



2000 Powell St., Suite 600  
Emeryville, CA 94608, USA  
[www.scscertified.com](http://www.scscertified.com)  
Brendan Grady  
[bgrady@scscertified.com](mailto: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
9/21/2012
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
11/06/2012

## 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 <sup>st</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <sup>nd</sup> annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <sup>rd</sup> annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 <sup>th</sup> annual audit
Name of Forest Management Enterprise and abbreviation used in this report:			

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.scs-certified.com](http://www.scs-certified.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 4.0 for those CARs and their disposition as a result of this annual audit);
- 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.

**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 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION ..... 9

    4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations ..... 9

    4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations ..... 13

5.0 STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS ..... 15

    5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted ..... 16

    5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable ..... 16

6.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION ..... 17

7.0 CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE ..... 17

8.0 ANNUAL DATA UPDATE ..... 17

    8.1 Social Information ..... 17

    8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide And Other Chemical Use..... 17

SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)..... 17

Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation..... 19

Appendix 2 – Evaluation of Management Systems ..... 19

Appendix 3 – List of Stakeholders Consulted..... 19

Appendix 4 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed..... 19

Appendix 5 – Pesticide Derogations ..... 20

Appendix 6 – Detailed Observations..... 20

Appendix 7 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs..... 58

## SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

### 1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

#### 1.1 Annual Audit Team

<b>Auditor Name:</b>	Dave Wager	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Lead auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b> 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 17 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.			
<b>Auditor Name:</b>	Peter Higgelke	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Forester
<b>Qualifications:</b> 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 2003.			

#### 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
<b>D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>(Line D = (Total number of days in Line A x Total number of auditors from Line B) + additional days from Line C.</b>	

#### 1.3 Standards Employed

##### 1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

None

##### 1.3.2. SCS Interim FSC Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
SCS Interim Standard for GLSL	2.0	2012

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 2010). 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](http://www.scs-certified.com/forestry) or upon request from SCS.

## 2.0 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES

### 2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

<b>Date: September 17, 2012</b> <b>Attendees:</b> NFRM Peter Street, Daryl Sebesta, Tom MacLean, Ric Hansel MNR Robin Hill (MNR) Auditors Dave Wager, Peter Higgelke	
Location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
Block 147 Nipissing First Nation; Brian Young (contractor) joins in for this stop.	Nipissing First Nation Block licensed to Young Forestry Services. Hardwood uniform seeding cut. Effort to regenerate birch. Small (<10 litre) spill from delimeter cleaned up by operator. No other FOIP issues. The block had one value (stream) that was not in NRVIS; AOC added for value protection. Interviewed contractor whose primary objective in harvesting this block was to provide fuelwood for his community.
GP Northwoods Block 150; Harvested by Sturgeon Falls Brush	Hardwood seeding regeneration cut where operator skidded some small crowned trees full tree. MNR issued non-compliance. Forced improvement and operations changed to tree length thereafter; additional stand improvement thinning completed by Brian Young after initial harvest. Block was harvested from September through December 2011. No noticeable residual stand damage. Two cedar trees inadvertently marked and harvested when stand was remarked for improvement thinning. Gravel pit < 3 ha with acceptable slope and overburden.  Area of heavy blowdown with loss of large diameter white pine residuals. No salvage operations on blowdown (no one was interested in salvaging the trees due to the poor market for white pine).  White birch and jack pine/black spruce clearcut with some white pine seed tree. Also some Uniform shelterwood and selection of hardwood stand.
Stop 8. Forestry Futures Project; Pre-commercial thinning	Year 3 of 3 red pine pre-commercial thinning conducted by R&H Forestry Services (First Nations contractor). NFRM is forecasting the

	first commercial entry into this stand in 2016.
Stop 46. McLaren Bay Road; primary road	Recent roadside brush clearing to width of road right-of-way and posting mile markers to improve safety. Right of way clearing caused some concern for local tourist outfitter as slash was left along-side of roadway; after first year this concern vanished as slash was hidden by new growth. NFRM driver consistently notified other trucks in the area of position and direction on road. RSA concerns and eagle nest AOC .
Tembec Block 201	White birch clearcut with roadside visual AOC roadside. White birch clearcut with 30 m partial cut in the AOC buffer. Regenerating well to poplar. Good leave trees and insular patch retention outside of block.
Tembec Block 210	Jack Pine/Black Spruce clearcut. Checked AOCs for cold water stream and moose aquatic. Road washed out in one spot a concern for public safety. Retention of wildlife trees looked sufficient. Some wet areas within stand but only very minor rutting.
Stop 13 UTM 0626703 5180737	2006 jack pine/spruce clearcut; broadcast spray with glyphosate 2009; mechanical site preparation with spiked chains in 2012; planted 52,000 jack pine in 2012. 90% quality.
Stop 12 UTM 0633661 5184405	Harvested in 2008; site prepared in 2010; 2011 ABS with VisionMax; planted in 2012. Chemical application was effective but missed some spots. Very good release and great pine growth.
Stop 43; Block 210	Harvested in fall of 2011 and again from spring through fall of 2012. First walkabout: MAFA AOC on warm water creek so modified strip cut permitted and completed. Planted to jack pine and red pine. Drought caused some seedling mortality. Second walkabout: Site preparation with heavy chains to remove balsam fir and red maple. Residual island showed how heavily these species had dominated the understory so site preparation was very effective. Slash had been piled with an excavator; the tree plant had been kept back from the slash piles for the burn.
Stop 13	2006 harvest in jack pine/black spruce clearcut. 2009 ABS but no tree plant in 2010 due to stock shortage. Chemical site preparation in 2012 five days before the tree plant. NFRM set up five-year stations to measure the plant. Some stations are set as monitoring stations which have demonstrated positive results such as improvements in using frozen stock.
Stop 16	2007 salvage cut; 2008 site preparation windrowing slash; 2009 plant to white pine and red pine; 2011 ABS chemical application.

	Shows no crop tree mortality; 80-90% coverage and approximately 75% competition control. Walkabout showed that the prescription was well done. White pine and red pine juveniles are doing well. Competition is reappearing but target species have been released. Further monitoring will follow to ensure follow-up treatment if needed.
<b>Date September 18, 2012</b>	
<b>Attendees:</b>	
NFRM Peter Street, Tom MacLean, Ric Hansel, Frank Simard. Mark Lockhart	
MNR Robin Hill (MNR)	
Mitig Jennie Gerow	
Auditors Dave Wager, Peter Higgelke	
<b>Location/ sites visited</b>	<b>Activities/ notes</b>
MEDC Block 229, Janveaux Contractor Joined by Tom Bartlet and Roger Ladouceur of Janveaux	Mixed wood clearcut and white pine seed tree harvested in fall of 2011. Moose aquatic and cold water fishery. Compliance issues had been addressed in FOIP Report- minor harvesting into AOC around pond with follow-up tree planting in harvested area. The validity of the fishery value had been questioned but has since been validated by MNR. Bear bait in the area had been protected.
Tembec Block 180, Janveaux Contractor	Hardwood regeneration and removal cuts in summer of 2011. Skid trails, site disturbance, residual damage, marking all looked good. Observed illegal firewood cutter on the site during the audit and the MNR representative issued a warning. Yellow birch seed tree harvest cut in summer and fall of 2011. Seed trees were spaced on a ~30 m grid and ground scarified. Good marking and reserve selection.
Voyageur multi-use trail system	Discussed coordination that NFRM has with this recreation group.
Antoine River	New bridge installation by Tembec.
Stop 23 Tom Clouthier, the Licensee joined the field audit	Red pine Pre-Commercial Thinning. Split block with ABS under white pine seed tree and ABS post-salvage and plant. First walkabout: a variety. Some open areas free or relatively free of competition. Good white pine and red pine growth. Other areas with very heavy competition and little to no white pine and red pine survival. Second walkabout: variability high. Heavy to no competition. Under the shade of residuals there was no competition while in areas with more direct sunlight completion levels were much higher.
Clouthier Block 126 North	Education site for Sir Stanford Flemming College – have been here for part of each of the past four years which makes silviculture

	difficult. Spruce/balsam fir clearcut and white pine seed tree. No residual damage, rutting, or other impacts noticeable. Good wildlife tree marking. Excellent example of slash matt/corduroy to cross low lying area of harvest.
Clouthier Block 126 South	Red pine seed tree harvest. Good protection of advanced regeneration. Good marking. No compliance issues or operational concerns identified.
Clouthier Block 133	White pine first removal and seed tree. Advanced regeneration protected. Will need tending. No compliance issues or operational concerns identified.

