



**Readers must note that, in the event of discrepancies due to translation,  
the French version of this report is the official version.**

# 1. Table of content

---

List of Acronyms and terms.....	4
Summary of recommendations .....	5
1. Context.....	8
1.1 Examination parameters.....	8
1.2 Scope of the review.....	9
2. Method.....	10
3. Results and Recommendations .....	11
3.1 General observations .....	12
3.1.1 Consultation process for PAFITs.....	12
3.1.2 Size of management units and coherence between tables .....	13
3.1.3 The territory and its occupants .....	13
3.2 Wildlife.....	14
3.2.1 Taking into account of culturally important species .....	14
3.2.2 Consideration of the insights, concerns and harmonization measures formulated by tallymen, Cree land users and coordination bodies .....	18
3.2.3 Consideration of wildlife habitat management norms and strategies .....	19
3.3 Access to the territory.....	20
3.4 Climate change.....	21
4. Conclusion.....	22
5. References .....	23
Appendix 1 – JBACE examination parameters .....	25
Appendix 2 – Interview questionnaires distributed to stakeholders .....	28

# List of Acronyms and terms

---

<b>ANRQC</b>	Agreement Concerning a New Relationship Between le Gouvernement du Québec and the Crees of Québec
<b>CQFB</b>	Cree-Québec Forestry Board
<b>FMU</b>	Forest management unit
<b>FSC</b>	Forest Stewardship Council
<b>HQM</b>	Habitat quality model
<b>JBACE</b>	James Bay Advisory Committee on the Environment
<b>JBNQA</b>	James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement
<b>JWG</b>	Joint working group
<b>MFFP</b>	Ministère des Forêts, de la Faune et des Parcs
<b>MRNF</b>	Ministère des Ressources naturelles et des Forêts
<b>PAFIO</b>	Operational plan for integrated forest development (Plan d'aménagement forestier intégré opérationnel)
<b>PAFIT</b>	Tactical plan for integrated forest development (Plan d'aménagement forestier intégré tactique)
<b><i>Paix des Braves</i></b>	Agreement Concerning a New Relationship Between le Gouvernement du Québec and the Crees of Québec
<b>PRAN</b>	Annual program (Programmation annuel)
<b>RSDF</b>	<i>Regulation respecting the sustainable development of forests in the domain of the State</i>
<b>SFI</b>	Wildlife sites of interest (Sites fauniques d'intérêt)
<b>TLGIRT</b>	Local integrated land and resource management panel – Category III lands (Table locale de gestion intégrée des ressources et du territoire – Terres III)
<b>TSG</b>	Timber supply guarantee

# Summary of recommendations

---

The review of the 2023-2028 Tactical Integrated Forest Management Plan (commonly and hereafter referred to by their French acronym, “PAFIT” (‘Plans d’Aménagement Forestier Intégré Tactique’) is a continuation of the previous review (2018-2023). We do not repeat all of the observations made at that time. We focus on what appears to be new, significant and of a contributing nature.

We present the recommendations and opportunities for improvement made in this report. Numbers are sequential and in no way reflect an order of importance. The numbering is sequential and does not reflect differing degrees of the importance of the latter.

## **Theme: Consultation process for PAFIT**

---

---

### **Recommendation # 1**

In collaboration with the concerned parties, review the production calendar of the PAFIT to bolster stakeholder participation in a timely manner.

The JBACE would like to discuss the matter in greater detail with the MRNF.

*Refer to section 3.1.1*

---

---

### **Opportunity for improvement # 1**

We believe that the accompanying documents (modules 1 to 3) should also be made available for consultation, even if the content is often factual rather than strategic in nature.

Strategies, policies and decisions, whether provincial or regional in scope, certainly have an impact on regional activity.

Here, it is not to put into question policies, strategies or other elements that have already been the subject of consultation, but to have the opportunity to comment on their implementation.

*Refer to section 3*

---

---

## **Theme: Area of management units and concordance between tables**

---

---

### **Recommendation #2**

We understand that the calculation made serves as a reference according to the subject being treated. The total area of a management unit is a reference that must be unique.

We recommend that this reference be made and, if necessary, that it be noted in a footnote what is and is not included in a table.

The Analysis of the Issues document, on page 36, footnote 2, is a good example of relevant and accurate information.

*Refer to section 3.1.2*

---

---

## Theme: The territory and its occupants (module 2)

---

### **Opportunity for Improvement #2**

Page 4, paragraph 3: The text suggests that the JBNQA is a problem. The JBACE is of the opinion that it should refer to "problems with the regarding the forest management" which is more accurate.

We propose the following wording: *“The implementation of the JBNQA highlighted a number of problems regarding forest management”, (...).*

Page 10, paragraph 2: The text suggests that the Governance Agreement is an element of implementation of the Paix des Braves. The JBACE believes that these are two separate things, but that the Paix des Braves has certainly created a favourable dynamic.

We propose the following wording: *“In light of the dynamic created under the Paix des Braves (...).”*

Page 54, paragraph 2: The text implies that all wood affected by a natural disturbance will be recovered. This depends on the extent of the disturbance, the quality of the wood and economic considerations.

We propose the following wording: *“Special management plans ensure some recovery of these woods.”*

*Refer to section 3.1.3*

---

## Theme: Consideration of culturally important species

---

### **Recommendation #3:**

Given the uniqueness of Lake Sturgeon, we recommend:

- That it be included as an issue in tables 1 and 2 of the PAFIT;
- That it be the subject of a specific protection plan developed in collaboration with the communities concerned.

*Refer to section 3.2.1*

---

### **Opportunity for Improvement #3:**

Assess the appropriateness of updating the terms and conditions for wildlife sites of interest. The document "Sites fauniques d'intérêt (SFI) – Région du Nord-du-Québec (R10)" dates from 2012.

*Refer to section 3.2.1*

---

### **Opportunity for Improvement # 4:**

In Table 2 of the PAFITs, include the Mixedwood Stands Management Strategy as part of the solution and associate it with moose.

*Refer to section 3.2.1*

---

**Theme: Taking into account the perspectives, concerns and harmonization measures formulated by tallyman, Cree users of the territory and consultation organizations**

---

**Recommendation #4:**

*Recommendation 3 in the report “Review of the PAFIT 2018-2023”.*

Implement, jointly with the Crees, a process for disseminating monitoring results by:

- Explaining all the follow-ups that are carried out, how they are done, and what are the indicators;
- Determining which of the monitoring or indicators are of interest to the Cree;
- Determining when, how and to whom monitoring results should be transferred;
- Jointly developing the dissemination format (tables, map, or text) according to the target clientele.

*Refer to section 3.2.2*

---

**Opportunity for Improvement # 5:**

*Opportunity for improvement 11 in the report “Review of the PAFIT 2018-2023”.*

Produce an accessible version of the statistical tables of traplines. These are portraits that are interesting for tallyman but are currently too complex.

*Refer to section 3.2.2*

---

**Theme: Access to the territory**

---

**Recommendation # 5:**

*Recommendation 4 in the report “Review of the PAFIT 2018-2023”.*

The access road management plan is the only answer to the issues of access to the territory to PAFIT. As the development of this one is currently underway, it is relevant to identify interim measures that can be put in place as soon as possible.

