



2000 Powell St., Suite 600
Emeryville, CA 94608, USA

www.scscertified.com

Brendan Grady

bgrady@scscertified.com

FOREST MANAGEMENT AND STUMP-TO-FOREST GATE CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY SURVEILLANCE EVALUATION REPORT

NIPISSING FOREST RESOURCE MANAGEMENT COMPANY LTD.

SCS-FM/COC-00055N

P.O. Box 179

128 Lansdowne Avenue East
Callander, Ontario POH 1H0
Peter Street; General Manager

<http://www.nipissingforest.com/>

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
05/16/2008	05/16/2013

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
10/04-05/11
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
11/23/11

Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate Database (<http://info.fsc.org/>) no less than 30 days after issue of the certificate. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use of by the FME.

FOREWORD

Cycle in annual surveillance audits			
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 st annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 nd annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 rd annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 th annual audit
Name of Forest Management Enterprise and abbreviation used in this report:			
Forest Management Enterprise (FME)	Nipissing Forest Resource Management Inc. (NFRM)		

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual audits to ascertain ongoing compliance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the SCS website www.scscertified.com.

Pursuant to FSC and SCS guidelines, annual/surveillance audits are not intended to comprehensively examine the full scope of the certified forest operations, as the cost of a full-scope audit would be prohibitive and it is not mandated by FSC audit protocols. Rather, annual audits are comprised of three main components:

- A focused assessment of the status of any outstanding conditions or Corrective Action Requests (CARs; see discussion in section 5.0 for a summary those CARs and their disposition as a result of this annual audit in the separate CAR report file);
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior to the audit; and
- As necessary given the breadth of coverage associated with the first two components, an additional focus on selected topics or issues, the selection of which is not known to the certificate holder prior to the audit.

All items marked with an asterisk (*) are not required for FMUs that qualify as single SLIMFs.

Contents

Section A – Public Summary	4
1.0 General Information	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team.....	4
1.2 Total time spent on evaluation	4
1.3 Standards Employed	4
2.0 Annual Audit Dates and Activities.....	5
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities	5
3.0 Changes in Management Practices.....	8
4.0 Annual Summary of pesticide and other chemical use.....	8
5.0 Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and Observations (OBSs).....	8
6.0 Stakeholder Comment*	14
7.0 Certification Decision	14
Section B - Appendices.....	16
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs selected for evaluation (CONFIDENTIAL)	16
Appendix 2 – Evaluation of Management Systems (CONFIDENTIAL)*	16
Appendix 3 – Stakeholder analysis (CONFIDENTIAL)*	17
Appendix 4 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed (CONFIDENTIAL)*	17
Appendix 5 – Changes in Certification Scope	18
Appendix 6 – Pesticide derogations.....	22
Appendix 7 – Detailed observations (CONFIDENTIAL).....	22

Section A – Public Summary

1.0 General Information

1.1 Annual Audit Team

Auditor Name:	Dave Wager	Auditor role:	Lead auditor
Qualifications: As previous FM Director for SCS, Dave spent ten years managing and/or leading Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) endorsed certification assessments on more than 100 forest management operations covering over 25 million acres of forestland across 16 countries. As a certification practitioner, Dave Wager has led FSC forest management and chain-of-custody assessments on a range of private and public operations across North America, Asia, and Latin America. In other natural resources work, Dave played a key role in the development of Starbucks CAFE Practices- a program to ensure procurement of sustainably grown and processed coffee. Dave has 16 years experience working in forestry and the environmental field. He has expertise in forest ecology and business (B.S. business, Skidmore College; M.S. Forest Resources, Utah State University). While studying forest ecology at Utah State University, Dave was awarded a NASA Graduate Student Research Fellowship to develop dendrochronological techniques to assess Douglas-fir growth in Utah’s Central Wasatch Mountains.			
Auditor Name:	Peter Higgelke	Auditor role:	Forester
Qualifications: Consulting Forester, Managing Partner of KBM Forestry Consultants Inc. (Ontario). As a principal in KBM, Mr. Higgelke specializes in forest auditing, forest management planning, forest inventory, wildlife habitat supply analysis modelling, business plan preparation, timber harvesting, and forest renewal prescriptions. Peter is a registered professional forester in the province of Ontario. He participates regularly in Independent Forest Audits in Ontario and has advised First Nations on forest management, forestry negotiations and economic development. In the past he lectured at Lakehead University on integrated forest resources management and GIS applications in forestry. Peter was a member of the SCS team that performed the original FSC certification audit in 2005.			

1.2 Total time spent on evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	2.5
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	2
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	1
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	7
(Line D = (Total number of days in Line A x Total number of auditors from Line B) + additional days from Line C.	

1.3 Standards Employed

Box 1.3.2. – SCS Interim FSC Standard		
Title	Version	Date of Finalization
SCS Interim Standard for GLSL	2.0	2008

The scope of this standard includes both natural and plantation forests. This standard fully incorporates the indicators of the FSC Canada GLSL Field-Tested. Draft Standard (April 2007). Once the FSC Canada GLSL Standard has been officially accredited by the FSC for use in the GLSL region, all further evaluations will be done against said standard. This standard complies with all applicable FSC International policies, standards, and advice notes. A copy of the standard is available at www.scs-certified.com/forestry or upon request from SCS.

2.0 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

Date: October 3, 2011	
Attendees: Peter Street, Daryl Sebesta, Mark Lockhart, Tom MacLean, Frank Simard, Ric Hansel, Guylaine Thauvette (MNR), Dave Wager, Peter Higgelke.	
Location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
North Bay Office.	Review of CARs, changes to NFRM, Review HCVF maps, discussion of current economic constraints.
Clouthier Blocks 136 and 137. Tom Clouthier, Roger Langlois joined us for the Clouthier Blocks.	Started at Clouthier logging camp. Discussed limitations in harvesting white pine due to poor markets. Hardwood shelterwood well executed. Very little residual stand damage, skid trails appropriately spaced, good wildlife tree marking/retention. Seeps and other wet areas that were not marked by tree marking crews were flagged by Clouthier. AOC on North River Road for Cold Water Fishery protected. Poplar and White birch mixedwood clearcut. Clearcut with standards easily met 25 TPA and appeared to meet larger diameter requirements. Viewed peninsular patch from road.
Janveaux Pre-commercial red pine thinning.	Thinning carried out by Janveaux Forest Products- a new First Nations contractor working with NFRM. 40 year white pine plantation that has some severely suppressed patches. Pine restoration treatment to remove poplar that has encroached plantation. Larger diameter poplar are not being cut and will need follow up to successfully release stand. Discussed follow-up monitoring needs.
Behnke Block 115.	White pine shelterwood cut. Cut in winter of 2010. NFRM required corduroy used on intermittent stream crossing to be removed from the water. One crossing was removed but another one not taken out.
Date October 4	

Attendees: Robin Hill (MNR); Joel Gerard (MNR); Marc Bouthillier (Tembec); Peter Street, Daryl Sebesta, Mark Lockhart, Frank Simard, Ric Hansel	
Location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
Behnke Block 115	Active operation only a small part of which had been completed. No compliance issues observed. Hardwood selection in Stand 257834 had very little residual stand damage and was clearly marked as an improvement cut on the upper hillside. Adjacent landowners were notified and boundaries agreed upon and painted. NFRM worked with club on snowmobile trail. Interviewed Blayne Behnke.
Janveaux Block 169.	Hardwood selection. Residual stand damage exceeded MNR standards. Rutting was excessive for FSC auditors to conclude non-conformance, however, the rutting did not violate MNR rutting standards. No remediation action had been taken yet. CAR 2011.3
Block 85-04; pine planting	2010 Chemical spray ABS ground spray using glyphosate/vision, 2010 mechanical site prep using anchor chains; planted spring 2011. Planted at 2000 SPH. New stock of seedlings used appears to be significant improvement in survival and growth. Additional release may be necessary in parts. Adjacent gravel pit was expanded and ~50 trees were removed.
Tembec Block 198	Mixed hardwood final removal and regeneration harvests. Grubbing to build road resulted in compliance issue with Moose Aquatic Feeding (MAF) 10m maximum width for road right of way (with grubbing road 13-15m). Had been identified by NFRM and MNR. Some rutting was noted, but not in excess of MNR standards. CWF identified as new value and AOC was updated.
Tembec Block 197	Shelterwood cut with 50% canopy opening. Operational issue identified by MNR questioning whether 50% was achieved because MNR considered understory saplings as canopy closure. Some cut trees missing stump marks. Problem appeared to be due to them not being painted as opposed to cutting unmarked trees.
Bridge Decommissioning Tembec 40-079	Removal of a temporary bridge. See discussion under CAR 2009.2 for more detail.
GP Northwood LP Block 143	Clearcut of poplar and birch with heavy component of cedar and balsam fir. No operational concerns identified. Harvest block was adjacent to cottagers who raised concerns about the sale. Cottagers were not present during the initial FMP process (and missed the standard opportunity for input), however, NFRM worked

