



**Forest Certification Surveillance Report
3rd surveillance
Prepared by:**

Daniel Martin, ing.f.
SAI Global
20 Carlson Court
Suite 100
Toronto, Ontario
M9W 7K6
CANADA
Tel: (416) 401-8700
1 800 465-3717
Fax: (416) 401-8710
www.saiglobal.com

for:

Federation of Nova Scotia Woodland Owners
c/o John MacDougall
285 George Street, Stewiacke Nova Scotia

for the following certified forest area(s):¹

Forest Management activities on defined woodlots enrolled in the group certification program in Nova Scotia

File number: 1607495-02

Date of surveillance evaluation: May 20, 2014

Date of finalized report: July 10, 2014

FSC® Registration Code: QMI-FM/COC-001680

Date of Certificate Issue: May 13, 2013

Validity of the certificate: From 13/05/2013 to 03/01/2017

¹ In the case of group certification, the certificate holder is the group manager and the region in which the group is located must be specified.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION	3
1.1.1 <i>Itinerary</i>	3
1.1.2 <i>Approach.....</i>	4
1.1.3 <i>Selected FMUs and Rationale</i>	4
1.1.4 <i>Sites Visited</i>	5
1.1.5 <i>Stakeholder Consultation.....</i>	6
1.1.6 <i>Additional Evaluation Techniques.....</i>	6
2.0 STANDARD(S).....	9
2.1 STANDARD USED.....	9
2.2 DESCRIPTION OF LOCAL ADAPTATION OF GENERIC STANDARD	9
3.0 OBSERVATIONS	9
3.1 OBSERVATIONS ON REVIEW AND RESOLUTION OF COMPLAINT.....	20
3.2 SUMMARIZED PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE CONDITIONS RELATED TO ANY APPROVED PESTICIDE DEROGATION.....	20
4.0 SURVEILLANCE DECISION.....	20
4.1 NON-COMPLIANCES.....	21
4.2 DIFFICULT ASSESSMENTS.....	23
4.3 STATUS OF PREVIOUS NON-COMPLIANCES.....	23
4.4 OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT.....	23
4.5 RECOMMENDATION TO MAINTAIN THE CERTIFICATE.....	24
5.0 GROUP MEMBERSHIP LIST (UPDATE)	25
6.0 FSC COMPLAINTS, DISPUTES AND APPEALS	25

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION

Evaluation dates:	May 20-22, 2014
Task	Person days (excluding travel)
Pre-evaluation	0.5 days
Preparatory Work	
Documents, Records and Fieldwork	6 days
Stakeholder Interviews	2 days
TOTAL	8.5 days

EVALUATION TEAM
Lead auditor: Daniel Martin, ing.f. Forest engineer with a more than 15 years of experience in the forest industry as a supervisor and manager, specifically in silviculture, harvesting and fiber procurement for sawmills in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. This has allowed for development of skills ranging from budgeting, negotiating and human resource management. Furthermore, Daniel has cumulated experience in the management of an engineered wood products facility in the province of Quebec. Daniel has negotiated collective bargaining agreements in both the forest harvesting industry and wood products manufacturing in the provinces of New Brunswick and Quebec. He has also been a lecturer at the <i>Université de Moncton</i> . Daniel is an ISO 14001 lead assessor and a FSC FM lead auditor and has conducted audits in the Maritimes, Boreal and Great Lakes/St-Lawrence forest types.
Auditor: Martin Litchfield, RPF A Registered Professional Forester in Ontario with extensive experience as a Lead Auditor. Martin has conducted audits to the ISO 14001 environmental management standard as well as both the FSC forest management and the FSC Chain of Custody standards. Martin was a member of the FSC National Boreal Standard coordinating committee.
Technical expert: N/A
Observer: N/A

1.1.1 Itinerary

May 19, 2014

- Arrive at FNSWO office, proceed with opening meeting.
- Review FSC criterion 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2
- Finalize schedule of woodlots to be verified.
- Auditors travel in preparation of field visit.

May 20, 2014

- Review of woodlot management plans (WMP)
- Field investigation of 4 certified woodlots.

May 21, 2014

- Review of woodlot management plans (WMP)
- Field investigation of 5 certified woodlot.

