (clearcutting)</i>	4	13
<i>Concerned about the way harvesting is done on the mountains</i>	4	13
<i>Mosaic cutting isn't even good for moose</i>	3	9
<i>Mosaic cutting creates too much access/many roads in the 25% areas, which is not good for wildlife</i>	3	9
<i>Mosaic cutting is only good for the companies</i>	2	6
<i>It would be best to leave moose yards fully intact</i>	2	6
<i>Other</i>	7	22
<i>Unanswered</i>	4	13

B) Sites of special interest to the Crees

B1. Over the last five years of Paix des Braves implementation, based on your experience, do you feel the special management approach in the 25% areas was effective in maintaining or improving wildlife habitat on your trapline? If not, what do you think could be improved?

Highly effective (%)	Effective (%)	Not really effective (%)	Ineffective (%)
9.5	38.1	47.6	4.8

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>There seem to be fewer animals now in these areas</i>	8	25
<i>Mosaic cutblocks/residual blocks are not useful for improving wildlife habitat</i>	6	19
<i>The presence of many cuts/roads in the 25% does not help wildlife</i>	5	16
<i>Wildlife habitat is better in this area</i>	4	13
<i>Many cumulative impacts are not taken into account: forestry, roads, mining, hydroelectricity, non-Native hunting</i>	4	13
<i>As long as there is no silviculture, the habitat remains good</i>	4	13
<i>Wildlife is becoming more and more abundant in this region</i>	3	9
<i>I can't go moose hunting in that area because of the forestry and the roads</i>	2	6
<i>Unanswered</i>	8	25

B2. Is the 1% provision for protection of Cree sites of interest on your trapline working well?

Perfect	Very good	Could be improved	Not effective at all
20.0 %	72.0 %	8.0 %	0.0 %

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>The 1% gets the job done / is complied with</i>	19	59



<i>For the protection of camps or former facilities</i>	10	31
<i>1% were identified because they are good fishing and hunting spots</i>	8	25
<i>He would like to have more than 1%</i>	4	13
<i>Protected from forestry activities, but people can still access it</i>	3	9
<i>1% is not fully protected; companies still get trees from the 1% area</i>	3	9
<i>Concerned about the impact of mining on the 1% and 25%</i>	2	6
<i>Other</i>	1	3
<i>Unanswered</i>	5	16

B3. How would you rate the quality of wildlife habitat in your 25%?

Perfect	Very good	Could be improved	Not effective at all
0.0	35.3 %	58.8 %	5.9 %

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>Too much activity on his trapline; habitat quality in the 25% is not as good; hunting is more difficult</i>	8	25
<i>Wildlife habitats are better in this area; wildlife is becoming more and more abundant</i>	4	13
<i>Good quality but takes time to regenerate after cuts</i>	4	13
<i>No cutting has yet been carried out in this area</i>	2	6
<i>It's very good as long as there is no silviculture or 2nd mosaic cutting pass</i>	2	6
<i>25% is too small/not enough</i>	1	3
<i>Unanswered</i>	12	38

B4. Have you been involved in the process of relocating the biological refuges and the 1%? It was considered a way of protecting better areas along bodies of water. Has the process addressed your concerns regarding protection of these sensitive areas? Do you feel that the relocation process has been satisfactory and useful for better protecting the Cree way of life?

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Could be improved	Dissatisfied
25.0 %	55.0 %	15.0 %	5.0 %

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>Yes, a biological refuge was moved to protect a camp near a lake or river</i>	8	25
<i>Aware of this new provision but not yet carried out</i>	7	22
<i>He moved his 1% to protect a hunting/fishing camp</i>	4	13
<i>Would like to have more hectares like this to protect other areas</i>	2	6
<i>I didn't want to change the location of my 1%</i>	2	6
<i>Other</i>	3	19
<i>Unanswered</i>	2	6

B5. Did you know that the Agreement has a provision that allows identification of 75-hectare areas for firewood per permanent camp where Cree users can harvest firewood for their own use? Does this



apply to your trapline? Does it meet the needs of Cree trappers? Is there a problem with the availability of firewood?

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>Requests have been made to companies to leave firewood</i>	13	41
<i>He cuts firewood wherever he wants: "When I need it"</i>	9	28
<i>Tried to get firewood from timber supply guarantee holder (BGA) but was taken by someone else</i>	7	22
<i>No 75-hectare area was identified</i>	6	19
<i>Tried to get firewood from BGAs but it's much harder than before; they don't deliver anymore</i>	5	16
<i>Poor quality firewood or firewood sent to the wrong place</i>	5	16
<i>75-hectare areas are not really useful or implemented</i>	5	16
<i>Satisfied with the firewood left behind by companies</i>	4	13
<i>He has to move far away from the camps to obtain firewood</i>	2	6
<i>Other</i>	2	6
<i>Unanswered</i>	5	16

B6. Were family maps/CLUMs used in the consultation to better understand your own considerations?
From your viewpoint, do you find the family maps/CLUMs useful for better taking into account the Cree way of life?

Very useful	Quite useful	Could be improved	Not useful at all
26.7 %	40.0 %	26.7 %	6.7 %

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>Maps not used in the consultation</i>	6	19
<i>Family maps are useful/complied with in planning</i>	4	13
<i>Family maps aren't really useful</i>	4	13
<i>Family maps are a conversation tool to preserve family knowledge</i>	3	9
<i>Family maps must be presented at each consultation</i>	2	6
<i>Family maps are useful but planners don't comply with them</i>	2	6
<i>I don't want planners or companies to see the CLUMs; the information can be used against the Crees</i>	2	6
<i>The CLUMs should be updated; the process is too long</i>	2	6
<i>Other</i>	3	10
<i>Unanswered</i>	11	34

C) Riparian areas

C1. Over the last five years of Paix des Braves implementation, based on your experience, do you feel that the Agreement's provisions regarding protection of areas near rivers and lakes helped to better take into account the Cree way of life?

Helped a lot	Helped a little	Could be improved	Didn't help at all
12.0 %	28.0 %	60.0 %	0.0 %



Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>The 20-m riparian buffer zone is insufficient</i>	22	69
<i>The 20-m riparian buffers are not really complied with</i>	7	22
<i>Applications to widen riparian buffers are refused</i>	4	13
<i>The riparian buffer zone must be widened to maintain sensitive areas important for wildlife, avoid large machinery near bodies of water, preserve water quality</i>	4	13
<i>The 20-m riparian buffer zone is sufficient</i>	2	6
<i>He requested that the residual forest be moved there to widen the buffer zone</i>	1	3
<i>Unanswered</i>	2	6

C2. Do you see a lot of windfalls in riparian buffers along bodies of water such as rivers and lakes? Is this a problem for you when it comes to practicing your Cree way of life? How? Can you show on a map where this problem occurs?