*Refer to section 3.3*

---

**Opportunity for Improvement # 6:**

*Opportunity for improvement 13 in the report “Review of the PAFIT 2018-2023”.*

Conduct an evaluation of the road closure process to determine if time savings can be achieved at certain stages.

*Refer to section 3.3*

---

# 1. Context

---

The James Bay Advisory Committee on the Environment (JBACE) has the mandate to review and comment on forest management plans for the territory covered by Section 22 of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement (JBNQA), prior to ministerial approval. Accordingly, the JBACE reviewed the tactical plans for integrated forest development (in French: Plans d'aménagement forestier intégrés tactiques or PAFITs) for the period 2023-2028. The JBACE retained the services of *Le groupe CAF* to assist in this mandate.

The review takes into account the adapted forestry regime under the Agreement Concerning a New Relationship Between le Gouvernement du Québec and the Crees of Québec (also referred to as the *Paix des Braves*) as well as the forestry related provisions of the Agreement on Governance in the Eeyou Istchee James Bay Territory between the Crees of Eeyou Istchee and the Gouvernement du Québec.

The complete the review, *Le groupe CAF* focused on two parameters, namely, the protection of wildlife resources and access to such resources.<sup>1</sup>

Three (3) complementary elements are part of the review: consideration of climate change, the new format of the PAFITs and follow-up on the recommendations and opportunities for improvement of the CCEBJ that were communicated to the MFFP following the review of the PAFITs 2018-2023

## 1.1 Examination parameters

### EXAMINATION PARAMETER 1

Ensure the implementation of a planning process that supports and respects Cree wildlife harvesting rights and activities by protecting the Territory's wildlife resources and the habitats that support them.

### EXAMINATION PARAMETER 2

Ensure the implementation of a planning process that accounts for and supports the Crees' continued access to and use of the Territory.

### COMPLEMENTARY ELEMENTS TO THE REVIEW

#### 1. Consideration of climate change

---

<sup>1</sup> The full text of Appendix 1 of the call for tenders for the review of the 2023-2028 tactical plans for integrated forest development (*Appel d'offre pour l'Examen des plans d'aménagement forestier intégrés tactiques – Période 2023-2028*), which discusses the parameters in more detail, appears in Appendix 1 of this report.

The JBACE considers that climate change issues must be part of forest planning and management.

### 2. New format of the PAFITs

The MFFP will use a revamped format for the 2023-2028 PAFITs. The documents will be divided into four modules. Only one of these modules will be subject to official consultation and review by the JBACE.

Access to and consultation on all necessary information is requisite for JBACE reviews.

### 3. Tracking of previous recommendations and opportunities for improvement

The JBACE completed its review of the 2018-2023 PAFITs in April 2020. The recommendations and opportunities for improvement that were formulated at the time merit follow-up. The implementation of recommendations and opportunities for improvement that were not retained for the 2018-2023 PAFITs and were ‘pushed back’ to the 2023-2028 PAFITs, for example, will be tracked over the course of this review.

## 1.2 Scope of the review

Cree concerns and needs can be taken into consideration at various levels. Since PAFITs are strategic planning exercises, the consideration given to Cree concerns and needs must also be examined at that level. Some issues may not be addressed in the PAFIT but may be considered during operational planning. It is important to make this distinction when reviewing the PAFITs.

Similarly, we hold that a need or concern may be taken into account but may not necessarily be addressed favourably. All the while, where a decision is made not to act on a need or concern, whether in whole or in part, we expect the reason for that decision to be clearly explained.

Lastly, it is important to mention that the review of the PAFITs is a constructive exercise with a view to continuous improvement in the planning process.

We have chosen to divide the recommendations into two categories: recommendations and opportunities for improvement. A recommendation is made when a substantive issue is raised and we believe that changes will better address Cree needs and concerns.

An opportunity for improvement is raised when we observe a potential improvement to the PAFIT. Most often, these are clarifications that could be made for better understanding, but which do not affect the consideration of wildlife or land access concerns as such.

## 2. Method

---

The main stages in the PAFIT review process are as follows:

- Establishment of an analysis matrix including monitoring indicators for each parameter;
- Adoption of an interview questionnaire <sup>2</sup>;
- Reading and analysis of the PAFITs released for consultation on November 15, 2022. Note that the 14 forest management units (FMUs) were grouped under four (4) PAFITs;
- Reading and analysis of PAFIT-related documents:
  - Interim measures for the management of woodland caribou habitat;
  - Sustainable Forest Development Strategy;
  - Calculation of allowable cuts for 2023-2028, Report of the calculation for each forest management unit (FMU) under review. Note that FMU 085-62 has not been recalculated for the period 2023-2028 ;
  - Management standards for sites of wildlife interest <sup>3</sup>;
  - *Regulation respecting the sustainable development of forests (RSDF)*;
  - SFI and FSC forest certification standards;
  - Mixedwood Stands Management Strategy for the Paix des Braves adapted forestry regime territory;
  - *Guide de demande de fermeture de chemin* (Road closure request guide).
- Identification of key stakeholders for interviews:
  - MRNF representative for each of the joint working groups (JWG);
  - Cree representative for each of the JWGs;
  - Person in charge of drawing up the PAFITs.
- Conducting of interviews with key stakeholders<sup>4</sup>;
- Consultation of other stakeholders to obtain additional information;
- Summary of the information gathered and formulation of recommendations.

---

<sup>2</sup> The questionnaire given to all key stakeholders appears in Appendix 2.

<sup>3</sup> Identified sites of wildlife interest are subject to special management standards/procedures. These sites are not to be confused with areas of wildlife interest under the ANRQC (25%).

<sup>4</sup> Interviews were conducted with representatives of the MRNF only. We considered all interviews conducted for the 2018-2023 review.

### 3. Results and Recommendations

---

For the 2023-2028 period, the tactical planning of the Ministère des Ressources naturelles et des Forêts (MRNF) is presented in a modular form, namely:

1. Legal and administrative context
2. The territory and its occupants
3. Analysis of the issues
4. Tactical integrated forest management plan (PAFIT)

Only the PAFIT is available for consultation. There are four (4) PAFITs, grouping the management units by planning unit. This is in line with the streamlining and the concern for synthesis that we had observed, and welcomed, during the review of the 2018-2023 PAFIT.

We appreciate the new format. We would like to highlight the quality of the documents and the wealth of information provided. The Tactical Integrated Forest Management Plan (PAFIT) is lighter and, in our opinion, more accessible because it is more "operational" in nature.

The other three (3) modules, accompanying documents, are very important and relevant. They explain the context in which forest management takes place, and the issues of the stakeholders.

#### OPPORTUNITY FOR IMPROVEMENT #1

We believe that the accompanying documents (modules 1 to 3) should also be made available for consultation, even if the content is often factual rather than strategic in nature.

Strategies, policies and decisions, whether provincial or regional in scope, certainly have an impact on regional activity.

Here, it is not to put into question policies, strategies or other elements that have already been the subject of consultation, but to have the opportunity to comment on their implementation.

The review of the 2018-2023 PAFITs was completed in March 2020. The interval between the two versions of the PAFITs is reduced. Some of the recommendations and opportunities for improvement from the 2018-2023 review remain relevant.

