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1. AUDIT PROCESS

1.1. Auditors and qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditor Name</th>
<th>Auditor role</th>
<th>Lead Auditor, environmental issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ugo Lapointe, Biol. M.Sc.</td>
<td>Auditor role</td>
<td>Lead Auditor, environmental issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications:</td>
<td>Ugo joined the Rainforest Alliance team in 2011. Until December 2013, he held the position of coordinator of FSC certification in Quebec before working with the Rainforest Alliance as a consultant. He had previously worked 4 years overseeing the collection and data analysis and writing reports and articles within the framework of research projects carried out in the boreal forests in Quebec. Holder of a Master's degree in forest ecology on the impact of forest management on wildlife in the boreal forest, Ugo completed the Rainforest Alliance FSC auditor training for the forest management and for the Chain of Custody as well as the Lead auditor ISO 14001 training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mylène Raimbault, F. Eng.</td>
<td>Auditor role</td>
<td>Socio-economic and indigenous issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications:</td>
<td>Forestry engineer accumulating nearly 10 years of experience in integrated resource management, forestry planning and environmental certification. Mylène was first in charge of an integrated resource management project, then worked for a forestry company for over 5 years as a certification, public and First Nation relation Coordinator. This position enabled her to manage the environmental management system of the company and participated in the development of the five-year and general forest management plans. As a forestry engineer for the MRNF from 2010 to 2012, Mylène coordinated the consultation activities to be carried out with Aboriginal communities as well as the development of the integrated tactical and operational forest management plans to be implemented under the new forest regime in Quebec. Mylène has joined Rainforest Alliance in 2012 as a forest certification specialist for Quebec and received the FSC Lead Auditor training with Rainforest Alliance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francine Bernier, F. Eng. M.Sc</td>
<td>Auditor role</td>
<td>Socio-economic and forestry issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications:</td>
<td>Graduate in Forest Engineering since 2001, and having obtained a master's degree in economics and forest policy in 2003, Ms. Bernier has been working in consultation for over 10 years, of which the last 6 years as an owner-partner of ProForêt consultants inc. Her expertise lies, in particular, in terms of forestry and environmental certification. In this regard, her skills are primarily associated with environmental standards and sustainable forest management, as well as chain of custody. Moreover, Ms. Bernier has recognized training by registrars for FSC, PEFC, SFI and PGES standards. She is also recognized as Lead Auditor at the level of the ISO 14001 standard. As project manager since 2003 and owner-partner of ProForêt consultants inc. since 2007, Ms. Bernier also has strong skills in project management, human resources management, labor law, in relation to communities as well as in forest economy. She has also worked on numerous projects for various clients, including Hydro-Québec and various forest industries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 1.2. Overview of sites visited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of site</th>
<th># of Sites Visited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest sites</td>
<td>11-51; 12-52; 12-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sites:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **AUDIT FINDINGS AND RESULTS**

2.1. **Changes in the forest management of the Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and/or standard and stakeholder issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Changes in the forest management of the FME have occurred since the last audit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Updates to group member list (if yes, see section 2.5 below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Changes in the forest management standard used for audit have occurred since the last audit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗ Stakeholder comments on the forest management of the FME were received</td>
<td>Comment summary and RA response: See below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stakeholder comment:**
Several interested parties stressed their concerns about the merger of management units that is envisaged by the MFFP.

**RA response:**
For now, the government signalled that it would go ahead with the merger, but it is not yet clear what management units will be merged. However, this merger could have an impact on the conformance of the CGCBSL with the standard. Potentially on including procurement costs and profitability of plants (**OBS 05/14**). For the moment, processes and operating agreements implemented between stakeholders meet the requirements of the standard.

**Stakeholder comment:**
A First Nation said that in the last year the CGCBSL was one of the most proactive certificate manager with regard to cooperation compared to other managers in the territory of interest of this community. Note that the territory claimed by the community itself is not recognized by the government and it is therefore for now through the CGCBSL that the community is involved and informed of forest management activities on this part of certified territory.

**RA response:**
The audit team was indeed aware that an agreement of collaboration and funding was signed with this community and was also able to see concrete examples of recent collaborations between the two parties. However, an opportunity for improvement was identified (see **OBS 04/14**) on the identification of sites of interest in the field.

