

RA-Cert Division Headquarters 65 Millet St. Suite 201 Richmond, VT 05477 USA Tel: 802-434-5491 Fax: 802-434-3116 www.rainforest-alliance.org

Audit Managed by:
Canada Regional Office
285 McLeod Street
Ottawa, Ontario K2P 1A1
Tel: 819.827.8278
Fax: 866.438.1971
Contact person: Alexandre Boursier
Email: aboursier@ra.org



ACCREDITED FSC-ACC-004

FM-06 19 April 2012



Forest Management 2013 Annual Audit Report for:

Federation of Nova Scotia Woodland
Owners
In
Nova Scotia, Canada

Report Finalized: [day/month/year]

Audit Dates: November 13-16, 2012

Audit Team: Jeremy Williams

Certificate code: SW-FM/COC-005735

Certificate issued: 05/01/2012 Certificate expiration: 04/01/2017

Organization Contact:

Address:

Logan Cochrane 285 George Street

Stewiacke, Nova Scotia B0N 2J0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.		INTRODUCTION	3
2.		AUDIT FINDINGS AND RESULTS	3
	2.1.	AUDIT CONCLUSION	3
	2.2.	CHANGES IN FMES' FOREST MANAGEMENT AND ASSOCIATED EFFECTS ON CONFORMANCE TO STANDARD REQUIREMENTS	4
	2.3	EXCISION OF AREAS FROM THE SCOPE OF CERTIFICATE	4
	2.4.	STAKEHOLDER ISSUES (COMPLAINTS/DISPUTES RAISED BY STAKEHOLDERS TO FME OR RAINFOREST	
	2.5.	ALLIANCE SINCE PREVIOUS EVALUATION)	
		NEW NONCONFORMITY REPORTS ISSUED AS A RESULT OF THIS AUDIT	
		AUDIT OBSERVATIONS	
	2.8.	NOTES FROM PREVIOUS AUDITS	
	2.9.	Notes for Future Audits	.14
3.		AUDIT PROCESS	.15
	3.1.	AUDITORS AND QUALIFICATIONS	.15
	3.2.	AUDIT SCHEDULE	.15
	3.3.	SAMPLING METHODOLOGY	
	3.4. 3.5.	STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION PROCESS	
	3.6.	REVIEW OF FME DOCUMENTATION AND REQUIRED RECORDS	
Α	PPEND	X I: FSC Annual Audit Reporting Form	
Α	PPEND	X II: List of visited sites (confidential)	.22
Α	PPEND	X III: List of stakeholders consulted (confidential)	.23
Α	PPEND	X IV: Forest management standard conformance (confidential)	.25
Α	PPEND	X V: Chain-of-Custody Conformance (confidential)	.26
Α	PPEND	X VI: Rainforest Alliance Database Update Form (confidential)	.31
Α	PPEND	X VII: Group management conformance checklist FSC-STD-30-005 v1-0 (confidential)	.32
Α	PPEND	X VII-a: Certified Group Member/FMU List	.38

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to document annual audit conformance of the Federation of Nova Scotia Woodland Owners, hereafter referred to as FNSWO. The report presents the findings of Rainforest Alliance auditors who have evaluated company systems and performance against the Forest Stewardship CouncilTM (FSC[®]) forest management standards and policies. Section 2 of this report provides the audit conclusions and any necessary follow-up actions by the company through nonconformity reports.

The Rainforest Alliance founded its previous SmartWood program in 1989 to certify responsible forestry practices and has grown to provide a variety of auditing services. Rainforest Alliance certification and auditing services are managed and implemented within its RA-Cert Division. All related personnel responsible for audit design, evaluation, and certification/verification/validation decisions are under the purview of the RA-Cert Division, hereafter referred to as Rainforest Alliance or RA.

This report includes information which will become public information. Sections 1-3, Appendix I will be posted on the FSC website according to FSC requirements. All appendices will remain confidential. A copy of the public summary of this report can be obtained on the FSC website at http://info.fsc.org/.