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>Yes, 20 m is insufficient; it makes the trees fall</i>	18	56
<i>Yes, trees tend to be blown over by the wind, which is strongest around lakes</i>	18	56
<i>No problem with trees falling in the buffer zone</i>	8	25
<i>Cutting occurs too close to water's edge</i>	2	6
<i>Trees blown over by the wind along rivers and lakes make access to these bodies of water difficult</i>	2	6
<i>These trees fall into the water and affect water quality</i>	2	6
<i>Other</i>	2	6
<i>Unanswered</i>	2	6

D) Access

The Agreement stipulates that tallymen are supposed to be consulted on the road network development plan and road closures for their trapline and that forestry company planners must make an effort to avoid building roads that create new accesses to lakes or rivers and to limit the number of road connections with neighbouring traplines.

D1. Do you have the impression forestry companies comply with this?

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>Requested changes to road planning or maintenance but not done</i>	10	31
<i>They refuse our requests to close roads</i>	8	25
<i>Companies do not keep their word: request for wood, buffer zone, interconnection, hunting period, new road, road maintenance</i>	7	22
<i>Companies keep their word when changes are made: harmonization/requests concerning roads</i>	6	19
<i>It's hard to change road planning; companies prefer to stick to their plan</i>	5	16
<i>Too many roads</i>	4	13
<i>Less money and fewer programs to repair and build roads now</i>	3	9
<i>Planning process and road closures are very good; likes participating in the process</i>	3	9
<i>Tallymen have made a lot of requests for road maintenance; the company says "no" because there is no work in the area but the road is still often used</i>	2	6
<i>Other</i>	4	13
<i>Unanswered</i>	1	3



D2. Do you think that these provisions help to better take into account the Cree way of life?

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>Too many roads create a lot of traffic: access to the trapline, cumulative impact, access to other hunters</i>	18	59
<i>Yes, long-term maintenance of the road network is important to maintain access</i>	8	25
<i>He uses gravel roads for hunting</i>	7	22
<i>Prefers winter roads to keep sensitive areas undisturbed (gravel roads = more access)</i>	6	19
<i>The road network is not good for wildlife</i>	4	13
<i>Would like to see more road closures or access control</i>	3	9
<i>Limit interconnections to avoid higher traffic volume</i>	3	9
<i>People come to the trapline but, as long as they respect the traditional activities and camps, that's fine</i>	2	6
<i>Agree on terms with companies to build new roads</i>	2	6
<i>Other</i>	3	9
<i>Unanswered</i>	5	16

D3. Did you influence road construction or closure?

	No.	%
<i>Yes</i>	5	25
<i>No</i>	15	75

D4. To what extent do you think you influence road development on your trapline?

I can influence a lot	I can influence a bit	I can't influence at all
14.3 %	28.6 %	57.1 %

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>Requests have been made repeatedly, without success, to repair a road access</i>	13	41
<i>Companies often deny requests because it's too expensive and there is less money and fewer programs for repairs</i>	10	31
<i>Winter roads should be cleared in winter; need access in winter</i>	5	16
<i>Old roads should be closed if they cannot be properly maintained</i>	3	9
<i>I would like the companies to use the old roads</i>	3	9
<i>He asked for a change in road planning and it was accepted</i>	3	9
<i>Request for road repair has been made</i>	2	6
<i>Unanswered</i>	4	13

E) Zoning — Cree way of life

E1. Do you think that the Paix des Braves AFR will allow you, your family and other Cree users of your trapline to practice and teach the Cree way of life on an ongoing basis?

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>The Agreement allows people to continue to carry out and teach traditional activities</i>	11	34
<i>Forestry activities have a negative impact on the ability to engage in traditional activities: e.g. no wildlife, damage from forestry activities, etc.</i>	5	16



<i>There hasn't been much difference since the Agreement</i>	5	16
<i>The younger generations cannot learn because there is nothing left in the territory (too much cutting)</i>	2	6
<i>Should better inform tallymen about Paix des Braves content and better explain Cree way of life to planners and company representatives</i>	2	6
<i>Other</i>	2	6
<i>Unanswered</i>	12	38

Cree Participation

F) Recognition of Eenu stewardship on the land

F1. How satisfied are you with the way the MRNF consulted you during the planning process?

Very satisfied	Satisfied	More or less satisfied	Dissatisfied
3.4 %	44.8 %	41.4 %	10.3 %

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>The consultation process and timeline are fine (more influence on the process, compliance with measures and provisions is now greater)</i>	9	28
<i>The planners listen but they still say "no" to the tallymen's requests</i>	7	22
<i>Communication is lacking (updates are needed)</i>	6	19
<i>The MRNF is doing a good job</i>	5	16
<i>The consultation process is worse than in the last five-year period; the harmonization process is slow</i>	3	9
<i>Implementation of the Wildlife Habitat Management Directives would improve consultations</i>	3	9
<i>The consultation schedule is not perfect; there should be more time for preparation</i>	2	6
<i>Satisfied with the work of the Cree JWG's</i>	2	6
<i>Difficult for tallymen to understand all the information given to them</i>	2	6
<i>Pre-consultations need to be improved</i>	2	6
<i>Harmonization measures are not complied with</i>	2	6
<i>Other</i>	5	16
<i>Unanswered</i>	0	0

F2. Do you feel that your knowledge, opinions, and concerns were taken into account in the planning process?

Perfectly	Mainly considered	Could be improved	Not at all
0.0 %	19.2 %	57.7 %	23.1 %

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>MRNF planners and BGA representatives listen to the tallymen but often refuse their requests</i>	17	53
<i>MRNF planners and representatives listen to the tallymen but give no feedback</i>	6	19
<i>MRNF planners should listen to tallymen before developing plans</i>	3	9
<i>Tallymen are consulted and respected when it comes to their knowledge</i>	2	6



<i>Doesn't feel like he's being listened to at all</i>	2	6
<i>Planners and tallymen don't have the same goals; the tallyman rarely wins</i>	2	6
<i>Sometimes they agree to postpone but they always come back with the same blocks later</i>	2	6
<i>Knowledge sharing is used against the Crees</i>	1	3
<i>Unanswered</i>	1	3

F3. Did the MRNF respond to your requests when you asked for harmonization measures?

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>We don't feel that our opinion is taken into account and that we are listened to</i>	12	38
<i>Planners listen but there is no concrete action</i>	10	31
<i>Requests are often refused</i>	9	28
<i>Satisfied with the process</i>	6	19
<i>We feel that our opinion is taken into account and that we are listened to</i>	5	16
<i>We should have more support from our JWG to help with the requests</i>	1	3
<i>Unanswered</i>	5	16

F4. Have you noticed an improvement in the way your requests are handled over the past five years?

