Alliance for Water Stewardship

Audit Report - Nestlé Waters North America, Inc.
Hope, BC Water Bottling Facility

The AWS International Water Stewardship Standard, Version 1.0, April 8th, 2014

Report Issued: January 31, 2018

SCSglobal SERVICES
Setting the standard for sustainability™

2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600, Emeryville, CA 94608 USA
+1.510.452.8000 main | +1.510.452.8001 fax
www.SCSglobalServices.com

Introduction to the Alliance for Water Stewardship
The AWS Standard ("the Standard") is intended to drive water stewardship, which is defined as the use of water that is socially equitable, environmentally sustainable and economically beneficial, achieved through a stakeholder-inclusive process that involves site- and catchment-based actions. Good water stewards understand their own water use, catchment context and shared concerns in terms of water governance, water balance, water quality and Important Water-Related Areas, and then engage in meaningful individual and collective actions that benefit people and nature. The Standard outlines a series of actions, criteria and indicators for how one should manage water at the site level and how water management should be stewarded beyond the boundaries of a site. In this Standard, the "site" refers to the implementing entity that is responsible for fulfilling the criteria. The site includes the facility and the property over which the implementer that is using or managing water (i.e., withdrawing, consuming, diverting, managing, treating and/or discharging water or effluent into the environment) has control.

Assessment Information:	
Client Name	Nestlé Waters North America, Inc. - Hope, BC
AWS Reference Number	AWS-010-INT-CAB-00-01-0004-0021
Client AWS Representative/Group Manager (Role/Name/Contact info)	Bruce Lauerman, Natural Resource Manager; bruce.lauerman@waters.nestle.com
Audit Team (Role/Name)	Lead Auditor: Brendan Grady, SCS Global Services
	Technical Expert: Isabella Polenghi-Gross, Ph.D. AMEC Foster Wheeler
	Technical Expert: Haris Gilani, Ph.D, SCS Global Services
Audit dates (DD-DD Month YYYY)	4-5 October 2017
Audit Location (main site being audited)	66700 Othello Rd, Hope, BC V0X 1L0 , Canada
Date(s) of previous audit (if applicable)	
Findings from previous year	☐ YES, see tab 9
SCS Certificate number (if applicable)	
Expiry date of previous certificate (if applicable)	

Scope of Audit (check all applicable boxes)	
The AWS International Water Stewardship Standard Version V1.0 April 8th 2014	
Initial audit	☑ YES
Surveillance audit	☐ YES
Re-certification audit	☐ YES
RE-evaluation audit	☐ YES
Single-site audit	☑ YES
Multi-site audit	☐ YES, see tab 3
Group audit	☐ YES, see tab 3
If yes, please description of the group structure and relationships	

Description of Operations

The NWNA Hope, BC plant is a water bottling facility, producing bottled water products under the brand names of Arrowhead Mountain Spring, Nestlé Pure Life (Spring Water) Canada, Nestlé Pure Life (Purified) US, Aberfoyle Spring, Montclair Spring and Splash. The facility produces a variety of different bottle types ranging from 330 mL to 1.5L bottles for distribution across western Canada and the United States. The facility is located in the District of Hope, and sources its all its water for bottling from the Hope springs, located on the property. The site also receives a small amount of water from the district water supplier for domestic use within the facility.

Description of the catchment in which the client operates:

Hope is situated at the confluence of the Coquihalla and the Fraser Rivers in Southwest British Columbia. The NWNA Hope Springs facility lies within a minor catchment area which feeds into the lower Coquihalla River just before it enters the Fraser River. The minor catchment includes rainfall, snowfall and streamflow collected over an area of approximately 2.3 square miles on hillslopes above the facility and Kawkawa Lake. The total surface water catchment area above Hope Springs represents an estimated 0.003% of the total surface water catchment of the Fraser River at Hope.

Summary of shared water challenges:

NWNA has identified water governance as the primary shared water challenge in the catchment. A secondary challenge is drought restrictions. While the catchment is not water stressed, drought restrictions at the provincial level can result in political challenges within the catchment.

Audit Attendance

Guidance:

Record in this section the people attending the different parts of the audit. Tick the parts of the audit attended by each person.

Audit Attendence	*Mark attendance with an 'x' as appropriate*				
Role/Title	**Opening meeting**	**Document review**	**Interview**	**Facility Inspection**	**Closing meeting**
Natural Resource Manager, NWNA	x	x	x	x	x
Natural Resource Manager, NWNA	x	x	x	x	x
Natural Resource Manager, NWNA	x	x	x	x	x
EHS Resource, NWNA	x	x	x	x	x
QA Manager, NWNA	x	x	x	x	x
Factory Manager, NWNA	x	x	x	x	x
Supply Chain Manager, NWNA	x	x	x	x	x