## 3.1 General observations

### 3.1.1 Consultation process for PAFITs

Cree consultation and participation in tactical planning is a long-term and ongoing process. Examples include work on the Mixedwood Stands Management Strategy, Wildlife Habitat Directives (in progress), revision of trapline mapping for sites of interest (in progress), and management of access roads (in progress).

The PAFIT is the integrating element.

Cree consultation and participation must also be measured in light of the progress made in various files, upstream of a PAFIT. These elements are taken into account by the Chief Forester in the calculation of allowable cut and by the planners in operational planning.

We appreciate the choice of presenting the work in progress, with a timetable in some cases, and understand that this represents a commitment by the MRNF to complete this work.

The PAFITs consultation puts a great deal of pressure on both the stakeholders invited to comment and on the MRNF, which must provide information on the one hand, and collate the comments received for adoption on April 1, 2023, on the other. This is a very tight timeframe. Particular care must be taken to ensure that this consultation period does not overlap with other consultations or important periods, such as the holiday season and the Goose Break.

Furthermore, over the years forest management has become more complex and so have forest management plans. The diversity of issues, scientific advances, consultation and stakeholder involvement have made forest planning more integrated and less one-dimensional.

As a result, the timeline and schedule of the various consultations that are prescribed for the drafting and review of integrated forest management plans will have to be reviewed – including the JBACE review – to take into consideration the realities and availabilities of stakeholders and to ensure that they have all the elements necessary to participate in a timely manner.

The sequence of consultations and reviews will need to be consistent to ensure that consultations and reviews of the PAFITs take place before the consultations of the PAFIOs. In addition, the PAFITs made available to the JBACE for review should include comments from the CQFB. Ideally, the public should be asked to comment on draft PAFITs that already account for the comments provided by the JBACE and the CQFB.

#### RECOMMENDATION #1

In collaboration with the concerned parties, review the production calendar of the PAFIT to bolster stakeholder participation in a timely manner.

The JBACE would like to discuss the matter in greater detail with the MRNF.

### 3.1.2 Size of management units and coherence between tables

As mentioned earlier, the PAFITs are rich in information. This information is presented in the form of maps, tables and graphs by FMU or by trapline.

In the case of the tables, we observed differences in the total area and productive area of the management units. Depending on the purpose or the monitoring indicator illustrated, the areas sometimes include protected areas, water, unproductive land within the boundaries of the FMU, and sometimes not.

For example, the total area of management units differs between "The Land and its Occupants", "Issues Analysis" and the Chief Forester's reports on the calculation of allowable cut. These differences are sometimes small, sometimes large.

#### RECOMMENDATION #2

We understand that the calculation made serves as a reference according to the subject being treated. The total area of a management unit is a reference that must be unique.

We recommend that this reference be made and, if necessary, that it be noted in a footnote what is and is not included in a table.

The Analysis of the Issues document, on page 36, footnote 2, is a good example of relevant and accurate information.

### 3.1.3 The territory and its occupants

Although the document "The territory and its occupants" is not under consultation, we offer a number of observations and suggest opportunities for improvement.

**Observations: In the French version, pages in landscape are not displayed correctly.**

**St-Cyr Royal outfitter is not shown on maps 15 and 16.**

The document is well done and covers the resources of the territory well. In the interest of accuracy, we propose the following improvements:

## OPPORTUNITY FOR IMPROVEMENT #2

Page 4, paragraph 3: The text suggests that the JBNQA is a problem. The JBACE is of the opinion that it should refer to "problems with the regarding the forest management" which is more accurate.

We propose the following wording: "*The implementation of the JBNQA highlighted a number of problems regarding forest management*", (...).

Page 10, paragraph 2: The text suggests that the Governance Agreement is an element of implementation of the Paix des Braves. The JBACE believes that these are two separate things, but that the Paix des Braves has certainly created a favourable dynamic.

We propose the following wording: "*In light of the dynamic created under the Paix des Braves (...)*."

Page 54, paragraph 2: The text implies that all wood affected by a natural disturbance will be recovered. This depends on the extent of the disturbance, the quality of the wood and economic considerations.

We propose the following wording: "*Special management plans ensure some recovery of these woods.*"

## 3.2 Wildlife

### 3.2.1 Taking into account of culturally important species

#### Mention of species of interest

Wildlife species of importance to the Cree, as mentioned in Chapter 3 of the *Paix des Braves* (moose, marten, beaver, hare, caribou, partridge and fish: walleye, lake trout and brook trout), are considered in the PAFITs and the complementary documents.

The PAFITs also deal with most of the species reserved exclusively for the Cree under Section 24 of the JBNQA. However, some species are not mentioned at all<sup>5</sup>:

- Porcupine;
- Woodchuck;
- Sucker (fish).

The Lake Sturgeon, a culturally important species, is dealt with specifically in the document "The Territory and its Occupants". Per Table 5 of this document, it is a species classified as "threatened" by the Quebec government, with no targeted protection measures. It should be noted, however, that there are several protection measures for fish in a broader sense, including the protection of wildlife sites of interest.

---

<sup>5</sup> The polar bear and freshwater seal are not taken into account here because their ranges are not in the study area.

### RECOMMENDATION #3

Given the uniqueness of Lake Sturgeon, we recommend:

- That it be included as an issue in tables 1 and 2 of the PAFIT;
- That it be the subject of a specific protection plan developed in collaboration with the communities concerned.

### OPPORTUNITY FOR IMPROVEMENT #3

Assess the appropriateness of updating the terms and conditions for wildlife sites of interest. The document "Sites fauniques d'intérêt (SFI) – Région du Nord-du-Québec (R10)" dates from 2012.

The Woodland and Mountain Caribou Strategy is planned for 2023. In the meantime, the interim measures for the management of woodland caribou habitat (2019-2023) continue to apply.

The issue is accounted for in the calculation of allowable cuts:

“For the Nottaway, Assinica, and Témiscamie populations, the precautionary approach is maintained. This approach aims to improve the existing network of protected areas by maintaining protected areas where harvesting is prohibited for a period of 65 years. The management units 086-63, 086-64, 086-66, 026-61, 026-63, 026-64 and 026-65 have these protected areas covering a total area of 700,380 hectares<sup>6</sup>.”

“For the Détour herd population, the 2015 North of La Sarre Woodland Caribou Habitat Management Plan has been maintained. This plan is present in management units 085-51 and 085-62. The terms and conditions are essentially based on protection zones covering a total area of 169,280 hectares where harvesting is prohibited for a period ranging from 15 to 150 years<sup>7</sup>.”

The situation relative to woodland and mountain caribou is well documented in terms of issues, actions, and monitoring in place. The strategy that will be announced will lead to adjustments and adaptations at both the strategic and operational levels.

---

<sup>6</sup> JBACE translation from the document “Possibilité 2023-2028, Fiche sur Caribous forestiers et montagnards, Bureau du Forestier en chef, 17 octobre 2022, page 5.”

<sup>7</sup> Idem, page 6

An update of the PAFITs could then be necessary.

Moose is certainly a preferred species. The adoption and implementation of the Mixedwood Stands Management Strategy is a response to this issue as identified in Table 2 of the PAFITs.