<b>Date September 19, 2012</b>	
<b>Attendees:</b> NFRM Peter Street, Tom MacLean, Daryl Sebesta Auditors Dave Wager, Peter Higgelke	
<b>Location/ sites visited</b>	<b>Activities/ notes</b>
Liard Block 19	White birch and poplar clearcut. Active operation. Contractor is primarily a firewood processor. Veneer logs separated at landing as Liard is expanding its utilization (in part through assistance from NFRM). Returning tops to the forest, but not dispersing. No compliance issues or operational concerns identified.
Goulard Block 15	White pine uniform shelterwood and seed tree harvest, jack pine/black spruce clearcut. First entry into previously unharvested block. Operational issues with slash, drainage, and garbage had been addressed. Native values portage route identified and protected. Sinton Creek Branch Road- New branch road construction.
Stop 3	2011 site prep; planted spring 2012; successful planting and control of competing vegetation although bindweed, pin cherry and raspberry returning. Re-assessment in spring of 2013 was contemplated during stop to schedule for 2013 treatment if required.

### 3.0 CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

No changes in management practices.



#### 4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

##### 4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2011.1</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	SCS GLSL Interim Standard, 1.4
<b>Non-Conformity:</b> Indicator 1.4.1 requires certificate holders to be aware of possible conflicts between regulations and FSC requirements. NFRM staff are not familiar with the current draft of FSC Canada's GLSL standard (V. 3.0) to know whether there will be conflicts. It would be advantageous of NFRM to identify any conflicts prior to the approval of this standard- and thus rectify them through the process of developing the standard. One potential conflict is that the MNR Stand and Site Guide does not require insular and peninsular patches in shelterwood treatments and the FSC standard requires these patches in final removal harvests. See CAR 2011.2.	
<b>Corrective Action Request:</b> NFRM should review Version 3.0 of FSC Canada's Draft GLSL Standard to identify any possible conflicts between regulations and FSC requirements.	
<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	At a conference call held on August 16th, 2012, with Vivian Peachey, from FSC Canada - NFRM/VFM offered to host a meeting to review possible conflicts with the draft FSC GLSL Standards (especially with respect to some of the requirements in the new Stand & Site Guide). Vivian responded positively in that FSC Canada would like to have a meeting with the General Managers in the GLSL Forest Region to discuss possible conflicts. The meeting will be hosted by NFRM/VFM in January or February 2013.
<b>SCS review</b>	SCS verified the above activities have taken place. SCS also modified its GLSL standard based on the latest draft from FSC Canada.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision <i>(refer to description above)</i>

<b>Finding Number: 2011.2</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	SCS GLSL Interim Standard, 6.3.9
<p><b>Non-Conformity:</b> 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. Indicator 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><b>Corrective Action Request:</b> NFRM must develop and implement procedures that clarify insular and peninsular patch retention during final removal harvests.</p>	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	Both NFRM & VFM are just starting to conduct final removal cuts in white pine and hardwood shelterwood areas. There is a conflict with Indicator 6.3.9 and the direction in the new Stand & Site Guide – which says "all stages of selection and shelterwood management are exempt" from leaving undisturbed patches. As NFRM understands it - the Natural Disturbance Pattern Emulation Guide (which the current FMP was written under), only requires insular & peninsular patches to be left in final removal cuts – which does not make sense if they are not required by the guide to be left in previous disturbances/interventions into the stand. NFRM/VFM is hoping to clear up this discrepancy with the introduction of the requirements of the Stand & Site guide into any future revision of the GLSL Standard.
<b>SCS review</b>	NFRM clarified its procedure regarding patch retention during final removal harvests and it does not conform to 6.3.11. This represents a conflict between MNR Stand and Site Guide and the FSC Standard. NFRM is working with FSC Canada to rectify this conflict in the next revision of the FSC standard. Now that NFRM has clarified its policy they need to develop a stop-gap to ensure conformance with FSC requirements until FSC Canada and the MNR standards are aligned. This CAR is closed and is replaced with minor CAR 2012.3. Because the

	audit team did not observe any instances where insular or peninsular patches did not meet FSC requirements, CAR 2012.3 is issued as a minor CAR.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

<b>Finding Number: 2011.3</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	SCS GLSL Interim Standard, 6.3.10; 6.3.11; 6.3.5
<p><b>Non-Conformity:</b> Indicator 6.10 requires “Forest roads, skid trails and landings are <b>well planned and designed</b> to minimise soil erosion and loss of productive area. Forest roads, landings and skid trails are designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- reduce soil and road embankment erosion, soil compaction and rutting;</li> <li>- minimise water crossings and loss of productive area;</li> <li>- minimize loss of site productivity; and,</li> <li>- ensure the protection of aquatic habitat quality during construction and use.</li> </ul> <p>SCS auditors observed a non-conformance at Tembec Block 198 and Janveaux Block 169. At Tembec Block 198 grubbing to build a road resulted in a compliance issue with maximum road width in Moose Aquatic Feeding (MAF) because with grubbing the road was 13-15m versus the 10m requirement. Janveaux Block 169 contained excessive rutting, compaction, and residual stand damage. The operation at Janveaux Block 169 did not represent a harvest that was “well 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. As discussed in CAR 2009.2, the level of compliance monitoring has increased in the last year, but is still less than where it was five years ago. If the level of compliance monitoring is not sufficient to avoid excessive damage such as in Janveaux Block 169 (and other major areas of concern identified in previous audits), then other measures (e.g., additional training, seasonal restrictions, equipment restrictions, etc) must be implemented.</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request:</b> NFRM must ensure forest roads, skid trails and landings are <b>well planned and designed</b> to minimise soil erosion and loss of productive area.</p>	
<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any</i>	The rutting damage and potential for further erosion along the major skid trail in Janveaux Block 169, has been voluntarily rehabilitated by Janveaux Forest

<i>evidence submitted)</i>	Products. The problem with the skid trail should have been initially identified as an “Operational Issue in FOIP”, and corrected to prevent further erosion – the trail itself was “Not Out Of Compliance” in accordance with the current FMP. The issue of well planned skid trails and landings to prevent/minimize soil erosion and loss of productive land was discussed at NFRM’s Spring Compliance Meeting – please refer to slides 21 & 22.
<b>SCS review</b>	SCS auditor verified that the above actions occurred. The rehabilitation work looked satisfactory. Furthermore, several 2012 harvests from Janveaux were selected for inspection during the 2012. Roads, skid trails, and landings visited in 2012 were well planned with had minimal erosion.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

<b>Finding Number:2011.4</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	SCS GLSL Interim Standard; 9.1.1
<b>Non-Conformity:</b> Indicator 9.1.1 requires that management makes use of existing efforts to, identify and map the presence of HCVFs by means of a process that meets the characteristics and intent of the assessment process outlined in the GLSL standard. NFRM has completed an HCVF assessment <a href="http://www.nipissingforest.com/downloads/FSC/NipissingHCVFV202007au7.pdf">http://www.nipissingforest.com/downloads/FSC/NipissingHCVFV202007au7.pdf</a> , however the assessment has not been updated with the AOC prescriptions from the current FMP.	
<b>Corrective Action Request:</b> NFRM should update the HCVF assessment so that it includes the current AOC prescriptions.	
<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	This action has been postponed. NFRM will be preparing new AOC prescriptions for Species at Risk in the next three months for Phase 2 Planning. The HCVF Report will be updated with the new prescriptions in time for the Re-Certification Audit to be conducted next spring 2013. The funding required to update the HCFV Report has been approved by the Shareholder’s in NFRM’s 2012-2013 Budget.
<b>SCS review</b>	Observation is continued until action has been completed. NFRM should note that SCS has included FSC Canada’s HCVF toolkit for the GLSL region in table

	format in the updated Interim Standard for GLSL.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