May 22, 2014

- Review of woodlot management plans (WMP)
- Field investigation of 1 certified woodlot.
- Review of FSC-STD-30-005 Group certification requirements

May 23, 2014

- Review of criterion 3.3, 3.4, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.4, 9.1, 9.3
- Auditor conference.
- Debriefing of management.
- Closing meeting.

1.1.2 Approach

The audit assessed conformance with the FSC Maritimes Standard (SLIMF) as well as the company's forest management program utilizing the following techniques:

- Review of the company's policies and procedures
- Review of the company's documentation and records
- Review of correspondence and communications
- Interviews with staff
- Interviews with contractors
- Field assessment of conformance
- Review of previous audit findings
- Review of the Woodlot Management Plans

1.1.3 Selected FMUs and Rationale

The audit utilized the sampling formula for both old and new WMP to be assessed:

- Old WMP, less than 100ha, $X=0.3\sqrt{32} = 2$ sites
- Old WMP, 100 ha – 1000 ha, $X=0.6\sqrt{20} = 3$ sites

- New WMP, less than 100 ha, $X=0.6\sqrt{12} = 3$ sites
- New WMP, 100 ha – 1000 ha, $X=0.8\sqrt{6} = 2$ sites

The new WMP's were sampled according to the formula for the main evaluation, as per section 6.3.5 of FSC-STD-20-007 V3-0.

Total number of FMU's visited = 10.

1.1.4 Sites Visited

Sites visited				
Management unit	Site #	Location	Audited activities	Indicators assessed
	1182	Lewis woodlot	Pre commercial thinning	Review of criterion 3.3, 3.4, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.4, 9.1, 9.3
	1106	Thomas woodlot	Shelterwood harvest Seed tree harvest	Review of criterion 3.3, 3.4, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.4, 9.1, 9.3
	1138	Bear River woodlot	Forest management plan. Interview with First Nations representatives.	Review of criterion 3.3, 3.4, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.4, 9.1, 9.3
	1163	Barker woodlot	Understory removal of balsam fir (non-commercial), using horses. Uneven age overstory Forest management plan	Review of criterion 3.3, 3.4, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.4, 9.1, 9.3
	1174	Small woodlot	Forest management plan. No interventions on the woodlot. Use of woodlot for other than fiber production.	Review of criterion 3.3, 3.4, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.4, 9.1, 9.3
	1175	Pulley woodlot	Interview with the land owner. 84 ha PCT in softwoods (4 ha) Chain-saw PCT Manual pruning No damage to residual trees ATV extraction of fuelwood Retaining some hardwoods for biodiversity Avoidance of wet areas	Review of criterion 3.3, 3.4, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.4, 9.1, 9.3
	1111	Berry woodlot	Hardwood retention Wildlife clumps (variable retention) Pre commercial thinning in red spruce (fill plantation, mixed with red pine) Manual weeding of competition every couple of years (no use of	Review of criterion 3.3, 3.4, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.4, 9.1, 9.3

			herbicides)	
	1122	Cameron woodlot	Plantation cleaning Natural regeneration (no use of herbicides) Wildlife clumps (variable retention)	Review of criterion 3.3, 3.4, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.4, 9.1, 9.3
	1121	Lorber woodlot	Pre commercial thinning Red spruce plantation Natural regeneration	Review of criterion 3.3, 3.4, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.4, 9.1, 9.3
	1191	Mersey River Chalet woodlot	No community values identified on the forest. Partial harvest in Eastern Hemlock stands. Rental of cottages for tourists on the woodlot. Potential use of the wood from the woodlot to renovate the cabins. Review of the forest management plan.	Review of criterion 3.3, 3.4, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.4, 9.1, 9.3

1.1.5 Stakeholder Consultation

Interest group of stakeholders contacted	# of stakeholders contacted	# of stakeholders having made comments	Observations resulting from stakeholder consultation
Individuals	4	4	Positive comments only. No issues were raised.
Enterprises	19	2	Positive comments only. No issues were raised.
Municipalities	1		
First Nations	7	3	Positive comments only. No issues were raised.
Contractors	1	1	Positive comments only. No issues were raised.
Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)	7		No comments
Associations	14		No comments
Governments	4		No comments
Public agencies	0		No comments
FSC Canada	1		No comments
University/College	5		No comments
TOTAL	63		

1.1.6 Additional Evaluation Techniques

No additional audit evaluation techniques were used.