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>The process hasn't really changed in the past five years</i>	19	59
<i>Yes, there is some improvement; we feel that our opinion is taken into account and that we are listened to</i>	5	16
<i>It's worse than the previous five years</i>	2	6
<i>Unanswered</i>	5	16

G) Effectiveness of participation mechanisms and conflict resolution process

G1. Did the forestry companies and the MRNF organize enough meetings for you to clearly understand the forest plan? Was this sufficient to allow you to make your requests for harmonization measures?

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>There are enough meetings (consultations)</i>	4	13
<i>I would like to have follow-ups about changes to plans and work schedules</i>	4	13
<i>There should be more meetings, especially when an issue is raised</i>	1	3
<i>I would like to see the planning maps with the comments/minutes</i>	1	3
<i>Unanswered</i>	17	53

G2. Do you know whether the CNG Forestry Monitoring Team or your JWG was involved in monitoring your trapline's harmonization measures? Did they help you?

Yes	No
42.1 %	57.9 %

G3. Were you involved in a land use dispute?

Yes	No
------------	-----------



18.5 %	81.5 %
--------	--------

G4. Did you know that a conciliation process exists in the event that a land use dispute is not resolved by the JWG or its coordinators?

Yes	No
41.2 %	58.8 %

Comments on silviculture

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>Promotes natural regeneration (no scarification and no tree planting)</i>	8	25
<i>I'm not against planting but no scarification and no jack pine because it is not a good habitat for moose</i>	8	25
<i>Planting conifers is not good for small game, wildlife and traditional activities</i>	7	22
<i>He would prefer planting birch and hardwoods rather than jack pine</i>	3	9
<i>Scarification is harmful to wildlife (rabbits, moose)</i>	2	6
<i>No scarification near water bodies to protect fish habitat</i>	1	3
<i>They have to build gravel roads for scarification and the tallyman doesn't like it</i>	1	3

Conclusion

After 20 years of Paix des Braves implementation, do you feel it helps better take into account the Cree way of life? If not, why? Is there anything else you would like to say to the CQFB regarding development of your trapline?

Concerns and observations	No.	%
<i>The tallymen's wishes and knowledge must be respected more</i>	7	22
<i>Smaller cutting areas are better for wildlife than clearcutting</i>	6	19
<i>At least the tallymen can see the plan and make requests</i>	3	9
<i>Tallymen should be hired to manage beaver when a beaver dam floods a road</i>	3	9
<i>Hasn't really changed in the last five years; even if tallymen refuse an area, the planner always comes back</i>	3	9
<i>trucks should slow down; it's unsafe and causes a lot of noise and dust</i>	3	9
<i>It was better before the PdB because you could negotiate directly with the company</i>	3	9
<i>Improvement is needed on the economic provisions; the Cree are supposed to work in forestry but they never get contracts</i>	2	6
<i>Improvement is needed to better protect buffer zones around water bodies</i>	2	6
<i>Almost all the trees were cut down in the past; only small plots remain, like islands</i>	2	6
<i>The Cree way of life should be better explained to planners and company representatives so that they can listen more</i>	2	6
<i>The Paix des Braves helps people be more aware of the Cree traditional way of life</i>	1	6
<i>There should be a financial assistance program for maintaining roads for Cree purposes</i>	1	3



<i>All mixed stands should be left alone because they are the last good quality habitats</i>	1	3
<i>Something needs to be done to limit access and cumulative impacts on traplines</i>	1	3
<i>Avoid cutting on mountains; keep the corridor between mountains and rivers/lakes</i>	1	3

APPENDIX 2 Synthesis of Responses - Group 2 Stakeholders

GENERAL QUESTIONS		
1) In your opinion, what are the most positive elements resulting from Paix des Braves (Chapter 3) implementation over the period 2018-2023?	No. responses	% respondents
<i>Well-defined consultation process that generally runs smoothly</i>	15	54
<i>Implementation of Mixedwood Stands Management Strategy</i>	13	46
<i>Diagnostic exercise that has made it possible to improve processes (JWG IOR, guides, pre-consultation, schedule adaptation, harmonization measures (HM) monitoring)</i>	12	43
<i>Creation of CNG Forestry Department, Forestry Monitoring Team</i>	10	36
<i>Parties' collaboration to move the files forward</i>	10	36
<i>The Agreement itself is very positive for Cree users compared to other First Nations</i>	7	25
<i>Consultations are a good opportunity to create ties with the Crees and get to know them better</i>	5	18
<i>Work on the reviewing 1% and 25% areas; excellent collaboration by parties; relocation exercise started</i>	5	18
<i>The Agreement enables the necessary dialogue between the parties at all levels</i>	4	14
<i>Beginning of Teams meetings, saves travel and time</i>	3	11
<i>Formalization of 6th Amendment ended uncertainty</i>	3	11
<i>Creation of CQFEC</i>	2	7
<i>Other</i>	3	11
<i>Unanswered</i>	1	4



2) What do you see as the main issues arising from implementation of Chapter 3 (Forestry) over the period 2018-2023?	No. answers	% respondents
<i>Provisions that are not yet in place (wildlife directives, caribou, economic provisions)</i>	18	64
<i>Political subjects discussed in consultations, which sometimes cause refusal of consultations. Significant influence of Waswanipi Cree JWG, which prevents tallymen from speaking. This is not the place; the JWGs should enforce the AFR.</i>	15	54
<i>Divergent interpretations of certain Agreement provisions remain (tallymen do not know much about the AFR and their rights, mistrust of non-commercial silvicultural works (NCSW), misinterpretations conveyed during consultations)</i>	12	43
<i>Governance problem among the Crees and among Agreement mechanisms (who makes decisions, who is accountable)</i>	5	18
<i>Unnecessary delays that cause conflicts to drag on before settlement; many sectors remain unharmonized for a long time</i>	5	18
<i>The rigidity of certain provisions requires the use of techniques that are not adapted to the tallymen's needs (too many roads, excessively narrow riparian buffers)</i>	4	14
<i>A lot of tallyman absenteeism, schedules that change/set at the last minute, time wasted</i>	4	14
<i>Economic component does not provide the expected benefits for the Crees</i>	3	11
<i>Departure of certain experienced JWG members, replaced by people who know little about the AFR</i>	3	11
<i>Growing problem of refusal of tallymen's requests; feel ignored; BGAs and planners seem not to know the traditional way of life enough</i>	3	11
<i>Big problem of communication between the parties, at all levels</i>	2	7
<i>BGAs absent from consultations or sending the wrong representative (must be able to respond to tallymen's requests)</i>	2	7
<i>MRNF inability to present a 500% PAFIO creates lack of predictability, delays and confusion</i>	2	7
<i>Other</i>	5	18
<i>Unanswered</i>	1	4