**4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations**

<b>Finding Number: 2012.1</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	SCS GLSL Interim Standard; 6.2.1
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):	
<p>Per the requirements of Indicator 6.2.1, FME’s are required to identify 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> <p>Braun’s Holly Fern and Ram’s Head Lady Slipper are rare vascular plants discussed in GLSL Tree Marking Guide. Both have been found in Nipissing District (although there are no documented occurrences on the Nipissing Forest). Both species occur in mature forests and moist sites, and are susceptible to harvest operations. Given the possibility of occurrences on Nipissing Forest, tree markers, operators, and NFRM foresters should be aware of these plants. Yet interviews revealed very little awareness, and records show that these plants have not been part of training sessions over the last few years.</p>	
<b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation):	
NFRM should implement approaches to ensure forest workers are aware of and looking out for rare vascular plant species that could be impacted from harvest operations.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	
<b>SCS review</b>	

<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>
-----------------------	--

<b>Finding Number: 2012.2</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	<b>SCS GLSL Interim Standard, Indicator 8.1.1</b>
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):	
<p>NFRM is in non-conformance with Indicator 8.1.1 that requires the management plan's implementation to be subject to regular monitoring that documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The degree in which goals, objectives and targets were met</li> <li>b. Conformance to the management plan</li> <li>c. Unexpected effects of management activities; and Social and environmental effects of management activities</li> </ul> <p>Specifically, monitoring of crossings/culverts across the FMU has not occurred per the FMP requirement of monitoring all water crossing every three years.</p>	
<b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation):	
NFRM must ensure water crossings are monitored per the requirements of the FMP.	
<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

<b>Finding Number: 3</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</b>	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator(s):</b>	<b>SCS GLSL Interim Standard, 6.3.11</b>
<p><b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</p> <p>NFRM procedures do not ensure that conformance with Indicator 6.3.11 that states “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.” Specifically the elements of 6.3.11 requiring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. 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.</li> <li>d. All residual retention is long term, meaning it will not be harvested until at least the subsequent rotation.</li> </ul> <p>NFRM does not maintain uncut insular and peninsular patches in shelterwood treatments of white pine or hardwoods. FMP and Stand and Site Guide does allow for harvesting in reserve patches when adjacent stand is 3m, thus jeopardizing the “long-term” requirement of the reserve patches.</p> <p>The audit did not uncover any harvests that did not conform with requirements of 6.3.11, rather this CAR is being issued on the fact that NFRM procedures do not conform to 6.3.911</p>	
<p><b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation):</p> <p>NFRM must implement measures to ensure conformance with 6.3.11.</p>	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

## 5.0 STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS

In accordance with SCS protocols, consultation with key stakeholders is an integral component of the evaluation process. Stakeholder consultation takes place prior to, concurrent with, and following field evaluations. Distinct purposes of such consultation include:

1. To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the FME’s management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the company and the surrounding communities.
2. To solicit input on whether the forest management operation has consulted with stakeholders regarding identifying any high conservation value forests (HCVFs).

Principal stakeholder groups are identified based upon results from the pre-evaluation (if one was conducted), lists of stakeholders from the FME under evaluation, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources (e.g., chair of the regional FSC working group). The following types of groups and individuals were determined to be principal stakeholders in this evaluation:

**5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted**

First Nation Representatives	NFRM Employees
Logging contractors	MNR Representatives
Licensees	

Stakeholder consultation activities are organized to give participants the opportunity to provide comments according to general categories of interest based on the three FSC chambers, as well as the SCS Interim Standard, if one was used. The table below summarizes the major comments received from stakeholders and the assessment team’s response. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS are noted below.

**5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable**

FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual audit.		<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Stakeholder comments</b>	<b>SCS Response</b>	
<b>Economic concerns</b>		
NFRM foresters have good availability when questions or concerns arise on active timber sales.	Noted as evidence of conformance	
<b>Social concerns</b>		
NFRM has done a good job communicating with First Nation communities and ensuring meaningful roles in management planning and local citizen committee processes.	Noted as evidence of conformance	
Good cooperation with MNR on	Noted as evidence of conformance	



a range of requirements.	
NFRM has worked with elders to do post-harvest monitoring to ensure sites with Native Values have been protected.	Noted as evidence of conformance
<b>Environmental concerns</b>	
None received.	

**6.0 CERTIFICATION 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 audits and the FME’s response to any open CARs.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	

**7.0 CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE**

There were no changes in the scope of the certification in the previous year.

**8.0 ANNUAL DATA UPDATE**

**8.1 Social Information**

<b>Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):</b>		
<b># of male workers: 4 FTE, 2 part time</b>	<b># of female workers: 0</b>	
<b>Number of accidents in forest work since last audit: none</b>	<b>Serious:</b>	<b>Fatal:</b>

**8.2 Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use**

FME does not use pesticides.

Commercial name of pesticide/ herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated annually (ha or ac)	Reason for use
Release	tryclopyr	2.88 kg	2.7 ha	Ground basal bark tending
Garlon	tryclopyr	2.88 kg	2.6 ha	Ground basal bark tending
Vision	glyphosate	6.8 kg	71.6 ha	Ground back pack foliar tending

Vision Max	glyphosate	8.76 kg	60.4 ha	Ground back pack foliar tending
Vision	glyphosate	296.65 kg	237.3 ha	Ground – air blast tending
Vision Max	glyphosate	207.86 kg	107.4 ha	Ground – air blast site preparation
Vision	glyphosate	1,043.48 kg	1,397.0 ha	Aerial tending
Release	tryclopyr	854.84 kg	356.3 ha	Aerial tending
Vision	glyphosate	36.78 kg	25.9 ha	Aerial site preparation

**SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)**

**Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation**

- FME consists of a single FMU
- FME consists of multiple FMUs or is a Group

**Appendix 2 – Evaluation of Management Systems**

SCS conducted the audit from September 16-21, 2012 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, SOPs, 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 – List of FME Stakeholders Consulted**

<b>Name/ Title</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>Consultation method</b>
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 Lockhart/Planning Forester	NFRM	(707) 752-5430	Field consultation
Daryl Sebesta /Forester	NFRM	(707) 752-5430	Field consultation
Frank Simard/Forest Technician	NFRM	(707) 752-5430	Field consultation
Jenny Gerow	GIS Consultant METIG		Field consultation

**List of other Stakeholders Consulted**

Name/ Title	Organization	Contact	Consultation method
Robin Hill Forest Technician	MNR		Field consultation
Tom Clouthier: Shareholder/Owner	Hec Clouthier & Sons		Field consultation
Brian Young, Owner	Young Forestry Services Nipissing First Nations		Field consultation
Roger Ladouceur, Logging supervisor	Tembec		Field consultation
Tom Bartlett, Manager	Jeanveaux Forest Products		Field consultation
Norm Dokis, Aboriginal Liaison	MNR	705-475-5594	Phone consultation

#### Appendix 4 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed

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

#### Appendix 5 – Pesticide Derogations

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> There are no active pesticide derogations for this FME.		
Name of pesticide/ herbicide (active ingredient)		Date derogation approved
Condition	Conformance (C/ NC)	Evidence of progress

#### Appendix 6 – Detailed Observations

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	New Criteria: P.2, P. 3., 5.1-5.4; Criteria required each year: 1.5; 2.3; 3.2; 4.2; 4.4; 5.6; 6.2; 6.3; 8.2; 9.4;

2013	Full Recertification Audit
------	----------------------------

C= Conformance with Criterion or Indicator  
 C\*= Conformance with Indicator- but Observation Issued  
 NC= Non-Conformance with Criterion or Indicator  
 NA = Not Applicable  
 NE = Not Evaluated

<b>PRINCIPLE #1: COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS AND FSC PRINCIPLES</b>		
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Criterion/ indicator</b>	<b>Evaluation Team Findings</b>	<b>C/NC</b>
<b>1.5 Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement or other unauthorized activities.</b>		C
1.5.1 The manager demonstrates that measures are in place to protect the management unit from illegal/unauthorized activities.  <i>Means of verification:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measures to prevent unauthorized activities (e.g boundary notices, access controls)</li> <li>• Procedures for reporting illegal activities.</li> <li>• Records of illegal activities (if any).</li> </ul>	Per NFRM procedures, MNR is notified of unauthorized activities identified on the FMU.  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 Road (Red Cedar Lake)  Evidence reviewed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policies 2 &amp; 3 in General Section - covers illegal harvesting on Crown land &amp; Illegal settlement &amp; other unauthorized activities on Crown land</li> </ul>	C