1.1.7 Update on any changes to the scope of the certificate

The update shall include;

a) Changes in the basic quantitative information as collected at the initial audit(Section 1 of main assessment report)

Type of certificate: <input type="checkbox"/> single FMU <input type="checkbox"/> multiple FMU <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Group			# of group members 57 owners (70 woodlots)
Type of SLIMF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> small SLIMF <input type="checkbox"/> low intensity SLIMF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF			
Number of FMUs:		Location of the non-SLIMFs FMU(refer to the center of the FMU) - N/A no non-SLIMF FMU's.	
Less than 100 ha	44	Latitude N/S	
100-1,000 ha	26	_____ degrees _____ minutes	
1,000-10,000 ha		Longitude E/W	
Over 10,000 ha		_____ degrees _____ minutes	
TOTAL	70		
Forest zone: Temperate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Boreal <input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical <input type="checkbox"/> Tropical <input type="checkbox"/>	Total forest area in scope of certificate that is:		
	Included in FMUs ≤100 ha	2349 ha	
	Included in FMUs between 100 and 1,000 ha	5183 ha	
	Eligible as low intensity SLIMF FMUs	0	
	Privately managed ²	6667 ha	
	State managed	82 ha	
	Community managed ³	783 ha	
# of forest workers within scope of certificate including contractor Male: 57 Female: 0 Total: 57			
Forest Area:			
Forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting and managed primarily for conservation objectives			0 ha
Protected from commercial harvesting and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services			0 ha
Classified as 'high conservation value forest'			26.2 ha
Production forest (from which timber may be harvested)			5,183 ha
Production forest classified as 'plantation'			0 ha
Production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems ⁴			23.0 ha

² Includes state owned forests leased to private companies for management.

³ The management and use of the forest and tree resources is controlled by local communities.

<p>b) List of chemical pesticides used within the forest area since the last audit, summarized quantitative data on their use (amount and area) and reason for use;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No chemical pesticides used since the last previous audit.
<p>c) Number of accidents in forest work (serious / fatal) since the last audit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No serious accidents since the last previous audit.

2.0 STANDARD(S)

2.1 Standard Used

For this audit we have used the following standard:
 Certification Standards for Best Forestry Practices in the Maritimes Region (FSC-STD-CAN-Maritimes-SLIMF-2008).

- You may get a copy of the standard at the following address:
<https://ca.fsc.org/maritimes-standard.205.htm>

FSC-STD-30-005(V1-0) FSC Standard for group entities in forest management groups.

- You may get a copy of the standard at the following address:
<https://ic.fsc.org/standards.340.htm>

2.2 Description of Local Adaptation of Generic Standard

Non applicable.

3.0 OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE #1: COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS AND FSC PRINCIPLES
Criterion 1.1 Compliance with national and local laws and administrative requirements.
<p>Verified the list of laws in the entry package for woodlot owners who are joining the program, as well as laws listed on the FNSWO website. Improvements could be made to the identification system for applicable municipal legislation. An opportunity for improvement was provided. Forest workers and program participants are made aware of applicable legislation through annual FNSWO workshop. A list of legal requirements is also provided at the pre-entry meeting. A pre-entry summary sheet is used to ensure no elements are forgotten. An opportunity for improvement was provided to consider identifying the list of Legal Requirements as a controlled document.</p> <p>Compliance inspections are adequately planned. The schedule is based upon the FNSWO risk assessment. A minor non-conformance (NC 2014-01) was raised to ensure proper follow-up of monitoring by developing a periodic review to ensure monitoring inspections are being conducted</p>

⁴ Total are regenerated by replanting, NOT annual area. (This area may be different from the area defined as 'plantation' for the purpose of calculating the AAF).