	with cottagers to adjust the harvest for aesthetics, trail protection, and cottage buffers. The adjustment to the sale triggered concerns from MNR about utilization. Auditors concluded that adjustments to the planned harvest were relatively minor from a utilization stand point and were consistent with expectations for minimizing social impacts of harvesting.
Tembec Block 227	Winter Hardwood regeneration cut. Whole tree skidding and full tree chipping allowed with exceptions monitoring for residual stand damage. Monitoring has showed operation to be well under limits for both major and minor damage. Good regeneration of yellow birch, cherry, and other hardwoods. Final removal will be completed within 5-10 yrs leaving a 390 ha block with no insular or peninsular patches as there is no MNR requirement to leave them in shelterwood systems (CAR 2011.2)
Date Oct 5	
Attendees: Robin Hill (MNR); Peter Street, Daryl Sebesta, Frank Simard, Ric Hansel	
Location/ sites visited/Attendees	Activities/ notes
Highway 64- Block 2. Red Pine Thinning. Longwood Forestry	26 year old red pine stand. Pre commercial thinning by new contractor- R&H Forestry Services (First Nations contractor). Thin from below with removal of on average 33% of stems. Operator well trained and good supervision by NFRM. Observed proper protective equipment and technique used. Interviewed owner/operator Rodney Beaucage.
Stop 36. 2011 pine planting	White pine shelterwood planted with white and red pine. Aerial spray of vision/glyphosate in fall 2010. Planted spring 2011. Some spray shadow of trees in shelterwood resulted in patches of maple competition.
Stop 28. Fall aerial spray using Release.	Spray of triclopyr. Red oaks clipped prior to spray to avoid undesired spray damage. Clipping worked well, but also noted that trees that were not clipped were not damaged.
Goulard Block 09	Hardwood shelterwood 1 st removal. Viewed operational issue of turnaround built in a no-roads-zone that was identified by MNR. Viewed excellent oak regeneration in part of the Block. A second operation issue identified by MNR dealt with failure to meet target of retaining 20 birch seed trees with large well developed crowns. While some yellow birch stumps of large diameter were noted- it was unclear whether they had well developed and healthy crowns. According to NFRM forester- the larger trees that were cut were of

poor quality with declining crown and vigor.
--

3.0 Changes in Management Practices

There were no significant changes in the management and/or harvesting methods that affect the FME's conformance to the FSC standards and policies.

4.0 Annual Summary of pesticide and other chemical use

This information has been requested. NFRM will provide it by mid-November

Commercial name of pesticide/ herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated during previous year (ha or ac)	Reason for use
Vision-Aerial Rotary Wing	Glyphosate - 356 g/l	4177.7 kg	0	Tending
Vision-Aerial Rotary Wing	Glyphosate - 356 g/l	598.7 kg	0	Site Preparation
Release -Aerial Rotary Wing	Trichlopyr - 480 g/l	508.9 kg	151.9 ha	Tending
Vantage - ABS	Glyphosate - 356 g/l	200.0	187.8 ha	Site Preparation
Vision - ABS	Glyphosate - 356 g/l	240.0	0	Site Preparation
Vision - ABS	Glyphosate - 356 g/l	587.0	0	Tending
Vision - Back Pack Foliar	Glyphosate - 356 g/l	5.5	0	Tending
Garlon RTU - Basal Bark	Trichlopyr - 144 g/l	3.7	0	Tending
Release - Basal Bark	Trichlopyr - 480 g/l	0.3	0	Tending
Vantage - Aerial Rotary Wing	Glyphosate - 356 g/l	0	697.1 ha	Tending
Vantage - Aerial Rotary Wing	Glyphosate - 356 g/l	0	108.2 ha	Site Preparation
Vantage - ABS	Glyphosate - 356 g/l	0	128.6 ha	Tending

5.0 Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and Observations (OBSs)

CAR 2009.2:
Water crossing decommissioning which has occurred during the winter period must be inspected after the spring thaw to determine if further rehabilitation and clean-up are required. A system such as the Tembec crossing removal checklist must be developed and adopted to review the removal during the inspection following the spring thaw.
Reference: FSC 6.3.4, 6.3.5, 6.3.6, 6.3.7, 6.3.10, and 6.5.1
FME response: All water crossing installations and removals now require an Access FOIP Report.
SCS Comment: SCS auditor inspected the one winter water crossing removal for 2010- occurring in Tembec area #04-079. The bridge was removed and slopes were stabilized with water bars, diversion ditch, straw bales, filter cloth, and branch tops. However, ATV's came through and damaged the area including moving logs into the stream bed. SCS auditor reviewed a copy of the FOIP Report detailing the bridge removal.
Disposition of CAR as of October 31, 2010:
CAR closed

Auditor Observation/Non-Conformity:
A growing problem observed during the 2009 annual audit was the extension of winter operations into the regular harvesting season. This requires the use of road and skid trail systems which were designed and constructed for winter operations only. Often these road and trail systems are inadequate for regular season operations due to wet conditions or the presence of temporary stream crossings designed for winter use only. There were no winter operations extended into the regular logging season this year, so this Recommendation could not be audited during the 2011 Surveillance Audit. If no operations are extended out of the winter season during 2011, the recommendation will be closed, because NFRM and the contractors are successfully completing the winter operations during the winter season and this recommendation is no longer a factor.
Recommendation 2009.1:
NFRM should develop a procedure to include inspection and evaluation of winter operations roads, where an extension of the operating period will take operations into the regular operating season. The evaluation should result in the development of a list of required upgrades to the road and trail system prior to the extension of the operations.
Reference: FSC Criterion 6.3.10 and 6.3.12
FME Response: NFRM has implemented a new inspection schedule for winter operations that are extended into the regular operating season. All winter blocks were inspected early in the spring and recorded in FOIP Reports as part of NFRM's new procedure. Only one small stretch of road (<0.5 kn), was required to be brought up to a summer standard (Quenneville Block# 09-033). NFRM Staff have been encouraging Licensees to have the hauling to be kept as close as possible to the harvesting in February and if it looks like not all of the wood will be hauled to have forward it to an all weather

road. Several of the Licensees moved to areas with summer roads for the February/March harvesting.
SCS did not observe any damage to road and skid trails from extending winter operations into spring.
Disposition of REC as of Oct 4, 2011:
Closed

Nonconformity: During the 2010 annual surveillance audit, workers were observed in the field where no communications or transportation was available in case of an accident or injury. This is a clear violation of Ontario regulations. The contract language for all silvicultural contractors is clear that they must obey all Ontario Health and Safety regulations. This example is a violation of Ontario regulations and the terms of the contract. Several FOIP reports were present on this contractor; however, the most recent was made during July, 2010. When the General manager of NFRM learned of this condition, he issued a stop work order immediately and contacted the contractor to make certain that the situation was rectified prior to the resumption of work in the field.	
Minor CAR 2010.1	NFRM must develop a policy and procedures to assure that more frequent and timely FOIP inspections are taking place with contractors in the field. This will assure better compliance with Ontario laws and regulations
Deadline	First annual audit.
Reference	FSC 1.1.2 and FSC 4.2.1
Action Taken By Company: NFRM has now set targets for staff doing Compliance Inspections. Additional enumeration is given to Staff for meeting their targets. Many more FOIP Reports have been completed since the last Surveillance Audit. The GM is also checking that all Blocks have a completed inspection. In 2010-2011 - there were 43 reports. So far in 2011-2012 (7 months) NFRM has prepared 52 reports - and I project to be close to 75-80 by year end.	
Auditor Comments: For year-to-date, there has been a significant increase in the frequency of compliance inspections over the previous year warranting closure of this CAR. However, the level of compliance monitoring is still lower than it was 5 to 10 years ago.	
Position in the end of this audit: Closed	

Nonconformity: In order to certify that the areas of various categories of HCV's are not decreasing, the audit team must be provided with evidence showing the areas included in each category. The tabular presentation of this in the report is a new report format requirement, that the auditee was not aware of at the time of the audit. NFRM was unable to provide the breakdown of HCVs by Category at the time of the 2010 annual surveillance audit, as required by the new FSC report format. NFRM does have an exemplary HCV document for the Nipissing Forest and has implemented the prescription, monitoring and protections as outlined in the report. The protections for the attributes are not threatened by the lack of information by Category; however this information is required. This is necessary in order to determine that the size of the HCVs by Category is not diminished over

time.	
Minor CAR 2010.2	NFRM must provide a breakdown of the HCVs present on the Nipissing Forest by Category of HCV by the 2011 annual audit. This must include an area in each of the Categories present on the forest.
Deadline	First annual audit.
Reference	FSC 9.3.1

Action Taken By Company:

A new HCVF composite map was completed that details HCV by category.