3) Can you identify contextual factor(s) that have significantly impacted (positive or negative) implementation of Chapter 3 (Forestry) over the period 2018-2023?	No. answers	% respondents
<i>Pandemic - Negative: loss of human contact, difficult, inadequate tools, ineffective in-person meetings. Significant delays in all files. Positive: technological updates facilitating remote meetings, positive impact on market, which has benefited the region</i>	14	50
<i>Relational issues and negotiations between parties delay implementation of Chapter 3; undermine credibility and trust</i>	14	50
<i>Problems with the organization of consultations (tallymen absenteeism, planning and compliance with schedules, JWG staff turnover) result in delays, uncertainty, unnecessary costs</i>	8	29
<i>Certain individuals in place do not agree with the Agreement, interfere in consultations, discuss political issues, prevent smooth operations</i>	6	21
<i>No wildlife directives, considerable uncertainty/delays/additional costs for industry</i>	5	18
<i>Cree and QC leadership change altered relations, priorities; setbacks for AFR implementation</i>	5	18
<i>Well-defined consultation framework allows tallymen to be heard, avoids blockades like in other regions</i>	3	11
<i>Other</i>	3	11
<i>Unanswered</i>	1	4

4) Do you feel the Adapted Forestry Regime has evolved on Agreement territory over the last five years?	No. answers	% respondents
<i>Formalization of the 6th Amendment made it possible to implement several changes (relocation of territories of interest and refuges, Mixedwood Stands Management Strategy, CQFEC)</i>	16	57
<i>Diagnostic project and improved consultation process, HM monitoring, tools created</i>	14	50
<i>The way stakeholders work together to implement the AFR has evolved (better relations, mutual understanding)</i>	11	39
<i>No evolution in management strategies over the last five years, despite all the opportunities</i>	11	39
<i>Setback in certain aspects: increase in timeline for harmonization/conflict resolution; pending files that block the process, less predictability, work environment during consultations, loss of confidence in the process</i>	9	32
<i>Unanswered</i>	1	4

5) What comments or observations can you make about AFR implementation mechanism effectiveness? Can you quantify your satisfaction with the mechanisms' operation, on a scale of 1 to 10? (1 = very ineffective and 10 = very effective).

5.1 JWG		
Effectiveness (Average in %)		66.7
	No. answers	% respondents
<i>Cree JWG oversteps its mandate; political discussions brought into consultations to influence tallymen; not the right forum, must let tallymen have their say</i>	19	68
<i>Recent changes in personnel; new people seem less aware of their roles</i>	13	46
<i>Waswanipi JWG is not/hardly functional</i>	12	43
<i>Cree and Québec JWG do not have the same knowledge or means at their disposal to carry out their mandate (AFR training and forestry context, work organization, task sharing). They don't work enough with their counterparts</i>	10	36
<i>Some Cree JWG are difficult to reach and not very involved in their JWG tasks (not full-time JWG)</i>	9	32
<i>JWGs are doing their best in a difficult context</i>	8	29
<i>There is still a lot of room for improvement</i>	7	25
<i>Some JWGs work better than others (e.g. Mistissini and Oujé-Bougoumou)</i>	6	21
<i>Stakeholder preparation prior to consultations is insufficient</i>	5	18
<i>New operating rules have been introduced to define roles and mandates</i>	5	18
<i>Poor follow-up both in the field and in informing the tallymen of the status of requests</i>	2	7
<i>Cree JWGs should be appointed by the CNG; this would help depoliticize the debate</i>	2	7
<i>Unanswered</i>	0	0

5.2 JWG coordinators		
Effectiveness (% average)		73.8
	No. answers	% respondents
<i>Collaborate well; play an important role in realigning things, reminding people of the rules</i>	15	54
<i>Should have more power over the JWGs, act as mediators, play a greater role in consultations, because they make a real difference in resolving conflicts</i>	14	50
<i>Change of coordinator on the Cree side; to have a Cree in this role is a plus</i>	10	36
<i>On the Québec side, the person is very competent and knows her role well. Satisfied with her work</i>	7	25
<i>Too many files at a time, files stagnate (filing of 30-day reports, conflict follow-up); takes too long to get feedback. Conflicts must be resolved quickly to shorten time lost</i>	7	25
<i>Same role, but different status in their respective organizations (no ties of authority between Cree coordinator and JWG, sometimes lack of autonomy to fully carry out his role)</i>	7	25
<i>Great improvements and initiatives that originate from the coordinators (JWG meetings, guides, IOR)</i>	6	21
<i>They should work together more and divide tasks better</i>	5	18
<i>Coordinators' reports to the Board are appreciated</i>	4	14
<i>Their role is not sufficiently known from the industry and the tallymen</i>	2	7
<i>Unanswered</i>	1	4

5.3 Cree-Québec Forestry Board		
Effectiveness	76.5	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>Should have more contact with local stakeholders to inform them about the AFR and ensure that all stakeholders involved clearly know their role</i>	11	39
<i>CQFB plays its role; many projects were launched during the period</i>	10	36
<i>Don't know, because there are no real links/discussions with the CQFB</i>	8	29
<i>Good relations, a lot of mutual respect, ability to discuss even when views are opposed, important venue for bringing the parties together and discussing contentious issues</i>	8	29
<i>CQFB is not a decision-making body/is not used sufficiently to resolve conflict situations; members have difficulty remaining impartial/agreeing on a common position to influence things</i>	7	25
<i>Meeting agendas are sometimes heavy and repetitive. Documentation, including minutes and long presentations, should be more concise and focus on decision-making points.</i>	6	21
<i>Change in management, positive; fresh outlook; understands his role well; well integrated</i>	4	14
<i>Prefers not to rate, does not know their role well enough</i>	4	14
<i>A number of AFR-related issues that are dragging on could be resolved via the CQFB</i>	4	14
<i>All members should be trained for a better understanding of the traditional way of life (field trips should be prioritized, not only reports and presentations)</i>	4	14
<i>Ensuring quorum at meetings was a challenge during the period; there is a lack of interest, a lack of involvement on the Cree side</i>	3	11
<i>The pandemic limited in-person exchanges, which must be encouraged for optimal functioning</i>	2	7
<i>CQFB must remain focused on its mandate and not duplicate the parties' work</i>	2	7
<i>Meetings are well prepared; the documentation is available in advance, thereby facilitating work</i>	2	7
<i>Members know little about the files; difficult to make informed decisions</i>	1	4
<i>Unanswered</i>	0	0

5.4 TGIRTs on Category II and III lands		
Effectiveness (%)		30.5
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>Almost a failure; ineffective; fail to achieve the objective “concerted action” between Jamesians and Crees; no Issues-Solutions agreed on</i>	16	57
<i>The panels’ importance has been poorly conveyed; Crees have little interest in participating</i>	12	43
<i>Lack of coordination: meeting poorly prepared; panels’ role seems unclear to the organizers</i>	9	32
<i>Too many panels; always the same people sitting everywhere</i>	7	25
<i>On Category II lands, no TGIRT has met since 2019; influenced by political negotiations</i>	7	25
<i>Other</i>	4	14
<i>Unanswered</i>	5	18

6) Based on your perspective and role in AFR implementation, to what extent do you feel that Chapter 3 (Forestry) achieved its objectives over the period 2018-2023? Rate on a scale of 1 to 10 and add comments as needed.