<p>as planned.</p> <p>While reviewing the non-conformances from the previous surveillance audit, it was found that the non-conformance were not recorded using the management system procedures. A minor non-conformance (NC 2014-02) was raised on this issue.</p>	
<p>Strength None identified.</p>	<p>Weakness OFI 2014-1.1.1 - Consider developing a mechanism to identify municipal and local legislation.</p> <p>OFI 2014-1.1.3 - Consider identifying the document 'List of Legal Requirements' as a controlled document.</p> <p>NCR 2014-01 (1.1.4) - The monitoring inspections are not being conducted as planned. (11/77)</p> <p>NCR 2014-02 (1.1.5) – Where non-compliances are identified and recorded, the management system did not implement the corrective actions as prescribed in the FNSWO procedures.</p>
<p>Criterion 1.2 Payment of fees, taxes etc.</p>	
<p>Verified the payment of applicable taxes and rent. All invoices are paid and in order.</p>	
<p>Strength Effective control of finances.</p>	<p>Weakness None identified.</p>
<p>Criterion 1.3 Compliance with international agreements</p>	
<p>The FNSWO employees demonstrated good knowledge of relevant international conventions and requirements.</p>	
<p>Strength None identified</p>	<p>Weakness None identified.</p>
<p>Criterion 1.4 Documenting of conflicts with laws.</p>	
<p> </p>	
<p>Strength</p>	<p>Weakness</p>
<p>Criterion 1.5 Protection from illegal activities</p>	
<p> </p>	
<p>Strength</p>	<p>Weakness</p>
<p>Criterion 1.6 Adherence to FSC principles.</p>	
<p> </p>	
<p>Strength</p>	<p>Weakness</p>

PRINCIPLE #2 TENURE AND USE RIGHTS AND REPSONSIBILITIES	
Criterion 2.1 Evidence of forest use rights.	
The pre-entry package requires proof of land ownership. The audit allowed the verification of the deeds for a sample of woodlots.	
Strength None identified.	Weakness None identified.
Criterion 2.2 Local communities with use rights can protect their rights and resources.	
All woodlot boundaries are identified in the GIS layer. This layer is available on the GPS units used by the FNSWO field staff.	
A procedure is implemented to consult with adjacent landowners when significant activities are planned. Management plans are available for consultation at the FNSWO office.	
Strength None identified.	Weakness None identified.
Criterion 2.3 Appropriate mechanisms to resolve disputes.	
Strength	Weakness
PRINCIPLE #3 INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' RIGHTS	
Criterion 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.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 3.2 Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 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.	
By interview, land owners indicated that none of their woodlots have culturally sensitive sites on them. This was confirmed by a representative of the FNSWO. The Federation uses the known location of sensitive First Nations sites identified in their GIS system. Currently, there are no known archeological sites identified by the NS DNR located on any of the member woodlots. No harvesting activities are occurring on sites of special cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance to Indigenous People(s).	

Strength None identified.	Weakness None identified.
Criterion 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.	
There is currently no use of First Nations' traditional knowledge regarding the use of forest species or management systems in forest operations.	
Regarding the OFI raised at last year's audit, a representative of the FNSWO indicated that the work is ongoing. The FNSWO have not yet put in place a process in place for compensating First Nations for the application of their traditional knowledge in regards to the use of forest species or management systems in forest operations.	
Strength None identified.	Weakness The FNSWO have not yet put in place a process in place for compensating First Nations for the application of their traditional knowledge in regards to the use of forest species or management systems in forest operations.
PRINCIPE 4 COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND FOREST WORKERS' RIGHTS	
Criterion 4.1 The communities within or adjacent to the forest management area should be given the opportunity for employment, training, and other services.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 4.2 Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 4.3 The rights of workers to organize and voluntarily negotiate with their employers shall be guaranteed as outlined in Conventions 87 and 98 of the International Labour Organization (ILO).	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 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.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 4.5 Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed for resolving grievances and for providing fair compensation in the case of loss or damage affecting the legal or customary rights,	

property, resources, or livelihoods of local peoples. Measures shall be taken to avoid such loss or damage.	
Strength	Weakness
PRINCIPE 5 BENEFITS FROM THE FOREST	
Criterion 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.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 5.2 Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest's diversity of products.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 5.3 Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.	
Reviewed monitoring inspection form for WMP2001. CSA woodlot????? Field inspections of WMP 2001, 1017, 1028, confirm good fibre utilization. Field inspections confirmed minimal damage to the residual trees. A significant proportion of harvesting is selection management. BMP are provided to operators.	
Strength Selection management with minimal damage to the residual trees	Weakness None identified.
Criterion 5.4 Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.	
Opportunities to merchandize sawlogs, studwood, pulpwood and fuelwood. Non-timber use includes maple syrup production.	
Strength Opportunities to merchandize sawlogs, studwood, pulpwood and fuelwood	Weakness None identified.
Criterion 5.5 Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources, such as watersheds and fisheries.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 5.6 The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.	
Strength	Weakness