Category	Values	Area in Ha
1 - Forest areas containing globally, nationally or regionally significant concentrations of biodiversity values	AOCs for Red shoulder hawk, bald eagle, wood turtle, white tail deer wintering areas, moose aquatic feeding areas, & heronries Naturally occurring red spruce stand	51,043
2 - Forest areas containing globally, regionally, or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exists in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.	None	
3 - Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems. (Does not include areas in Parks or Protected Areas)	Late serial stage white pine, red pine hemlock and undisturbed tolerant hardwood stands	5,424
4 - Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations.	Trout Lake & Sturgeon River AOCs	2,652

<i>5 - Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities.</i>	None	
<i>6 - Forest areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity</i>	Ottawa, French and Mattawa Waterway Parks	102,859
Auditor Comments: Auditor reviewed composite HCVF map in the NFRM office on October 3.		
Position in the end of this audit: Closed		

Background/ justification: During the 2010 annual surveillance audit a field stop was a winter operation from last winter which was on a block of a First Nation and included a training program to encourage participation in forest operations by First Nation members. This training program was an exemplary attempt to increase participation by First Nation members. There were several problems observed on the unit, including: incomplete skidding, incomplete falling, wood still left on landings, issues with road construction (including grubbing around the root systems of residual trees), an incomplete spill kit by the operator, and equipment sabotage on the site.	
OBS 2010.1	NFRM should continue to work with the First Nations to encourage participation in the economic opportunities that forest operations can provide. A coordination strategy should be developed between NFRM and the First Nations to make certain that the operations meet the Provincial and FSC standards.
Reference	FSC 3.1.3 and FSC 6.1.6
Action Taken By Company: At the Aboriginal Working Group Meeting held November 17th, 2010, NFRM discussed the potential opportunity to conduct pre-commercial red pine plantation thinning operations in 2011. At the meeting it was decided that a Tender package would be prepared and sent out to all the Aboriginal Communities. This was done in January 2011. Four proposals were received and considered. Two contractors Janveaux Forest Products and RH Forestry Services were selected. (We no longer use Redbridge Forestry or Young's Forestry Services). Both Contractors started in the spring and have been working since then. Both Contractors are meeting Provincial & FSC Standards. Please refer to the documents in P3.	
Auditor Comments: This CAR can be closed based on the review of the NFRM written response, interviews with NFRM staff, and interviews with a First Nations thinning contractor.	
Position in the end of this audit: Closed	

Background/ justification: The current FRI data provided by the MNR is over 20 years old. NFRM worked to update this data set with additional information to provide a better dataset for the 2009

<p>FMP planning data base. This updated data set was certified for the FMP and was therefore determined to be adequate for planning. The amount of updating of the existing old database is admirable and does provide an adequate although not the most desirable basis for forest planning. Updates included information related to field assessment of white pine stands, free-to-grow assessments, aerial inventory of blowdown and spruce budworm damaged areas, aerial surveys of moose aquatic feeding habitat, and a forecast of depletions. Future planning efforts badly need an updated FRI data set. New imagery for the next FRI was captured for the Nipissing Forest in 2008 and 2009. The updating of the FRI database from the imagery is a three-year process from start to finish, so the entire new database set will not be available until 2012 at the earliest. Problems with the older FRI dataset continue to affect current operations when expected forest types are not present.</p>	
OBS 2010.2	NFRM needs to continue to strive to attain the updated FRI dataset at the earliest possible date and to incorporate the new FRI dataset into the planning efforts.
Reference	FSC 7.2.1 and FSC 8.4.1
<p>Action Taken By Company: The last we heard from the MNR was that we should be getting a new inventory in 2014 - just after we finish Phase 2 planning. It also means that when we do get to use the new inventory to develop the 2019 FMP it will base on photography that will be 10 years old. Most of the Forest Industry in Ontario is upset with the MNR's FRI Program - it is secretive and unresponsive to requests to discuss scheduling. Several maps have been included in the evidence as to the current status of image acquisition and interpretation. Having said that - we are using the new imagery every day to help plan our activities. Please refer to Mark Lockhart's response to the Forestry Futures Committee's survey.</p>	
<p>Auditor Comments: NFRM does not have any control over MNR timeline for updating FRI. NFRM is making the best of the situation by using the new imagery in its operational planning.</p>	
<p>Position in the end of this audit: Closed.</p>	

<p>Background/ justification: NFRM has made good progress toward meeting the overall condition for the completion and implementation of the gap analysis. The efforts resulted in the Ontario Parks completing the gap analysis and providing that information in January 2007. Some problems with the model were observed and NFRM worked with Ontario Parks to remedy this situation. The old model identified intensively managed red pine plantations as a gap. NFRM and VFM have made a joint proposal to Ontario Parks for gap mitigation. The MNR and Ontario Parks are working on "disentanglement" of proposed parks and protected areas. No additional information has been received by NFRM from either the MNR or Ontario Parks on their gap proposals or on the disentanglement process.</p>	
OBS 2010.3	NFRM should continue to work with the MNR and Ontario Parks to complete the disentanglement process and to expedite the transfer of identified lands to

	transfer to Ontario Parks to complete the gap analysis protection strategy.
Reference	FSC 6.4.5
<p>Action Taken By Company: NFRM has continued to work with MNR and Ontario Parks on the process. Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Letter from NFRM sent to Ed Tear agreeing to the additions to the Chiniguchi Waterway Park in Sudbury; - Map of the proposed amendment; - Email from Mary Lou McKeen (North Bay District) confirming that the area dropped from the Floodwood Conservation Reserve (in the North Bay District) was used for the addition to the Chiniguchi Waterway Park. An McKeen's email also identifies that a number of other OLL sites will become regulated and be formally removed from our SFL landbase. <p>Based on the above, NFRM concludes that it has been so long since the original gap analysis was carried out that they should now wait until receipt of the new inventory which is planned for 2014 to see if there are any remaining gaps in representation.</p>	
Auditor Comments: Based on a review of the above information, this Observation can be closed.	
Position in the end of this audit: Closed	

2011 Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and Observations (OBSs) assigned as a result of the current evaluation are published as separate files on the FSC certificate database.

6.0 Stakeholder Comment*

SCS conducts stakeholder outreach as part of annual audits in order to assess on-going conformance to the applicable FSC standards. Stakeholder consultation activities can include telephone calls, written letters, emails or consultation in the field. The results of stakeholder consultation activities are summarized below. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS have been noted.

Box 6.1 – Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team Where Applicable	
SCS did not receive any comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

7.0 Certification Decision

Box 7.1 Surveillance Decision	
The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship standards. The SCS annual audit team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

audits and the FME's response to any open CARs.	
Comments: No additional comments	

Section B - Appendices

Appendix 1 – List of FMUs selected for evaluation (CONFIDENTIAL)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FME consists of a single FMU – <i>No further action required</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> FME consists of multiple FMUs – <i>See table below, which applies to multiple FMU and group management evaluations, but is inapplicable if the scope of the evaluation is a single FMU.</i>

Appendix 2 – Evaluation of Management Systems (CONFIDENTIAL)*

SCS conducted the audit from Oct 3-5, 2011 with an audit team comprised of Dave Wager (lead auditor) and Peter Higgelke (team forester). The process included the assembly and review of audit evidence consisting of documents, interviews, and on-site inspections of ongoing or completed forest practices. Documents describing these activities and lists of management activities were provided to the auditors in advance, and a sample of the available field sites was designated by the audit team for review. The selection of field sites for inspection was based upon the risk of environmental impact, special features, past non-conformances/observations, and other factors. During the audit, the audit team reviewed a sample of the available written documentation as objective evidence of FSC conformance. Documents that were reviewed during this audit included management plans, SOP's, timber sale inspection forms, chemical use records, among other policies, procedures and records.

The audit team used a consensus approach to determine whether or not there was conformance with each of the indicators being assessed during this audit. The audit team also selected and interviewed contract loggers, employees within the SFL, and MNR regulatory officials, to assess conformance with the FSC standards.

Appendix 3 – Stakeholder analysis (CONFIDENTIAL)*

3.1 Stakeholder list (confidential)

Name/ Title	Organization	Contact	Consultation method
Peter Street/General Manager	NFRM	(707) 752-5430	Email, telephone, interview
Tom MacLean/Forester	NFRM	(707) 752-5430	Field consultation
Ric Hansel/Forester	NFRM	(707) 752-5430	Field consultation
Mark Lockart/Planning Forester	NFRM	(707) 752-5430	Field consultation
Darryl Sebesta /Forester	NFRM	(707) 752-5430	Field consultation
Frank Simard/Forest Technician	NFRM	(707) 752-5430	Field consultation

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name/ Title	Organization	Contact	Consultation method
Robin Hill Forest Technician	MNR		Field consultation
Guylaine Thauvette/Area Forester	MNR	705-475-5539	Field consultation
Joel Gerard, Forester	MNR		
Tom Clouthier/Shareholder/Owner	Hec Clouthier & Sons		Field consultation
Roger Langlois/Forest Technician	Hec Clouthier & Sons		Field consultation
Blayne Behnke. Shareholder, operator	Behnke Logging		Field consultation
Marc Bouthillier/Forester	TEMBEC		Field consultation
Rodney Beaucage, Thinning contractor	Longwood Forestry		Field Consultation

3.2 Stakeholder review, complaints, and resolution

Box 3.2.1 – Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team Where Applicable	
FME has not received any stakeholder complaints and the annual audit uncovered no known disputes since the previous evaluation. SCS has not received any complaints from stakeholders regarding its performance or treatment of FME's management system.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Appendix 4 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed (CONFIDENTIAL)*

The audit team did not employ any additional audit techniques for this annual surveillance audit.

Appendix 5 – Changes in Certification Scope

Categorization of HCVF was updated.

Changes in Certificate Scope				
<i>Check all applicable changes and include updated information</i>				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Organization name			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Contact person	Name:		
		Telephone:		e-mail:
<input type="checkbox"/>	FSC salesperson	Name:		
		Telephone:		e-mail:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Website address			
Certificate information				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Certificate Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Group		
<input type="checkbox"/>	SLIMF <i>if applicable</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Group Members <i>if applicable</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Number of FMUs in scope of certificate	# of Group Members		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Number of FMUs in scope of certificate	#		
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:				
<input type="checkbox"/>	privately managed ¹	ha or ac		
<input type="checkbox"/>	state managed	ha or ac		
<input type="checkbox"/>	community managed ²	ha or ac		
Number of FMUs in scope that are:				
<input type="checkbox"/>	less than 100 ha in area	#	100 - 1000 ha in area	#
	1000 - 10 000 ha in area	#	more than 10 000 ha in area	#
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:				
<input type="checkbox"/>	are less than 100 ha in area	#		
<input type="checkbox"/>	are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	#		
<input type="checkbox"/>	meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs	#		

¹ The category of 'private management' includes state owned forests that are leased to private companies for management, e.g. through a concession system.

