

**4th 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 28, 2015

Date of finalized report: June 24, 2015

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

Based on FSC-STD-20-007a V1-0/ FSC-STD-20-007b V1-0

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>	5
1.1.6 <i>Additional Evaluation Techniques</i>	5
2.0 STANDARD(S)	7
2.1 STANDARD USED	7
2.2 DESCRIPTION OF LOCAL ADAPTATION OF GENERIC STANDARD	7
3.0 OBSERVATIONS	7
3.1 OBSERVATIONS ON REVIEW AND RESOLUTION OF COMPLAINT	16
3.2 SUMMARIZED PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE CONDITIONS RELATED TO ANY APPROVED PESTICIDE DEROGATION	16
4.0 SURVEILLANCE DECISION	16
4.1 NON-COMPLIANCES	16
4.2 DIFFICULT ASSESSMENTS	16
4.3 STATUS OF PREVIOUS NON-COMPLIANCES	17
4.4 OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT	18
4.5 RECOMMENDATION TO MAINTAIN THE CERTIFICATE	19
5.0 COMPLAINTS, DISPUTES AND APPEALS	19
6.0 NEXT AUDIT	19
7.0 GROUP MEMBERSHIP LIST (UPDATE)	20

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION

Evaluation dates:	May 28-29, 2015
Task	Person days (excluding travel)
Pre-evaluation	0,5 days
Preparatory Work	
Documents, Records and Fieldwork	3 days
Stakeholder Interviews	2 days
TOTAL	5.5 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 Université de Moncton. 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: François Grimard, ing.f. François Grimard has over twenty years of experience as a Forest engineer in the related fields of forestry and environment. Since 1995, he has a consultant office where he carries out mandates primarily associated with the certification of sustainable forest management and environmental management systems. He has acquired over the years a solid practical expertise in forestry as Chief Forester and Forestry Supervisor allowing him to master the requirements of the Quebec forestry regime and appreciate the challenges posed by the management of public and private forest. His work as lead auditor of forest management and environmental management systems led him to be constantly at the heart of the forest practices evolution and make critical and rigorous judgments on their actual or potential impacts.
Technical expert: N/A
Observer: N/A

1.1.1 Itinerary

Thursday, May 28 2015		
08:00	Daniel Martin	François Grimard
	Debriefing of management following the woodlot inspections	
	Follow-up on audit notes	
	FSC 1.4 (2)	FSC-STD-30-005
	FSC 1.6 (2)	FSC 6.5 (4)
	FSC 2.3 (1)	FSC 6.6 (6)
	FSC 3.1 (2)	FSC 6.7 (3)
	FSC 3.2 (1)	FSC 6.8 (3)
	FSC 4.4 (5)	FSC 6.9 (2)
	FSC 9.2 (1)	FSC 6.10 (2)

	FSC 5.1 (4)	FSC 8.1 (1)
	FSC 5.2 (3)	FSC P10
	FSC 5.5 (3)	
17:00	End of the audit day	

Friday, May 29 2015		
08:00	Auditor arrival at FNSWO office	
	Daniel Martin	François Grimard
	Auditor conference	
11:00	Closing meeting	
12:00	End of the audit	

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

1.1.3 Selected FMUs and Rationale

The audit did not require a field visit this year. FSC-STD-20-007 allows for the following provisions under section 6.3.3:

In the case of groups or sub-groups of SLIMFs with less than 100 members the certification body shall carry out at least one FMU level site visit at the end of the first year in which the certificate was issued, and at least one additional FMU level site visit during the period of validity of the certificate. If there are no outstanding corrective actions to be evaluated and no unresolved complaints requiring evaluation the remaining surveillance evaluations may be based on review of documentation and records specified in 6.2 above, and do not require FMU level site visits. The certification body shall take account of the rate of change of membership within the group; changes to the group management structure and the type and variety of forest activities being implemented within the group before making the decision to waive an annual FMU level site visit.