<b>PRINCIPLE N°2 - TENURE AND USE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES</b>		
<b>Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.</b>		
<b>Criterion/ indicator</b>	<b>Evaluation Team Findings</b>	<b>C/NC</b>
<b>2.1</b> Clear evidence of long-term forest use rights to the land (e.g., land title, customary rights, or lease agreements) shall be demonstrated.		C
2.1.1 The applicant is the owner of the forest under assessment or has the legal right to manage and use its forest resources.	<p>Sustainable Forest Licence is in place, which provides NFRM will the legal capacity to harvest species of forest resources from the Licence Area in the Nipissing Forest, subject to the Crown Forest Sustainability Act and the regulations thereto, and the terms and conditions as listed in the Licence.</p> <p>Harvesting under the SFL only occurs on Crown (public) land.</p> <p>The licesnse was renewed in 2011. Additionally, the Independent Forest Audit (IFA) in 2011 recommended renewal for the next term.</p>	C
<b>2.2</b> Local communities with legal or customary tenure or use rights shall maintain control, to the extent necessary to protect their rights or resources, over forest operations unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.		C
2.2.1 Customary tenure or resource use rights held by communities are identified and documented where they occur on the management unit.	The Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources is the steward of Ontario's provincial parks, forests, fisheries, wildlife, mineral aggregates and Crown lands and waters, including the Nipissing Forest.	C

	<p>NFRM maps show private, federal, First Nation Reserves ownership, and associated tenure rights. Area of Concern (AOC) prescriptions in the FMP document and contain provisions to protect identified values including tourism values, native values, canoe routes, parks, watersheds, recreation trails, etc..</p> <p>The public has had a chance to review and comment on the latest values maps.</p>	
<p>2.2.2 The free, prior and informed consent of communities holding customary tenure or resource rights has been obtained regarding all parts of the management plan that affect their rights and resources.</p> <p>NOTE: This requirement is normally addressed through the public participation requirements of Criterion 4.4.</p>	<p>Resource Stewardship Agreements (RSAs) are in place with tourism operators who are located and/or operate on the forest.</p> <p>Locally affected landowners, businesses, communities and First Nations are continually notified of operations and planning activities through Annual Work Schedules (AWS), Local Citizens Committee and other notification processes.</p> <p>First Nations have acceptable harvest allocation levels. NFRM works with local tourism operators on an as needed basis to maintain access roads.</p> <p>Additional Evidence:</p> <p>Reviewed copies of public notices for the AWS, slash pile burning and herbicide use.</p>	<p>C</p>

<p><b>2.3 Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claim and use rights. The circumstances and status of any outstanding disputes shall 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.</b></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>	<p>A dispute resolution processes is identified in the Forest Management Planning Manual; dispute mechanisms also form part of the overlapping license agreements and the shareholder’s agreements.</p> <p>There are no ongoing disputes over tenure claim and use rights subject to the dispute resolution process.</p>	C
<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"> <li>a. Whether the dispute involves local rights holders;</li> <li>b. Whether the dispute involves legal or customary rights;</li> <li>c. The range of issues and/or interests involved;</li> <li>d. Whether the potential impacts on the disputant(s) are irreversible or cannot be mitigated; and/or</li> <li>e. Whether the dispute involves issues related to meeting the FSC GLSL Regional Standard.</li> </ul>	<p>NFRM is not involved in any outstanding disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests in relation to tenure claims and use rights on the management unit.</p>	C



<b>PRINCIPLE Nº 3 : INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' RIGHTS</b> <b>The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.</b>		
<b>Criterion/ indicator</b>	<b>Evaluation Team Findings</b>	<b>C/NC</b>
<b>3.1 Indigenous peoples shall control forest management on their lands and territories unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.</b>		C
<p>3.1.1. Applies on public forests -The manager keeps abreast of and is able to demonstrate a good working knowledge of the Aboriginal communities, their legal and customary rights and their interests related to forest lands within the forest management planning area.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <p>Documented knowledge of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the number and demographic profile of distinct Aboriginal communities having or claiming rights and interests within the area;</li> <li>• the legal and customary rights of the Aboriginal communities;</li> <li>• the political organization and governance structure of each respective Aboriginal community; the traditional use areas or lands within the manager’s forest management area asserted by each respective Aboriginal community;</li> <li>• the existence, and current status of publicly known negotiations between Government and the Aboriginal</li> </ul>	<p>NFRM is participating in the meetings regarding the Algonquin Land Claim. General Manager, Peter Street, has excellent working knowledge of Aboriginal communities and their rights on the Nipissing forest.</p> <p>Discussions with First Nations stakeholders indicated NFRM has a good working knowledge of the legal and customary rights of communities and their issues and that the staff are helpful.</p>	C

<p>communities regarding rights and interests asserted by each respective Aboriginal community in relation to lands and resources.</p>		
<p>3.1.2 Applies on Private and Community forests - The manager has a familiarity with available information about Aboriginal communities with traditional rights within the region.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated knowledge of:</li> <li>• The Aboriginal communities with reserves, claims or asserted traditional rights in the region</li> <li>• The traditional use areas or lands within the forest management unit</li> </ul>	<p>NA</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>3.1.3 On Public forests, the manager applies best efforts and achieves measurable progress towards obtaining agreement from each affected Aboriginal community verifying that their interests and concerns are clearly incorporated into the management plan. Such agreement shall include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. A description of the roles and responsibilities of the parties;</li> <li>b. The interests of the parties;</li> <li>c. A provision indicating that this agreement is not intended to abrogate or derogate from any Aboriginal or Treaty rights held by any party to the agreement;</li> <li>d. A description of appropriate decision-making authorities for all parties;</li> <li>e. A dispute resolution mechanism; and</li> <li>f. Conditions under which consent has been given and under which it might be withdrawn, if any.</li> </ol> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal agreement or memorandum of</li> </ul>	<p>Each First Nation had a representative on the planning team for the 2009 FMP. First Nation communities are represented on the LCC by Dave Joannis of Antoine Algonquin. First Nation communities participate in the Board of Directors process through Clayton Goulais of Nipissing First Nation.</p> <p>NFRM also has developed an Agreement of Understanding. Signed agreements are in place with Antoine First Nation, Mattawa/North Bay Algonquins and Dokis First Nations.</p> <p>The Agreement of Understanding includes the provision that the agreement is not intended to abrogate or derogate from any Aboriginal or Treaty rights held by any party to the agreement. The purpose of the agreement as stated in the agreement is "...to formalize opportunities that exist in the Nipissing Forest to ensure a more equal participation of Aboriginal people in the benefits provided by Forest Management activities..."</p> <p>A dispute resolution mechanism is described in the FMPM.</p>	<p>C</p>

<p>understanding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indication from each Aboriginal community indicates that it is satisfied that the manager has incorporated their interests and concerns within the management plan.</li> </ul> <p><i>In situations where a formal agreement is not concluded, the following means of verification can help to determine the manager efforts toward reaching agreement:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the manager has informed the community in writing of their intentions to seek FSC certification, provided a copy of Principle 3 of the applicable standard and asked for a meeting to discuss how to proceed.</li> <li>• Evidence of repeated attempts, using different tactics, to open communications towards reaching agreement.</li> <li>• Minutes of any meetings with representatives of the Aboriginal community.</li> <li>• Evidence that the manager has negotiated as much of the required agreement as possible, from the description of the roles and responsibilities of the parties through to the interests of the parties, a description of appropriate decision-making authorities for all parties; a dispute resolution mechanism and the conditions under which consent has been given (or withheld) and under which it might be withdrawn (or granted)</li> <li>• Written summary of what the manager understands to be the key concerns of the community and evidence of efforts to seek confirmation in writing of this understanding from the Aboriginal community.</li> </ul>	<p>Discussions with the First Nations indicate that they are currently satisfied that NFRM has incorporated their interests and concerns within the management plan.</p> <p>NFRM participates in the Aboriginal Working Group quarterly meetings and uses the mechanism to share information, provide clarification, and discuss concerns. Some of the meeting minutes were provided to the auditors as evidence.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Minutes of meetings of the Aboriginal Working Group</li> <li>-Stakeholder interviews</li> <li>- Also made a presentation to the Temagami First Nation Community on planned activities in this AWS</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