² A community managed forest management unit is one in which the management and use of the forest and tree resources is controlled by local communities.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Division of FMUs into manageable units:		
	Describe any changes as to how FMUs are divided into manageable areas, units or stands.		
Social Information			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):		
	# of male workers	# of female workers	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Number of accidents in forest work since last audit	Serious	Fatal
		#	#

Production Forests		
Timber forest products		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	<i>ha or ac</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	<i>ha or ac</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems ³	<i>ha or ac</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	<i>ha or ac</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	The sustainable rate of harvest (usually the AAC where available) of commercial timber (cubic meters of round wood)	<i>m³ or bd ft by species</i>
Non-timber forest products		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	<i>ha or ac</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	<i>ha or ac; kg; or some other quantity per ha or ac</i>
Species and product categories in scope of joint FM/COC certificate		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scientific/ Latin Name (Common/ Trade Name)	
	<i>Abies religiosa</i> (Sacred fir), <i>Nothofagus</i> spp. (Southern beech), <i>Vochysia ferruginea</i> (Chancho), <i>Carya ovata</i> (Pignut hickory)	

³ The area is the *total* area being regenerated primarily by planting, *not* the area which is replanted annually. NB this area may be different to the area defined as a 'plantation' for the purpose of calculating the Annual Accreditation Fee (AAF) or for other purposes.

FSC Product Classification			
Wood Products	Product Level 1	Product Level 2	
<input type="checkbox"/>	W1 Rough Wood	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	W1 Rough Wood	W1.2 Fuel Wood	
<input type="checkbox"/>	W1 Rough Wood	W1.3 Twigs	
<input type="checkbox"/>	W2 Wood charcoal		<i>E.g. Barbecue charcoal</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	W3 Wood in chips or particles	W3.1 Wood chips <i>(Please select the appropriate product from the list)</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	W5 Solid wood (sawn, chipped, sliced or peeled)	W5.1 Fitches and boules <i>(Please select the appropriate product from the list)</i>	<i>E.g. Lumber core, rough-cut lumber, blockboard, stave core board, Railroad tie, Wood blocks, friezes, strips.</i>
Non-timber forest products	Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3
<input type="checkbox"/>	N1 Bark		
<input type="checkbox"/>	N4 Straw, wicker, rattan and similar	N4.1 Rattan cane (rough form) <i>(Please select the appropriate product from the list)</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	N6 Plants and parts of plants	N6.1 Flowers <i>(Please select the appropriate product from the list)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> N6.3.1 Christmas trees
<input type="checkbox"/>	N7 Natural gums, resins, oils and derivatives	N7.1 Rubber/ Latex <i>(Please select the appropriate product from the list)</i>	<i>E.g. Gum arabic, gum tragacanth, gamboge, frankincense, myrrh, Dammar, elemi, sandarac, canada balsam, benjamin, pitch, lacquer, unguents, incense, Camphor, Brazil nut oil, Copaiba Oil.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	N9 Food	N9.1 Nuts <i>(Please select the appropriate product from the list)</i>	<i>E.g. Deer, rabbit, berries, açai, Shiitake mushrooms, pine mushrooms, mate, Brazil nuts, cashew nuts</i>
For a full list of FSC product classes, product types, and product sub-types, see FSC-STD-40-004a (Version 2-0) EN – FSC Product Classification.			

Conservation Areas				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives		ha or ac
High Conservation Value Forest/ Areas				
High Conservation Values present and respective areas				
	Code	HCV Type ⁴	Description & Location	Area
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV1	Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	AOCs for Red shoulder hawk, bald eagle, wood turtle, white tail deer wintering areas, moose aquatic feeding areas, & heronries Naturally occurring red spruce stand	51,043
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV2	Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.	None	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	Late seral stage white pine, red pine hemlock and undisturbed tolerant hardwood stands	5,424
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	Trout Lake & Sturgeon River AOCs	2,652
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV5	Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).	None	
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV6	Forest areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).	Ottawa, French and Mattawa Waterway Parks	102,859
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest'			161,978 ha
<i>There has been no reduction in HCVF. A new HCVF Composite map has been prepared showing all of these</i>				

⁴ High conservation values should be classified following the numbering system given in the ProForest High Conservation Value Forest Toolkit (2003) available at www.ProForest.net or at www.wwf.org

areas. The above areas do not include areas that overlap between Categories (Category 1 was given a higher priority over Category 3, Category 3 was given a higher priority than Category 4 etc.)

Appendix 6 – Pesticide derogations

NFRM does not have any pesticide derogations.

Appendix 7 – Detailed observations (CONFIDENTIAL)

Evaluation year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2009	P6, P7
2010	P4, P9
2011	P1, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, P8, and 9.4
2012	
2013	Full Recertification Audit

C= Conformance with indicator/ criterion

NC= Non-Conformance with indicator/ criterion

NA = indicator/ criterion is not applicable

REQUIREMENT	C/N	NFRM
P1 Forest management shall respect all applicable laws of the country in which they occur, and international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC Principles and Criteria.		
C1.1 Forest management shall respect all national and local laws and administrative requirements.	C	
1.1.1 The manager, staff and/or contractors understand their obligations regarding forestry, environmental, labour and health and safety regulations and a system is in place whereby staff are kept up-to-date with new regulations. (See Appendix 1 for a listing of relevant provincial and national legislation). <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff members display working knowledge of the regulations/legislation and legal responsibilities. System/process whereby staff members are kept abreast of new developments in regulations/legislation and legal responsibilities.	C	NFRM staff demonstrated sufficient awareness of pertinent regulations. Staff have access to MNR webpages, which detail all pertinent regulations. Numerous avenues exist through which NFRM is provided with information about new regulations, legislation and legal responsibilities. NFRM staff are notified by MNR of changes in regulatory or policy documents and of training events. NFRM involvement in Provincial Committees ensures staff are kept up-to-date with current & proposed legislation.
1.1.2 The manager shall demonstrate that it has a satisfactory record of compliance with legal and administrative regulations regarding forest management <i>Means of verification:</i>	C	There were 127 FOIP Reports carried out by NFRM & MNR since the 2010 and there were only two instances of non compliance (another eight reports are awaiting further review). Since the 2010 audit five warning letters have been issued by MNR (1 of which was not

<p>Record of periodic compliance inspections. Record of corrective actions that have been implemented in the case of any identified non-compliances</p>		<p>SFL related). Documents/records reviewed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2009-2010 Annual Report – Text • 2009-2010 Annual Report – Tables • 2011-2012 Annual Work Schedule – Text • 2011-2012 Annual Compliance Plan • Folder with the 2011 Spring Compliance Meeting Presentations • Folder with Safe Work Place Certification information • FOIP Report Summary • FOIP Issues & Status Summary <p>Based on discussions with MNR and review of records/reports- SCS finds satisfactory compliance.</p>
<p>C1.2. All applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges shall be paid.</p>	C	
<p>1.2.1 The manager shall pay all applicable and legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges are paid by due date.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Records showing payment of fees and dues, including, GST, municipal taxes, stumpage, land use permit fees, workplace safety insurance board assessments, etc. Documented procedures to ensure payment of applicable stumpage and licence fees by subcontractors supplying certified wood to the manager from the forest management unit.</p>	C	<p>The following records demonstrated that payments are being made per requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Renewal Trust Balance as of March 31st, 2008 (minimum balance met) - NFRM's WSIB Clearance Certificate - Provincial & Federal Tax Returns - showing a \$0 balance owing - Stumpage Payments Summarized in Annual Reports AR- 11 found in Section 1.1.2
<p>C1.3. In signatory countries, the provisions of all binding international agreements such as CITES, ILO Conventions, ITTA, and Convention on Biological Diversity, shall be respected.</p>	C	
<p>1.3.1 The manager shall respect the relevant provisions of all binding international agreements such as CITES, ILO Conventions, and the Convention on Biological Diversity, as listed in Annex X.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Descriptions of activities carried out by the manager related to international training on international agreements, etc.</p>	C	<p>Staff are aware of pertinent agreements through Appendix B of GLSL Standard Version 3.0. Also, staff have access to a document prepared by Domtar that summarizes relevant international agreements.</p>
<p>C1.4. Conflicts between laws, regulations and the FSC Principles and Criteria shall be evaluated for the purposes of certification, on a case by case basis, by the certifiers and</p>	C	