Additional information on audit attendance

The AWS International Water Stewardship Standard, Version 1.0, April 8th, 2014

Criterion #	Standard Provision or Requirement	Major Minor Observation Conforming	Objective Evidence/Notes
STEP 1:			
Criterion 1.1	1.1 Establish a leadership commitment on water stewardship: Have the senior-most manager at the site, and if necessary a suitable individual within the corporate head office, sign and publicly disclose a commitment to: - Uphold the AWS water stewardship outcomes (good water governance, sustainable water balance, good water quality status and healthy status of Important Water- Related Areas); - Engage stakeholders in an open and transparent manner; - Strive to comply with legal and regulatory requirements - Respect water-related rights, including ensuring appropriate access to safe water, sanitation and hygiene for all workers in all premises under the site's control; - Support and coordinate with public sector agencies in the implementati on of plans and policies, including working together towards meeting the human right to water and sanitation. - Continually improve and adapt the site's water stewardship actions and plans; - Maintain the organizationa l capacity necessary to successfully implement the AWS Standard, including ensuring that staff have the time and resources necessary to undertake the implementati on; - Support water-related national and international treaties; - Disclose material on water-related information to relevant audiences.		see below

	1.1.1 Signed and publicly disclosed statement that explicitly covers all requirements (see details in Criterion 1.1)	NC	The site policy, signed by the Plant Manager in August 2017, explicitly covers all requirements listed in the Standard. It was not clear at the time of the audit how the policy would be publically disclosed. CAR 2017.1 was issued.
Criterion1.2	1.2 Develop a water stewardship policy: Develop an internally agreed-upon and communicated and publicly available water stewardship policy that references the concept of water stewardship (as informed by the AWS Standard, outcomes and criteria).		
	1.2.1 Publicly available policy that meets all requirements (see Guidance)	C	Nestle's corporate water stewardship policy "Nestle and Water: Sustainability, Protection, and Stewardship" extensively discusses Nestle's commitment to sustainable water use. The policy is publicly available on the Nestle website.
STEP 2: GATHER & UNDERSTAND			
Criterion 2.1	2.1 Define the physical scope: Identify the site's operational boundaries, the sources the site draws its water from, the locations where the site returns its discharge to, and the catchment(s) that the site affect(s) and is reliant upon.		
	2.1.1 Documentation or map of the site's boundaries	C	A site plan is included in the 2016 Annual Report by Piteau Associates. The map shows the property and facility boundaries, the bottling facility, the spring source, the water supply boreholes, and surface water features. Another map of the site was provided ("HBC 2.1 Parcellated recharge w capture zone"), which shows the NWNA site parcel as well as other nearby privately owned parcels

	2.1.2 Names and location of water sources, including both water service provider (if applicable) and ultimate source water	C	The site plan included in the 2016 Annual Report by Piteau Associates includes Hope Spring source, three spring-water production boreholes identified as BH-1, BH-2, and BH-3, and the surface water features (water courses and ponds). The Hope bottling facility receives water for bottling from the Hope Spring. A very limited amount of municipal water is provided to the factory for its domestic use (e.g. staff kitchens and toilets).
	2.1.3 Names and location of effluent discharge points, including both water service provider (if applicable) and ultimate receiving water body	C	The Hope Plant discharges non-hazardous liquid waste into the Hope District sewers. This water is treated by the Hope water treatment facility and then ultimately discharges to the Fraser River.
	2.1.4 Geographical description or map of the catchment(s)	C	Catchment maps are provided as part of the 2016 Annual Report by Piteau Associates and as separate files ("HBC 2.1 Hope Watershed Map" and "HBC 2.1 AWS Catchment Map"). The NWNA Hope site lies within a minor catchment area which feeds into the lower Coquihalla River just before it enters the Fraser River. It is located on the south side of an east - west trending valley that terminates at Kawkawa Lake.
Criterion 2.2	2.2 Identify stakeholders, their water-related challenges and the site's sphere of influence: Identify stakeholders, document their water-related challenges and explain how the stakeholders are within the site's sphere of influence.		
	2.2.1 List of stakeholders, descriptions of prior engagements and summaries of their water-related challenges *(TCW in Guidance)*	OBS	A list of stakeholders was provided as part of the audit. NWNA has also developed a corporate initiative for stakeholder mapping (called Community Relations Process) to better understand the local community. The site underwent a stakeholder mapping exercise, ranking stakeholders by Influence and Interest; interviews were conducted by NWNA with all identified and interested stakeholders regarding the AWS process. Interviews were conducted by NWNA with all identified and interested stakeholders regarding the AWS process. Recent interviews were used as information in identifying shared water challenges in the catchment. OBS 2017.5 was issued.
	2.2.2 Description of the site's sphere of influence	C	The guidance to the standard allows for this requirement to be met by providing a list of the stakeholders ability to influence or be influenced by the site (Indicator 2.2.1).