PRINCIPE 6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	
Criterion 6.1 Environmental impact assessments.	
Ecological Land Classification information provided to the Woodlot Management Plan planner and the Forest Ecosystem Classification system for stand prescriptions	
Strength FEC prescriptions	Weakness None identified.
Criterion 6.2 Safeguards must exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas).	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 6.3 Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced or restored.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 6.4 Representative samples of existing ecosystems within the landscape shall be protected in their natural state and recorded on maps, appropriate to the scale and intensity of operations and the uniqueness of the affected resources.	
Ecological Landscape Classification is used in the WMPs. Adjacent crown protected areas are adequately identified. FNSWO participation in the Provincial protected area program.	
Strength None identified.	Weakness None identified.
Criterion 6.5 Written guidelines shall be prepared and implemented to: control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbances; and protect water resources.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 6.6 Management systems shall promote the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management and strive to avoid the use of chemical pesticides.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 6.7 Chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes including fuel and oil shall be disposed of in an environmentally appropriate manner at off-site locations.	

Strength	Weakness
<p>Criterion 6.8 Use of biological control agents shall be documented, minimized, monitored and strictly controlled in accordance with national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. Use of genetically modified organisms shall be prohibited.</p>	
Strength	Weakness
<p>Criterion 6.9 The use of exotic species is carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.</p>	
Strength	Weakness
<p>Criterion 6.10 Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and b. Does not occur on high conservation value forest areas; (HCVF) and c. Will enable clear, sustainable, additional, secure long-term conservation benefits across the forest management unit. 	
Strength	Weakness
<p>PRINCIPE 7 MANAGEMENT PLAN</p>	
<p>Criterion 7.1 Content of management plan.</p>	
<p>Landowner strategies for meeting management objectives are stated in the WMP, including statements for the primary purpose of the woodlot, table listing the strategies for meeting management objectives. By interview, landowners confirmed their silvicultural and management objectives to match the management plan.</p> <p>The owned/managed lands are described and mapped in adequate detail in the management plan prepared for each woodlot.</p> <p>None of the woodlot visited during the audit contained areas of special ecological significance, including habitat of vulnerable, rare, threatened, and endangered species, primordial Acadian forest, areas with unusually high species diversity, or exceptional cultural significance. By interview, the forest planner demonstrated good knowledge of this requirement. One cruise point/stand is recorded with the GPS and among other data, the current stand condition and recommended treatment is recorded. This information is detailed in the FMP. SOP are defined in the FNSWO's management system.</p> <p>Ecosystem based management is conducted in all forest management plans.</p> <p>Forest Ecosystem Classification assessments are undertaken when an inventory is conducted on a woodlot. Ecosystem based management strives to produce healthy, natural forest ecosystems by conserving their biodiversity, productive capacity, natural conditions, resilience, and ecological</p>	

<p>processes. This is detailed in section 3 (Forest Management Strategy) of the management plans.</p> <p>Harvest level is determined using the Von Mantel Formula minus 5%. The 5% factor is used to account for natural disturbances. An opportunity for improvement was raised because the applicable procedure does not specify to apply a 5% reduction to the result of the AAC calculation. The 5% reduction factor was applied to all the WMP's verified in the course of the audit. The opportunity for improvement is raised to consider updating the applicable SOP. Volume to be harvested is detailed in WMP as a volume/10 year period.</p> <p>The predictable future influence of pests, pathogens and non-commercial species on allowable harvests, timber values, stocking etc. are taken into account by implementing a monitoring system conducted by the woodlot owner annually. High attention is given to stands prone to wind throw, fire, disease or insect infestation, or other possible damage. Regular inspections are scheduled by FNSWO staff for each woodlot. A minor NCR was raised because there was no evidence of a strategy for monitoring forest changes and assessing the environmental and social impacts of forest management.</p>	
<p>Strength Woodlot owners demonstrated good knowledge of the vision and objectives stated in their WMP.</p>	<p>Weakness OFI 2014-7.1.9 – The 5% reduction factor to the AAC determination is not specified in SOP 12.18. NCR 2014-03 (7.1.12) – There is no evidence of a strategy for monitoring forest changes and assessing the environmental and social impacts of forest management.</p>
<p>Criterion 7.2 The management plan shall be periodically revised to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances.</p>	
<p>A minor NCR was raised because there is no evidence that indicators of progress relative to objectives have been identified and that an effective and thorough plan for monitoring these indicators are in place.</p> <p>Management plans are designed to cover a 10-year period, with a 5-year review, but management strategies consider an ecological timeframe of 100+ years.</p>	
<p>Strength None identified.</p>	<p>Weakness NCR 2014-04 (7.2.1) – There is no evidence that indicators of progress relative to objectives have been identified and that an effective and thorough plan for monitoring these indicators are in place.</p>
<p>Criterion 7.3 Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plan.</p>	
<p>Operators and woodlot owners demonstrated good knowledge of the management plan implementation requirements. One employee did express the desire to follow BMP training to allow him to further his knowledge??. An opportunity for improvement was raised to allow the FNSWO to address this situation.</p>	
<p>Strength</p>	<p>Weakness</p>