by the involved or affected parties.		
<p>1.4.1 Any situations in which the manager’s compliance with FSC requirements conflicts with laws and regulations shall be documented and provided to FSC Canada by the manager.</p>	C	<p>No recent conflicts have arisen. However, NFRM has not compared draft version 3.0 of the GLSL standard against laws and regulations effecting their operations. (Observation 2011.1). One potential conflict is that new Stand and Site Guidelines (although not yet in-effect for NFRM) do not require insular and peninsular patches to be designated in shelterwood harvest.</p> <p>There have been no changes to a conflict discussed in 2008. NFRM has worked with FSC Canada concerning the use of herbicides in the restoration of red and white pine and the general use of herbicides to meet MNR standards. FSC Canada has provided direction in response to NFRM’s concern.</p>
<p>1.4.2 The manager should work with the appropriate regulatory bodies and FSC to resolve discrepancies between laws/regulations and FSC Principles and Criteria</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Action plan (e.g. identification of priorities, identification of key players, recommendations to solve conflicts, communications plan)</p>	C	See 1.4.1 above
<p>C1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.</p>	C	
<p>1.5.1 The manager demonstrates that measures are in place to protect the management unit from illegal/unauthorized activities.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Measures to prevent unauthorized activities (e.g boundary notices, access controls) Procedures for reporting illegal activities. Records of illegal activities (if any).</p>	C	<p>Per NFRM procedures, MNR is notified of unauthorized activities identified on the FMU. Campsites (and other illegal settlements) that appeared to exceed maximum allowed days were observed during the audit. MNR has had difficulty enforcing these regulations.</p> <p>Access restrictions are in place to protect values identified in the Crown Land Use Atlas for the following roads: LaSalle Extension, Gooderham Extension, and Hangstone (Red Cedar)</p> <p>Evidence reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policies 2 & 3 in General Section - covers illegal harvesting on Crown land & Illegal settlement & other unauthorized activities on Crown land - 1.1.2 FOIP reports - the 2 non-SFL non-compliance are from illegal harvesting of crown timber
<p>C1.6. Forest managers shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria.</p>	C	
<p>1.6.1 The manager shall demonstrate a commitment to comply with these regional standards for the length of the current management plan and has declared its intention to</p>	C	As detailed in Section 3.1 to 3.6, of FMP long term management direction is consistent with indicator 1.6.1.

protect and maintain the integrity of the forest in the long term.		
<p>FSC does not require a forest management enterprise to apply to have all of its forest operations certified, nor to agree to a timetable for such evaluation.</p> <p>A manager can further demonstrate a long-term commitment to the FSC Principles and Criteria by demonstrating that all of the forests it manages are certified to FSC's Controlled Wood standard (FSC-STD-30-010). This standard allows forest management enterprises to provide evidence that the wood they supply has been controlled to avoid wood that is illegally harvested, harvested in violation of traditional and civil rights, harvested in forest management units in which high conservation values are threatened by management activities, harvested in areas in which forests are being converted to plantations or non-forest use or harvested from forests in which genetically modified trees are planted.</p> <p>It is the goal of FSC Canada to encourage certificate holders to move towards having all of their holdings FSC certified.</p>		
<p>P2 Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.</p>		
<p>C2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claims and use rights. The circumstances and status of any outstanding disputes will be explicitly considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.</p>	C	
<p>2.3.1 Where there is a dispute over tenure claim and use rights, the applicant is implementing a dispute resolution process that has been mutually agreed to.</p>	C	<p>There are no disputes over tenure claim or use rights. NFRM procedures/policies ensure disputes follow a clear resolution process should they arise.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dispute Mechanism Process identified in Part 11 of the sample Overlapping Licence Agreements found in Section 1.1. - See Section 20 page 34 in the Shareholder's Agreement found in the General Information Section - See NFRM Policy # 5 found in the General Information Section <p>There is also an Issue Resolution Process identified in the 2009 Forest Management Planning Manual</p>
<p>2.3.2 The manager is not involved in outstanding disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests in relation to tenure claims and use rights on the management unit. The magnitude and extent depend on various factors including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the dispute involves local rights holders; • Whether the dispute involves legal or customary rights; • The range of issues and/or interests involved; • Whether the potential impacts on the disputant(s) are irreversible or cannot be mitigated; and/or • Whether the dispute involves issues related to meeting the FSC GLSL Regional Standard. 	C	<p>There are no outstanding disputes of significant magnitude. See 2.3.1 above. NFRM worked closely with stakeholder on a recent harvest in GP Northwood LP Block 143 to avoid a dispute.</p>

P3 The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.

Terminology

The term “Indigenous Peoples” in this standard means “Aboriginal Peoples” as defined in the Canadian Constitution Act, 1982 to include “Indians, Inuit and Métis”.

The Supreme Court in Canada has recognized and clarified the application of Aboriginal and Treaty rights in a number of recent landmark decisions (e.g. Sparrow 1990, Delgam’uukw 1997, Powley 2003 and Haida 2004, to name a few). The legal framework related to Aboriginal Peoples in Canada is constantly evolving.

Aboriginal rights are collectively held rights, therefore most of the language referring to Indigenous or Aboriginal rights in this standard refers to “Aboriginal Peoples” or communities as a whole, rather than to individuals. “Aboriginal community” refers to any First Nations or Métis community (status or non-status) with a demonstrated traditional connection to the area in question.

<p>C3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.</p> <p>On Private and Community forests, the dispute resolution requirements described in 3.1.5b is the mechanism to address 3.2.</p>	C	
<p>3.2.1 On Public forests, the manager makes use of an assessment of Aboriginal resources and tenure rights, undertaken by or jointly with the affected Aboriginal communities.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Baseline data on numbers of traditional land users, resources used, areas frequented and revenues generated from traditional land-use.</p>	C	<p>Each First Nation has prepared the social economic profile report for its own community. They also prepared background information reports which contain information on past resource uses and values identified by the community. During the preparation of the FMP the First Nations were involved in identifying their values on the Forest and developing protection measures (AOCs) for those values. Some of these are also included as HCVFs on the Nipissing Forest. During 2011 audit, SCS auditor viewed maps of AOC- and observed consistent protection of AOC’s during field inspections.</p>
<p>3.2.2 On Public forests, the manager ensures that management activities outlined in the management plan do not threaten or diminish Aboriginal resources are based on the results of the assessment described in 3.2.1.</p>	C	<p>Verified that the Native Values are protected by AOC’s as part of the FMP.</p>

P4 Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.

Employees and Forest Workers Definitions

Employee: Anyone who is on the payroll of the manager, in a full-time, part-time or seasonal capacity, for whom the manager withholds and remits taxes in accordance with federal and provincial laws.

<p>Forest worker: All employees as defined above, as well as self-employed contractors, the employees of contractors or the employees other companies whose activities (e.g. planning, road-building, thinning, harvesting, hauling, etc) contribute directly to the delivery of wood to the manager that will be included in the scope of the FSC certificate.</p>		
<p>C4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.</p>	C	
<p>4.2.1 The manager ensures that all forest workers comply with all relevant provincial occupational health and safety requirements,</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Safety policy. Equipment safety inspection records. Worker interviews. Written contracts or understandings with contractors or other employers of forest workers</p>	C	<p>NFRM is certified as an Ontario Safe Work Place, a manual of Health and Safety Policies and Procedures, April 2010, and a health and safety representative identified. NFRM’s SWO Safety Policies were updated in 2010. No workplace safety concerns were observed during the audit. There have been no cases of lost time or medical aids injuries to Staff since SFL started in 1996.</p>
<p>4.2.2 The manager has a process in place for fairly resolving disputes with employees pertaining to occupational health and safety.</p>	C	<p>NFRM abides by SWO Safety Policies which includes fair dispute resolution for employees. In its “Health and Safety Policies and Procedures”, NFRM has established an “Overview of Roles and Responsibilities” to ensure that health and safety concerns are communicated to the NFRM general Manager.</p> <p>Furthermore, NFRM has a Health and Safety Representative who acts on behalf of NFRM staff and contractors in ensuring that employer health and safety requirements are met as described in the Occupational Health and Safety Act (Ontario). NFRM employees and contractor employees are encouraged to contact the health and safety representative with any issues regarding safety in the workplace. The Health and Safety representative has been contacted by contractor employees in the past about working conditions and has met with the contractor to rectify the situation. This act includes provision for any worker to refuse to perform work that he or she believes will endanger themselves or others. The act prohibits reprisals by the employer. Evidence: SWO Health and Safety Policies</p>
<p>C4.4. Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups directly affected by management operations.</p>	C	
<p>4.4.1 Local communities, community and non-government organizations, forest workers, and the</p>	C	<p>The legislated Forest Management Planning Manual (FMPM) requires that meaningful public consultation</p>