**Stakeholder comment:**
A representative of a group of indigenous communities said he was disappointed with the lack of progress which he believed to be expected since the issuance of the FSC certificate to the CGCBSL in the development of the capacities of indigenous communities. This group is to internally organize itself to define a way of which these communities wish to participate in the CGCBSL certification activities and audits, FSC is seen as a tool to increase their level of involvement and improve their conditions. This representative was nevertheless pleased with the initiatives and the degree of cooperation of the CGCBSL, which has favored the eventual signing of the protocol proposed by this group and, since the beginning of 2014, tries even more to advance an agreement specifying the basis for the relationship to be established.
RA response:
The CGCBSL informed the RA team upstream of the audit that this group had developed a memorandum of understanding to clarify how the communities want to be involved in the certification process. However, this protocol is not yet effective because it is waiting to be approved by the leaders of these communities. This representative asserted seeing the signature of this agreement as the first step to carry out before any other step. So there is actually for now, few examples of collaborations established between CGCBSL and communities, the efforts are currently devoted to both sides to establish a common vision for the relationship to be established between both parties. The audit team concluded that the requirements of the standard are met on the basis that the records are progressing to the satisfaction of both parties.

Stakeholder comment:
Another Aboriginal community raised several issues, all related to the lack of time, skills and resources to properly decide on the many ongoing consultations. The late payment of funding amounts made available to it are forcing the community to absorb substantial margin loans for several months before they can be reimbursed for expenses incurred. Furthermore, the amounts available would not cover the resources it would need to be significantly involved in the different forest issues.

Having assimilated this community, it is in process to try to reclaim the land and its resources. It is also interested in eventually establishing a co-management approach and collect royalties from forestry activities in order to benefit more from the benefits these activities generate. Currently, it holds a timber harvesting permit for the supply of a wood processing plant (delegation agreement for forest management, formerly CvAF) of 3,900 m$^3$, but would like more volumes since for now, this small volume does not justify investing time and resources to make the management itself. But it confirmed that the CGCBSL was particularly involved during the past year to agree on a cooperation agreement and views it as positive that this agreement will help to improve the current situation.

RA response:
The audit team was able to examine the various agreements reached with the community on the side of MFFP and CGCBSL. At the time of the audit, an agreement on data sharing, on operations schedules harmonization and a funding agreement had recently been finalized between this community and the MFFP. On the side of the CGCBSL, steps were underway to establish a framework of operation with this community, which aims to identify the deliverables of both parties as part of the FSC process. Funding is required for any proposed approach but not covered by government budget. Based on interviews with CGCBSL and this community, this agreement is progressing well and is expected to close in the coming months. The audit team also witnessed various steps taken by the CGCBSL to support the efforts of the community, particularly in terms of facilitating access to firewood and technical assistance to set up an application project to increase the occupation and the activities on the territory of interest of the community.

Despite the issues raised by the community in terms of its lack of capacity, the audit team concludes that the requirements of the standard are met at the bases of the efforts of the CGCBSL during all of 2014 to support the steps taken by the community and on the basis that it recognizes the CGCBSL as a good partner to support the various initiatives and projects it undertakes or intends to undertake.

Stakeholder comment:
An interested party was concerned by the fact that the auction sale of the sites by the Bureau de mise en marché des bois (BMMB) could have impacts on workers since bidders may pay too much and try to reduce costs at the expense of workers. In addition, some workers interviewed said they were dissatisfied with their working conditions and were in the process of finding jobs on the mining side.

RA response:
Sites from the auction were visited during field visits and operators have been interviewed. The operators interviewed indicated that there were no differences in the compensation in yards from the auction compared with other sites. The conditions of employment offered by the bidders are adequate based on the evidence obtained during the audit. As for the few dissatisfied workers, the audit team concluded that this testimony is an isolated case, as all other workers encountered were satisfied and several
Stakeholders from various backgrounds have been met and all testified that members of CGCBSL with whom they did business were committed players involved in their communities and also had a good reputation as an employer. Also note amongst other things, that one of the members has also been recognized as the “Business of the Year” in 2012 in Témiscouata by the SADC, the mission of this organization being the creation of economic activity and job creation. Thus, members of the CGCBSL are in conformance with the requirements of criterion 4.1, which deals with the local impacts of forest management activities.