Criterion 2.3	2.3 Gather water-related data for the catchment: Gather credible and temporally relevant data on the site's catchment's x Water governance, including catchment plan(s), water-related public policies, major publicly led initiatives under way, relevant goals, and all water-related legal, regulatory requirements; x Water balance for all sources while considering future supply and demand trends; x Water quality for all sources while considering future physical, chemical and biological quality trends; x Important Water-Related Areas, including their identification and current status, while considering future trends; x Infrastructure's current status and exposure to extreme events while considering expected future needs. *(TCW in Guidance)*		
	2.3.1 List of relevant aspects of catchment plan(s), significant publicly led initiatives and/or relevant water-related public policy goals for the site *(TCW in Guidance)*	C	There are no District-level catchment plans. Hope has a comprehensive plan that includes some water use goals, but nothing the site could use. Integrated official community plan. There is an Upper Fraser Vally Regional plan, but not something the site is involved with.
	2.3.2 List, and description of relevance, of all applicable water-related legal and regulatory requirements, including legally defined and customary water rights and water-use rights	C	A list of State and local legal and regulatory requirements is included in "HBC 2.3.2 BLAKES 2015 LEGALHope_Plant_Environmental_Compliance_Chart" together with a description of NWNA Hope related plant's operations. No major issues were identified. The most signifcant recent legislation change was the Water Sustainability Act coming into force in 2016. The deadline for permit applications under this act for all groundwater users in the province is Feb 2019. NWNA is undergoing a pre-consultation phase in order to prepare for their application.

	2.3.3 Catchment water balance by temporally relevant time unit and commentary on future supply and demand trends *(TCW in Guidance)*	NC	A monthly aquifer water balance spreadsheet was developed for the aquifer and for the catchment area (HBC 2.3.3 2014_WaterBudgetReport_FINAL) Average groundwater withdrawal rates by Plant production boreholes, the District of Hope's Well No. 8, and private water wells upgradient from the Site represents an estimated less than one percent of groundwater available in the local aquifer. Commentary on future trends was missing from the analysis. CAR 2017.2 was issued.
	2.3.4 Appropriate and credibly measured data to represent the physical, chemical and biological status of the site's water source(s) by temporally relevant time unit, and commentary on any anticipated future changes in water quality	C	All water sources undergo the standard quality testing for microlobiological factors, and daily testing for total dissolved solids and other quality parameters. Samples collected from spring source boreholes are tested annually for a full screen of parameters including but not limited to: physical; nutrients; anions/cations and volatile organics (last data are from 2017). The on-site monitoring well is only used to monitor water levels and groundwater temperature. Fraser River at Hope and municipal wells are also tested by others. No anticipated changes in water quality, depends on the overall precip to some extent, describes variations related to natural changes.
	2.3.5 Documentation identifying Important Water-Related Areas, including a description of their current status and commentary on future trends *(TCW in Guidance)*	C	Nine wildlife/environmental IWRAs and five cultural IWRAs have been identified, described and rated as in good or excellent condition. NWNA identified IWRAs themselves in consultation with stakeholders, such as the Hope Mountain Centre, First Nations groups, fisheries and oceans regulators. UBC student is currently doing a study in Kawkawa lake. No known adverse trend is anticipated for any of them.

	2.3.6 Existing, publicly available reports or plans that assess water-related infrastructure, preferably with content exploring current and projected sufficiency to meet the needs of water uses in the catchment, and exposure to extreme events *(TCW in Guidance)*	C	Distribution, wasterwater, oil pipeline, and natural gas pipelines are listed as infrastructures. Exposure to extreme events is commented on. Susceptibilities, responses and alternatives are discussed.
Criterion 2.4	2.4 Gather water-related data for the site: Gather credible and temporally relevant data on the site's: x Governance (including water stewardship and incident response plan); x Water balance (volumetric balance of water inputs and outputs); x Water quality (physical, chemical and biological quality of influent and effluent) and possible sources of water pollution; x Important Water-Related Areas (identification and status); x Water-related costs (including capital investment expenditures, water procurement, water treatment, outsourced water-related services, water-related R&D and water-related energy costs), revenues and shared value creation (including economic value distribution, environmental value and social value).		
	2.4.1 Copies of existing water stewardship and incident response plans *(TCW in Guidance)*	C	A copy of a Water Stewardship Plan was reviewed. An annual surface and groundwater montiroting report is produced (the Sustainability report). NWNA is committed to providing measurable sustainability metrics. Emergency response plan was also provided, for spills, fires, natural gas leak, weather, medical, threats, mail contamination, etc.
	2.4.2 Site water balance (in Mm3 or m3) by temporally relevant time unit and water-use intensity metric (Mm3 or m3 per unit of production or service) *(TCW in Guidance)*	C	A detailed water map for the facility, was in place, matching the same as for other sites. NWNA assigns or calculate losses to every water process, boiler, etc, in order to identify losses. This site is either first or second amongst NWNA for benchmarking KPIs. The water mapping exercise allows them to identify overflow from filling as the main water loss saving opportunity, leading to focus on filler improvement, and better timing of silo management (to prevent loss from water stored in the silos).