<p>3.1.4 On public forests, the manager participates in and/or supports the efforts of the affected Aboriginal communities to develop their capacity to enable them to participate in all aspects of forest management and development.</p>	<p>NFRM has worked with First Nations to establish numerous economic opportunities. First Nation Contractors working on NFRM include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Young Forestry</li> <li>- Redbridge Forestry Services</li> <li>- Janveaux Forest Products</li> </ul>	<p>C</p>
<p>3.1.5 On public forests, the manager has jointly established with affected and interested Aboriginal communities, opportunities for long-term economic benefits where that is the desired objective.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Record of jobs filled and employment opportunities provided to Aboriginal individuals;</li> <li>• Record of training opportunities provided/available to Aboriginal individuals;</li> <li>• Joint agreements signed by both parties clearly stating the nature of the economic opportunities, evidence of revenue-sharing from forest operations, and timelines; and</li> <li>• Indication of satisfaction from the affected and interested Aboriginal community(ies).</li> </ul>	<p>See 3.1.4</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>3.1.6 Applies on Public forests - A dispute resolution process, where necessary, has been jointly developed with the affected Aboriginal communities, is documented and is being fairly implemented.</p>	<p>A dispute resolution mechanism is described in the FMPM.</p> <p>Based on interviews with First Nations (2008 FSC assessment) the dispute resolution process in the FMPM is sufficient. Neither NFRM or First Nations believe a separate dispute process to be necessary. Ongoing</p>	<p>C</p>

	communication through Aboriginal Working Group has helped prevent disputes from arising.	
3.1.7 Applies on private and community forests - If a conflict over tenure and use rights is raised by an aboriginal community, the manager comes to an agreement with the aboriginal community on measures the manager will take towards resolving the dispute.	NA	NA
<p><b>3.2 Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of Indigenous Peoples</b></p> <p>Note: On Private and Community forests, the dispute resolution requirements described in 3.1.7 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></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline data on numbers of traditional land users, resources used, areas frequented and revenues generated from traditional land-use.</li> </ul>	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 HCVMs on the Nipissing Forest. During 2012 audit, SCS auditor viewed maps of AOCs and observed consistent protection of AOCs during field inspections.	C
3.2.2 On Public forests, the manager ensures that management activities outlined in the management plan do not threaten or diminish Aboriginal	Verified that the Native Values are protected by AOCs as part of the FMP.	C

<p>resources, and are based on the results of the assessment described in 3.2.1.</p>		
<p><b>3.3 Sites of special cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance to Indigenous People(s) shall be clearly identified in cooperation with such Peoples, and recognized and protected by forest managers.</b></p>		C
<p>3.3.1 Applies on Public forests - The manager supports the efforts of the affected Aboriginal communities to conduct land use studies and mapping which result in an Aboriginal areas of concern protection agreement, addressing information sharing, protection, mitigation and/or compensation, and confidentiality measures for Aboriginal traditional values and uses.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written plan on Aboriginal land use and values and supporting maps;</li> <li>• Evidence of financial or technical support by the manager to conduct land use studies and mapping;</li> <li>• Evidence of the implementation of the Aboriginal areas of concern protection agreement including evidence of change in forestry operations, if pertinent;</li> <li>• Evidence of negotiations with hunters, trappers and other Aboriginal individuals who are land users, that are endorsed by the Aboriginal communities</li> </ul>	<p>Each community produced a Background information report which summarizes, for each Aboriginal community, past and current resource use and recent forest management-related concerns, and includes an Aboriginal values map. Often community members, including elders, were interviewed as a source of valuable knowledge.</p> <p>Values identified in these reports are treated as confidential and used by NFRM solely for the purposes of forest management planning. The Agreements of Understanding with Antoine First Nation, Mattawa/North Bay Algonquin’s and Dokis First Nations speak to the confidentiality of this values information and how the values will be protected through AOC prescriptions.</p> <p>MNR provides funds to First Nations to do values mapping. High Potential Cultural Heritage areas have been investigated by an Archeologist with First Nations participation as coordinated by MNR.</p>	C
<p>3.3.2 Applies on Private and Community forests - The manager gathers and documents publicly available information about sites of special</p>	NA	NA

<p>cultural, ecological, economic or spiritual significance to Aboriginal People(s) that has been provided by relevant authorities or that has been identified during the public consultation process described in 4.4.</p>		
<p>3.3.3 Applies on Public forests - Where Aboriginal communities indicate that forestry operations on particular blocks or sites are creating a threat of serious environmental, economic, or cultural impact, the manager suspends or relocates forestry operations until disputes are resolved. Examples of serious threats could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destruction of burial sites, spiritual sites, spawning areas, medicinal areas;</li> <li>• Severe disruption of livelihood;</li> <li>• Damage to community water supply; or,</li> <li>• Severe disruption of food chain to the community.</li> </ul> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies in place to suspend or relocate operations pending dispute resolution;</li> <li>• Record of suspended or relocated operations in response to an identified threat; and,</li> <li>• Community satisfaction with handling of serious threats.</li> <li>• Agreement(s) with the affected Aboriginal communities on monitoring.</li> <li>• Regular joint assessments on the effects of forest management activities on the Aboriginal communities.</li> </ul>	<p>No threats of environmental, cultural, or economic impact have arisen, and there are no open disputes.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>3.3.4. Applies on Private and Community forests - Consistent with landowner objectives, the manager takes steps to protect values identified in 3.3.1.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>

<p>3.3.5. On Public forests, the manager supports the efforts of the affected Aboriginal communities to monitor the impacts over time of forestry activities on the values identified in the Aboriginal areas of concern protection agreement.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreement(s) with the affected Aboriginal communities on monitoring.</li> <li>• Regular joint assessments on the effects of forest management activities on the Aboriginal communities.</li> </ul>	<p>While there has been some joint visit monitoring with Elders to ensure Native Value sites are protected, the majority of monitoring is done by NFRM through its Compliance Plan. Additional compliance audits of NFRM work are performed by MNR.</p> <p>NFRM has developed a Compliance Strategy and Plan for the Forest as part of the FMP. Annual Compliance Plans are also developed as part of the Annual Work Schedule each year. The compliance plans detail how NFRM will monitor adherence to, among other things, the AOC prescriptions for all values, including values identified by First Nations. The AWS is made available to the First Nations at the beginning of each operating year.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p><b>3.4 Indigenous Peoples shall be compensated for the application of their traditional knowledge regarding the use of forest species or management systems in forest operations. This compensation shall be formally agreed upon with their free and informed consent before forest operations commence.</b></p>		<p>C</p>
<p>3.4.1 The manager enters into an agreement with the affected Aboriginal communities which compensates for the use of traditional knowledge in forest management. Examples of traditional knowledge use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercial use of a forest species, in particular non-timber forest products;</li> <li>• Improved management plans; or</li> <li>• Improved operations.</li> </ul> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p>	<p>Agreement of Understanding was developed to address the sharing of values information and to formalize NFRM’s obligations under the SFL and its desire to work cooperatively with First Nations. To date, Antoine First Nation, Mattawa/North Bay Algonquins and Dokis First Nations have each signed an agreement.</p> <p>First Nation representatives on the Planning Team receive from MNR a set per diem rate for participation in meetings. Mileage is paid by MNR to First Nation representatives who participate in the Aboriginal Working Group meetings.</p>	<p>C</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written compensation agreement</li> <li>• Evidence that compensation has been delivered and of satisfaction of Aboriginal individuals with the application of the agreement</li> </ul>		
---	--	--

<p><b>PRINCIPLE N°4 - COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND WORKERS' RIGHTS</b>  <b>Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well being of forest workers and local communities.</b></p>		
<p><b>Criterion/ indicator</b></p>	<p><b>Evaluation Team Findings</b></p>	<p><b>C/NC</b></p>
<p><b>4.2 Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.</b></p>		<p>C</p>
<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></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety policy.</li> <li>• Equipment safety inspection records.</li> <li>• Worker interviews.</li> <li>• Written contracts or understandings with contractors or other employers of forest workers</li> </ul>	<p>NFRM has maintained its certification as an Ontario Safe Work Place.                      NFRM maintains a manual of Health and Safety Policies and Procedures and a health and safety representative is in-place.                      NFRM’s SWO Safety Policies from May 2010 are still being utilized as no updates were deemed necessary. 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>Contractor safety inspections are routinely conducted. Viewed inspection done by Frank Simard (Aug 16, 2012).</p>	<p>C</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>	<p>At the 2012 audit, auditor confirmed the following system for compliance with 4.2.2</p> <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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p><b>4.4 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.</b></p>		<p>C</p>
<p>4.4.1 Local communities, community and non-government organizations, forest workers, and the interested public affected by forest management are</p>	<p>The legislated Forest Management Planning Manual (FMPM) requires that meaningful public consultation occur during the preparation of a plan. All input received from the public during the consultative</p>	<p>C</p>