In the PAFITs, Table 2 “Grouping of issues that require similar solutions,” moose is mentioned as an issue, but no solution is associated with it.

#### OPPORTUNITY FOR IMPROVEMENT #4

In Table 2 of the PAFITs, include the Mixedwood Stands Management Strategy as part of the solution and associate it with moose.

### Culturally important species listed as threatened or vulnerable

The least weasel and wolverine are identified in both Section 24 of the JBNQA and/or Section 3 of the Paix des Braves and on the list of species at risk for northern Quebec.

For these species at risk without a protection plan, the concepts of the coarse and fine filters apply.

The coarse filter identifies sensitive species of interest (caribou, marten, black-backed woodpecker and pileated woodpecker) and species of interest (moose, black bear and fish). The premise is that healthy habitats for these species are beneficial to a majority of other species. The Mixedwood Stands Management Strategy is an example of a rough filter.

It should be noted that over the course of the interviews conducted during the 2018-2023 review, no specific concerns for wolverine and least weasel emerged. Where appropriate, the concern will be addressed at the PAFIO and PRAN level.

### Habitat status

Habitat status is monitored based on different indicators linked to landscape-related issues, such as:

- The age structure of forests, which has a strong influence on biodiversity;
- The spatial organization of forests based on mosaic cutting, the aim of which is to preserve the Cree traditional way of life, as provided for in the *Paix des Braves*;
- Mixed stands, which provide important habitat for wildlife. Mature and old-growth mixed stands provide habitat for, among other species, marten, hare and moose, whereas young mixed stands benefit moose, hare, ruffed grouse and beaver;
- Wetlands and riparian habitat, which are an important source of biodiversity and benefit a vast majority of species.

Habitat quality models (HQM) are being developed. It is a planning tool, both strategic and operational, depending on the territory of application.

## Management strategies and silvicultural treatments relating to habitat needs

There are three (3) documents of importance in this regard: the Woodland and Mountain Caribou Strategy, the Wildlife Habitat Directives and the Mixedwood Stands Management Strategy.

At present, only the Mixedwood Stands Management Strategy is adopted and implemented (February 2021). The other two are planned for 2023.

**Observation: In the PAFITs, in the footnote to Table 14, the Mixedwood Stands Management Strategy is referred to as a document under development, whereas it is adopted.**

The development strategies put forward aim to respond to the issues identified on the territory, including wildlife needs:

- Variable retention cutting and irregular shelterwood cutting to maintain attributes specific to mature and old-growth forests, as well as biological legacies<sup>8</sup>;
- Measures to maintain habitats associated with mixedwood stands,<sup>9</sup> such as mitigation measures during stand tending treatments (e.g., conservation of fruit bushes<sup>10</sup>) and the spreading of treatments over time to maintain young, dense stands that provide habitat for small wildlife species;
- Measures to limit simplification of internal stand structure in young second-growth stands (to preserve young, dense stands and thereby provide suitable habitat for snowshoe hare, moose and American marten)<sup>11</sup>;
- Targets for old-growth forests (habitats of interest) and regenerating forests<sup>12</sup>;
- Maintenance of connectivity between habitats.

The network of protected areas, biological refuges and exceptional forest ecosystems also contributes to habitat protection.

The RSDF and the *Regulation respecting wildlife habitats* also take wildlife habitats into account.

Finally, the land use allocations and the identification of wildlife sites of interest include other measures related to wildlife, for example:

---

<sup>8</sup> Source: 2023-2028 PAFIT Issues and Solutions Sheets 1.02.1 and 1.03.1.

<sup>9</sup> Source: 2023-2028 PAFIT Issues and Solutions Sheet 1.01.2.

<sup>10</sup> Sorb, elderberry, juneberry, hazel, arrowwood and cherry.

<sup>11</sup> Source: 2023-2028 PAFIT Issues and Solutions Sheet 1.04.1.

<sup>12</sup> Source: 2023-2028 PAFIT Issues and Solutions Sheet 1.09.1.

- Protection of strips of land connected to a site of wildlife interest;
- Special constraints applicable to identified wildlife development areas.

### Consideration of areas of wildlife interest (1% and 25%)

The PAFITs mention areas of wildlife interest (25%) because special management standards apply in these areas. Although the 1% is not directly mentioned, they fall within areas where management activities are prohibited, which are mentioned in the PAFITs.

The Cree section of the PAFIT includes maps identifying the most up-to-date areas of special interest. It provides a picture of traplines and areas of wildlife interest (25%) and specifies that a trapline or 25% of the productive forest area of a trapline might be closed if it does not meet the target thresholds for young and old-growth forests.

Note that the MRNF avoids forest planning within new areas of special interest (1%) that are in the process of being granted official status.

All areas of wildlife interest (1% and 25%) are taken into consideration upstream in the calculation of allowable cuts.

### 3.2.2 Consideration of the insights, concerns and harmonization measures formulated by tallymen, Cree land users and coordination bodies

There is no dedicated and comprehensive consultation for the PAFIT. Forest management on the Paix des Braves territory involves several stakeholders (Cree-Québec Forestry Board, Cree Nation Government, Joint Working Groups, tallymen), each with their own mission, fields of interest and expertise, and prerogatives. Their level of action, whether strategic or operational, also varies.

As mentioned earlier, the PAFITs are the integrating element at the strategic planning level.

The PAFIO and the PRAN are the implementation tools.

We note in the PAFITs, in the accompanying documents, and in the various documents consulted, especially those of a strategic nature, that the Crees' concerns regarding wildlife are documented and followed up.

The adequacy between a concern expressed and its consideration in forest management is difficult to measure and is often a matter of perception.

We also add a question of understanding. The PAFITs are rich in information, often complex and very technical.

The development of simplified tools that are accessible to the target clientele would contribute to a better understanding of the issues and solutions. In this spirit, we take up Opportunity for Improvement 11 and Recommendation 3 of the 2018-2023 PAFITs review.

## OPPORTUNITY FOR IMPROVEMENT #5

*Opportunity for improvement 11 in the report “Review of the PAFIT 2018-2023”.*

Produce an accessible version of the statistical tables of traplines. These are portraits that are interesting for tallyman but are currently too complex.

## RECOMMENDATION #4

*Recommendation 3 in the report “Review of the PAFIT 2018-2023”.*

Implement, jointly with the Crees, a process for disseminating monitoring results by:

- Explaining all the follow-ups that are carried out, how they are done, and what are the indicators;
- Determining which of the monitoring or indicators are of interest to the Cree;
- Determining when, how and to whom monitoring results should be transferred;
- Jointly developing the dissemination format (tables, map, or text) according to the target clientele.

The creation of a forestry department within the Cree Nation Government and its beneficial contribution to the dissemination of forestry information to the lay community should be noted in this regard.

### 3.2.3 Consideration of wildlife habitat management norms and strategies

#### Measures to identify and protect species at risk

To effectively protect species at risk, knowing where they are located is crucial. Land users are invited to report habitats or species at risk to the MRNF. The reports are verified before being included in land and taken into account in land uses where applicable.

Issues and Solutions Sheet 3.02.2 deals specifically with spawning grounds in order to ensure that precautionary measures are taken while awaiting validation.