Multi-processor operator as well as the interviewed woodlot owners demonstrated good knowledge of the management plan implementation requirements.	OFI 2014-7.3.1 – Consider encouraging employees active in forestry operations to attend BMP training.
Criterion 7.4 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the primary elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1.	
In respect of confidential information, woodlot management plans for each landowner are not made available on the FNSWO website. Woodlot management plans are available upon request. Confidential information will be deleted from the WMP.	
Strength None identified	Weakness None identified
PRINCIPE 8 MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT	
Criterion 8.1 Frequency and intensity of monitoring.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 8.2 Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators: a) Yield of all forest products harvested. b) Growth rates, regeneration and condition of the forest. c) Composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna. d) Environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations. e) Costs, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 8.3 Documentation shall be provided by the forest manager to enable monitoring and certifying organizations to trace each forest product from its origin, a process known as the "chain of custody."	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 8.4 The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 8.5 While respecting the confidentiality of some information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.	
Strength	Weakness

PRINCIPLE 9 HIGH CONSERVATION VALUE FORESTS	
<p>Criterion 9.1 Assessment to determine the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests will be completed, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management.</p> <p>The staff at the FNSWO use a document entitled 'High Conservation Value Forests – FNSWO evaluation table'. This document lists the entire criterion found in Appendix F of the SLIMF standard. A grading system is used to determine if HCVF are present in the woodlot. This document was developed in collaboration with the Mersey Tobeatic Research Institute.</p> <p>No primordial forests, as defined by the FSC have been inventoried on any of the participating woodlots. An opportunity for improvement was raised to consider adding the definition of a primordial forest in the training material provided to forest planners.</p> <p>There was no evidence of an external review report, and that it has been made available to the public. A minor NCR was raised on this issue. An opportunity for improvement was provided to consider providing a summary table of the HCVF found on the woodlots.</p>	
<p>Strength None identified.</p>	<p>Weakness</p> <p>OFI 2014-9.1.2 – Consider adding the definition of a primordial forest in the training material provided to forest planners.</p> <p>OFI 2014-9.1.4 – Consider providing a summary table of the HCVF that have been found on the woodlots.</p> <p>NCR 2014-05 (9.1.4) – There is no evidence of an external review report, and that it has been made available to the public.</p>
<p>Criterion 9.2 The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.</p>	
<p>Strength</p>	<p>Weakness</p>
<p>Criterion 9.3 The management plan shall include and implement specific measures that ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. These measures shall be specifically included in the publicly available management plan summary.</p> <p>Section 2.3.10 of the WMP specifies the strategies to ensure maintenance and/or enhancement of the HCV identified. The table of contains of the management plans is available on the FNSWO website. Woodlot management plans are available upon request.</p> <p>No primordial forests have been identified on the woodlots included in the program.</p>	
<p>Strength None identified.</p>	<p>Weakness None identified.</p>