**Stakeholder comment:**
A trapper mentioned that the trappers association had applied for the trapping territories to be recognized and used as limits in the potential RADF for establishing and monitoring thresholds with respect to the harvest rates. They would like for this request be recognized because for them, this would represent a significant improvement on how to address their concerns, which would be adapted to their level. Knowing that there is always room for improvement, it still recognizes the value of the opportunities available to them through the engagement process in place (TGIRT, Harmonization Tables, public consultations).

**RA response:**
The audit team reviewed the work of the TGIRT, who collaboratively developed since 2010, a number of issues-solutions sheets, some of which related to wildlife habitat. As raised by the CRE, following the public consultation on the PAFI-T, it is not all the issues-solutions sheets that have been implemented in the VOIC and integrated with the PAFI-T. However, it was agreed that these issues will be considered in the development of the PAFI-O by means of harmonization measures. Thus, operating adjustments were agreed in the GIR tables (e.g. introduction of harmonized tables) and others have been initiated (establishment of a work plan prioritizing certain 2014-2015 issues, identification of HCVF in social values in progress), and demonstrate the opportunities available to different stakeholders to be involved in the planning activities in the medium and long term, which meets among other things the requirements of indicators 4.4.1 and 4.4.4.

**Stakeholder comment:**
Several stakeholders met reported that September was hard on the side of the harmonization of non-commercial work. A stakeholder even said that this year (2014) was the worst ever in the harmonization of operating schedules. The process asking participants to harmonize and agree was not respected. It regrets that in general, it is very difficult to enforce its rights. It claimed to feel that it's never a good time for its concerns to be taken into account. The tranquility of hunters is for wildlife territories a fundamental value and we explained to it that such concern cannot be considered either in the PAFI-T or in the PAFI-O. In its opinion, the problem is only “putting things off”.

**RA response:**
It was determined that the harmonization of annual programming is the responsibility of the performers and to do that, Harmonization Tables were set up. Most stakeholders met testified that members of the CGCBSL show being open to accommodate the concerns expressed during these meetings and the audit team was able to examine several interface agreements that have been agreed with them. That said, shortcomings were detected in the harmonization process of non-commercial work. **NCR 01/14** is issued.

Regarding the consideration of longer-term concerns, it is not all issues-solutions sheets that have been implemented in the VOIC and integrated with the PAFI-T. Especially about issues related to structured wildlife territories elsewhere (landscape aesthetics, territorial boundaries, peace and sustainability of infrastructure). However, the audit team was able to observe that it has been agreed that these will be considered in the PAFI-O through harmonization measures. **NCR 01/14** covers the gaps on this process.

**Stakeholder comment:**
Stakeholders were concerned because the consultations are progressing rapidly for the economic concerns of the SADF (timber production site), while the government has not made public the other aspects of sustainable forest management strategies (SADF) and the sustainable forest management regulation (RADF). In other words, the parties are concerned that the economic concerns have precedence over the environmental and social components.
RA response:
The audit team noted that adjustments to the participation process have been made (e.g. introduction of harmonized tables) or were introduced (establishment of a work plan prioritizing some issues for 2014-2015, current social values HCVF identification), which clearly demonstrate the opportunities that are available to different stakeholders to get involved in prioritizing the issues and the planning activities in the medium and long term. These approaches meet among others the requirements of indicator 4.4.4 on jointly agreed processes.

Stakeholder comment:
Several interested parties stressed their concerns about the merger of management units that is envisaged by the MFFP.

RA response:
For now the government has signalled that it would go ahead with the merger, but it is not clear which management units would be merged. However, this merger could have an impact on the conformance of the CGCBSL to the standard. In particular, the effect of mergers on procurement costs and profitability of the plants should be monitored (OBS 05/14).

Stakeholder comment:
One interested party mentioned that according to him, the access routes used by forestry contractors employed by Rexforêt were not adequately restored before work.