A. Allow adaptations to the forestry regime to better take into account the Cree traditional way of life:

i. Trapline as a territorial reference unit		
Objective achieved (%)		94.23
	No. answers	% respondents
<i>Objective achieved</i>	16	57
<i>Boundaries determined by the Crees, for the Crees; good compliance</i>	11	39
<i>Except for management unit (MU) 84-62, where there is confusion, the objective has been achieved</i>	2	7
<i>This is a recurring planning problem since there are still different trapline boundaries, which was never resolved by the CTA</i>	2	7
<i>It is essential that the trapline approach be maintained</i>	1	4
<i>Unanswered</i>	1	4

ii. Areas of special interest to the Crees (1%, 25% and refuges)		
Objective achieved (%)	75	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>The tallymen are dissatisfied with the 25%; they do not clearly understand the terms and conditions; there has been miscommunication. The Crees consider each portion of the 25%, while the MRNF considers it as a whole</i>	17	61
<i>The 1% do the job</i>	13	46
<i>Objective partially achieved for the update of areas of special interest. Process is dragging on. There are planning problems due to old and new areas being active on the map. Tallymen have not all benefited equally from relocations</i>	11	39
<i>Planners and industry comply with terms and conditions in these areas</i>	9	32
<i>Relocation of refuges (and updating of 1% and 25%) has helped to solve long-standing problems; tallymen have been able to protect sensitive sectors</i>	6	21
<i>These areas are very important for the tallymen, who concentrate their activities there; they make many requests</i>	5	18
<i>Other Indigenous nations would be happy with such adaptations; too bad the Crees are dissatisfied</i>	4	14
<i>All AFR terms and conditions are designed specifically to take the Cree way of life into account</i>	4	14
<i>Corridors are needed between these isolated areas to be fully effective for wildlife</i>	2	7
<i>Other</i>	2	7
<i>Unanswered</i>	1	4



iii. Management approaches (mosaic cutting and other special approaches, harvesting rate and size of area harvested)		
Objective achieved (%)	69.23	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>Terms and conditions precisely applied but not always satisfactory for Cree users. Regardless of the approach, some tallymen do not want harvesting; difficult to reconcile opposing objectives</i>	11	39
<i>Tallymen requests often contradict mosaic cutting (e.g. fewer roads)</i>	10	36
<i>Opinions divided among tallymen as to roads and accesses; depends on their objectives</i>	10	36
<i>The mosaic approach must be redesigned, less appropriate in a climate change (CC) context, especially in the North; 2nd pass will create a lot of dissatisfaction</i>	9	32
<i>Mosaic approach better meets the Crees' needs (lower harvesting rate, scattered logging, returns to territory allow road maintenance) but does not consider the caribou</i>	9	32
<i>Mosaic cutting creates numerous roads and accesses that harm wildlife and habitats</i>	6	21
<i>Openness in AFR to adapt the regime; should shift to more modern, less rigid practices</i>	2	7
<i>Other</i>	4	14
<i>Unanswered</i>	1	4

iv. Protection of riparian areas		
Objective achieved (%)	65.77	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>20 m insufficient for tallymen; many harmonization requests for widening</i>	19	68
<i>Planners make an effort to meet demands when it comes to sensitive areas. They refuse wall-to-wall solutions; difficult for tallymen to obtain gains if forest is mature in the area</i>	9	32
<i>Regulation is very well applied</i>	8	29
<i>Essential wildlife environment; 20 m is not wide enough for land-based wildlife</i>	7	25
<i>Rules are too rigid, applied wall-to-wall, prevent creativity in meeting tallymen's needs</i>	4	14
<i>Removing partial cuts in buffer improved protection</i>	4	14
<i>Scientifically speaking, 20 m is sufficient for protecting waterways</i>	4	14
<i>Biological refuges have helped protect some sensitive areas</i>	3	11
<i>Biological refuges were intended to protect riparian areas but were not used for that purpose</i>	2	7
<i>Buffer width should be variable, based on habitat sensitivity/water body size</i>	2	7



<i>Other</i>	2	7
<i>Unanswered</i>	1	4
v. Development of road access network		
Objective achieved (%)	61.6	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>Difficult to rate because some tallymen want less, others more</i>	11	39
<i>The Agreement terms are contradictory (mosaic cutting vs. limiting access)</i>	11	39
<i>No long-term vision for road network development in the region; lack of predictability increases costs and uncertainty for the industry</i>	8	29
<i>Maintaining road access is now necessary for the Cree way of life; long-term maintenance is a major concern</i>	8	29
<i>Unresolved issues (caribou, roads subject to the environmental and social impact assessment process, etc.) prevent access to many logging areas</i>	5	18
<i>The many road accesses encourage predation and increase hunting pressure and poaching</i>	4	14
<i>Improved interconnections; fewer issues reported but file not resolved</i>	4	14
<i>Tallymen requests are denied; The tallymen are not satisfied with road management/maintenance</i>	4	14
<i>Process of closing roads is cumbersome, time-consuming and expensive</i>	3	11
<i>Negotiations with the tallymen about the roads are difficult; additional costs for industry</i>	2	7
<i>Mosaic cutting creates many roads; this has significant costs for the industry</i>	2	7
<i>Other</i>	3	11
<i>Unanswered</i>	1	4