Criterion 9.4 Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.	
Strength	Weakness
PRINCIPE10 – PLANTATIONS	
Criterion 10.1 The management objectives of the plantation, including natural forest conservation and restoration objectives, shall be explicitly stated in the management plan, and clearly demonstrated in the implementation of the plan.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 10.2 The design and layout of plantations should promote the protection, restoration and conservation of natural forests, and not increase pressures on natural forests. Wildlife corridors, streamside zones and a mosaic of stands of different ages and rotation periods, shall be used in the layout of the plantation, consistent with the scale of the operation. The scale and layout of plantation blocks shall be consistent with the patterns of forest stands found within the natural landscape.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 10.3 Diversity in the composition of plantations is preferred, so as to enhance economic, ecological and social stability. Such diversity may include the size and spatial distribution of management units within the landscape, number and genetic composition of species, age classes and structures.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 10.4 The selection of species for planting shall be based on their overall suitability for the site and their appropriateness to the management objectives. In order to enhance the conservation of biological diversity, native species are preferred over exotic species in the establishment of plantations and the restoration of degraded ecosystems. Exotic species, which shall be used only when their performance is greater than that of native species, shall be carefully monitored to detect unusual mortality, disease, or insect outbreaks and adverse ecological impacts.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 10.5 A proportion of the overall forest management area, appropriate to the scale of the plantation and to be determined in regional standards, shall be managed so as to restore the site to a natural forest cover.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 10.6 Measures shall be taken to maintain or improve soil structure, fertility, and biological activity. The techniques and rate of harvesting, road and trail construction and	

maintenance, and the choice of species shall not result in long term soil degradation or adverse impacts on water quality, quantity or substantial deviation from stream course drainage patterns.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 10.7 Measures shall be taken to prevent and minimize outbreaks of pests, diseases, fire and invasive plant introductions. Integrated pest management shall form an essential part of the management plan, with primary reliance on prevention and biological control methods rather than chemical pesticides and fertilizers. Plantation management should make every effort to move away from chemical pesticides and fertilizers, including their use in nurseries. The use of chemicals is also covered in Criteria 6.6 and 6.7.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 10.8 Appropriate to the scale and diversity of the operation, monitoring of plantations shall include regular assessment of potential on-site and off-site ecological and social impacts (e.g., natural regeneration, effects on water resources and soil fertility, and impacts on local welfare and social well-being), in addition to those elements addressed in Principles 8, 6 and 4. No species should be planted on a large scale until local trials and/or experience have shown that they are ecologically well-adapted to the site, are not invasive, and do not have significant negative ecological impacts on other ecosystems. Special attention will be paid to social issues of land acquisition for plantations, especially the protection of local rights of ownership, use or access.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 10.9 Plantations established in areas converted from natural forests after November 1994 normally shall not qualify for certification. Certification may be allowed in circumstances where sufficient evidence is submitted to the certification body that the manager/owner is not responsible directly or indirectly for such conversion.	
Strength	Weakness

3.1 Observations on review and resolution of complaint

No complaints have been lodged since the previous audit.

3.2 Summarized progress in implementing the conditions related to any approved pesticide derogation

N/A – No pesticides used.

4.0 SURVEILLANCE DECISION

4.1 Non-Compliances

NCR#:	NC 2014-01	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:	1.1.4 Compliance inspections are performed periodically and kept on record.			
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:				
The monitoring inspections are not being conducted as planned. (11/77)				
Timeline for Conformance:	By the next annual audit (maximum 12 months)			
Evidence Provided by Organization:				
NCR Status:	Open			
Comments (optional):	N/A			

NCR#:	NC 2014-02	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:	1.1.5 Where non-compliances are identified and recorded, corrective actions are implemented.			
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:				
Where non-compliances are identified and recorded, the management system did not implement the corrective actions as prescribed in the FNSWO procedures.				
Timeline for Conformance:	By the next annual audit (maximum 12 months)			
Evidence Provided by Organization:				
NCR Status:	Open			
Comments (optional):	N/A			

NCR#:	NC 2014-03	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:	7.1.12 The management plan shall include a strategy for monitoring forest changes and assessing the environmental and social impacts of forest management.			
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:				
There is no evidence of a strategy for monitoring forest changes and assessing the environmental and social impacts of forest management.				
Timeline for Conformance:	By the next annual audit (maximum 12 months)			
Evidence Provided by Organization:				
NCR Status:	Open			
Comments (optional):	N/A			

NCR#:	NC 2014-04	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:	7.2.1 Indicators of progress relative to objectives shall be identified and an effective and thorough plan for monitoring these indicators shall be in place.			
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:				
There is no evidence that indicators of progress relative to objectives have been identified and that an effective and thorough plan for monitoring these indicators are in place.				
Timeline for Conformance:	By the next annual audit (maximum 12 months)			
Evidence Provided by Organization:				
NCR Status:	Open			
Comments (optional):	N/A			