<p>provided with meaningful opportunities to participate in forest management planning. The manager demonstrates that all input was considered and responded to.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of consultation when appropriate</li> <li>• Demonstration of how input was considered and responded to.</li> </ul>	<p>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 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"> <li>- Summary of Public Consultation by Stage of FMP Development</li> <li>- Summary of Public Input and Responses during the development of the 2009 FMP</li> <li>- Terms of Reference for the 2009 FMP - which identifies what public consultation will be taken during the preparation of the FMP</li> </ul> <p>Public Notice for the recent minor amendment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 10-year FMP is in place until 2019 with the first five-year period covered in Phase I. The second five-year period will require planning of operations with public consultation; and Aboriginal involvement. Additionally, FMP Amendments and Annual Work Schedule (AWS) Revisions processes keep this as working document with all of these processes open for public input through LCC meetings.</li> </ul>	
---	---	--

<p>4.4.2 Adjacent landowners and local resource users that may be directly affected by forest operations are provided with notice prior to commencement of harvesting and operations.</p>	<p>Numerous letters to adjacent landowners and other Stakeholders were sent by NFRM. All adjacent land owners to proposed operations were sent letters inviting them to attend the Information Centres for the 2009 FMP.</p> <p>Confirmed letters were sent for 2012 operations. Evidence letters (April 20, May 17, June )</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>4.4.3 Concerns or issues raised by adjacent landowners and local resource users after notice of harvest and operations are duly considered prior to commencement of activity.</p>	<p>Concerns were raised by an organic farmer adjacent to an area planed for aerial spray. NFRM altered the treatment area in order to avoid the risk of overspray onto the farm.</p> <p>NFRM has a history of working with adjacent landowners to give them meaningful notification and try to find solutions to conflicts.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>4.4.4 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>	<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 outlined within the Manual or develop their own consultation approach with NFRM.</p> <p>As documented through consultations and review of minutes, the LCC has remained active in 2012.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>4.4.5 The public participation process on</p>	<p>The public consultation process required by</p>	<p>C</p>

<p>public lands uses clearly defined ground rules that contain provisions on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Goals;</li> <li>b. Timelines;</li> <li>c. Internal and external communications;</li> <li>d. Resources (human, physical, financial, informational or technological) according to needs;</li> <li>e. Roles, responsibilities and obligations of participants, including their organizations;</li> <li>f. Decision-making methods;</li> <li>g. Authority for decisions;</li> <li>h. Mechanism to adjust the process as needed;</li> <li>i. Access to information;</li> <li>j. Participation of experts, other interests and government; and</li> <li>k. A dispute resolution mechanism.</li> </ul> <p>The participants have been involved in the development of, and agreed to, the ground rules.</p>	<p>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.</p>	
--	---	--

<p><b>PRINCIPLE N°5 - BENEFITS FROM THE FOREST</b></p> <p><b>Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest’s multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.</b></p>		
Criterion/ indicator	Evaluation Team Findings	C/NC
<p><b>5.1 Forest management should strive toward economic viability, while taking into account the full environmental, social, and operational costs of production, and ensuring the investments necessary to maintain the ecological productivity of the forest.</b></p>		C
<p>5.1.1 Resources are in place to implement</p>	<p>The comparison of planned versus actual</p>	C

<p>the management plan(s), and all associated forest management activities (including road building, harvesting, renewal and tending, restoration, monitoring and mitigation of negative impacts, habitat management, etc.).</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparison of planned versus actual activities in past years.</li> </ul>	<p>activities show targets were not met in most categories. However, this is primarily due to harvest levels being significantly reduced because of poor markets. As such, the audit team has found conformance with Indicator 5.1.1.</p> <p>The Nipissing Forest has not achieved its allowable harvest level primarily for reasons associated with inadequate markets for wood products. However, harvest levels have been consistent over the last decade- despite these deteriorating markets.</p> <p>Forest renewal is being maintained in a successful manner based on SCS auditor observations of natural and planted regeneration, NFRM renewal data, and IFA report from 2011.</p> <p>Road building is sufficient given existing harvest levels.</p> <p>Tending levels are below targets but commensurate with the reduced harvest level. Observed generally effective tending treatments during 2012 audit.</p> <p>Timber stand improvement is not occurring at levels prescribed in the FMP, and will be more closely assessed in future audits.</p> <p>Monitoring of water crossings is not occurring at the planned levels (note this has been issued as a non-conformance against Criterion 8.1.1).</p>	
<p><b>5.2 Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest’s diversity of products.</b></p>		C
<p>5.2.1 The manager seeks the optimal or “highest and best” value for forest</p>	<p>During the field audit portion of the 2012 recertification audit, several landings were visited where product sorting was occurring to</p>	c

<p>products.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Product sorting at harvest operations or wood yards.</li> <li>• Documentation of efforts made to determine quality and value of products prior to harvest (e.g. Operational cruising).</li> <li>• Forest manager demonstrates working knowledge of forest product markets.</li> <li>• Trend over time in value obtained per unit of product.</li> </ul>	<p>maximize the value and utilization of logs from harvest operations.</p> <p>Observed some salvage operations include damaged trees from blowdown, spruce budworm and jack pine budworm.</p> <p>There are some preliminary discussions underway about a pellet plant moving into the general area to provide an outlet for otherwise non-merchantable wood. A market for logs and debris that have typically been non-merchantable would make a significant difference in performance. SCS auditors observed numerous landings and roadsides with considerable slash and debris due to inadequate markets.</p>	
<p>5.2.2 Preference is given to local processing and value-added facilities if financially competitive.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records of timber sales and/or deliveries to determine the percent of volume harvested which is processed locally.</li> <li>• Interviews with local wood processors.</li> <li>• Efforts made to provide local value added industry with access to wood supply</li> </ul>	<p>The Wood Utilization Table in the NFRM annual report shows the utilization of wood from the Nipissing forest by mill. This report demonstrates clearly that local processing plants and value added processors are given priority in the delivery of logs from the forest.</p>	C
<p><b>5.3 Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.</b></p>		C
<p>5.3.1 Within the framework of the silvicultural system used, all harvested merchantable and marketable timber is utilized unless left on-site to provide structural diversity and</p>	<p>The Ontario Crown Forest Sustainability Act requires adherence to the Scaling Manual that provides minimum utilization standards and defines the “Failure to comply with minimum utilization standards unless otherwise</p>	C

<p>wildlife habitat or for cultural reasons.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forest manager has developed and implemented a wood utilization standard</li> <li>• Forest manager can demonstrate efforts to improve the utilization of lower diameter and quality wood.</li> <li>• There is evidence that log specifications and harvest procedures are designed to optimize value and avoid waste.</li> <li>• Active measures are taken to prevent loss in value after harvest.</li> </ul>	<p>described in the Forest Management Plan to be a wasteful practice. No person shall commit wasteful practices in forest operations.”</p> <p>Did not observe active salvage operations- despite considerable blowdown of white pine in some areas.</p> <p>NFRM facilitated approach to grind slash piles for biofibre (McConnel Lakes Rd).</p>	
<p>5.3.2 The manager avoids and minimize the removal of valuable but non-marketable trees without sound silvicultural justification.</p>	<p>Hemlock and cedar tend to be non-marketable species which are afforded protection during harvesting operations. Observed good protection of both of these species.</p>	C
<p>5.3.3 On-site processing sites are limited in size and number and all by-products are properly disposed of.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of forest by-products for bioenergy, co-generation firewood, etc..</li> <li>• Slashing and chipping residue is properly disposed of and not left piled on-site</li> <li>• Proportion of waste recycled from milling operations</li> <li>• Number and surface area of on-site processing sites</li> </ul>	<p>Examination of on-site processing sites during the field portion of the audit demonstrated a marginal conformance. Large slash piles are very common across the forest. Although most piles are eventually burned, there are opportunities to distribute slash back in the forest rather than pile on the landing. Pile and burned sites are renewed.</p>	C
<p><b>5.4 Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.</b></p>		C
<p>5.4.1 Forest management diversifies forest use and products while maintaining</p>	<p>The Nipissing Forest is extremely diverse in species composition. This is characteristic of the transitional forest included in the GLSL</p>	C