	2.4.3 Appropriate and credibly measured data to represent the physical, chemical and biological status of the site's direct and outsourced water effluent by temporally relevant time unit, and possible pollution sources (if noted) *(TCW in Guidance)*	C	Effluent monitoring onsite for volume and pH neutralization. NWNA has stricter pH limits than the local wastewater facility (District of Hope). All internal gutters go to internal pump system, balances pH before sending it down the sewer. No real BOD or COD, concerns. The facility has data from Hope WWTP as to their own permit requirements and capacity.
	2.4.4 Inventory of all material water-related chemicals used or stored on-site that are possible causes of water pollution	C	A list of all on-site chemicals was provided. Chemical storage was inspected during audit of the facility.
	2.4.5 Documentation identifying existing, or historic, on-site Important Water-Related Areas, including a description of their status	C	The Hope Springs are identified as on-site IWRAs. Status was identified and included on the larger IWRA list. Key important water related areas were identified on the site, such as the Hope spring itself. However, stakeholder consultation suggested other IWRAs that were not identified, such as Thacker Marsh. IWRA designation of IWRAs could be improved through additional stakeholder consultation. OBS 2017.6 was issued.
	2.4.6 List of annual water-related costs, revenues and description/quantification of social, environmental or economic value generated by the site to the catchment	NC	Finances are compiled and reviewed by NWNA corporate headquarters. Normally data is reviewed regionally or at the product level, not at the level of individual sites such as the Hope facility. CAR 2017.1 was issued: The standard asks for a list of annual water-related costs, revenues and description/quantification of social, environmental or economic value generated by the site to the catchment. Site level costs were presented, however economic value is tracked at a product level and specific data was not presented. Social and environmental values were also not described or quantified. Thus a true cost benefit analysis of the site to the catchment was not completed. CAR 2017.3 was issued.
Criterion 2.5	2.5 Improve the site's understanding of its indirect water use: Identify and continually improve the site's understanding of: x Its primary inputs, the water use embedded in the production of those primary inputs and, where their origin can be identified, the status of the waters at the origin of the inputs; x Water used in outsourced water-related services within the catchment. *(TCW in Guidance)*		

	2.5.1 List of primary inputs with their associated embedded annual (or better) water use and (where known) their country/region/or catchment of origin with its level of water stress	C	A list of inputs was created as part of a water footprinting analysis. Primary input providers were listed, such as paper and cap providers, along with embedded water use and percentage of annual water consumption for each site.
	2.5.2 List of outsourced services that consume water or affect water quality and both (A) estimated annual (or better) water withdrawals listed by outsourced services (Mm3 or m3) and (B) appropriate and credibly measured data to represent the physical, chemical and biological status of the outsourced annual (or better) water effluent	C	Documentation provided shows values of water withdrawals and availablility, calculates the blue water scarcity value and scores to grade the water stress caused. Have blue water scarcity values for the outsourced service providers and primary inputs. The only service provider in a water stressed region was a label manufacturer in Nevada.
Criterion 2.6	2.6 Understand shared water-related challenges in the catchment: Based upon the status of the catchment and stakeholder input, identify and prioritize the shared water-related challenges that affect the site and that affect the social, environmental and/or economic status of the catchment(s). In considering the challenges, the drivers of future trends and how these issues are currently being addressed by public-sector agencies must all be noted.		
	2.6.1 Prioritized and justified list of shared water challenges that also considers drivers and notes related to public-sector agency efforts *(TCW in Guidance)*	C	Shared water challenges, Water governance (WSA) and drought restrictions. The catchment is not water stressed, but drought restrictions at a province level are a local political challenge. Water quality/contamination are also a potential threat. Shared water infrastructure with the District occurs on the property (District of Hope Well #8).
Criterion 2.7	2.7 Understand and prioritize the site's water risks and opportunities: Based upon the status of the site, existing risk management plans and/or the issues identified in 2.6, assess and prioritize the water risks and opportunities affecting the site. *(TCW in Guidance)*		

	2.7.1 Prioritized list of water risks facing the site, noting severity of impact and likelihood within a given time frame	C	Water risks were identified and analyzed for the site (including priority and likelihood). For example, borehole contamination, high priority, low risk. Failure to meet WSA requirements, high impact, low risk. Water stress index for the site was calculated: an average of WRI aqueduct, Pfister's water stress index, WWF water risk filter. Based on these indexes, Hope BC is not water stressed.
	2.7.2 Prioritized list of water-related opportunities for the site	C	Water related opporunities for the sites were prioritized. Maintain water quality, better educate the public, potentially relocate existing oil pipeline on the site. Continue downward trend in L/L Water Use Ratio.
	2.7.3 Estimate of potential savings/value creation	C	Value creation estimates were provided, such as positive public perception. Challenges were paired with opportunities. For example: Challenge, status of environment; Opportunity, assess status of IWRA; Value, healthy IWRA, increased brand value.
STEP 3: PLAN			
Criterion 3.1	3.1 Develop a system that promotes and evaluates water-related legal compliance: Develop, or refer to, a system that promotes and periodically evaluates compliance with the legal and regulatory requirements identified in Criterion 2.3.		
	3.1.1 Documented description of system, including the processes to evaluate compliance and the names of those responsible and accountable for legal compliance *(TCW in Guidance)*	C	Legal compliance matrix for site was shown. NWNA uses a 3 point system for compliance, Nestle Environmental requirements, annual review of criteria for plan, ISO 14001 (includes review of legal requirements), subscriptions to legal information services.