RA response:
During field visits, the access routes leading to silvicultural sites visited were in adequate condition. Since silvicultural work is carried out mainly in areas that have recently been harvested, the paths used are usually new or have been the subject of a recent refurbishment. The RNI (Regulation respecting standards of forest management for forests in the domain of the State) requirements apply to silvicultural work. Rexforêt targets the needs compared with the paths and provides repairs to subcontractors needed. The group manager has identified certain problems in this regard that were being solved during the audit. Furthermore, the review of a sample of operational procedures of companies working in certified forests and their implementation shows that they meet the requirements for repair of access routes.

Stakeholder comment:
Interested parties expressed their concern with government cutbacks in the MFFP wildlife sector. According to them, the cuts could limit the wildlife sector's ability to play its role in the protection of endangered species and in monitoring wildlife objectives of the forest management strategy in place.

RA response:
During the audit, the recent cuts in the MFFP wildlife sector had the consequence that biologists did not go out on the field to validate reports of endangered species or to monitor the protective measures applied. To limit the impact of this change, precautionary measures have been put in place by MFFP planners. Based on interviews with MFFP, the approach is to document all reports obtained and to apply protection arrangements. This approach meets the requirements of the standard, but OBS 06/14 has been issued since the absence of field validation on reports of endangered species could discourage reports, since false occurrences could have an impact on the cut, or if the wrong species at risk is indicated, inadequate measures could be applied.

Stakeholder comment:
A stakeholder shared his dissatisfaction with the level of involvement and consideration of the concerns of the organization in identifying High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF).

RA response:
During the audit, the team found that CGCBSL had initiated updating their report on HCVF and had planned on implementing a consultation process with the TGIRT participants. During report writing, a first meeting was held (in November) with the key stakeholders and this particular stakeholder was included in
the process. CGCBSL activities are consistent with the aspects evaluated in scope for this audit, i.e. 02/13 RNC and the criterion 9.4 on follow-up activities. It is to be noted the next annual audit planned in spring 2015 will be specifically devoted to the assessment of HCV requirements and this organization will be met in order to monitor the course of this HCVF report update specifically.

Pesticide Use
☒ FME does not use pesticides. (delete rows below)

2.2. Excision of areas from the scope of certificate

☒ Not applicable. Check this box if the FME has not excised areas from the FMU(s) included in the certificate scope as defined by FSC-POL-20-003. (delete the rows below if not applicable)

☐ The FME has excised areas from FMU(s) included in the scope of the certificate since the last assessment/audit? If yes complete sections A, B and C below

☐ The FME excised areas from FMU(s) included in the scope of the certificate prior to the last assessment/audit, and conformance with FSC-POL20-003 was evaluated? If yes complete sections B and C below.

A. Rationale for excision of area from FMU(s) included in scope of evaluation:

Finding:

B. Summary of conformance evaluation against requirements of FSC-POL-20-003

Finding:

C. Control measures to prevent contamination of certified wood with wood from excluded/excised forest areas.

Finding:

2.3. Conformance with applicable nonconformity reports

The section below describes the activities of the certificate holder to address each applicable nonconformity report (NCR) issued during previous evaluations. For each NCR a finding is presented along with a description of its current status using the following categories. Failure to meet NCRs will result in non-conformances being upgraded from minor to major status with conformance required within 3 months with risk of suspension or termination of the Rainforest Alliance certificate if Major NCRs are not met. The following classification is used to indicate the status of the NCR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Categories</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Operation has successfully met the NCR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Operation has either not met or has partially met the NCR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description of Nonconformance and Related Evidence:

#### Requirement:
When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific conservation attribute, the manager re-evaluates the measures taken to maintain or enhance that attribute, and adjusts the management measures to reverse the trend.

#### Finding:
The applicant has not demonstrated that the efficiency monitoring results, in other words a monitoring that monitors the status of high conservation values (HCVs), are used to modify management measures of HCVs to reverse the trend when an HCV is at risk.

#### Evidence:
- HCVF report
- HCVF Monitoring Program

#### Corrective action request:
Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the nonconformance.

#### Timeline for conformance:
By the next annual audit

#### Evidence provided by organization:
- HCVF updated report (September 2014).
- Interview with the certificate coordinator.