### 3.3 Access to the territory

The problems, issues and concerns raised at the TLGIRTs or expressed by the Crees are set out in the PAFITs. In this regard, needs are identified in relation to limiting the expansion of the road network, reducing redundancy in the network and the quality of access.

Table 17 of the PAFITs summarizes this by stating the values and objectives on which the access road management plan is based. These include free movement of fish, protection of spawning grounds and maintenance of woodland caribou habitat.

There was a joint project with the Cree to close 15 km of access roads.

There is no change from the 2018-2023 PAFITs. We reiterate the recommendation and opportunity for improvement that we made at the time.

#### RECOMMENDATION #5

*Recommendation 4 in the report “Review of the PAFIT 2018-2023”.*

The access road management plan is the only answer to the issues of access to the territory to PAFIT. As the development of this one is currently underway, it is relevant to identify interim measures that can be put in place as soon as possible.

#### OPPORTUNITY FOR IMPROVEMENT #6

*Opportunity for improvement 13 in the report “Review of the PAFIT 2018-2023”.*

Conduct an evaluation of the road closure process to determine if time savings can be achieved at certain stages.

## 3.4 Climate change

The JBACE considers that issues related to climate change must be part of forest planning and management.

“In October 2021, it tabled a draft Climate Change Adaptation Strategy for Forest Management and Development for public and Indigenous consultations. The draft Strategy is based on four key topics designed to:

- improve knowledge of the impacts of climate change;
- strengthen integrated management of the risks associated with natural disturbances;
- maintain the forest’s resilience and productive capacity;
- maintain access to the forest.”<sup>13</sup>

Climate change is presented as a challenge, an opportunity and a risk factor.

It is an important and unavoidable issue because, among other things, we do not know everything about the effects and extent of the changes. The habitat of animal and plant species associated with the forest environment will therefore also be affected by climate change.

The possibility of a growing demand, as a whole, for wood products as a substitute for products with a higher environmental footprint, may become an opportunity for the development of new businesses and for the consolidation of existing ones.

Finally, as a risk factor, climate change, through species maladaptation, epidemics and invasive species, may lead to changes in management strategy and objectives.

Flexibility in management will be required to make the necessary adaptations as knowledge advances.

In the medium and long term, there must also be an assessment of assumptions and projections regarding forest growth and productivity, regeneration and renewal, the quality of wildlife habitats in general and the maintenance of old growth forests in particular.

---

<sup>13</sup> Ministère des Ressources naturelles et des Forêts, Legal and administrative context, Document in support of the development of the 2023-2028 PAFITs, p.10

## 4. Conclusion

---

The review of the 2023-2028 PAFITs followed on from the 2018-2023 review. We have not repeated all the findings of that review, but have focused on what we consider to be new, significant and contributing factors.

The planning exercise is constantly evolving and takes place at various levels. In setting out its parameters, the JBACE has identified its concerns and interests as focused but not restrictive. Overall, the plans respond well to these concerns and interests.

We appreciate the new modular format of the PAFITs. While the PAFIT, module 4, deals specifically with one territory, the other three (3) modules address broader strategic considerations. For us, it is in line with the development of tools and ways of doing things, to make forest management planning more accessible and comprehensive.

---

---

*For the next generation of PAFITs, Le groupe CAF proposes to the JBACE, the following three (3) review parameters which are, in our view, interrelated and certainly important issues:*

- *Accesses, which will allow the progress of the road access management plan to be measured;*
  - *Wetlands and bodies of water;*
  - *Climate change.*
- 

This report was produced by the CAF group under the supervision of Paul Bouvier, ing.f.

We would like to thank the various stakeholders for their excellent collaboration in the review of the PAFITs, as well as the JBACE, which placed its trust in us to carry out the mandate and provided us with support throughout the exercise.

## 5. References

---

- Bureau du Forestier en chef. 2018. Fascicule 4.17 -Cris. Manuel de détermination des possibilités forestières. Gouvernement du Québec. 5 pages.
- Bureau du Forestier en chef. 2022. Possibilités forestières 2023-2028- Comptabilisation et suivi du carbone forestier Gouvernement du Québec. 4 pages.
- Bureau du Forestier en chef. 2022. Possibilités forestières 2023-2028- Caribous forestiers et montagnards Gouvernement du Québec. 11 pages.
- Bureau du Forestier en chef. Possibilités forestières 2023-2028, Rapport du calcul pour les unités d'aménagement 026-61, 026-62, 026-63, 026-64, 026-65, 026-66, 086-63, 086-64, 086-65, 086-66, 087-62, 087-63 et 086-64.
- Gouvernement du Québec. 1998. La Convention de la Baie-James et du Nord québécois et conventions complémentaires. Les publications du Québec. 754 p.
- Gouvernement du Québec. 2002. Entente concernant une nouvelle relation entre le Gouvernement du Québec et les Cris du Québec. Secrétariat aux affaires autochtones, Gouvernement du Québec. 108 p.
- Ministère des Forêts, de la Faune et des Parcs. 2012. Sites fauniques d'intérêts (SFI) – Région du Nord du Québec (R10). Gouvernement du Québec. 4 pages.
- Ministère des ressources naturelles et des Forêts. 2022. Plan d'aménagement forestier intégré tactique 2023-2028. Unités d'aménagement 026-61, 026-62, 026-63, 026-64, 026-65 et 026-66. Direction générale du secteur nord-ouest, Gouvernement du Québec. 133 pages.
- Ministère des ressources naturelles et des Forêts. 2022. Plan d'aménagement forestier intégré tactique 2023-2028. Unités d'aménagement 085-62. Direction générale du secteur nord-ouest, Gouvernement du Québec. 91 pages.
- Ministère des ressources naturelles et des Forêts. 2022. Plan d'aménagement forestier intégré tactique 2023-2028. Unités d'aménagement 086-63, 086-64, 086-65 et 086-66. Direction générale du secteur nord-ouest, Gouvernement du Québec. 122 pages.
- Ministère des ressources naturelles et des Forêts. 2022. Plan d'aménagement forestier intégré tactique 2023-2028. Unités d'aménagement 087-62, 087-63 et 087-64. Direction générale du secteur nord-ouest, Gouvernement du Québec. 114 pages.
- Ministère des ressources naturelles et des Forêts. 2022. Contexte légal et administratif, document en soutien à l'élaboration des Plans d'aménagement forestier tactique 2023-2028 – Version préliminaire, Région Nord-du-Québec. 30 pages.
- Ministère des ressources naturelles et des Forêts. 2022. Le territoire et ses occupants, document en soutien à l'élaboration des Plans d'aménagement forestier tactique 2023-2028 – Version préliminaire, Région Nord-du-Québec. 107 pages.

Ministère des ressources naturelles et des Forêts. 2022. Analyse des enjeux, document en soutien à l'élaboration des Plans d'aménagement forestier tactique 2023-2028 – Version préliminaire, Région Nord-du-Québec. 78 pages.

Ministère des Forêts, de la Faune et des Parcs, 2021 Stratégie d'aménagement des peuplements mixtes pour le territoire du régime forestier adapté de la paix des Braves, 42 pages.