Criterion 3.2	3.2 Create a site water stewardship strategy and plan: Develop an internally available water stewardship strategy and plan for the site that addresses its shared water challenges, risks and opportunities identified in Step 2 and that contains the following components (see Guidance for plan template): x a strategy that considers the shared water challenges within the catchment, water risks for the site (noting in particular where these are connected to existing public-sector agency catchment goals) and the site's general response (from Criteria 2.6 and 2.7) x a plan that contains: o A list of targets (based upon Criterion 2.7) to be achieved, including how these will be measured and monitored. Note: where identified as a shared water challenge, these targets must be continually improving for the four water stewardship outcomes until such time as best practice is achieved; o A list of annual actions that links to the list of targets; o A budget for the proposed actions with cost/benefit financial information (based, in part, upon financial data from 2.7); o An associated list indicating who will undertake the actions (i.e., who is responsible for carrying out the work) and who will ensure that the work is completed (i.e., who is accountable for achieving the target), including actions of other actors in the catchment; o A brief explanation that speaks to how the proposed actions will affect: (A) water-risk mitigation, (B) water stewardship outcomes and (C) shared water challenges.		
	3.2.1 Available water stewardship strategy	C	A copy of the Water Stewardship Strategy is provided. A general water stewardship strategy is described as focusing on addressing shared water challenges through on-site and off-site actions. Key objectives are included to help lower their physical, regulatory, and reputational water risks, and benefit other stakeholders in the basin and local communities.
	3.2.2 Available plan that meets all component requirements and addresses site risks, opportunities and stakeholder shared water challenges *(TCW in Guidance)*	C	A copy of the Water Stewardship Plan is provided. Objectives are clear and targets are SMART. Shared water challenges outlined in the strategy plan include: Water Quality/Contamination, Water Scarcity, Public Education, Emergency Response, Water Governance.

Criterion 3.3	3.3 Demonstrate responsiveness and resilience to water-related risks into the site's incident response plan: Add to or modify the site's incident response plan to be both responsive and resilient to the water-related risks facing the site.		
	3.3.1 A description of the site's efforts to be responsive and resilient to water-related issues and/or risks in an appropriate plan *(TCW in Guidance)*	C	Have back up wells for more catastrophic long term problem. Longer term project need for a third borehole as a backup. NWNA has had only one incident near the site, an oil spill off the property, where they did initial containment before the cleanup crews arrived.
Criterion 3.4	3.4 Notify the relevant (catchment) authority of the site's water stewardship plans: Contact the appropriate catchment authority/agency (if any) and inform them of the site's plans to contribute to the water stewardship objectives of their catchment plan as identified in Criterion 2.3. *(TCW in Guidance)*		
	3.4.1 Documented evidence of communicating the site's plan to the relevant catchment authority/agency	C	Sustainability report was shared with local government, District of Hope and the City Council. District of Hope was briefed on AWS and CRP process.
STEP 4: IMPLEMENT			
Criterion 4.1	4.1 Comply with water-related legal and regulatory requirements and respect water rights: Meet all applicable legal and regulatory requirements related to water balance, water management and Important Water-Related Areas as well as water-related rights. As noted in Criteria 1.1 and 3.2, where, through its water use, the site is contributing to an inability to meet the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation, the site must also continually work with relevant public sector agencies until this basic human right to water and sanitation is fulfilled.		
	4.1.1 Documentation demonstrating compliance *(TCW in Guidance)*	C	Site level compliance matrix was provided, along with copy of the annual site environmental audit report and a List of Legal and Other Requirements.

	4.1.2 (Catchments with stakeholders who have an unmet human right to safe drinking water and sanitation) Documentation of efforts to work with relevant public sector agencies to fulfill human right to safe drinking water and sanitation.	NA	No unmet human right needs within the catchment.
Criterion 4.2	4.2 Maintain or improve site water balance: Meet the site's water balance targets. As noted in Criterion 3.2., where water scarcity is a shared water challenge, the site must also continually decrease its water withdrawals until best practices are met and work with relevant public sector agencies to address the imbalance and shared water challenge. Note: if a site wishes to increase its water use in a water scarce context, the site must cause no overall increase in water scarcity in the catchment and depletion of the site's water source(s) and encourage relevant public sector agencies to address the unlawful water use contributing to the imbalance in the catchment. *(TCW in Guidance)*		
	4.2.1 Measurement-based evidence showing that targets have been met	C	KPIs are best evidence of water balance. They have targets for targets for improvements in efficiency, but not gross use of water.
	4.2.2 (Water scarce catchments only) Evidence of continual decrease or best practice	NA	Site is not within a water scarce catchment.
	4.2.3 (Sites wishing to increase withdrawals in water scarce catchments only) Evidence of no net increase in water scarcity	NA	Site is not within a water scarce catchment.