B. Allow greater integration of sustainable development concerns		
ECONOMIC COMPONENT		
i. Economic development of Cree communities		
Objective achieved (%)	64	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>The potential is there but not yet sufficiently exploited</i>	13	46
<i>Considerable funding under the Agreement that goes back to the communities</i>	9	32
<i>In principle, the volumes granted should generate benefits for the Crees but benefits are not optimized (not evenly distributed among the communities, wood quality lower; far from the communities)</i>	8	29
<i>The 15% in silvicultural work for the Cree is a plus</i>	7	25
<i>Not many actions in this direction yet but the file is progressing; better than the previous period</i>	5	18
<i>The Waswanipi plant was reopened during the period</i>	5	18
<i>Companies that receive Cree allowances are straw-man companies only; do not benefit the Crees</i>	4	14
<i>The Agreement provides for significant funds but we know little about how they are used</i>	4	14
<i>There is good collaboration between Cree companies and local companies</i>	2	7
<i>Other</i>	2	7
<i>Unanswered</i>	2	7

ii. Job creation and maintenance (Crees and Jamesians)		
Objective achieved (%)	56.52	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>The industry has made attempts to hire Crees, with however mitigated results (unattractive jobs, poorly adapted to Cree culture, less competitive salaries, fewer benefits)</i>	15	54
<i>Only a few individuals benefit; few Crees work in forestry</i>	7	25
<i>Very few Crees work in forestry; alignment between the industry and the communities must be improved</i>	6	21
<i>The tallymen sometimes ask to work during consultations, do not know where to go</i>	5	18
<i>All companies continued during the period</i>	3	11
<i>Partnerships with Cree companies; employees work very poorly; quality and performance is insufficient/not competitive</i>	3	11
<i>Cree forestry companies create specialized jobs in communities</i>	3	11
<i>The work of the CQFEC has not yet yielded conclusive results in this regard</i>	2	7



<i>Nothing is happening, economically speaking, in the territory (MU 84-62) for or with the Crees</i>	1	4
<i>Unanswered</i>	3	11
iii. Forest sector sustainability in the region		
Objective achieved (%)	67.73	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>The Agreement creates a certain security and predictability in terms of access to AACs vs. blocking roads like elsewhere in Québec</i>	6	21
<i>Forestry activity creates wealth in the region. It's the main activity. Projects and partnerships developed by industry to keep investments in the region</i>	5	18
<i>The pandemic had a major impact on the market, good for the region</i>	5	18
<i>Unresolved files that could impact the AAC create a lot of uncertainty and can jeopardize the sector's viability (harmonization issues, wildlife directives, decline in social acceptability)</i>	5	18
<i>2018-2023 was a good period but confidence was put to the test by the 2023 wildfires</i>	4	14
<i>Shortage of manpower, difficulty finding tree planters, brush cutters; fewer Jamesians employed; many factors that are independent of the AFR</i>	4	14
<i>Significant backlog bringing the territory into production again; refusal of NCSW can put the sector's viability at risk in the long term</i>	2	7
<i>In the context of climate change (CC), we have to think long-term, diversify the industry, think multi-resource, reduce haversting</i>	2	7
<i>Other</i>	3	11
<i>Unanswered</i>	3	11

SOCIAL COMPONENT		
iv. Consideration of all users of the territory		
Objective achieved (%)	56	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>Chapter 3 is to the Crees' advantage; the Jamesians are not considered much</i>	16	57
<i>The TGIRTs (and public consultations) exist to better represent the Jamesians</i>	9	32
<i>Although TGIRTs allow the Jamesians to express themselves, ultimately the tallyman has the last word</i>	6	21
<i>A number of files cause discontent among the Jamesians, who feel like they are being put out of their homes (moratorium on leases, closure of hunting zone 17)</i>	6	21
<i>The Crees have constitutional rights that the Jamesians do not. The Agreement was negotiated to remedy harms done to the Crees; It is normal that certain types of hunting are reserved for them</i>	3	11



<i>The territory is not closed to non-Crees but sharing it requires cohesion among Crees and non-Crees, which is not always easy</i>	2	7
<i>Relations between the tallymen and other users are good; things are going well despite complexity</i>	2	7
<i>Other</i>	2	7
<i>Unanswered</i>	2	7
ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT v. Protection of biodiversity		
Objective achieved (%)	71.92	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>The strategies and provisions in force contribute to this (mixedwood stands, caribou, RADF, new protected areas and refuges)</i>	16	57
<i>The AFR'S objective is not to protect biodiversity but forest productivity and protect the quality of wildlife habitats</i>	5	18
<i>There is room for improvement</i>	4	14
<i>Compared to the rest of Québec it's better because harvesting is less intense; but knowledge is lacking; more studies are needed on the subject; improvement needed in terms of follow-up</i>	3	11
<i>Ecosystem-based management would be better than mosaic cutting for safeguarding biodiversity; vulnerable species are at risk</i>	2	7
<i>Other</i>	2	7
<i>Unanswered</i>	1	4

vi. Integrity of ecosystems of importance to the Crees		
Objective achieved (%)	70	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>The AFR was developed with particular attention to these ecosystems; implementation of the Mixedwood Stands Management Strategy contributes further</i>	15	54
<i>Harmonizations with tallymen go beyond the terms of the Agreement and target habitat protection</i>	10	36
<i>Integrity is compromised by unresolved files (woodland caribou, wildlife directives)</i>	9	32
<i>It is important to question the tallymen on which areas they consider sensitive and important</i>	9	32
<i>Many tallymen are dissatisfied with their 25%</i>	5	18
<i>Even if the AFR is applied to the letter, the tallymen do not feel it is sufficient to preserve ecosystem integrity</i>	5	18
<i>Until the directives are in place, harmonization with the tallymen is the only way to maintain the integrity of these habitats</i>	4	14

<i>Existing provisions are too rigid; important to find case-by-case solutions and be open to tallymen's requests</i>	2	7
<i>More studies are needed to determine whether the AFR maintains/safeguards/preserves habitats</i>	2	7
<i>Other</i>	4	14
<i>Unanswered</i>	1	4



vii. Increase knowledge about the territory		
Objective achieved (%)	72.92	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>Much forest knowledge about the territory exists. Many analysis and knowledge acquisition projects were under way during the period</i>	14	50
<i>Consultations are a forum for knowledge exchange between the tallymen, industry, planners</i>	8	29
<i>The tallymen know their trapline very well. They are first to witness CCs. A lot of traditional knowledge is available but it is not sufficiently taken into account by stakeholders</i>	8	29
<i>The North lacks habitat-related surveys and studies compared to forests of the South</i>	6	21
<i>Projects incorporating Cree knowledge were developed/ongoing during the period</i>	4	14
<i>The moose project does not seem to materialize; too many players involved; CQFB objectives are diluted</i>	3	11
<i>Opening up the territory through forestry makes it accessible to researchers</i>	2	7
<i>CLUM maps are interesting but the current format is not suitable for integration into planning</i>	2	7
<i>There is a lot of information but we need to acquire more to address our issues</i>	2	7
<i>Tallymen's lack of knowledge about forestry activities leads them to refuse regeneration work</i>	1	4
<i>Unanswered</i>	3	11

C. Ensure participation, in the form of consultation, by the Crees in the various forest development activities planning and management processes.