#### Finding after reviewing evidence:
To address this non-conformance, CGCBSL set up an HCVF monitoring grid in the territory as well as the applicable terms, measures of monitoring and monitoring results of the effectiveness of these measures to conserve the attributes of HCV identified.

The monitoring is documented on a regular basis to see if HCVs are maintained or not when the work will be carried out. If there is a decline, an analysis of the case will be made to see if there is correlation with forestry activities. If this is the case, the terms are modified to maintain or restore the affected HCV. Thus, the requirements are met and the NCR is closed.

### NCR Status: CLOSED

### Comments (optional):

---

### Description of Nonconformance and Related Evidence:

#### Requirement:
The group entity shall implement a documented monitoring and control system that includes at least the following:

i. Written description of the monitoring and control system;
ii. Regular (at least Annual) monitoring visits to a sample of Group members to confirm continued compliance with all requirements of the applicable Forest Stewardship standard.

Finding:
The “Group Handbook” v 2012-08-20 provides that an internal audit be performed annually. The certificate was suspended between February and November 2013, no internal audit has been conducted. The last internal audit predates the previous annual audit, or summer 2012. The temporary suspension of a certificate does not relieve the applicant from the obligation to fulfill its commitments, which are among others to comply with the requirements of the standard and its internal procedures, hence the issuance of this present NCR.

Evidence:
- Interview with the applicant
- Group Handbook, 2012-08-20 version

Corrective action request: Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above.
Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the nonconformance.

Timeline for conformance: By the next annual audit

Evidence provided by organization:
- 2014_04_24_Manuel_du_Groupe_CGCBSL.doc
- Rapport d'audit interne CGCBSL 2014 11-51.doc
- Rapport d'audit interne CGCBSL 2014 11-52.doc
- Rapport d'audit interne CGCBSL 2014 12-51.doc
- Rapport d'audit interne CGCBSL 2014 12-53.doc

Finding after reviewing evidence:
The audit team found that CGCBSL conducted visits to several members as part of the internal audit conducted in September 2014. The reports are complete and the clear and accurate results on the detected nonconformities and implementation deadlines of corrective actions. 3 MU out of 6 were visited. This corresponds to the prescribed minimum sampling of the FSC-STD-30-005 V1-0 standard preliminary draft 2-0, or the square root of the number of MU (6) in the group certificate. The audit team also reviewed the latest version of the group handbook, which was revised in May 2014 in order to clarify the different responsibilities among other members that have been modified with the implementation of the new forest regime. The monitoring and control system of CGCBSL is well documented and the team has seen its implementation. The NCR is closed.

NCR Status: CLOSED

Comments (optional):

2.4. New nonconformity reports issued as a result of this audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCR #</th>
<th>Classification of NC:</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/14</td>
<td>Rainforest Alliance/SmartWood Locally adapted Standards for Assessing Forest Management in the Great Lakes/Saint-Lawrence region - August 2010 version, Indicator 4.5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report section: Appendix IV, criterion 4.5

Description of Nonconformance and Related Evidence:

Requirement:
The manager takes measures to avoid loss or damage to property, rights, resources or livelihoods.
Finding:
Several stakeholders interviewed raised issues regarding the harmonization of the non-commercial silvicultural work timetable. Some claim to have suffered damages (complaints from customers and loss of revenue caused by certain work) because of the particularly difficult situation experienced this fall on the harmonization thereof. Moreover, at the time of the audit, a complaint had been made to the MFFP as to loss and damage caused by the execution of certain works. However, note that those involved in this case are not members of the Corporation.

It was the subordinates who had the task of agreeing with stakeholders on the implementation period of non-commercial work. That said, it is not all the performers who sit on GIR Tables nor at the harmonization tables, where the concerns of stakeholders are discussed and where measures are generally agreed and incorporated into the planning. In addition, due to the allocation of the work process, the identity of the subordinates was revealed only very late in the process, which ensures that they have not been able to respect the agreed harmonization process. Also note that some stakeholders testified that it was unclear who would operate and who to contact to reach agreements, even after the sectors allocated. Interviews with stakeholders have revealed that there are some different interpretations on the roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders involved.