SAI Global considered the fact the FNSWO currently has 84 woodlots in the group certification program. This number includes 10 new woodlots added in the last year. There were no changes to group management structure as the managers have not changed since the last audit. Furthermore, there were no changes in the type and variety of forest activities being implemented within the group since the S3 audit. Considering FMU site visits have been conducted every year since the initial registration audit, and since there are no outstanding non-conformances and no unresolved complaints requiring evaluation, SAI Global decided to base the Surveillance 4 on the review of documentation, records as well as interviews with staff. SAI Global did not require FMU level field visits for this audit.

1.1.4 Sites Visited

See section 1.1.3 above for rational.

1.1.5 Stakeholder Consultation

Interest group of stakeholders contacted	# of stakeholders contacted	# of stakeholders having made comments	Observations resulting from stakeholder consultation
Individuals and enterprises	15		
Municipalities	1		
First Nations	6		Compliance.
Contractors	0		
Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)	13		
Associations	12		
Governments	3		
Public agencies			
FSC Canada	1		
University/Community College	5		
TOTAL	55		

1.1.6 Additional Evaluation Techniques

No additional evaluation techniques were required.

1.1.7 Update on any changes to the scope of the certificate

There are no changes to the scope on the certificate.

Forest management activities on defined woodlots enrolled in the group certification program.

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:			# of group members
<input type="checkbox"/> single FMU	<input type="checkbox"/> multiple FMU	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Group	84 woodlots 66 owners
Type of SLIMF			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> small SLIMF	<input type="checkbox"/> low intensity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF	

SLIMF																	
Number of FMUs: <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">Less than 100 ha</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">59</td> </tr> <tr> <td>100-1,000 ha</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1,000-10,000 ha</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 10,000 ha</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">84</td> </tr> </table>	Less than 100 ha	59	100-1,000 ha	25	1,000-10,000 ha		Over 10,000 ha		TOTAL	84	Location of the non-SLIMFs FMU (refer to the center of the FMU) - N/A no non-SLIMF FMU's. Latitude N/S degrees minutes Longitude E/W degrees minutes						
Less than 100 ha	59																
100-1,000 ha	25																
1,000-10,000 ha																	
Over 10,000 ha																	
TOTAL	84																
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: <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">Included in FMUs ≤100 ha</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">3158 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Included in FMUs between 100 and 1,000 ha</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">4895 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eligible as low intensity SLIMF FMUs</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">Privately managed²</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">6667 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">State managed</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">82 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">Community managed³</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">783 ha</td> </tr> </table>	Included in FMUs ≤100 ha	3158 ha	Included in FMUs between 100 and 1,000 ha	4895 ha	Eligible as low intensity SLIMF FMUs	0	Privately managed ²	6667 ha	State managed	82 ha	Community managed ³	783 ha				
Included in FMUs ≤100 ha	3158 ha																
Included in FMUs between 100 and 1,000 ha	4895 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: <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">Forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting and managed primarily for conservation objectives</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">0 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Protected from commercial harvesting and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">0 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Classified as 'high conservation value forest'</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">26.2 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Production forest (from which timber may be harvested)</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">5,183 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Production forest classified as 'plantation'</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">0 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems⁴</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">23.0 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"> </td> </tr> </table>		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				
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																
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; There has been no use of chemical pesticides on the certified woodlots since the previous audit.																	
c) Number of accidents in forest work (serious / fatal) since the last audit. There have been no accidents since the previous audit.																	

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.
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).

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.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 1.2 Payment of fees, taxes etc.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 1.3 Compliance with international agreements	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 1.4 Documenting of conflicts with laws.	
There are no identified conflicts between laws, regulations and the FSC Principle and Criteria.	
Strength	Weakness
None identified	None identified
Criterion 1.5 Protection from illegal activities	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 1.6 Adherence to FSC principles.	