NCR#:	NC 2014-05	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:	9.1.4 The owner/manager shall make the assessment document(s), associated maps, and external review report available to the public.			
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:				
There is no evidence of an external review report, and that it has been made available to the public.				
Timeline for Conformance:	By the next annual audit (maximum 12 months)			
Evidence Provided by Organization:				
NCR Status:	Open			
Comments (optional):	N/A			

NCR#:	NC 2014-06	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:	FSC-STD-30-005 V1-0 - Section 6.2: The Group entity shall specify in their procedures the maximum number of members that can be supported by the management system and the human and technical capacities of the Group entity.			
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:				
The staffing complement to meet the FSC expectations has not been determined nor implemented				
Timeline for Conformance:	By the next annual audit (maximum 12 months)			
Evidence Provided by Organization:				
NCR Status:	Open			

Comments (optional):	N/A
----------------------	-----

4.2 Difficult Assessments

4.3 Status of previous non-compliances

NCR#:	NC 2013-01	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:	8.1.1 A documented monitoring program that outlines the frequency, intensity, and rationale for monitoring is implemented with the following characteristics: a) consistent and replicable monitoring procedures; b) monitoring of the performance of the owner/manager and the owner/managers employees and contractors, including compliance with Standard Operating Procedures and contract specifications; c) identification of staff members or others with responsibility for implementing monitoring programs; and, d) procedures for taking corrective actions where non-compliances are identified.			
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:				
The monitoring system does not consistently evaluate the legal compliance, BMP implementation and other monitoring requirements specified by the FNSWO				
Timeline for Conformance:	By the next annual audit (maximum 12 months)			
Evidence Provided by Organization:	Combined 4 monitor forms into 1 – Controlled document ‘DO24 Monitor Form’.			
NCR Status:	Closed.			
Comments (optional):	N/A			

4.4 Opportunities for Improvement

OFI 2014-1.1.1 Consider developing a mechanism to identify municipal and local legislation

OFI 2014- 1.1.3 Consider identifying the List of Legal Requirements as a controlled document

OFI 2014- 7.1.9 – The 5% reduction factor to the AAC determination is not specified in SOP 12.18. Consider removing the addendum to the systems manual and updating the applicable sections of the manual.

OFI 2014- 7.3.1 – Consider encouraging employees active in forestry operations to attend BMP training.

OFI 2014- 9.1.2 – Consider adding the definition of a primordial forest in the training material provided to forest planners.

OFI 2014- 9.1.4 – Consider providing a summary table of the HCVF that have been found on the woodlots.

OFI FSC-STD-30-005 - 1.3 Consider having the policy of commitment to the FSC Principles and Criteria dated and signed. Done in WMP?????

FSC-STD-30-005 - 5.2 Consider having a procedure stating that records shall be retained for at least five years.

4.5 Recommendation to maintain the certificate

It is the opinion of the lead auditor that, the Federation of Nova Scotia Woodland Owner's system of management is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the applicable standard were met over the whole forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation. A recommendation to maintain the certificate will be made to SAI Global.

5.0 GROUP MEMBERSHIP LIST (UPDATE)

For reasons of confidentiality, the list of group members shall not be provided on the public summary report. The list is available on file at SAI Global.

6.0 FSC COMPLAINTS, DISPUTES AND APPEALS

On receiving a complaint the relevant details are recorded on a complaint register by the person receiving the complaint.

A QMI-SAI Global person is responsible for the handling of complaints/appeals, and forwards the complaint on to the respective Manager in charge of QMI-SAI Global FSC Program for resolution.

An initial response, including an outline of the proposed course of action to follow up on the complaint, will be sent within two (2) weeks of receiving the complaint.

QMI-SAI Global will keep the complainants informed of progress in evaluating the complaint.

An investigation of the allegations and all its proposed actions in response to the complaint/appeal will be dealt within three (3) months of receiving the appeal. Upon completion of the investigation a full report of the investigation and its findings are then sent to the complainant.

Full implementation of actions and confirmation of implementation (e.g. correction and closing out of non-compliances that may have been identified as a result of the complaint) outlined in the final report will be completed.

QMI-SAI Global ensures that the persons engaged in the appeals, complaints and disputes handling processes are different from those who carried out the audits, made the certification decisions and the day to day implementation.

If the issue has not been resolved through the full implementation of QMI-SAI Global's procedures the person or organization raising the complaint/dispute/appeal has the opportunity to refer their complaint/dispute/appeal to FSC's dispute resolution process.