<p>composition, structure and functions.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Record of forest products derived from the forest.</li> <li>• Provisions for NTFP's (e.g. maple syrup, mushrooms, nuts, etc) in the management plan.</li> </ul>	<p>region. As such there is a great potential for diverse products. Crown lands are available to the residents of Ontario for collection of a number of products, such as mushrooms, berries, firewood (with a permit), hunting, trapping, maple syrup, and recreational use. Firewood cutting occurs extensively across the Nipissing Forest and is regulated through permits from the MNR.</p> <p>Some other products, such as ground hemlock shoots and foliage are used in the pharmaceutical industry as a source of paclitaxel and other taxanes. NFRM has entered into more RSA agreements with local outfitters and lodge owners to protect the resources they derive their living from on the forest. These uses and other products are recognized and provided for in the FMP.</p>	
--	--	--

<p><b>5.5 Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources, such as watersheds and fisheries.</b></p>		
<p>5.5.1 The manager identifies forest services and resources provided by the management unit including, but not necessarily limited to, watersheds, fisheries and recreation, drawing on existing information (e.g., relevant assessments, inventories, studies) and public consultation as applicable.</p>	<p>The FMP identifies numerous forest services and resources including fisheries, watersheds, recreation, and others. The areas of the forest that are generating these services or values are protected through harvest prescriptions that safeguard the Area of Concern (AOC).</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>5.5.2 The effectiveness of practices to protect forest services and resources is assessed on an on-going basis by the appropriate knowledgeable parties, such as; specialists, local community members, stakeholders, or other interested parties. <b>Not applicable to SLIMF.</b></p>	<p>The Nipissing Forest is exemplary in its protection and enhancement of the value of forest services and resources.</p> <p>There is frequent assessments of NFRM’s protection efforts through MNR assessments and LCC member involvement in the forest .</p> <p>The high degree on concern and protection was evident at the numerous field audit stops across the forest landscape. The number of RSA agreements (39 in the list of signed RSA’s provided the audit team), the number of extra protections accorded resources, the HCV forest report and values, as well as the general attitude and approach of the staff are important aspects in demonstrating this. There is a strategic direction for protection of the diversity for the Province of Ontario and the Nipissing Forest is managed to meet this direction.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p><b>5.6 The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.</b></p>		<p>C</p>

<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>	<p>Sustainable harvest levels are determined for each 10-year forest management plan. 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>C</p>
--	---	----------

<p><b>PRINCIPLE N°6 - ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</b></p> <p><b>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 integrity of the forest.</b></p>		
<p><b>Criterion/ indicator</b></p>	<p><b>Evaluation Team Findings</b></p>	<p><b>C/NC</b></p>
<p><b>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 intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping and collecting shall be controlled.</b></p>		<p>C</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>	<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</p>	<p>C</p>

	<p>there is potential for it to exist.</p> <p>Braun’s Holly Fern and Ram’s Head Lady Slipper are listed are rare species needing special protection that have been found in Nipissing county (although there are no documented occurrences on the Nipissing Forest). Both species occur in mature forests and moist sites, and are susceptible to harvest operations. Given the possibility of occurrences on Nipissing Forest, tree markers, operators, and NFRM foresters should be aware of these plants. Yet interviews revealed very little awareness, and records show that these plants have not been part of training sessions over the last few years (Observation 2012.1) .</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Table FMP 14 for AOC prescription for species that are threatened</li> <li>- A booklet titled “Species at Risk in the Lake Nipissing Watershed” was prepared with NFRM’s assistance</li> </ul>	
<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.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection plans for species and habitat or a development schedule for plans.</li> <li>• Records of activities undertaken under the plans.</li> </ul>	<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. In 2011 and 2012 a considerable amount of work has been done identifying habitat and locations of Blandings turtles.</p>	C
<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>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</p>	C

<p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of precautionary measures.</li> <li>• Comparison of approaches and levels of activity in neighbouring, similar forests.</li> <li>• Results of habitat modeling for relevant species, where it has been undertaken.</li> </ul>	<p>Chimney Swift and nesting sites and for Least Bittern nesting sites.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- numerous value updates are on file at the NFRM office</li> <li>- The AOC prescriptions in FMP Table 14 - for species at risk were taken from the draft Stand &amp; Site Guide which is based upon the latest scientific knowledge</li> <li>- NFRM has a procedure for reporting new values to the MNR</li> </ul>	
<p>6.2.4 Special prescriptions are applied to protect rare and uncommon species:</p> <p>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></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Species and habitat protection plans, or timetable for preparing such plans.</li> <li>• Records of activities undertaken in accordance with these plans</li> </ul>	<p>Protection of rare and uncommon species occurs 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>	C
<p>6.2.5 The manager has established a desired target for the future distribution and abundance of rare tree species listed in 6.2.1 consistent with site conditions, historical abundance and the scale of the forest being managed. The target, management plan and operational plans are designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase its relative abundance;</li> <li>• Conserve genetic diversity;</li> <li>• Ensure successful regeneration ;</li> <li>• Maintain a balance of age classes in the management unit;</li> <li>• Harvest isolated stands only if adequate natural regeneration is present within the stand or if seed</li> </ul>	<p>Summary of Management Objectives (FMP- Table 6) contains numerous targets for distribution and abundance of under-represented tree species- such as white pine. 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>During the audit SCS observed care being taken to protect red oak seedlings in herbicide treatments. Observed good protection of cedar and pine regeneration, and efforts to regenerate white birch.</p>	C

<p>from the appropriate seed zone is used to successfully regenerate (free to grow) an equivalent site within the seed zone;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harvest isolated individuals that have seed bearing potential only where they are showing signs of severe decline and are hazardous</li> </ul>		
<p><b>6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced or restored, including:</b></p> <p><b>a)Forest regeneration and succession;</b>  <b>b)Genetic, species and ecosystem diversity; and,</b>  <b>c)Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem.</b></p>		C
<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"> <li>• diversity of forest types</li> <li>• diversity of successional stages</li> <li>• distribution of age classes, including old growth</li> <li>• diversity of forest structures (e.g. horizontal, vertical and pattern)</li> <li>• connectivity</li> <li>• levels of disturbances at the landscape level (e.g. watershed)</li> </ul>	<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>Although there is a high level of success in regeneration, approximately 40% of regenerated stands are renewed to another forest type, e.g., losing white pine acres to poplar. Thus, maintaining diversity of forest types and successional stages are the more challenging long-term requirements of this indicator. White birch and white/jack pine remain difficult to successfully regenerate. However, NFRM is investing considerable effort to regenerate white pine, jack pine, and to a lesser degree white birch.</p>	C
<p>6.3.2 Quantitative short to mid-term (e.g. 2-5 years) objectives have been set, using expert input, to maintain, enhance or restore natural conditions in natural forests.</p>	<p>The 2009 FMP identifies Management Objective #7: “Move towards a more natural age class distribution for 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</p>	C

	<p>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. 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 Plans have been developed and are being implemented to achieve the objectives established in 6.3.2.</p>	<p>Enhancing and restoring natural forest conditions is a long-term process that is accomplished over multiple plans. During the 2011 and 2012 audits we observed extensive efforts to regenerate and maintain the white pine (a critical component of restoration) component of the forest.</p> <p>NFRM is currently developing the second 5-year phase of the 10-year forest management plan , and part of that process will be to refine objectives for restoring natural conditions.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>6.3.4 Quantitative habitat objectives are 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>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, Lynx, Hermit Thrush, Marten, Moose, Moose Late Winter, Pileated Woodpecker, Redback Salamander, Ruby-Crowned Kinglet,</p>	<p>C</p>