Commitment to Sustainable Forest Management which is signed by the land owner. Signed Sustainable Forest Management Policy, signed by the Project Coordinator, the Executive Director as well as the Chairman of the Board of the FNSWO.	
Strength None identified	Weakness None identified
PRINCIPLE #2 TENURE AND USE RIGHTS AND REPSONSIBILITIES	
Criterion 2.1 Evidence of forest use rights.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 2.2 Local communities with use rights can protect their rights and resources.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 2.3 Appropriate mechanisms to resolve disputes.	
Verified the complaints registry. There are no complaints. Verified the dispute resolution process defined in the procedures manual, section 9.3.4.	
Strength None identified	Weakness None identified
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.	
There have been past communication with representatives of First Nations. Rights of First Nations are recognized by the FNSWO in a Standard Operating Procedure. By interview, the Executive Director as well as the Certification coordinator of the FNSWO demonstrated excellent knowledge of this SOP.	
Strength None identified	Weakness. None identified
Criterion 3.2 Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
There are no forest management activities in established Aboriginal and Treaty rights. Verified GIS system. Layers include Indian Reserves lands, Archeological remains provided by DNR. By interview, Certificaion Coordinator explained that each woodlot is compared to all the available GIS layers, including First Nations.	
Strength None identified.	Weakness None identified.
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.	

Strength	Weakness
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.	
Strength	Weakness
PRINCIPLE 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.	
<p>Due to the limited size of the management team, employees have ample opportunity to participate in the decision making process.</p> <p>There a no community groups taking active interest in small woodlot management. This is due to the size and intensity of the management occurring on the woodlots, and the size of the landowners.</p> <p>MOU between the FNSWO and MTRI is still effectively implemented. This was confirmed by interview with both parties.</p> <p>Provision in the management plans stating that harvest operations and road designs must consider impacts on visual and sound quality in the vicinity of high use areas.</p>	
Strength None identified	Weakness None identified
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
PRINCIPLE 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.	
The FNSWO operates on funding from DNR. Investments are done annually in training of woodlot owners participating in the certification program. Funding from DNR is provided for silviculture activities for certified woodlots.	
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.	
Woodlot owners are responsible for marketing their own wood products. The wood market provides the incentive for the land owner to capture the optimal value of forest products.	
Strength None identified	Weakness None identified
Criterion 5.3 Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 5.4 Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.	
Strength	Weakness
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.	
Verified a woodlot management plan as part of a sample for the audit. Current use of the woodlot includes recreational trails for nature retreat. Management strategy consists of excluding stands from forest management, as well as implementing uneven age/selection management.	
Strength None identified	Weakness None identified
Criterion 5.6 The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.	
Strength	Weakness
PRINCIPLE 6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	
Criterion 6.1 Environmental impact assessments.	

Strength	Weakness
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.	
Strength	Weakness
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.	
Written guidelines (SOP's) and a BMP booklet are used to inform FSC program participant about criteria to control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting and road construction in order to protect water resources.	
The woodlot owner or representative makes periodic inspections of forest conditions and the effectiveness of forest operations.	
No field visit during this surveillance audit.	
Strength None identified	Weakness None identified
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.	
Pesticide use is discussed with program participant at the Pre-entry meeting and before signature of the Woodlot Management Plan. There is an Integrated Pest Management program that has been developed and described in SOP 12.16 by FNSWO and which is aiming to zero usage of pesticides. There is also a commitment to pesticide-free forest management in the WMP and the use of herbicides and pesticides has been zero since the very first assessment.	
The provincial subsidization of herbicide use in forestry has been eliminated, and this will ensure that the future use of herbicides will be near or, more likely, at zero. Pesticide use is expected to be zero for the foreseeable future except any spruce budworm population control becomes necessary (Btk will be used).	
In some cases, section 3.9 of the WMP lists the conditions where pesticides could be used (complying with 6.6.4).	