<p>interested public affected by forest management are provided with meaningful opportunities to participate in forest management planning. The manager demonstrates that all input was considered and responded to.</p>		<p>occur during the preparation of a plan. All input received from the public during the consultative process for the 2009 FMP has been summarized including responses given by NFRM and/or MNR and provided to the auditors.</p> <p>NFRM has a signed Resource Stewardship Agreements with 39 tourism outfitters which recognizes and provides for protection of their values on the forest. Areas of Concern prescriptions currently being applied were reviewed for use by the public during the 2009 FMP planning process. Many changes to the AOC prescriptions were included in the 2009 FMP as a result of the input received. First Nation communities are given an option to follow the consultation process outlined in the Manual or develop their own consultation approach with NFRM.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Summary of Public Consultation by Stage of FMP Development - Summary of Public Input and Responses during the development of the 2009 FMP - Terms of Reference for the 2009 FMP - which identifies what public consultation will be taken during the preparation of the FMP - Public Notice for the recent minor amendment
<p>4.4.2 Adjacent landowners and local resource users that may be directly affected by forest operations are provided with notice, and their concerns considered prior to commencement of harvesting and operations.</p>	C	<p>Numerous letters to adjacent landowners and other Stakeholders were sent by NFRM. NFRM worked closely with stakeholder on a recent harvest in GP Northwood LP Block 143 to avoid a dispute. The North Bay District MNR has identified all adjacent land owners to proposed operations and sent letters inviting them to attend the Information Centres for the 2009 FMP.</p>
<p>4.4.3 On public lands, a public participation process is used to supplement the requirements of 4.4.1. The manager openly seeks representation from a broad and balanced range of interested parties and invites them to participate.</p>	C	<p>The planning process in Ontario requires that a Local Citizens' Committee participate in plan development and implementation through regular meetings. Members represent a range of interests local to the area and are able to comment and provide input on forest management. NFRM and MNR attend the meetings and use the forum as another means of providing information to the public. The LCC was heavily involved in the development of the 2009 FMP.</p> <p>Under the FMP Manual, First Nation communities are provided an option to follow the consultation process</p>

		outlined within the Manual or develop their own consultation approach with NFRM.
<p>4.4.4 The public participation process on public lands uses clearly defined ground rules that contain provisions on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals; • Timelines; • Internal and external communications; • Resources (human, physical, financial, informational or technological) according to needs; • Roles, responsibilities and obligations of participants, including their organizations; • Decision-making methods; • Authority for decisions; • Mechanism to adjust the process as needed; • Access to information; • Participation of experts, other interests and government; and • A dispute resolution mechanism. <p>The participants have been involved in the development of, and agreed to, the ground rules.</p>	C	<p>The public consultation process required by the Forest Management Planning Manual for Ontario addresses all of the bullet points within this criterion. Specifically, it sets goals and timelines for the plan development; it outlines a public communication process; it describes the human resources required to develop a sound plan; it requires that a planning team be struck and develop a terms of reference to guide it which must address many of the items listed in this criterion. The Manual also describes a dispute resolution process.</p> <p>The planning team develops and agrees to the terms of reference.</p> <p>The current Manual underwent a public review as required for its development and release in 2009. The 2009 FMP was developed using the 2004 FMP Manual and that manual contained a similar section.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2009 FMP Manual (2004) section 3.0 starting at page A-89 outlining the public participation process and the issue resolution process - Policy #5 on Resolving Disputes found in the General Information section above - Sample of notices that have gone out for the 2009 FMP (and which newspapers they were
<p>C5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels that can be permanently sustained.</p> <p>This Criterion addresses the actual harvest of forest products. The related but different topic of setting sustainable harvest levels is addressed in 7.1.1 (Annex D)</p>	C	
<p>5.6.1 The manager demonstrates that the average of the present and projected annual timber harvests over the next decade, and averages of projected timber harvests over all subsequent decades, do not exceed the projected long term harvest rate, while meeting the GLSL Standards over the long term.</p>	C	<p>Sustainable harvest levels are determined during each 10 year forest management planning process. Harvest level projections for the Forest were determined for a period of 150 years, and levels do not exceed the amount that can be sustained over the long run.</p> <p>Evidence: Long Term Management Direction in Sections 3.1 through to 3.6 in the text of the 2009 FMP</p>
<p>P6 Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.</p>		
<p>C 6.2. Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas). Conservation zones and protection areas shall be established, appropriate to the scale and</p>	C	

<p>intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.</p>		
<p>6.2.1 The management plan – or related documents – has an updated list of species at risk (i.e. flora and fauna) that are presently or potentially found in the forest (i.e. the forest is located in their distribution area), as indicated in federal, provincial or regional government listings, as well as other species that have been identified as needing special protection.</p>	C	<p>Per MNR requirements, species currently listed at risk in Ontario are included in the forest management planning process. The species modeled are specific to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Forest Region and more specifically, the Nipissing Forest. Additionally, they must have documented occurrences on the Forest. For this plan, the red-shouldered hawk, southern flying squirrel, and Blandings turtle are listed as SAR. There are currently no forest-dwelling SAR flora documented on the Forest, but the Plan has included Area of Concern prescriptions for American Ginseng since there is potential for it to exist.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Table FMP 14 for AOC prescription for species that are threatened - A booklet titled “Species at Risk in the Lake Nipissing Watershed” was prepared with NFRM’s assistance
<p>6.2.2 Where plans exist, or are under development by government to protect the habitat and populations of species at risk in the forest, the manager implements all measures relevant to their activities and cooperates with efforts to control inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping and collecting.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Protection plans for species and habitat or a development schedule for plans. Records of activities undertaken under the plans.</p>	C	<p>The Endangered Species Act influences activities specifically related to species of flora or fauna that are designated as “at risk”. Existing direction for species at risk are included in the FMP.</p> <p>New direction for species at risk is developed by the MNR and is added to existing requirements for forest managers, if deemed appropriate by MNR.</p> <p>The MNR is working on recovery plans for all species at risk</p>
<p>6.2.3 Where plans identified through Indicator 6.2.2 do not exist or are incomplete or inadequate, a precautionary approach is used in management of the habitats of the relevant species at risk.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Review of precautionary measures. Comparison of approaches and levels of activity in neighbouring, similar forests. Results of habitat modelling for relevant species, where it has been undertaken.</p>	C	<p>In the FMP, all identified species at risk are afforded protection, some as mandated by Provincial direction, others as developed with the forest management planning process. Examples include AOCs for Chimney Swift and nesting sites and for Least Bittern nesting sites.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - numerous value updates are on file at the NFRM office - The AOC prescriptions in FMP Table 14 - for species at risk were taken from the draft Stand & Site Guide which is based upon the latest scientific knowledge - NFRM has a procedure for reporting new values to the MNR
<p>6.2.4 Special prescriptions are applied to protect rare</p>	C	<p>Protection of rare and uncommon species occurs</p>

<p>and uncommon species: For rare and uncommon plant and wildlife species, appropriate buffer zones or harvest modifications are applied in order to ensure their protection.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Species and habitat protection plans, or timetable for preparing such plans. Records of activities undertaken in accordance with these plans</p>		<p>primarily through area of concern (AOC) planning. Where planned operations may impact values, they become “areas of concern”. Detailed prescriptions are developed for areas of concern to mitigate the effect of timber operations on these values See also comments under 6.2.2.</p>
<p>6.2.5 The manager has established a desired target for the future distribution and abundance of rare tree species listed in 6.1.1 consistent with site conditions, historical abundance and the scale of the forest being managed. The target, management plan and operational plans should be designed to:</p> <p>Increase its relative abundance; Conserve genetic diversity; Ensure successful regeneration ; Maintain a balance of age classes in the management unit; Harvest isolated stands only if adequate natural regeneration is present within the stand or if seed from the appropriate seed zone is used to successfully regenerate (free to grow) an equivalent site within the seed zone; Harvest isolated individuals that have seed bearing potential only where they are showing signs of severe decline and are hazardous</p>	C	<p>Summary of Management Objectives (FMP-Table 6) contains numerous targets for distribution and abundance of under-represented tree species- such as white pine. During the audit SCS observed care being taken to protect red oak seedlings in herbicide treatments. The Tolerant Hardwood Guide and the Tree Marking Guide call for the retention or rare tree species in different stands. Furthermore, seed zones are used to track cones collected and stock planted to maintain genetic diversity.</p>
<p>C6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored, including: a) Forest regeneration and succession. b) Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity. c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem.</p>	C	<p>**</p>
<p>6.3.1 In consideration of the assessment results in 6.1, the manager has determined a long-term desired future forest condition that maintains, enhances or restores natural conditions in natural forests relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. diversity of forest types b. diversity of successional stages c. distribution of age classes, including old growth d. diversity of forest structures (e.g. horizontal, vertical and pattern) e. connectivity f. levels of disturbances at the landscape level (e.g. watershed) 	C	<p>Covered in the Long Term Management Direction in Sections 3.1 through to 3.6 in the text of the 2009 FMP. The long term direction is premised on emulating natural disturbances and the forest community types that such disturbances create.</p>
<p>6.3.2 Quantitative short to mid-term (e.g. 2-5 years) objectives have been set, using expert input, to maintain,</p>	C	<p>The 2009 FMP identifies Management Objective #7: “Move towards a more natural age class distribution for</p>