	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Long Term Management Direction in Sections 3.1 through to 3.6 in the text of the 2009 FMP</li> <li>- An MNR Biologist participated on the Planning Team and was involved in the balancing of objectives.</li> </ul>	
<p>6.3.5 Plans have been developed and are being implemented in natural forests to achieve the objectives established in 6.3.4.</p> <p>Note: 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>	<p>See 6.3.4.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>6.3.6 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"> <li>• reducing road density;</li> <li>• reducing and/or limiting access to High Conservation Value Forest areas;</li> <li>• decommissioning roads;</li> <li>• avoiding road building in or around</li> </ul>	<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>Evidence of reducing road density includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Roads no longer passable with a 4X4 half ton truck have been removed from the roads layer and are no longer shown to the public</li> <li>- Motorized vehicle access is restricted in remote enhanced management areas - such</li> </ul>	<p>C</p>



<p>protected areas; and-or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>maintaining remoteness of areas with sensitive cultural or ecological values or where required for tourism</li> <li>Maintain or restore connectivity</li> </ul> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The manager collaborates with the government or other relevant authorities in implementing the strategic access management plan.</li> </ul>	<p>as on the LaSalle Primary Road extension (north of Ottertail Creek)</p> <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>6.3.7 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>	<p>Riparian and wetlands are protected through AOC's. Observed only one isolated instance of cutting into an AOC at MEDC Block 229, Janveaux. Numerous examples of conformance- see field notes in section 2.1 of this report.</p> <p>Evidence: FMP Table 14 for AOC prescriptions that place conditions on harvesting and road construction</p>	C
<p>6.3.8 Disturbance to seasonal watercourses (including intermittent and ephemeral streams, seeps, ponds, vernal pools) is avoided wherever possible.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Temporary crossings are restored so as to avoid damage to seasonal watercourses.</li> </ul>	<p>Riparian and wetlands are protected through AOC's. Observed good conformance at water crossings. See field notes in section 2.1 for evidence of conformance.</p>	C
<p>6.3.9 The manager is implementing relevant "best management practices" pertaining to the protection of soils, water quality and sensitive sites.</p> <p>(Examples of relevant "best management practices" include but are not limited to: Silvicultural Guide to Managing Southern Ontario Forests Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources,</p>	<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>	C

<p>Forest Management Guide for Conserving Biodiversity at the Stand and Site Scales Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, and in Quebec 'Saines pratiques : voirie forestière et installation de ponceaux, MRNQ – Direction régionale de la Gaspésie– Iles-de-la-Madeleine')</p>	<p>Observed good implementation of BMP's across the forest. See field notes in section 2.1 for evidence of conformance.</p>	
<p>6.3.10 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• diversity of vertical and horizontal structure and tree pattern relevant to the site;</li> <li>• wildlife habitat; and</li> <li>• woody debris</li> </ul>	<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>	<p>C</p>
<p>6.3.11 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> <p>a. Post harvest residual includes patches or clumps of trees and individual trees and/or patches.</p> <p>b. Residual retention includes all standing residual structure in a defined and mapped harvest area, including insular patches, peninsular patches, partial harvest</p>	<p><b>CAR 2012.3</b></p>	<p>NC</p>

<p>areas and reserves established for other purposes.</p> <p>c. 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.</p> <p>d. All residual retention is long term, meaning it will not be harvested until at least the subsequent rotation.</p> <p>e. The amount of residual structure retained in harvest operations will approximate levels of expected natural post-disturbance residual identified in 6.1.3.</p> <p>f. 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 on average shall be retained within the clearcut harvest area, based on the managers' goals related to wildlife habitat and ecological characteristics.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maps and aerial photographs of harvested areas.</li> <li>• Relevant training material used in courses or by harvest and site preparation</li> <li>• Field reconnaissance.</li> </ul>		
---	--	--

<p>6.3.12 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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. reduce soil and road embankment erosion, soil compaction and rutting,</li> <li>b. minimise water crossings and loss of productive area;</li> <li>c. minimize loss of site productivity; and</li> <li>d. ensure the protection of aquatic habitat quality during construction and use.</li> </ol> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proof of implementation of standards/practices, assessed in the field</li> <li>• Use of waterbars on steep slopes and/or switchbacks</li> <li>• Knowledge by the field workers of the standards/practices, assessed through interviews</li> <li>• Rate and severity of non-compliances</li> </ul>	<p>All of the harvest sites visited during this audit met the requirements of 6.3.10. See field notes in Section 2.1.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>6.3.13 Rutting related site damage and damage to residual trees (crown, trunks and roots) does not exceed provincial acceptable levels.</p>	<p>Did not observe any excessive rutting during the 2012 audit.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>6.3.14 Harvest plans schedule operations on damage prone sites to periods of the year when risks are minimized.</p>	<p>Harvest scheduling on particularly damage prone areas is generally done during dry periods or planned winter operations. However, NFRM has no authority to require operators to cease logging during wet periods. 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</p>	<p>C</p>

	damage.	
6.3.15 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).	Mechanical site preparation observed during 2012 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.	C
6.3.16 In natural forests regeneration efforts emulate natural processes such as natural regeneration, direct seeding, and use local seed sources.	See field note in Section 2.1.	C
6.3.17 Regeneration occurs in a timely fashion, and consistent with successional objectives as outlined in 6.3.1.	See field notes in Section 2.1 .	C

<b>PRINCIPLE N°8 – MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT</b>		
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Criterion/ indicator</b>	<b>Evaluation Team Findings</b>	<b>C/NC</b>
<p><b>8.2 Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a) Yield of all forest products harvested</b></li> <li><b>b) Growth rates, regeneration and condition of the forest</b></li> <li><b>c) Composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna</b></li> <li><b>d) Environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations</b></li> <li><b>e) Costs, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.</b></li> </ul>		C
<p><b><u>Yield of all forest products harvested</u></b></p> <p>8.2.1 The manager monitors timber harvest volumes by species and product.</p>	<p>NFRM prepares Annual Reports which include 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>	C
<p>8.2.2 The manager has assembled readily available information about the harvest of timber by parties other than themselves on the managed forest unit.</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i></p>	<p>This is covered in the Annual Report.</p>	C

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>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.</li></ul>		
---	--	--

<p><b><u>Growth rates, regeneration and condition of the forest</u></b></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>	<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 trends reporting every five years, also by the SFL holder. This reporting includes discussions of these points.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p><b><u>Composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna</u></b></p> <p>8.2.4 The manager conducts regular monitoring of the forest in order to highlight changes to important habitat characteristics.</p>	<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>C</p>
<p><b><u>Environmental impact</u></b></p> <p>8.2.5 The manager monitors environmental impacts of forest management activities assessed in accordance with Criterion 6.1.</p>	<p>Covered through compliance monitoring. Viewed numerous FOIP reports from 2012.</p>	<p>C</p>
<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documented HCV monitoring program.</li> </ul>	<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.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>8.2.7 When monitoring results indicate increasing risk to a specific conservation attribute, the manager re-evaluates the</p>	<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</p>	<p>C</p>



<p>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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results of monitoring program.</li> </ul>	<p>habitat and the AOCs for the developing 2009 FMP include critical thermal cover for moose which cover both winter and summer 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><b><u>Impacts on cultural values and resources</u></b></p> <p>8.2.8 The manager monitors the impacts of forest management activities on cultural values, resources and uses.</p>	<p>Trends Reporting prepared every five years and IFA reports include discussions of meeting FMP objectives related to this indicator.</p> <p>Also each year numerous FOIP reports are filed for operations where cultural values are protected. Viewed protection of Native Value site in Goulard Block 15- covered in FOIP monitoring.</p>	C
<p><b><u>Economics</u></b></p> <p>8.2.9 The manager monitors the costs, productivity and efficiency of forest management activities, consistent with Criterion 5.1.</p>	<p>Stumpage revenues and silvicultural expenditures are reported annually. Annual reports include reporting of revenues and silviculture expenditures.</p>	C

<b>PRINCIPLE N°9 - HIGH CONSERVATION VALUE FORESTS</b>		
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Criterion/ indicator</b>	<b>Evaluation Team Findings</b>	<b>C/NC</b>
<b>9.4 Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.</b>		<b>C</b>
See 8.2.6 and 8.2.7.	<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 or adjacent to lands managed 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>	<b>C</b>

**Appendix 7 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs**

Chain of Custody indicators were not evaluated during this annual audit.