Strength None identified	Weakness None identified
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.	
Operators are responsible for the management of all fuels, oils and chemicals that may harm the environment and recycling the products and goods used for forest management activities.	
Strength None identified	Weakness None identified
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.	
No recent use of BT. Anticipating a spruce budworm infestation in 2-5 years. Spraying and monitoring of effectiveness will be conducted by DNR if required. There is no use of genetically modified organisms.	
Strength None identified.	Weakness None identified
Criterion 6.9 The use of exotic species is carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.	
There is no use of exotic tree species.	
Strength None identified	Weakness None identified
Criterion 6.10 Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion:	
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.	
Deforestation and conversion to non-forest use within the defined woodlot shall be minimized through careful planning of forest roads, landings, etc. There has been no conversion of forests to non-forest land use. As well, there are no examples of conversion back to forests.	
This requirement is covered during the pre-entry meeting with candidate land owners.	
Strength None identified	Weakness None identified
PRINCIPLE 7 MANAGEMENT PLAN	
Criterion 7.1 Content of management plan.	
Strength	Weakness
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.	

Strength	Weakness
Criterion 7.3 Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plan.	
Strength	Weakness
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.	
Strength	Weakness
PRINCIPLE 8 MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT	
Criterion 8.1 Frequency and intensity of monitoring.	
Monitoring is a two-tiered program that consists of regular woodlot monitoring by the woodlot owner or designated person, and scheduled program monitoring by the Federation or a designated representative.	
Strength None identified	Weakness None identified
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	
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.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 9.2 The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.	
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. High Conservation Values are taken into consideration in the course of meeting the requirements under Criterion 4.4.	
Strength None identified	Weakness None identified
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.	
Strength	Weakness
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
PRINCIPLE10 – 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

There are no complaints in the complaints registry.

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

Non applicable.

4.0 SURVEILLANCE DECISION

4.1 Non-Conformances

NCR#:	NC 2015-01	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:	FSC-STD-30-005, Clause 9.4 The Group entity shall ensure that all uses of the FSC Trademark are approved by the responsible certification body in advance.			
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:				
There is no evidence that the logo used on the website has been submitted to SAI Global for approval.				
Timeline for Conformance:	By the next annual audit (maximum 12 months)			
Evidence Provided by Organization:	Obtaining logo approval is the corrective action. Approval document was presented and verified as evidence on June 19 2015. Approval document is available in the objective evidence file. Lead auditor considers this NCR closed.			
NCR Status:	Closed			
Comments (optional):	No follow-up is required.			

4.2 Difficult Assessments

No indicators were difficult to assess. No issues.

4.3 Status of previous non-conformances

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:	12 FSC woodlot were inspected has planned in 2014. Detail monitoring forms are available for each inspection and a summary is also produced.			
NCR Status:	Closed			
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:	The corrective action registry has been updated All NCRs, corrective action plans and follow-ups on the plans are now recorded in the registry (2010 to 2014)			
NCR Status:	Closed			
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:	The annual updated form has been reviewed. A section on social impacts of forest management has been added and Forest conditions section will allow to record changes in the forest stands. Re: Annual updates (form D009)			
NCR Status:	Closed			
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:	The objectives will be reviewed at the 5 year WMP review. A review schedule of the WMPs has been set up on an Excel spreadsheet. WMP reviews are now planned until 2017.			
NCR Status:	Closed			
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:	Based on the historical work man days per support/management activity, it has been established by FNSWO that the actual management staff can support 200 woodlots.			
NCR Status:	Closed			
Comments (optional):	N/A			

4.4 Opportunities for Improvement

- Consider having the commitment policy to the FSC Principles and Criteria made available through the FNSWO Website.
- Consider the relevance of establishing and publishing a list of all the collect points where chemicals, containers, contaminated soil and liquid wastes can be disposed-off in an environmental friendly manner.

4.5 Recommendation to maintain the certificate

It is the opinion of the lead auditor that, Federation of Nova Scotia Woodland Owners' 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 COMPLAINTS, DISPUTES AND APPEALS

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

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

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.

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 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.