Criterion 4.3	4.3 Maintain or improve site water quality: Meet the site's water quality targets. As noted in Criterion 3.2., where water quality stress is a shared water challenge, the site must also continually improve its effluent for the parameters of concern until best practices are met and work with relevant public sector agencies to address the imbalance and shared water challenge. Note: if a site wishes to increase its water use in a water stressed context, the site must cause no overall increase in the degradation of water quality in the catchment and degradation of the site's water source(s) and encourage relevant public sector agencies to address the unlawful water use contributing to the degradation in the catchment.		
	4.3.1 Measurement-based evidence showing that targets have been met	C	Nestle Norms, standards for spring water efficiency, water quality targets for effluent (acceptable pH range of 6-9); goals are to meet their own water quality needs for the site. Water quality targets meet or surpass national requirements
	4.3.2 (Water quality-stressed catchments only) Evidence of continual improvement or best practice	NA	Not applicable, water quality is not a shared water challenge in this context
	4.3.3 (Sites wishing to increase effluent levels of water quality parameters of concern in water quality-stressed catchments only) Evidence of no net degradation in water quality in the catchment	NA	Not applicable, water quality is not a shared water challenge in this context
Criterion 4.4	4.4 Maintain or improve the status of the site's Important Water-Related Areas: Meet the site's targets for Important Water-Related Areas at the site. As noted in Criterion 3.2., where Important Water-Related Area degradation is a shared water challenge, the site must also continually improve its Important Water-Related efforts until best practices are met, and the site must not knowingly cause any further degradation of such areas on site. *(TCW in Guidance)*		
	4.4.1 Documented evidence showing that targets have been met	C	Sustainability report includes detailed monitoring of the springs and ponds on site. Water monitoring temperature in the ponds.
	4.4.2 (Degraded Important Water-Related Area catchments only) Evidence of continual improvement or best practice	NA	IWRAs are not identified as a shared water challenge in the catchment.

Criterion 4.5	4.5 Participate positively in catchment governance: Continually coordinate and cooperate with any relevant catchment management authorities' efforts. As noted in Criterion 3.2, where water governance is a shared water challenge, the site must also continually improve its efforts until best practices are met *(TCW in Guidance)*		
	4.5.1 Documented evidence of the site's ongoing efforts to contribute to good catchment governance	C	NWNA is in continual communication with catchment authorities. Have participated with the Ministry of Environment on Water Sustainability Act. NWNA were supporters of the At in order to promote responsible water use. Plans to visit with new provincial Ministry of Environment officials.
	4.5.2 (Weak water governance catchments only) Evidence of continual improvement or best practice	C	Water governance was identified as a catchment weakness. NWNA is working on various efforts to improve water governance through government outreach.
Criterion 4.6	4.6 Maintain or improve indirect water use within the catchment: Contact the site's primary product suppliers and water-related service providers located in the catchment and request that they take actions to help contribute to the desired water stewardship outcomes.		
	4.6.1 List of suppliers and service providers, along with the actions they have taken as a result of the site's engagement relating to indirect water use	C	A list of suppliers and outsource service providers was prepared. No real water related service providers are found within the Catchment. The majority of input providers have compiled water usage data.
Criterion 4.7	4.7 Provide access to safe drinking water, adequate sanitation and hygiene awareness (WASH) for workers on-site: Ensure appropriate access to safe water, effective sanitation and protective hygiene for all workers in all premises under the site's control.		
	4.7.1 List of actions taken to provide workers access to safe water, effective sanitation and protective hygiene (WASH) on-site *(TCW in Guidance)*	C	NWNA uses a self-assessment tool at each site to review access to drinking water, sanitation and hygiene awareness (WASH). The nature of the product made at the facility requires strict adherence to these principals. Pledged compliance was achieved at the Hope facility.
Criterion 4.8	4.8 Notify the owners of shared water-related infrastructure of any concerns: Contact the owners of shared water-related infrastructure and actively highlight any concerns the site may have in light of its risks and shared water challenges.		