<p>enhance or restore natural conditions in natural forests. Plans have been developed and are being implemented to achieve the objectives.</p>		<p>each forest unit over the entire forest in mature and old-aged condition, similar to that of a natural forest dynamic. The desired level for any biodiversity indicator (Forest cover type, age structure and wildlife habitat) is intended to mimic the most likely ecological conditions that we would expect to occur.</p> <p>Using the forest management model, the approach in the FMP is to target the results of the natural benchmark to achieve an ecologically desired level. This desired level also considers that although the general intent of forest management is to emulate natural disturbance, current silviculture practices may not replicate exactly the process carried out in a natural context.</p> <p>Subsequently, the modeled achievement reflects this reality. The 82% value has been developed through the course of scoping analysis, and designated as the maximum ecological level for the Forest in the 2009 FMP.</p>
<p>6.3.3 Quantitative habitat objectives should be set, using expert input, for species whose habitat requirements have not been addressed in 6.3.1. Plans have been developed and are being implemented in natural forests to achieve the objectives.</p> <p>This indicator is intended to supplement the “coarse filter” approach outlined in 6.3.1, by encouraging managers to implement measures aimed at improving habitat for significant species with specific habitat needs.</p>	C	<p>A variety of modeling tools and software packages were utilized to model wildlife in the FMP. This results in a determination of the sustainability for various wildlife species including: Black Backed Woodpecker, Black Bear, Autumn Lynx, Hermit Thrush, Marten, Moose, Moose Late Winter, Pileated Woodpecker, Redback Salamander, Ruby-Crowned Kinglet, Red Shouldered Hawk, Rough Grouse, Southern Flying Squirrel, Snow Shoe Hare, Spruce Grouse, White Tailed Deer, and White Throated Sparrow.</p> <p>The 2009 FMP includes objectives that direct forestry activities towards achieving wildlife habitat targets for 16 wildlife species. Expert input supported the selection of the 16 species to ensure that their habitat requirements represented a broad range of habitats on the forest.</p> <p>Evidence: -Long Term Management Direction in Sections 3.1 through to 3.6 in the text of the 2009 FMP - An MNR Biologist participated on the Planning Team and was involved in the balancing of objectives.</p>
<p>6.3.4 The manager has a strategic access management plan to minimize and mitigate the negative impacts of roads. This may include but is not necessarily limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reducing road density; • reducing and/or limiting access to High Conservation 	C	<p>The FMP described the existing and planned road system on the Nipissing Forest. This includes the assigned responsibility for the road, whether that is a licensee or the MNR. A road density analysis was conducted as part of the FMP process.</p>

<p>Value Forest areas;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • decommissioning roads; • avoiding road building in or around protected areas; and-or • maintaining remoteness of areas with sensitive cultural or ecological values or where required for tourism • Maintain or restore connectivity <p>The manager collaborates with the government and other relevant authorities in implementing the plan.</p>		<p>Evidence of reducing road density includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roads no longer driveable with a 4X4 half ton truck have been removed from the roads layer and are no longer shown to the public - Motorized vehicle access is restricted in remote enhanced management areas - such as on the LaSalle Primary Road extension (north of Ottetail Creek) <p>Also, some AOC prescriptions limit road construction in certain areas such as near self-sustaining trout lakes and moose aquatic feeding area. These restrictions are included with the specific goals of maintaining remoteness for areas of sensitive cultural or ecological values or to protect tourism.</p>
<p>6.3.5 The manager complies at a minimum with all provincial regulations, policies and licence conditions pertaining to riparian and wetland protection during harvesting and road construction.</p>	C	<p>Riparian and wetlands are protected through AOC's. Observed only one isolated non-conformance of a road right of way exceeding AOC for Moose Aquatic Feeding Ara. Tembec 198. See 6.3.10 and CAR 2011.3</p> <p>Evidence: FMP Table 14 for AOC prescriptions that place conditions on harvesting and road construction</p> <p>-</p>
<p>6.3.6. Disturbance to seasonal watercourses (including intermittent and ephemeral streams, seeps, ponds, vernal pools) is avoided wherever possible. Temporary crossings are restored so as to avoid damage to seasonal watercourses.</p>	C	<p>In Ontario, forestry operations are required to comply with the "Environmental Guidelines for Roads and Water Crossings" which includes measures to minimize disturbances to seasonal watercourses where crossings are not avoidable. NFRM is obligated to adhere to these guidelines. Observed conformance with water crossings on NFRM.</p> <p>Evidence: 2009 FMP in Supplementary Documentation Section 6.1.28 for Prescriptions for Harvest, Renewal and Tending: Tree Marking, Harvesting Operations, Forest Access Roads, and Aggregate Management</p>
<p>6.3.7 The manager is implementing relevant best management practices pertaining to the protection of soils, water quality and sensitive sites.</p>	C	<p>As detailed in the 2009 FMP in Supplementary Documentation Section 6.1.28 best management practices are in place for protecting soils, water quality, and sensitive sites. Additionally, NFRM's Standard Operating Procedures Manual is available at the office for review.</p>
<p>6.3.8 In partial cuts in natural forests, harvesting (whether during normal operations or salvage following a natural disturbance) and other stand management activities leave residual structures in sufficient quantity and distribution for them to serve their ecological functions. Precise objectives for different structural components are determined and documented, and include the following considerations:</p>	C	<p>Observed sufficient quality and quantity of residual trees on sites inspected during audit. See Table 4.2 on page 123 of the Tree Marking Guide for a summary of requirements.</p>

diversity of vertical and horizontal structure and tree pattern relevant to the site; wildlife habitat; and woody debris		
<p>6.3.9 In clearcuts and other final removal cuts in natural forests, harvesting maintains residual structures in sufficient quantities and distribution so as to fulfill their ecological functions. Specific ranges for the various structural components are described in the forest management plan, consistent with the requirements below, and are implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post harvest residual includes patches or clumps of trees and individual trees and/or patches. • Residual retention includes all standing residual structure in a defined and mapped harvest area, including insular patches, peninsular patches, partial harvest areas and reserves established for other purposes. • Residual structure consists of a mix of dispersed trees and/or a range of patch sizes adapted to the size of the cutblock. Residuals are well distributed at all scales throughout the harvest area. Where the harvest area is an aggregation of smaller cutblocks, residual trees and patches shall be well distributed within the small cutblocks as well as between or among them. • All residual retention is long term, meaning it will not be harvested until at least the subsequent rotation. • The amount of residual structure retained in harvest operations will approximate levels of expected natural post-disturbance residual identified in 6.1.3. • In small harvest blocks (i.e. 5-20ha) where there is abundant residual forest in the form of harvest block separators, peninsulas, riparian or other types of reserves, or stands harvested under one of the partial cut systems in the surrounding area, residual structure of 25 to 30 individual trees per hectare should be retained within the clearcut harvest area, based on the managers' goals related to wildlife habitat and ecological characteristics. <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Maps and aerial photographs of harvested areas. Relevant training material used in courses or by harvest and site preparation Field reconnaissance.</p>	N C	<p>NFRM does not maintain uncut insular and peninsular patches when undertaking seeding and regeneration harvests. Based on a review of NFRM's procedures and discussions with NFRM and MNR staff it is unclear whether or not insular patches will be maintained during final removal harvests. FSC standard 6.3.9 requires that <i>in clearcuts and other final removal cuts in natural forests, harvesting maintains residual structures in sufficient quantities and distribution so as to fulfill their ecological functions.</i> The Indicator further specifies that <i>residual retention includes all standing residual structure in a defined and mapped harvest area, including insular patches, peninsular patches, partial harvest areas and reserves established for other purposes.</i> Clearly, if insular and peninsular patches are not designated during seeding and shelterwood harvests, uncut forest patches will not be available for retention at the final removal stage. Finally, based on NFRM's FMP, insular and peninsular patches are to be designated as uncut forest stands.</p> <p>CAR 2011.2</p>
<p>6.3.10 Forest roads, skid trails and landings are well planned and designed to minimise soil erosion and loss of productive area. Forest roads, landings and skid trails are designed to: reduce soil and road embankment erosion, soil compaction and rutting, minimise water crossings and loss of productive area;</p>	N C	<p>Nearly all of the harvest sites visited during this audit met the requirements of 6.3.10. However, SCS auditors observed a significant non-conformance at Janveaux Block 169 with excessive rutting, compaction, and residual stand damage. The operation at Janveaux Block 169 did not represent a harvest that was "well</p>

<p>minimize loss of site productivity; and ensure the protection of aquatic habitat quality during construction and use.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Proof of implementation of standards/practices, assessed in the field Use of waterbars on steep slopes and/or switchbacks Knowledge by the field workers of the standards/practices, assessed through interviews Rate and severity of non-compliances</p>		<p>planned and designed to minimize soil erosion and loss of productive area". The requirement of being "well planned and designed" includes the timing of the harvest (seasonal restrictions), equipment being used, training/oversight of contractors, and other major factors significantly influencing the outcome. CAR 2011.3</p>
6.3.11 Ruting related site damage and damage to residual trees (crown, trunks and roots) does not exceed provincial acceptable levels.	C	See 6.3.10.
6.3.12 Harvest plans schedule operations on damage prone sites to periods of the year when risks are minimized.	C	Harvest scheduling on particularly damage prone areas is generally done during dry periods or planned winter operations. Winter operations are planned on sites where access is difficult due to high water tables or wet areas that must be crossed. These operations are limited to periods when the ground is frozen to limit potential damage. In previous years problems with completion of winter operations during the period of freeze up were observed.
6.3.13 Where mechanical site preparation is adopted it keeps to a minimum soil compaction, erosion and organic nutrient displacement. The top organic layer and the underlying mineral soil are mixed rather than the organic layer removed (may vary depending on the targeted regeneration, expected competition and availability of herbicides as a treatment option).	C	Mechanical site preparation observed during 2011 audit was in conformance with these requirements. Standard practice for mechanical site preparation involved the dragging off small anchor chains with a small skidder. Desired levels of mineral soils exposure was achieved without adverse impacts to the site.
6.3.14 In natural forests regeneration efforts should emulate natural processes such as natural regeneration, direct seeding, and use local seed sources.	C	See Report Section 2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities
6.3.15 Regeneration occurs in a timely fashion, and consistent with successional objectives as outlined in 6.3.1.	C	See Report Section 2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities
C6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.	C	
<p>6.9.1 The use of exotic species, in plantations or otherwise, shall be justified and monitored for adverse environmental impacts. Only species known to be non-invasive are to be used.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Description and records of areas where exotic species are planted Inspection of exotic species plantations Results of monitoring measures</p>	C	No exotic species have been used on the forest with the knowledge of NFRM staff.
Hybrids		NA