6.0 NEXT AUDIT

Next Scheduled Audit:

Date: September 26 2016

Audit time:

7.0 GROUP MEMBERSHIP LIST (UPDATE)

Name and Contact Information	# of FMUs and location	Total forest area ha.	Location	Managed by:			Main products	Registration Code (including sub-code)
				P	S	C		
James Thibault	1	112.6	Digby Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1019
Kevin Clattenburg	1	81.0	Halifax Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1031
Les Harlow	1	167.8	Halifax Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1037
Paul McDonald	1	40.6	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1048
Bob Barteaux	1	72.7	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1049
Terry Smith	1	80.7	Halifax Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1065
Karen Miller	2	96.7	Halifax Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1066 1080
Ted McFetridge	1	82.9	Halifax Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1067
Thomas Miller	1	224.0	Halifax Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1068
Jack Redden	1	245.9	Halifax Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1069
Gini Proulx	1	36.3	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1073
Albert Higgins	1	211.3	Halifax Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1078
George Uhlman	1	39.2	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1101
Stewart Fotheringham	2	97.5	Annapolis	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1102

				Co.					1103
Peter	Van Dyk	1	13.7	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1104
Jim	Crooker	1	316.5	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1105
Dave	Thomas	1	167.8	Digby Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1106
Braydon	Anthony	1	56.9	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1107
Lyman	Huskins	4	546.0	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1108 1109 1119 1120
Tom	Daly	1	90.3	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1110
Tom	Berry	1	22.3	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1111
Greg	Sheffer	1	94.8	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1113
Jim	Todd	1	99.9	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1114
Harley	Redden	1	39.7	Halifax Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1115
Don&Sheila	Munroe	1	93.1	Kings Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1117
Rick	Hoffman	1	105.7	Inverness Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1118
Bryan	Lorber	1	147.2	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1121
Randy	Cameron	1	89.5	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1122
Murray	Crouse	1	35.0	Lunenburg Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1123
Adrian	Samson	1	58.0	Colchester Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1125

Real	Thibault	1	13.3	Digby Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1127
Herman	Berfelo	1	131.0	Colchester Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1128
Scott & Stewart Forestry Consultants Ltd.		3	148.7	Antigonish Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1132 1133 1135
Bear River	First Nations	1	420.5	Annapolis Co.			C	Non Timber Forest Products & Fuelwood	1138
Ian & Linda	MacLean	4	578.5	Pictou Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1142 1161 1038 1204
Century Forestry Ltd.		7	553.1	Pictou Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1056 1143 1144 1145 1165 1166 1167
Scott & Lisa	MacEachern	1	283.0	Pictou Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1146
Frederick	Sweet	1	14.4	Lunenburg Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1147
Robin	Barrett	1	18.1	Halifax Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1148
John	Therault	2	223.8	Digby Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1149 1150
Kika	Joy	1	42.2	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1151
Town of Yarmouth Watershed		1	362.8	Yarmouth Co.			C	Sawlogs & fuelwood	1157
Raymond	Harris	1	111.2	Shelburne Co.	P				1158
Greg	Jollymore	1	68.2	Lunenburg	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1160

			Co.					
Prince Edward Island Valleyfield Public Forest	1	82.0	Kings Co. PEI		S		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1162
Jane Barker & Richard Lane	1	25.8	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1163
Tom Sheppard	1	34.8	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1172
Richard White	1	48.7	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1173
David Small & Jaqueline Jorissen	1	56.6	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1174
Glen Pulley	1	84.8	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1175
Hantford Lewis	1	203.3	Digby Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1182
Daniel Deveau & Daniel Riley	1	15.7	Digby Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1185
Jonathan Roach	1	67.8	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1188
Mersey River Chalets	1	139.6	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1191
Don Kimble	1	31.7	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1192
Alex & Marie MacLeod	1	30.8	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1194
Royce Ford	1	28.3	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1196
John Tanner	2	100.0	Hants Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1129 1131
Mike Penny	1	72.1	Hants Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1124
Darren Hawkes	1	24.9	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1195
Daniel Deveau	1	21.2	Digby Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1197

Peter & Margaret Waterman	1	58.0	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1198
David Smith	1	56.9	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1199
Lloyde Blois	1	256.0	Hants Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1201
Herman & Elizabeth Huesker	1	38.3	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1178
Rod & Robin MacLennan	1	46.6	Pictou Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1205
66 members								
P: Private, S: State or Province, C: Community								