Ministère des Forêts, de la Faune et des Parc. 2021. Demande de fermeture de chemins multiusages – Guide et formulaire du demandeur. Direction de la coordination opérationnelle. Gouvernement du Québec. 9 pages

Ministère des Forêts, de la Faune et des Parcs, 2020 Rapport de suivi des commentaires du CCEBJ sur le PAFIT 2018-2023 modifié, 8 pages.

.



jeopardize habitats and the interconnectivity required by other species reserved for the Cree per section 24 of the JBNQA (e.g., beaver, black bear, mustelids, sturgeon)<sup>14</sup>.

The insights, concerns and harmonisation measures expressed by Tallymen, Cree land users, and collaborative planning bodies (e.g., the Joint Working Groups and the CQFB) that relate to wildlife and wildlife habitats are crucial inputs that should factor in the development of the PAFITs. A thorough integration of the orientations stemming from applicable laws, regulations and policies relating to wildlife habitat management is also necessary during the PAFIT development process.

The JBACE's review will thus seek to confirm that the PAFIT planning process allows due consideration of 1) stakeholder insights and concerns relating to wildlife; and, 2) the orientations, treatments and prescriptions set out in applicable wildlife habitat management instruments.

### **Examination parameter n° 2**

#### **Ensure the implementation of a planning process that accounts for and supports the Crees' continued access to and use of the Territory.**

##### Context

Continued access to wildlife habitats is a key concern. The planning and management of access infrastructures is also a strategic issue for mitigating access-related disturbances that may affect wildlife and wildlife habitats.

The consideration of Cree concerns and of proposed mitigation and monitoring measures to ensure continued Cree access to and use of the Territory (e.g., siting of roads and water crossings, monitoring silvicultural treatments), are key elements that must be a part of the PAFIT drafting process.

Examination parameters n° 1 and n°2 are different but intimately linked. While parameter n° 1 focuses on the protection of Cree wildlife harvesting rights by ensuring a process that safeguards wildlife resources themselves, parameter n° 2 focuses on ensuring a planning process that supports the Cree's continued access to the said resources.

Here again, like parameter n° 1, the JBACE's review will thus seek to confirm that the PAFIT planning process allows due consideration of 1) stakeholder insights and concerns relating to

---

<sup>14</sup> Schedule 2 of Section 24 of the JBNQA provides the complete list of species reserved exclusively for the Cree.

access throughout the Territory; and, 2) the orientations, treatments and prescriptions set out in applicable or interim management instruments relating to access infrastructures.<sup>15</sup>

### **Complementary elements to the review of 2023-2028 PAFITs**

#### **1. Consideration of climate change**

The JBACE holds that climate change issues should be part of forest planning and management. Comments on the integration and approach used for their consideration in the 2023-2028 PAFITs may be formulated as a complementary element.

#### **2. New format of the 2023-2028 PAFITs**

The MFFP will use a revamped format for the 2023-2028 PAFITs. The documents will be divided into four modules. Only one of these modules will be subject to official consultation and review by the JBACE.

Access to and consultation on all necessary information is requisite for JBACE reviews. Comments on the matter may be formulated as a complementary element.

#### **3.3. Tracking of previous recommendations and opportunities for improvement**

The JBACE completed its review of the 2018-2023 PAFITs in April 2020. The recommendations and opportunities for improvement that were formulated at the time merit follow-up. The implementation of recommendations and opportunities for improvement that were not retained for the 2018-2023 PAFITs and were ‘pushed back’ to the 2023-2028 PAFITs, for example, will be tracked over the course of this review. Comments on the matter may be formulated as a complementary element.

---

<sup>15</sup> Paragraphs 24.3.1 to 24.3.31 of the JBNQA state that Cree wildlife harvesting rights include the right to travel throughout the Territory, at all times of year, without authorization and subject to a minimum of control or regulations.

## Appendix 2 – Interview questionnaires distributed to stakeholders

---

### CONDUCTION OF INTERVIEWS FOR THE REVIEW OF THE 2023-2028 PAFITS

#### CONTEXT

In accordance with paragraph 22.3.34 of the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement (JBNQA), the James Bay Advisory Committee on the Environment (JBACE) is currently proceeding with the review of the 2023-2028 tactical plans for integrated forest development (also known by the French acronym 'PAFITs') that are applicable in the James Bay Territory.

The objective of the exercise is to review the process for taking Cree concerns into consideration during the planning of the PAFITs, in order to:

- Ensure the implementation of a planning process that supports and respects Cree wildlife harvesting rights and activities by protecting the Territory's wildlife resources and the habitats that support them; and,
- Ensure the implementation of a planning process that accounts for and supports the Crees' continued access to and use of the Territory.

In this regard, the JBACE's review will include exchanges with different stakeholders involved in the drafting of the PAFITs in order to evaluate how the concerns raised by the various actors are accounted for in the plans.

#### **Constructive nature of the review**

- The JBACE's review is grounded in a constructive approach of continued improvement.
- The review and its related exchanges are opportunities for the JBACE to determine how the concerns and comments of the actors are considered and if the justifications for the decisions made are available and clear.
- The JBACE wants to ensure that there is an effective process for the consideration of the issues, concerns, needs, etc. as expressed by local and regional actors over the course of the planning of the PAFITs.
- Once the review is completed, the JBACE will offer recommendations for the strengthening and improvement of the process.

## INTERVIEW PROCESS

### GROUPS TO CONSULT

For the review of the 14 PAFITs, we have identified 7 consultation groups:

- FMUs 026-61 and 026-62: Community of Mistissini and management unit for Chibougamau;
- FMUs 026-63 and 026-64: Community of Oujé-Bougoumou et management unit for Chibougamau;
- FMU 085-62: Community of Waskaganish and management unit for Mont Plamondon;
- FMU 086-63: Community of Waskaganish management unit for Harricana-Nord;
- FMUs 26-65 and 026-66: Community of Waswanipi management unit for Chibougamau
- FMUs 086-64, 086-65, and 086-66: Community of Waswanipi management unit for Quévillon
- FMUs 087-62, 087-63, and 087-64: Community of Waswanipi management unit for Quévillon

### STEPS IN THE WORK PLAN

The main steps in the work plan for the interviews are as follows:

- Three sets of representatives will be identified for each of the following groups for consultation:
  - MRNF (planning)
  - JWG (Cree member)
  - JWG (MRNF member)
- The JWG (Cree member) may invite any person of interest to the interview (Tallyman, other land users, representatives on the TLGIRT, etc.).
- Two weeks before the interview, the questionnaire will be transmitted to the various representatives in order to facilitate preparation for a fruitful interview. The blank questionnaire is not confidential and can be circulated by the representatives throughout their networks to collect additional comments.
- Each set of representatives will be interviewed individually.
- 2 hours will be set aside for each group of representatives.

In addition to these interviews, a questionnaire will also be transmitted electronically to the applicable holder of a timber supply guarantee (TSG) for a given FMU or group of FMUs. If a territory is certified, the applicable TSG holder will be targeted. The TSG holders will be questioned only on parameter #2 which covers the road network. The TSG holders will also be contacted by telephone if additional clarifications are required. We wish to communicate with the TSG holders because they are generally the important actors in relation to issues concerning the road network.