The responsibility falls under the responsibility of the certificate holder to exercise due diligence while ensuring that the implementation conditions of the agreed harmonization process are favorable so that they can indeed minimize impacts, for example, on the service quality and the income generated by hunting in the controlled territories.

In addition, the procedure of the Corporation developed in order to notify all adjacent landowners when the work is planned near private lots is not consistently applied by all members. Examples of communications have however been provided demonstrating that notices are carried out when the cuts may affect the adjacent owners directly (in accordance with 4.4.2). However, the applicant has not demonstrated that these activities are sufficiently diligent, while the limits of the MU may be incorrect or that operations can be performed by stakeholders not members of the CGCBSL.

For the reasons explained above, this NCR is issued.

Evidence:
- Interviews with the applicant
- Interviews with MFFP (harmonization and Register of disputes)
- Interview with the coordinator of the GIR Tables
- Interviews with stakeholders
- Table “Mesures d’harmonisation pour suivi.docx” (harmonization process)

Corrective action request: Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the nonconformance.

Timeline for conformance: By the next annual audit.

Evidence provided by organization: PENDING

Finding after reviewing evidence: PENDING

NCR Status: OPEN

Comments (optional):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCR #</th>
<th>02/14</th>
<th>Classification of NC :</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rainforest Alliance/SmartWood Locally adapted Standards for Assessing Forest Management in the Great Lakes/Saint-Lawrence region - August 2010 version, Indicator 6.3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report section:</td>
<td>Appendix IV criterion 6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Nonconformance and Related Evidence:**

**Requirement:**
The manager is implementing relevant best management practices pertaining to the protection of soils, water quality and sensitive sites.

**Finding:**
During the field visit in the MU 11-51, the audit team found that a logging trail of a little less than a km long passing through a non-mapped wetland (alders grove) was used to get access to a harvest block, thus creating an immense rut. This company has operating procedures in place to ensure compliance with the standards (in accordance with 6.3.5) as well as the completion-of-work inspection procedures. That said, they have not adequately been implemented since no corrective action had been provided and the site manager was not aware of this situation before the audit, hence the issuance of the NCR.

**Evidence:**
- Field observations
- Interview with the foreman
- Review of plans and permits issued
- “Certification.pdf” document

**Corrective action request:**
Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the nonconformance.

**Timeline for conformance:**
By the next annual audit

**Evidence provided by organization:**
PENDING

**Finding after reviewing evidence:**
PENDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCR #</th>
<th>Classification of NC :</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rainforest Alliance/SmartWood Locally adapted Standards for Assessing Forest Management in the Great Lakes/Saint-Lawrence region - August 2010 version, Indicator 6.3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report section:</td>
<td>Appendix IV, criterion 6.3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Nonconformance and Related Evidence:**

**Requirement:**
The manager has a strategic access management plan to minimize and mitigate the negative impacts of roads. This may include but is not necessarily limited to:

a. reducing road density;
b. reducing and/or limiting access to High Conservation Value Forest areas;
c. decommissioning roads;
d. avoiding road building in or around protected areas; and-or
e. maintaining remoteness of areas with sensitive cultural or ecological values or where required for tourism.
f. Maintain or restore connectivity

Finding:
The eastern portion of forest management unit (MU) 12-54 is included in the limits of the forest management plan of the Gaspésie caribou use area for 2013-2018. Recent literature shows that the management of access roads is a crucial issue for this species as the caribou avoids roads and that they form a gateway into its habitat for predators. The management plan for caribou provides guidelines to limit the construction of new roads while the access roads management plan of CGCBSL is a strategy that aims to control and monitor the level of fragmentation of the canopy forest by road access for the 6 MUs. The latter strategy does not include specific guidelines to limit the impact of the existing network on the caribou. The audit team concludes that there is no demonstration that the approach is adequate to meet the issues related to the existing access routes in the application area of the Gaspésie caribou management plan, more specifically points a, b and e of the requirements listed above.

Evidence:
- Forest management plan for the Gaspésie caribou use area
- The management of forest roads to CGCBSL and references

Corrective action request: Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the nonconformance.