	4.8.1 List of individuals contacted and key messages relayed *(TCW in Guidance)*	C	The only shared water-related infrastructure on the site is a District well located on the site property. NWNA is in routine communication with the District over management of the well and other water related concerns.
STEP 5: EVALUATE			
Criterion 5.1	5.1 Evaluate the site's water stewardship performance, risks and benefits in the catchment context: Periodically review the site's performance in light of its actions and targets from its water stewardship plan to evaluate: x General performance in terms of the water stewardship outcomes (considering context and water risks), positive contributions to the catchment, and water-related costs and benefits to the site. *(TCW in Guidance)*		
	5.1.1 Post-implementation data and narrative discussion of performance and context (including water risk)	C	Initial post-implementation performance data was reviewed within the water stewardship plan, particularly related to water use efficiency.
	5.1.2 Total amount of water-related costs, cost savings and value creation for the site based upon the actions outlined in 3.2 (drawn from data gathered in 2.4.6)	C	Data on shared value creation was reviewed, including demonstrating # of NWNA man hours for maintaining and improving stakeholder relationships in the catchment, cost benefit analysis for maintaining water ratio/year.
	5.1.3 Updated data for indicator 2.4.7 on catchment shared value creation based upon the actions outlined in 3.2	NA	As the AWS standard is still in its initial implementation phase, this will be reviewed in more detail during future assessments.
Criterion 5.2	5.2 Evaluate water-related emergency incidents and extreme events: Evaluate impacts of water-related emergency incidents (including extreme events), if any occurred, and determine effectiveness of corrective and preventive measures. Factor lessons learned into updated plan.		
	5.2.1 Documented evidence (e.g., annual review and proposed measures)	C	No water related emergency events have occurrred on the site.
Criterion 5.3	5.3 Consult stakeholders on water-related performance: Request input from the site's stakeholders on the site's water stewardship performance and factor the feedback/lessons learned into the updated plan.		

	5.3.1 Commentary by the identified stakeholders *(TCW in Guidance)*	C	Stakeholder comments were summarized particularly in response to implementation of the AWS standard. A phone and internet poll were conducted on water related issues in the region in order to prioritize issues. The facility regularly does site tours with open houses and school tours, etc.
Criterion 5.4	5.4 Update water stewardship and incident response plans: Incorporate the information obtained into the next iteration of the site's water stewardship plan. Note: updating does not apply for initial round of Standard implementation.		
	5.4.1 Modifications to water stewardship and incident response plans incorporating relevant information *(TCW in Guidance)*	NA	Not applicable for the initial assessment. This criterion will be reviewed during future assessments.
STEP 6: COMMUNICATE & DISCLOSE			
Criterion 6.1	6.1 Disclose water-related internal governance: Publicly disclose the general governance structure of the site's management, including the names of those accountable for legal compliance with water-related laws and regulations.		
	6.1.1 Disclosed and publicly available summary of governance at the site, including those accountable for compliance with water-related laws and regulations *(TCW in Guidance)*	C	An organizational chart is posted on-site, and available at open houses.
	6.2 Disclose annual site water stewardship performance: Disclose the relevant information about the site's annual water stewardship performance, including results against the site's targets. *(TCW in Guidance)*		
	6.2.1 Disclosed summary of site's water stewardship results	C	The annual Sustainability report includes water stewardship targets. The report is disclosed to the District Council and available for the public to review at the District offices.

	6.3 Disclose efforts to address shared water challenges: Publicly disclose the site's shared water challenges and report on the site's efforts to help address these challenges, including all efforts to engage stakeholders and coordinate and support public-sector agencies. *(TCW in Guidance)*		
	6.3.1 Disclosed and publicly available description of shared challenges and summary of actions taken to engage stakeholders (including public-sector agencies)	C	A stakeholder presentation was reviewed, discussing the sites water stewardship performance, discussed IWRAs, listed shared water challenges, AWS plan development, implementation of the plan, water use effeciency outcomes, the Hope facility water map, etc. Consultation by the audit team confirmed that the presentation had been given to District leaders and local stakeholders.
	6.4 Drive transparency in water-related compliance: Make any site water-related compliance violations available upon request as well as any corrective actions the site has taken to prevent future occurrences. Note: any site-based violation that can pose an immediate material threat to human or ecosystem health from use of or exposure to site-related water must be reported immediately to relevant public agencies.		
	6.4.1 Available list of water-related compliance violations with corresponding corrective actions	C	No violations have occurred, confirmed with District managers. Any violations would be reported to the District and other regulators.
	6.5 Increase awareness of water issues within the site: Strive to raise the understanding of the importance of water issues at the site through active communications.		
	6.5.1 Record of awareness efforts (dates and communication) and, if possible, level of awareness *(TCW in Guidance)*	NC	Internal trainings covering AWS awareness were conducted, confirmed through staff interviews. However, no specific AWS training records existed. CAR 2017.4 was issued.

Audit Non-conformities and Observations

Guidance

Disclaimer: auditing is based on a sampling process of the available information and therefore nonconformities may exist which have not been identified.

Observations are defined as an area of concern regarding a process, document, or activity where there is opportunity for improvement.

Major non-conformity is raised if the issue represents a systematic problem of substantial consequence; the issue is a known and recurring problem that the client has failed to resolve; the issue fundamentally undermines the intent of the AWS Standard; or the nature of the problem may jeopardize the credibility of AWS.
Applicants must close* major NCR within Ninety (90) days of the NCR issue date. Failure to meet this deadline will require another conformity assessment.
Certificate Holders must close* major NCR within Thirty (30) days of the NCR issue date. If the Major NCR is not addressed within 30 days SCS shall suspend or withdraw the certificate and reinstatement shall not occur before another conformity assessment has been successfully completed.