#### Notes

1. Over the course of the review, it is possible that additional interviews will occur with other actors if required.
2. Although the questions are designed to cover specific elements, the interviewees are encouraged to provide additional information, at their discretion, in order to enrich the discussions and the review.
3. The questionnaires are designed to stimulate an open dialogue and to cover the breadth of the indicators identified for the review of the PAFITs. However, it is possible that we may develop additional questions over the course of the interviews based on the discussions.

# INTERVIEW OUTLINE – MRNF PLANNING

## PARAMETERS

The interview questions stem from the two review parameters established by the JBACE. The two parameters are outlined in detail below. Note that each of the questions must be considered in the context of the PAFIT.

### PARAMETER #1

**Statement of the parameter:** Ensure the implementation of a planning process that supports and respects Cree wildlife harvesting rights and activities by protecting the Territory's wildlife resources and the habitats that support them.

**Elements of the analysis:**

- Consideration of culturally-important species;
- Consideration of the insights, observations, concerns and harmonization measures formulated by:
  - The Tallymen;
  - The Cree land users;
  - The coordination bodies;
- Consideration of wildlife habitat management norms and strategies.

The JBACE's review will thus seek to confirm that the PAFIT planning process allows due consideration of 1) stakeholder insights and concerns relating to wildlife; and, 2) the orientations, treatments and prescriptions set out in applicable wildlife habitat management instruments.

### PARAMETER #2

**Statement of the parameter:** Implementation of a planning process that accounts for and supports the Crees' continued access to and use of the Territory.

**Elements of the analysis:**

- Consideration of the insights and observations expressed by:
  - The Tallymen;
  - The Cree land users;
  - The coordination bodies.

Examination parameters #1 and #2 are different but intimately linked. While parameter #1 focuses on the protection of Cree wildlife harvesting rights by ensuring a process that safeguards wildlife resources themselves, parameter #2 focuses on ensuring a planning process that supports the Cree's continued access to the said resources.<sup>16</sup> Here again, like parameter #1, the JBACE's review will thus seek to confirm that the PAFIT planning process allows due consideration of 1) stakeholder insights and concerns relating to access throughout the Territory; and, 2) the orientations, treatments and prescriptions set out in applicable or interim management instruments relating to access infrastructures

---

<sup>16</sup> Paragraphs 24.3.1 to 24.3.31 of the JBNQA state that Cree wildlife harvesting rights include the right to travel throughout the Territory, at all times of year, without authorization and subject to a minimum of control or regulations.

## INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

### THEME #1 WILDLIFE SPECIES OF INTEREST

1.1 On what basis are the species of interest that must be considered in the tactical planning determined?

1.2 What are the available tools used to protect wildlife resources and their habitats? Which tools are used for the PAFIT and how are they integrated into the planning process?

1.3 Are protection plans available for all of the endangered and vulnerable species, and species that are likely to be so designated, that are also culturally-important for the Cree (e.g., yellow sturgeon)?

1.4 What measures are in place to allow for the identification and protection of species of concern, and of endangered or vulnerable species? What is done to ensure that measures are implemented on the ground if the location of a species is not well known?

### THEME #2 MANAGEMENT AND WILDLIFE

2.1 Do the management strategies presented in the PAFIT link up with the different habitats needs of the species?

2.2 How are the strategies for the conservation of wildlife habitats monitored?

### THEME #3 FOLLOW-UP ON CONCERNS REGARDING WILDLIFE

3.1 How are Cree concerns regarding wildlife treated? What determines if a concern is integrated or not into the PAFIT?

3.2 Are monitoring indicators documented in the PAFIT that address Cree concerns regarding wildlife?

3.3 How do you gauge the satisfaction of the Cree with the process regarding the consideration of wildlife resources in the PAFIT?

3.4 If a concern is not considered in the context of the PAFIT, could it be considered at another level (e.g., allowable cut calculations, land use designations, operational harmonization measures, wildlife directives, etc.)?

3.5 How are the results of the various wildlife monitoring initiatives communicated to the Cree?

### THEME #4 ACCESS TO WILDLIFE RESOURCES

4.1 Pending the filing of the Access Road Management Plan, it is mentioned that there is the possibility of implementing interim measures. Can you clarify the approach for implementing these measures (e.g., planned consultations, timeline and procedures for updating PAFITs if necessary)?

4.2 How are Cree access needs to wildlife resources accounted for in the PAFIT?

4.3 Does a consultation process for new access infrastructure – in conjunction with access roads for hunting, fishing and trapping activities – exist? And, can you elaborate further on when and on how the Cree were consulted to determine Cree road network needs during the planning process?

4.4 Is a road closure planned for the 2023-2028 period? If so, how is this presented to the Cree?

## INTERVIEW OUTLINE – JWG (MRNF MEMBER)

### PARAMETERS

The interview questions stem from the two review parameters established by the JBACE. The two parameters are outlined in detail below. Note that each of the questions must be considered in the context of the PAFIT.

#### PARAMETER #1

**Statement of the parameter:** Ensure the implementation of a planning process that supports and respects Cree wildlife harvesting rights and activities by protecting the Territory’s wildlife resources and the habitats that support them.

**Elements of the analysis:**

- Consideration of culturally-important species;
- Consideration of the insights, observations, concerns and harmonization measures formulated by:
  - The Tallymen;
  - The Cree land users;
  - The coordination bodies;
- Consideration of wildlife habitat management norms and strategies.

The JBACE’s review will thus seek to confirm that the PAFIT planning process allows due consideration of 1) stakeholder insights and concerns relating to wildlife; and, 2) the orientations, treatments and prescriptions set out in applicable wildlife habitat management instruments.

#### PARAMETER #2

**Statement of the parameter:** Implementation of a planning process that accounts for and supports the Crees’ continued access to and use of the Territory.

**Elements of the analysis:**

- Consideration of the insights and observations expressed by:
  - The Tallymen;
  - The Cree land users;
  - The coordination bodies.

Examination parameters #1 and #2 are different but intimately linked. While parameter #1 focuses on the protection of Cree wildlife harvesting rights by ensuring a process that safeguards wildlife resources themselves, parameter #2 focuses on ensuring a planning process that supports the Cree’s continued access to the said resources.<sup>17</sup> Here again, like parameter #1, the JBACE’s review will thus seek to confirm that the PAFIT planning process allows due consideration of 1) stakeholder insights and concerns relating to access throughout the Territory; and, 2) the orientations, treatments and prescriptions set out in applicable or interim management instruments relating to access infrastructures.

---

<sup>17</sup> Paragraphs 24.3.1 to 24.3.31 of the JBNQA state that Cree wildlife harvesting rights include the right to travel throughout the Territory, at all times of year, without authorization and subject to a minimum of control or regulations.

## INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

### THEME #1 WILDLIFE SPECIES OF INTEREST

1.1 What are the wildlife species of interest that must be accounted for during the planning process?

1.2 Do you feel that the wildlife resources and their associated habitats are adequately considered in the PAFIT for the Cree?

1.3 Are protection plans available for all of the endangered and vulnerable species, and species that are like to be so designated, that are also culturally-important for the Cree (e.g., yellow sturgeon)?