Participation characteristics to consider:

i. Effectiveness of consultation mechanisms and dispute settlement		
Objective achieved (%)		68.15
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>Well-established, well-defined process</i>	18	64
<i>Clear, well-defined process, but easy to derail (some individuals do not always comply, political topics and exerted influences during consultations)</i>	16	57
<i>Significant improvement, especially in the conflict resolution process</i>	9	32
<i>The process of arriving at a harmonized plan is slow</i>	9	32
<i>There are marked differences between communities with regard to the mechanisms' effectiveness</i>	8	29
<i>Conflict resolution timelines are unreasonable</i>	8	29
<i>First Nations participation process that is unique in the world</i>	6	21
<i>Issues in AFR comprehension remain and hinder optimal operation of the process (Examples: JWG not aware of their roles, tallymen do not know their rights, do not understand what is presented to them)</i>	5	18
<i>Far too many people at the consultations; difficult to negotiate and less effective; need to clarify who should be there</i>	4	14
<i>A lot of tallymen absenteeism without consequences</i>	4	14
<i>The conflict resolution mechanism is little known to companies, which are not involved in it</i>	3	11
<i>Pre-consultations were supposed to address the tallymen's concerns upstream but this was not taken into consideration/was poorly planned</i>	2	7
<i>JWG supervision and training improved over the period (CNG, coordinator)</i>	1	4

ii. Recognition of tallyman as steward of the territory		
Objective achieved (%)	78.52	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>AFR is based on recognition of the tallyman as a steward, his place is central</i>	14	50
<i>Designation problems (after a death, when tallyman is absent, family conflicts, complex cases such as MU 84-62, difficulty obtaining an up-to-date list from the CTA)</i>	13	46
<i>Sometimes Cree JWG members want to interfere and prevent the tallymen from expressing themselves; this is a lack of recognition of the tallyman's role</i>	10	36
<i>Consultations allow tallymen to make their needs known</i>	7	25
<i>Power is really in the tallymen's hands; their refusal puts work on hold</i>	7	25
<i>AFR is sometimes too rigid to easily accommodate the tallymen's requests (riparian buffers, roads)</i>	4	14
<i>The tallyman's role is to make decisions and to keep other trapline users informed, to consult them, which is done less and less</i>	4	14
<i>The tallymen is listened to but his opinion is not always taken into consideration; should have more decision-making power</i>	3	11
<i>Some tallymen think the territory belongs to them and abuse their power (systematic NCSW refusal)</i>	1	4

iii. Contribution to Cree institution governance		
Objective achieved (%)	72.61	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>The Agreement significantly helped the Crees to adopt means to organize themselves; they are increasingly autonomous and involved in the files (establishment of Forestry Department, Forestry Monitoring Team)</i>	16	57
<i>Much improvement and significant progress during the period</i>	15	54
<i>Improvements still needed (communication, task sharing, structure)</i>	10	36
<i>The chain of command still fluctuates within Cree AFR mechanisms</i>	8	29
<i>Discussions on implementation of the collaborative regime are unending; this influences the AFR</i>	3	11
<i>The funds provided for the Waswanipi JWG are insufficient to cover the heavy workload</i>	1	4
<i>Unanswered</i>	3	11



iv. Development of individual and institutional capacities		
Objective achieved (%)	71.36	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>More Crees are studying and working in forestry (specialized positions available with development of CNG structure, Forestry Department, JWG's)</i>	16	57
<i>Training is required to develop individual capacities and standardize the knowledge of the stakeholders involved</i>	16	57
<i>Improvement in development of capacities through training</i>	11	39
<i>Ongoing negotiation of political files interferes with institutional development (funds)</i>	3	11
<i>Need for a clear mechanism to address political requests with the proper bodies and not during consultations</i>	3	11
<i>Cree tallymen have extensive experience/knowledge in the field that they can share with other stakeholders</i>	2	7
<i>The more Crees are involved in forestry, the more people will be aware of this reality</i>	1	4
<i>Unanswered</i>	4	14

D. Promote collaboration, in the form of concerted action, by the CNG and the EIJBRG in the forest plan participation process set out in Schedule C-4 of the Agreement		
i. Participation and representativeness in TGIRTs (Category II and III lands)		
Objective achieved (%)	33.68	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>Considerable efforts made to try to reach the Crees but they are not very involved; they have other platforms to voice their concerns</i>	22	79
<i>Always the same people on the panels, causing fatigue, disinterest</i>	6	21
<i>The "concerted action" objective is not achieved because the Crees and Jamesians do not sit at the same table</i>	3	11
<i>There are few ties between the AFR and the TGIRTs</i>	3	11
<i>It's normal that it's less dynamic than elsewhere in Québec; there are fewer users</i>	2	7
<i>Although the industry is a stakeholder on Cat. II lands, it is completely excluded from discussions</i>	1	4
<i>Unanswered</i>	6	21

ii. Concerted action within the TGIRTs (Cat. II and III lands)		
Objective achieved (%)	34.67	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>Issues-Solutions have not yet been determined</i>	11	39
<i>Not effective due to lack of leadership and participants' lack of preparation</i>	9	32
<i>Not enough participants for genuine concerted action</i>	7	25
<i>The subjects dealt with do not motivate participants and interest in forestry varies</i>	3	11
<i>We can only observe what is happening at the TGIRT; even if we want to evaluate it, we have no influence</i>	2	7
<i>Brings users together to discuss common topics</i>	1	4
<i>Unanswered</i>	9	32

iii. Taking TGIRT work into account in forest planning		
Objective achieved (%)	N/A	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>Once the Issues have been determined, they will be taken into account by planification, but nothing has been decided yet</i>	3	11
<i>The panels are recent; it will take time for concerted action to take place</i>	1	4
<i>Unanswered</i>	19	68

iv. For the period in question, what are your main observations regarding the panels for Category II and Category III lands?		
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>Interesting process, which brings people together but runs out of steam; few results in the end</i>	10	36
<i>It's all a question of participation; so few people attend the meetings that they are useless</i>	6	21
<i>The Cat. II lands panel is not operational; it is useless, a duplication</i>	6	21
<i>We have to wonder whether the TGIRTs are relevant on AFR territory since the Crees have their process</i>	4	14
<i>Other</i>	2	7
<i>Unanswered</i>	6	21



v. In your opinion, what are the main challenges with regard to establishing these panels and the concerted action desired?		
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>The panels should be grouped together for genuine concerted action between the Crees and the Jamesians</i>	10	36
<i>Ensure increased Cree participation</i>	10	36
<i>The authorities must communicate the TGIRTs' role and importance in order to regain credibility and interest in them</i>	9	32
<i>Clarify the mandate to avoid losing focus; refocus on the main objective</i>	8	29
<i>TGIRTs on Cat. II lands should be eliminated</i>	3	11
<i>EIJBRG coordination/facilitation should be more creative, more dynamic</i>	2	7
<i>Unanswered</i>	7	25