Minor non-conformity: Where the audit team has evaluated an audit finding and determines that the seriousness of the issue does not meet the any of the criteria for Major non-compliance the audit team shall grade the finding as a minor non-conformity.
Applicants must submit an acceptable corrective action plan^ to address all minor non-conformities to be recommended for certification.
Certificate Holders must close minor NCR within Ninety (90) days of the NCR issue date. SCS may agree to an alternative time frame with the client as long as this can be justified and is documented in the NCR report.
If corrective actions are inadequate to resolve a minor non-conformity by the time of the next scheduled audit, SCS shall upgrade the audit finding to a major non- conformity.
If an unusually large number of minor non-conformities are detected during the course of a single audit, the audit team may at their discretion raise a major non-conformity to reflect a systematic failure of the client's management system to deliver conformity with the AWS Standard.

** closed = actioned by the client, corrections & corrective actions verified and closed by the auditor.*
^The corrective action plan shall include an analysis of the root cause of the minor non-conformity; the specific corrective action(s) to address the minor non-conformity; and an appropriate time frame to implement corrective action(s).

NC #	Criteria / Indicator #	Major – Detail on Non Conformance	Due Date (XX calendar Days)	Root Cause Analysis and Corrective Action Taken

NC #	Section #	Minor – Detail on Non Conformance	Due Date (XX calendar Days)	Corrective Action Taken
2017.1	**1.1.1**	**A signed site policy explicitly covers all requirements listed in the Standard, but it was not clear at the time of the audit how the policy would be publically disclosed.**	**16-Mar-18**	**Root Cause Analysis:** The Site Policy had not been publicly shared prior to the audit. **Corrective Action:** The Site Policy has been prominently posted at the Visitor Check-In station at the entrance to the building.
2017.2	**2.3.3**	**Commentary on future trends in the catchment water balance was not given**	**16-Mar-18**	**Root Cause Analysis:** The Catchment Water Balance did not comment on future trends in the water balance. **Corrective Action:** Comment on future trends will be included in the annual review of the Cathment Water Balance.

2017.3	**2.4.6**	**The standard asks for a list of annual water-related costs, revenues and description/quantification of social, environmental or economic value generated by the site to the catchment. Site level costs were presented, however economic value is tracked at a product level and specific data was not presented. Social and environmental values were also not described or quantified. Thus a true cost benefit analysis of the site to the catchment was not completed.**	**16-Mar-18**	**Root Cause Analysis:** Currently, the company tracks financial data by total brand values and not at a factory-specific level. However, costs and revenues presented during the audit represent the financial data as specifically attributed to the Hope factory, where possible. **Corrective Action:** Revised water-related costs and revenues will be presented and/or estimated for the Hope site, where possible and where company determines proprietary information is not required to be disclosed. Explicit references will be made regarding social and environmental values provided to the catchment.
2017.4	**6.5.1**	**The site had made efforts to increase awareness of water issues internally amongst site staff (such as internal training on AWS). However, no records of these events were available.**	**16-Mar-18**	**Root Cause Analysis:** Sufficient documentation of employee AWS training was lacking. **Corrective Action:** Hope management has included an introductory tutorial on AWS in the required employee training matrix. Training acknowledgement will be documented.

OBS #	Section #	Observation – Detail on Opportunity for Improvement	Due Date	Corrective Action Taken
2017.5	**2.2.1**	**While consultations with stakeholders and audit records evidenced active communication between NWNA on water related topics, stakeholders were largely unfamiliar with the specific AWS concepts such as shared water challenges. General understanding of AWS concepts amongst stakeholders could be improved.**		**Note:** We understand the observation and will take the advice under consideration. No Corrective Action Plan required.
2017.6	**2.4.5**	**Key important water related areas were identified on the site, such as the Hope spring itself. However, stakeholder consultation suggested other IWRAs that were not identified, such as Thacker Marsh. IWRA designation of IWRAs could be improved through additional stakeholder consultation.**		**Note:** We understand the observation and will take the advice under consideration. No Corrective Action Plan required.

Certification Decision

Guidance
The recommendation section to be filled out by the auditor with optional comments. The Certification Decision section is to be completed by the SCS's decision-making entity after initial, re-certification and re-evaluation audits. Details of the decision making entity and any observations or further details can be included in the comments field.

Auditor's recommendation for initial, continued or re-certification based on compliance with requirements:	**X**	Initial/Continued Certification **Recommended**
		Initial/Continued Certification **Not Recommended**
Level of certification recommended (if applicable):	**X**	AWS Core
		AWS Gold
		AWS Platinum
Comments (e.g. justification for change in certification level, recommendations for sampling):		

To be completed by the SCS Decision-Making Entity	**SCS Certification Decision:**	**X**	**Approved**
			Denied
	Certification decision by:	*Neil Mendenhall*	
	Technical Review by:	*Neil Mendenhall*	
	Date of decision:	**31 January 2018**	
	Surveillance schedule:	**Next audit is scheduled for** *(include range)* **: October 2018**	