1.4 Are the wildlife protection measures that are in place sufficient for the Cree?

### THEME #2 MANAGEMENT AND WILDLIFE

2.1 Do the management strategies presented in the PAFIT link up with the different habitats needs of the species?

2.2 How are the strategies for the conservation of wildlife habitats monitored?

### THEME #3 FOLLOW-UP ON CONCERS REGARDING WILDLIFE

3.1 Were Cree concerns regarding wildlife and wildlife habitats discussed during the consultations held for the PAFITs?

3.2 How are Cree concerns regarding wildlife treated? What determines if a concern is integrated or not into the PAFIT?

3.3 How do you gauge the satisfaction of the Cree with the process regarding the consideration of wildlife resources in the PAFIT?

3.4 If a concern is not considered in the context of the PAFIT, could it be considered at another level (e.g., allowable cut calculations, land use designations, operational harmonization measures, wildlife directives, etc.)?

3.5 What follow-up is undertaken regarding the concerns that were expressed in relation to wildlife resources? If a concern is not considered, does the MRNF explain its decision?

3.6 Are you satisfied with the process for the consideration of wildlife resources in the PAFIT?

3.7 How are the results of the various wildlife monitoring initiatives communicated to the Cree?

### THEME #4 ACCESS TO WILDLIFE RESOURCES

4.1 What are the needs of the Cree in terms of the road network? Can you elaborate further on when and on how the Cree were consulted to determine Cree road network needs during the planning process?

4.2 How are Cree access needs to wildlife resources accounted for in the PAFIT?

4.3 Does a consultation process for new access infrastructure – in conjunction with access roads for hunting, fishing and trapping activities – exist?

4.4 Is a road closure planned for the 2023-2028 period? If so, how is it presented to the Cree?

## INTERVIEW OUTLINE – JWG (CREE MEMBER)

### PARAMETERS

The interview questions stem from the two review parameters established by the JBACE. The two parameters are outlined in detail below. Note that each of the questions must be considered in the context of the PAFIT.

#### PARAMETER #1

**Statement of the parameter:** Ensure the implementation of a planning process that supports and respects Cree wildlife harvesting rights and activities by protecting the Territory’s wildlife resources and the habitats that support them.

**Elements of the analysis:**

- Consideration of culturally-important species;
- Consideration of the insights, observations, concerns and harmonization measures formulated by:
  - The Tallymen;
  - The Cree land users;
  - The coordination bodies;
- Consideration of wildlife habitat management norms and strategies.

The JBACE’s review will thus seek to confirm that the PAFIT planning process allows due consideration of 1) stakeholder insights and concerns relating to wildlife; and, 2) the orientations, treatments and prescriptions set out in applicable wildlife habitat management instruments.

#### PARAMETER #2

**Statement of the parameter:** Implementation of a planning process that accounts for and supports the Crees’ continued access to and use of the Territory.

**Elements of the analysis:**

- Consideration of the insights and observations expressed by:
  - The Tallymen;
  - The Cree land users;
  - The coordination bodies.

Examination parameters #1 and #2 are different but intimately linked. While parameter #1 focuses on the protection of Cree wildlife harvesting rights by ensuring a process that safeguards wildlife resources themselves, parameter #2 focuses on ensuring a planning process that supports the Cree’s continued access to the said resources.<sup>18</sup> Here again, like parameter #1, the JBACE’s review will thus seek to confirm that the PAFIT planning process allows due consideration of 1) stakeholder insights and concerns relating to access throughout the Territory; and, 2) the orientations, treatments and prescriptions set out in applicable or interim management instruments relating to access infrastructures.

---

<sup>18</sup> Paragraphs 24.3.1 to 24.3.31 of the JBNQA state that Cree wildlife harvesting rights include the right to travel throughout the Territory, at all times of year, without authorization and subject to a minimum of control or regulations.

## INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

### THEME #1 WILDLIFE SPECIES OF INTEREST

1.1 What are the wildlife species of interest that must be accounted for during the planning process?

1.2 Do you feel that the wildlife resources and their associated habitats are considered in the PAFIT for the Cree?

1.3 Do you have concerns relating to the protection of wildlife resources and of their associated habitats? Were these concerns discussed during the consultations held for the PAFITs?

### THEME #2 MANAGEMENT AND WILDLIFE

2.1 Are you aware of the strategies and measures that are in place in the PAFIT for the protection of endangered and vulnerable wildlife species, and for species that are likely to be so designated – including measures to protect their habitats?

2.2 Are the measures presented in the PAFIT sufficiently specific to address exceptional sites, habitats or resources, and of the particular needs of endangered and vulnerable species, of species likely to be so designated, or of species of cultural interest?

2.3 Are the measures presented in the PAFIT sufficient to protect the wildlife resources and habitats?

2.4 Does the MRNF communicate to the Cree the results of the various monitoring initiatives regarding the wildlife resources and habitat protection measures presented in the PAFIT?

### THEME #3 FOLLOW-UP ON CONCERNS REGARDING WILDLIFE

3.1 Are you aware of follow-ups regarding the consideration of your concerns regarding wildlife resources? If a concern is not considered, does the MRNF explain its decision?

3.2 Are you satisfied with the process for the consideration of wildlife resources in the PAFIT?

### THEME #4 ACCESS TO WILDLIFE RESOURCES

4.1 What are your needs in terms of the road network? Can you elaborate further on when and on how you and other Cree stakeholders were consulted to determine Cree road network needs during the planning process?

4.2 Is the current road network and quality of the network in the Territory adequate for accessing wildlife resources?

4.3 Are you involved in the strategic development of the road network and in the closing of roads?

5. In general, how do you see the evolution of forest management in recent years?

## QUESTIONNAIRE – TSG HOLDER

The interview questions stem from the two review parameters established by the JBACE. The second is outlined in detail below, given that it is within the sphere of influence of the forest industry. Note that each of the questions must be considered in the context of the PAFIT.

**Statement of the parameter:** Implementation of a planning process that accounts for and supports the Crees' continued access to and use of the Territory.

**Elements of the analysis:**

- Consideration of the insights and observations expressed by:
  - The Tallymen;
  - The Cree land users;
  - The coordination bodies.

Examination parameters #1 and #2 are different but intimately linked. While parameter #1 focuses on the protection of Cree wildlife harvesting rights by ensuring a process that safeguards wildlife resources themselves, parameter #2 focuses on ensuring a planning process that supports the Cree's continued access to the said resources.<sup>19</sup> Here again, like parameter #1, the JBACE's review will thus seek to confirm that the PAFIT planning process allows due consideration of 1) stakeholder insights and concerns relating to access throughout the Territory; and, 2) the orientations, treatments and prescriptions set out in applicable or interim management instruments relating to access infrastructures.

### INTERVIEWS QUESTIONS

4.1 Do you have an access road management plan? Is this plan transmitted to the MRNF for consideration in the PAFIT?

4.2 Are Cree access needs to the territory accounted for in the access road management plan? Can you elaborate further on when and on how the Cree were consulted to determine Cree road network needs during the planning process?

---

<sup>19</sup> Paragraphs 24.3.1 to 24.3.31 of the JBNQA state that Cree wildlife harvesting rights include the right to travel throughout the Territory, at all times of year, without authorization and subject to a minimum of control or regulations.