2013-2018 Status Report Follow-Up and Outlook for the Future		
7. How would you rate the progress made in achieving the following goals over the past five years? For each goal, quantify progress made on a scale of 1 to 10.		
A. Pursue collaboration and strengthen communication between AFR implementation mechanisms		
Progress rating (%)	71.25	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>Collaboration has improved, with recommendations incorporated during the period (tools for JWG, HM monitoring system and information sharing between MRNF, industry, CNG/JWG)</i>	22	79
<i>A lot of improvement over the period but much remains to be done in terms of communication, especially on the Cree side</i>	15	54
<i>Creation of the CNG Forestry Department has helped a lot</i>	10	36
<i>Stakeholders now all possess the basic technical knowledge required</i>	9	32
<i>Many tools developed but not really used/complied with, too technical</i>	8	29
<i>Change in personnel has not helped strengthen collaboration and communication</i>	7	25
<i>CLUM maps still out of date; current format inadequate to integrate into planning</i>	7	25
<i>In Mistissini and Oujé-Bougoumou, collaboration is good</i>	4	14
<i>Progress was uneven depending on the file; some files moved forward, others stagnated or regressed</i>	2	7
<i>Feeling that the industry has been less involved since it became possible to join consultations remotely (setback)</i>	1	4
<i>Unanswered</i>	3	11



<i>B. Remain open to the AFR adaptations required and step up monitoring aimed at AFR assessment and evolution</i>		
Progress rating (%)	52	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>Some adaptations should have been implemented long ago (caribou, wildlife directives, monitoring); better approaches are known and should be implemented in the CC context. Difficult to make the legal context evolve; the MRNF lacks openness/will to change things</i>	21	75
<i>Files are moving forward but actions and changes are slow to occur</i>	15	54
<i>Some aspects have progressed (mixed stands and monitoring) but not much major change</i>	14	50
<i>Need to clarify and analyze provisions on which the parties disagree (25%, riparian buffers (RB), scarification, 2nd pass)</i>	10	36
<i>Files that drag on, e.g. directives, are extremely costly and cause significant delays</i>	6	21
<i>No change observed in management approach</i>	4	14
<i>The Board implemented its monitoring framework during the period</i>	4	14
<i>Tallymen don't want ecosystem-based management (caribou strategy)</i>	4	14
<i>Tallymen's needs will not be met by the wildlife directives but by flexibility that allows detailed harmonization based on their requests</i>	2	7
<i>Other</i>	2	7
<i>Unanswered</i>	2	7

C. Ensure implementation of the AFR's economic component		
Progress rating (%)	52	
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>The CQFEC is in place but has resulted in few actions/benefits; no budget or human resources</i>	12	43
<i>A stagnating file; significant efforts devoted to it but few results during the period</i>	12	43
<i>Economic levers and political will exist but it is difficult to gauge the Crees' interest and to involve them; working in industry/forestry does not always suit the Crees</i>	10	36
<i>Hard to know; indicators for assessing benefits for the Crees are not in place</i>	9	32
<i>Few alternative solutions for small Cree enterprises that would like to take on contracts</i>	3	11
<i>Implementation was difficult in context of labour shortage and/or pandemic, which have delayed progress</i>	3	11
<i>The Nabakatuk plant reopened during the period, which is a plus</i>	2	7
<i>Does not apply in MU 84-62; wish for more Crees in forestry but did not occur during the period</i>	1	4
<i>Unanswered</i>	5	18

Conclusion		
8) Do you have recommendations for improving implementation of Chapter 3 (Forestry) in future?		
	No. answer	% respondents
<i>Improve consultations for more efficiency: planning calendar, compliance with schedules, absenteeism, present NCSWs at the same time as harvesting blocks</i>	14	50
<i>There is still work to do in terms of JWG training and skill development (knowledge of territory, mandates, tasks, Paix des Braves, tallymen's needs)</i>	14	50
<i>Continue work on stakeholder communication and collaboration, particularly for field follow-up and HM monitoring</i>	11	39
<i>MRNF must resolve strategic files (caribou, directives, collaborative regime) to restore predictability and regain credibility regarding the parties' capacity to collaborate on implementation</i>	11	39
<i>Publicize the 6th Amendment to all stakeholders and Cree communities. Have a neutral body publicize AFR successes and restore the credibility and social acceptability of forestry</i>	9	32
<i>Provide all stakeholders with AFR training, not just JWGs (planners, industry)</i>	9	32
<i>Find a way to speed up dispute settlement, which can take several years and creates uncertainty for the industry</i>	9	32
<i>Exclude political topics from consultations. Stay focused on plans and tallymen's requests</i>	9	32
<i>Ensure greater presence of coordinators/neutral arbitrators during consultations to remind JWGs seeking to overstep their roles of the rules</i>	6	21
<i>Raise awareness among the Crees (JWG; tallymen) of the need for NCSWs. Educate them about these practices</i>	6	21
<i>Adapt management approaches to climate change (stop mosaic cutting)</i>	5	18
<i>Ensure that all JWG members are more involved in tasks so as to share the workload</i>	4	14
<i>Analyze the situation in Waswanipi in order to find solutions to recurring problems</i>	4	14
<i>Continue study and analysis projects relating to the main problems reported. Set up future reflection regarding climate change, 2nd pass, riparian buffers, etc. Implement existing recommendations resulting from previous reports and reviews.</i>	4	14
<i>Add flexibility and predictability into the harvesting rate (five-year planning instead of annual)</i>	3	11
<i>Act rapidly after fires to accurately report on impacts (closed traplines, relocation, special plans, NCSW, Cree satisfaction with process)</i>	3	11
<i>Increase concerted action between tallymen and planners prior to planning</i>	3	11
<i>Avoid wall-to-wall solutions. Detailed, case-by-case harmonization with each tallyman is best</i>	3	11



<i>Organize more meetings involving all JWG members</i>	2	7
<i>Ask the CNG to set forestry objectives and action priorities</i>	2	7
<i>Ensure that financial and technological means are allocated to JWGs so that they can carry out their mandate effectively (virtual meetings, field follow-ups, sufficient funds to work full-time on JWG tasks)</i>	2	7
<i>Rather than two delegations, the CQFB should have ten impartial members dedicated to the Board mandate</i>	1	4
<i>Solve the problem of greyed lots (agreement with other First Nations) in MU 84-62</i>	1	4
<i>Focus implementing s. 3.60. Solve the problems related to allocated volumes</i>	1	4
<i>Build on the fact that applying special plans has had a unifying effect and shown that the parties can work together effectively</i>	1	4