Timeline for conformance: By the next annual audit

NCR Status: OPEN

Comments (optional): Although a non-conformance which affected this indicator was issued in 2012, this is not considered to be a recurring nonconformity as the cause of the identified deficiency is different. Indeed, the previous non-conformance had been issued because the access roads management plan was not complete. This non-conformance was closed in 2013 when an adequate management plan for access roads had been produced. The new non-conformance is issued because the approach is deficient in the application area of the Gaspésie caribou use area forest management plan for 2013-2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCR #</th>
<th>04/14</th>
<th>Classification of NC :</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard &amp; indicator:</td>
<td>FSC-STD-40-004 standard, CoC Indicator 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report section:</td>
<td>Appendix V, Section 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Nonconformance and Related Evidence:

Requirement:
For material sold with FSC statement, the EAF must include the following information on sales and shipping documents:
  a) The registration code of the certificate of the EAF and
  b) FSC statement: FSC 100%

Finding:
Although procedures exist in this regard, transport documents (A.T.) of some members used during the transportation of FSC certified material from the forest to the factory do not indicate the full FSC declaration (FSC 100%) nor the AFD FSC certificate code.
Evidence:
– Groupe Lebel transport document (A.T.)

Corrective action request: Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the nonconformance.

Timeline for conformance: By the next annual audit

Evidence provided by organization: PENDING

Finding after reviewing evidence: PENDING

NCR Status: OPEN

Comments (optional):

2.5. Audit decision

The table below gives an overview of the NCRs status after the current audit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCR type</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open before current audit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgraded to Major</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New NCRs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Major NCRs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification Recommendation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certification requirement met: client approved for certificate maintenance:</td>
<td>Following the acceptance of NCR(s) issued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification requirements not met: major non-conformances identified that need to be addressed during 3 months after the final report date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification Suspension required: major non-conformance not addressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6. Updated Group Member list

1. Total # members in the certified pool: 17

2. Total area in the Current Pool (ha or acres.): 988.867 ha

CERTIFIED FMU TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BGA/PRAU member</th>
<th>MRN Client Number</th>
<th>Entry Date</th>
<th>Withdrawal date &amp; reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bégin &amp; Bégin inc.</td>
<td>011 1 002</td>
<td>November 25, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bois BSL Amqui inc.</td>
<td>012 1 032</td>
<td>July 20, 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bois Serco</td>
<td>012 1 011</td>
<td>March 3, 2011</td>
<td>March 9, 2012 - cessation of its activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bois de Sciage Lafontaine inc.</td>
<td>125 1 002</td>
<td>January 26, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Bois d’œuvre Cedrico inc.</td>
<td>012 1 012</td>
<td>November 25, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- F. Huard inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>November 26, 2010</td>
<td>March 12, 2012 - cessation de ses activités</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Groupe Lebel (2004) inc.</td>
<td>011 1 001, 011 1 014, 012 1 003, 011 1 012</td>
<td>November 25, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Groupe NBG inc.</td>
<td>011 1 018</td>
<td>November 25, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Les Bardeaux Lajoie inc.</td>
<td>011 2 007</td>
<td>November 25, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Lulumco inc.</td>
<td>012 1 002</td>
<td>December 15, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 La Corporation internationale Masonite (IMM)</td>
<td>051 1 035</td>
<td>January 28, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Multi Cèdre Itée</td>
<td>012 2 008</td>
<td>April 25, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Municipalité de Mont-Carmel</td>
<td>011 M 001</td>
<td>January 24, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Cascades Canada UC (« Norampac-Cabano »)</td>
<td>011 0 003</td>
<td>November 25, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Produits forestiers Basques inc.</td>
<td>011 2 008</td>
<td>November 25, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Scierie de Ste-Irène Itée</td>
<td>012 1 015</td>
<td>February 17, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Tembec (« Tembec Matane »)</td>
<td>012 0 003</td>
<td>November 25, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Uniboard Canada inc. (‘Uniboard Sayabec »)</td>
<td>012 0 001</td>
<td>November 25, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forest areas not included in the pool:

1. Number of forest areas on which the candidate group manager has certain management responsibilities: None
   (the certificate covers the 6 FMUs present in the BSL)

Total area these timberlands represent (ha): 0