<p>Hybrids derived from at least one exotic species are considered exotic species. Hybrids are typically sterile, and hence non-invasive. Hybridization does not constitute genetic modification of the sort referred to in FSC's definition of Genetically Modified Organisms.</p>		
<p>P8 Monitoring shall be conducted -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management -- to assess the condition of the forest, yields of forest products, chain of custody, management activities and their social and environmental impacts.</p>		
<p>C8.1. The frequency and intensity of monitoring should be determined by the scale and intensity of forest management operations, as well as, the relative complexity and fragility of the affected environment. Monitoring procedures should be consistent and replicable over time to allow comparison of results and assessment of change.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>8.1.1 The management plan's implementation is subject to regular monitoring that documents:</p> <p>The degree in which goals, objectives and targets were met Conformance to the management plan Unexpected effects of management activities; and Social and environmental effects of management activities</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Regular monitoring occurs in multiple forms. First, site specific monitoring is accomplished through compliance monitoring. Annually the SFL submits Annual Reports to the MNR which include reports of activities during the year. These Annual Reports formulate the basis for the development of the Report of Past Forest Operations (RPFO) every five years, also by the SFL holder. The RPFO includes discussions of these points.</p> <p>Also, every SFL undergoes an Independent Forest Audit (IFA) once every five years as specified in the Crown Forest Sustainability Act. The IFA is performed by a team of qualified auditors, each of which has no conflict of interest in completing the audit and covers a term of five years. Included as components of the IFA are all of the requirements of this indicator. The last IFA for the Nipissing Forest was 2011; however, it has yet to be released.</p> <p>- The Long Term Management Direction also identifies how each objective will be measured and when as a test for sustainability</p> <p>- Monitoring of full tree skidding was carried out in white pine shelterwood stands several years ago. A monitoring program for full tree skidding in hardwood shelterwood areas was visited during the audit.</p> <p>Evidence:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 10 Year and Annual Compliance Plans - Annual Reports - FOIP Report Summaries - IFA Documents
8.1.2 The monitoring program has been designed to see if the results of management activities conform to the stated objectives, and provide the information required to allow the necessary adaptations if the objectives are not met.	C	See 8.1.1. Documented in MNR's Forest Resource Assessment Policy (FRAP)
8.1.3 The manager should have or be participating in the development of a system of sample plots, including permanent plots, and should use this information to measure forest condition and trends over time, including the impacts of forest management.	C	<p>NFRM participates in the development of several sampling initiatives including planting assessments, regeneration assessments and free-to-grow surveys. This information is used to measure forest condition and trends over time and is considered in the RPFO and IFA report to assess impacts of forest management.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall Planting Summary • 2002-2003 Planting Summary Report • Fall versus Spring Planting • NEBIE Plot Network • NEBIE Partner's Report • SIRD Project Report • SEM Report McWilliams Township
8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators: a) yield of all forest products harvested, b) growth rates, regeneration, and condition of the forest, c) composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna, d) environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations, and e) cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.	C	
<p>Yield of all forest products harvested</p> <p>8.2.1 The manager monitors timber harvest volumes by species and product.</p>	C	<p>NFRM prepares Annual Reports which includes reporting of timber harvest volumes by species by all parties on the Nipissing Forest for the period April 01 to March 31.</p> <p>Evidence: Annual Report</p>
8.2.2 The manager has assembled readily available information about the harvest of timber by parties other	C	This is covered in the Annual Report.

<p>than themselves on the managed forest unit.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <p>Information (i.e. volume harvested by species, location of harvest) related to the timber harvests of overlapping licensees, third parties, independent operators, and any others who conduct harvest operations in the forest.</p>		
<p>Growth Rates, Regeneration, and Condition of the Forest</p> <p>8.2.3 The manager monitors growth rates, regeneration and condition of the forest, including but not necessarily limited to forest health, disturbance, and age class structure.</p>	C	See 8.1.1.
<p>Changes in Flora and Fauna</p> <p>8.2.4 The manager conducts regular monitoring of the forest in order to highlight changes to important habitat characteristics.</p>	C	<p>RPFOs and IFA reports include monitoring of habitat characteristics.</p> <p>There are numerous value updates on file at the NFRM office</p> <p>MNR also conducts wildlife surveys and updates the information in NRVIS on a regular basis.</p> <p>Also, see comments in 8.1.1.</p>
<p>Environmental Impacts</p> <p>8.2.5 The manager monitors environmental impacts of forest management activities assessed in accordance with Criterion 6.1.</p>	C	Covered through compliance monitoring. See FOIP report discussion in 1.1.2
<p>8.2.6 The manager sets up and implements, or participates in, a program to monitor the status of the applicable High Conservation Values as identified in 9.1 following the manager’s activities in or adjacent to those High Conservation Value Forests, including the effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or restoration.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <p>Documented HCV monitoring program.</p>	C	<p>HCV protection measures are implemented through AOC prescriptions in the forest management planning process and performance of harvesting operations are required to be in accordance with the FMP. Monitoring of AOCs is done through compliance monitoring and depletions mapping to ensure that harvesting activities are implemented only within areas so designated. Also, see comments in 9.1.1.</p>
<p>8.2.7 When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific conservation attribute, the manager re-evaluates the measures taken to maintain or enhance that attribute, and adjusts the management measures to reverse the trend.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <p>Results of monitoring program.</p>	C	<p>All AOC prescriptions are re-evaluated in the development of each new forest management plan. For example, the 2004 FMP included moose late wintering habitat and the AOCs for the developing 2009 FMP include critical thermal cover for moose which cover both winter and summer</p>

		<p>concerns.</p> <p>The AOC Task Team reviewed all AOC prescriptions and increase/modified protection where required - example self sustaining lake trout (SSLT) AOC</p>
<p>Impacts on Cultural Values and Resources</p> <p>8.2.8 The manager monitors the impacts of forest management activities on cultural values, resources and uses.</p>	C	<p>RPFOs and IFA reports include discussions of meeting FMP objectives related to this indicator.</p> <p>Also refer to FOIP reports under indicator 1.1.2.</p>
<p>Economics</p> <p>8.2.9 The manager monitors the costs, productivity and efficiency of forest management activities, consistent with Criterion 5.1.</p>	C	<p>Stumpage revenues and silvicultural expenditures are reported annually. Annual reports include reporting of revenues and silviculture expenditures.</p>
<p>C8.3. Documentation shall be provided by the forest manager to enable monitoring and certifying organizations to trace each forest product from its origin, a process known as the "chain of custody."</p>	C	
<p>8.3.1 A documented procedure is in place to identify FSC-certified products leaving the management unit so that the forest of origin can be identified.</p>	C	<p>Wood is sold as standing stumpage but under the ownership of the crown until it is received by the mill. NFRM's COC covers the forest to the mill gate.</p> <p>It is a legal requirement that all wood harvested from Crown land in Ontario is transported using the scaling and billing system of the MNR. This system includes paper work in the form of a bill of lading prepared at the loading site by the loader operator. Copies of this bill of lading then are kept by the transporter, the receiving facility and the MNR, thereby ensuring that the source of all products can be identified.</p>
<p>C8.4. The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.</p>	C	
<p>8.4.1 The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan in accordance with the requirements of 7.2.1.</p>	C	<p>Ontario's forest management planning system involves planning to be performed at 10 year intervals. These plans have requirements that address all items in 7.2.1., as well as other new developments put forth by the MNR.</p> <p>The Nipissing Forest 2009 FMP was developed in accordance with the 2004</p>

		FMPM. Additionally, past compliance problems were used in the development of the 10 Year Compliance Plans and annually reviewed for the development of the Annual Compliance Plans.
C8.5. While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.	C	
8.5.1 The results of monitoring activities are regularly compiled. For public lands, a summary report is available to the public.	C	<p>- Compliance inspection reports are available for review by the public & are summaries in the Annual Reports.</p> <p>- Each Annual Compliance Plan documents previous compliance concerns and identifies steps/training required to prevent re-occurrence.</p> <p>Annual reports are made available for public inspection at the appropriate MNR district or area office, and the office of the sustainable forest licensee (2004 FMPM; page E-19). As well, online provisions of Tables AR-12 http://www.web2.mnr.gov.on.ca/mnr/forests/public/compliance/AR_12_05_06/2005/en/58978-1.html and AR-13 http://www.web2.mnr.gov.on.ca/mnr/forests/public/compliance/AR_12_05_06/2005/en/58978-2.html of the Annual Reports, are made to show the results of annual forest operations inspections on the Nipissing Forest by all parties including the MNR.</p>
P9 Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach.		
C9.4. Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.	C	**
See 8.2.6 and 8.2.7.	C	<p>Compliance monitoring during operations has been utilized to assure that the protective measures are applied on the ground and the effectiveness of protection measures. The field operations are also constantly providing new information on HCV values that have not been previously identified in the forest.</p> <p>Regular updates of endangered species with high probability of occurrence on adjacent to lands managed</p>

	<p>as part of Nipissing Forest are received and reviewed. New species that must be monitored are then included in training for tree markers and other forest workers who may have an opportunity to observe and identify the species as part of forest operations. This helps to assure that such species are found and protected during operations.</p>
--	--