Dispute resolution: If Rainforest Alliance clients encounter organizations or individuals having concerns or comments about Rainforest Alliance and our services, these parties are strongly encouraged to contact Rainforest Alliance regional or Headquarters offices directly (see contact information on report cover). Formal complaints or concerns should be sent in writing.

2. AUDIT FINDINGS AND RESULTS

2.1. Audit conclusion

Based on Company's conformance with FSC and Rainforest Alliance requirements, the audit team makes the following recommendation:					
	Certification requirements met, certificate maintenance recommended NCR(s) closed Upon acceptance of NCR(s) issued below				
	Certification requirements not met:				
Additional comments:					
Issues identified as controversial or hard to evaluate.					

2.2. Changes in FMEs' forest management and associated effects on conformance to standard requirements

There has been no change in the main objectives of the FNSWO or the management approach of the woodlot owners who are participants in the FSC group of FNSWO members. The FSC group has increased from 19 at the time of the assessment to a present level of 40 members, with new members being added as quickly as forest management plans can be prepared for them. During the last year, the province introduced a program whereby funding is provided for silvicultural activities to forests that are certified – the availability of these funds to certified forests has enabled forest owners to be better able to undertake management activities such as pre-commercial thinning (PCT), commercial thinning and selection harvest. These funds are available until August 2013 – it is not known at this time whether the program will be continued.

2.3 Excision of areas from the scope of certificate

Not applicable. Check this box if the FME has not excised areas from the FMU(s) included in the certificate scope as defined by FSC-POL-20-003. (delete the rows below if not applicable)

2.4. Stakeholder issues (complaints/disputes raised by stakeholders to FME or Rainforest Alliance since previous evaluation)

FNSWO reported that there had been no stakeholder complaints or issues raised since the assessment with either the FSC group of woodlot owners or with FNSWO's management approach.

2.5. Conformance with applicable nonconformity reports

The section below describes the activities of the certificate holder to address each applicable non- conformity report (NCR) issued during previous evaluations. For each NCR a finding is presented along with a description of its current status using the following categories. Failure to meet NCRs will result in nonconformances being upgraded from minor to major status with conformance required within 3 months with risk of suspension or termination of the Rainforest Alliance certificate if Major NCRs are not met. The following classification is used to indicate the status of the NCR:

Status Categories	Explanation
Closed	Operation has successfully met the NCR.
Open	Operation has either <u>not met</u> or has <u>partially met</u> the NCR.

NCR#:	01/11	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requir	ement:	FSC-STD-CAN-Maritimes-SLIN include the assumptions and ramade in accordance with the rehistorical information, research appropriate.	ationale for the harvest equirements of Criterio	t level determinations on 5.6, incorporating

Report Section:		Appendix II.				
Description of No	on-conforma	nce and Related Evidence:				
template (Section account for the pereductions or indicated volume should be	The methodology for the determination of the annual allowable cut (AAC) is provided in the WMP template (Section 4.2.). While the methodology indicates that reductions should be made in the AAC to account for the percentage of inoperable area within stands the plans reviewed did not show such reductions or indicate that reductions were not required and therefore applied. Additionally a reduction in volume should be applied for timber in areas removed from timber production by riparian zones, etc. where all timber is not available for harvest.					
Corrective Action	ŕ	Organization shall implem conformance with the requirer Note: Effective corrective a occurrence described in evic eliminate and prevent recurrent	ment(s) referenced abo actions focus on add lence above, as well a	ve. ressing the specific as the root cause to		
Timeline for Con	formance:	By the next annual audit.				
Evidence Provided Organization:	d by	 A statistic published by between 1994 and 199 insects, fire and disease 	97, the harvestable for	prest volume lost to		
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:		The FNSWO used the statist 5% reduction in the annual a new plan. The 5% figure doe NCR 01/11 – it is more releval used as the global reduction management plans calculated stock in the forest, and automatically excluded from being excluded. In addition Redden 1115), the road area associated area excluded from required beside riparian area riparian buffer can be remocareful logging methods must In summary, 5% is likely a reduction that should be app NCR 01/11 and NCR 02/11 somewhat from woodlot to we excluded seems to be much together with potential losses seems reasonable.	es not apply directly to ant to NCR 02/11, hower figure. However, it is the AAC as a fraction of so unproductive are the calculation by virus, in some plans that as were delineated in the productive foreas, however up to 20% oved under provincial be employed. As reasonable estimated in the world of the estimated to account for the estimated of	ne calculated in each the issues raised in ever the 5% has been noted that the forest of the existing growing as will have been tue of their volumes were reviewed (e.g. he inventory and the st area. Buffers are of the volume in a regulation, although the of the percentage of factors identified in riate factor will vary of area that should be average, and taken		
NCR Status:		Closed				
Comments (optional):		Because landowners in the FSC group harvest well below their AAC (i.e. in 2011-12, 45% of the 8,850 m3/yr AAC was actually harvested), the decision was made not to revise plans that are already in effect.				
NCR#:	02/11	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X		

NCR#:	02/11	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:		FSC-STD-CAN-Maritimes-SLIMF-2008 7.1.10: The predictable future influence of pests, pathogens and non-commercial species on allowable harvests, timber values, stocking etc. shall be taken into account and prepared for in the management plan.		
Report Section:		Appendix II Page 49 of 78.		
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:				

Volume reductions should be applied to account for the predictable influence of pests etc. The plans reviewed did not have any reduction factors applied or alternatively did not indicate that a reduction for pests or pathogens was not necessary. Corrective Action Request: Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance. **Timeline for Conformance:** By the next annual audit Evidence Provided by See NCR 01/11. Organization: Findings for Evaluation of See discussion and conclusion for NCR 01/11. Evidence: Also of note, relevant to potential losses to natural disturbances, is that the landowners will often salvage trees that have blown over or quickly harvest trees which are beginning to die back, thus capturing some of the potential losses. This factor may have to be revisited in the event of a spruce budworm infestation, however if there was a substantial loss of volume due to spruce budworm or another major disturbance, then it would be appropriate to revise the calculation of the AAC in the plan. This is a preferred approach to dealing with occasional major disturbances, compared to taking a large pre-emptive AAC reduction. **NCR Status:** Closed.

NCR#:	03/11	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:		FSC-STD-CAN-Maritimes-SLIMF-2008 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.		
Report Section:		Appendix II		
Description of No	on-conforma	nce and Related Evidence:		
		ative to objectives are not expli the specific objectives is not ar		voodlot management
Corrective Action Request:		Organization shall impleme conformance with the requirem Note: Effective corrective acoccurrence described in evide eliminate and prevent recurren	nent(s) referenced abo ctions focus on add ence above, as well a	ve. ressing the specific as the root cause to
Timeline for Con	formance:	By the next annual audit		
Evidence Provided by Organization:		Woodlot managementInterviews with the ProFNSWO post treatment	jects Coordinator;	·
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:		The woodlot management production indicators for the objectives, however, the objectives in their WMP's the many other checklists us	owever the Project Co in on the woodlots that The post treatment	ordinator was able to at were sampled with checklist, along with

Comments (optional):

	many objectives. The woodlot owner is required to be monitored at least once every three years. During this visit the landowners' objectives are evaluated. The informal process of assessing the progress towards the objectives is very useful. An enquiry to FSC Canada resulted in the determination that there is a typographical error in the standard – the intent box below the wording of the indicator should point to indicator 7.2.1 as not being applicable to SLIMF's or small groups.
NCR Status:	Closed
Comments (optional):	

NCR#:	04/11	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:		FSC-STD-CAN-Maritimes-SLIMF-2008 7.4.1. A summary of the management plan, including all elements in 7.1. shall be made available to the public		
Report Section:		Appendix II.		
Description of No	on-conforma	nce and Related Evidence:		
Plan summaries a	are not availa	ble to the public.		
Corrective Action Request:		Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.		
Timeline for Con	formance:	By the next annual audit.		
Evidence Provided by Organization:		 The FNSWO website; and Interviews with the FNSWO Projects Coordinator. 		
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:		The FNSWO website states request', and there is a web woodlot management plan, who f information that is provid organization is consistent with of the standard.	page that lists the s nich provides a good led in the plan. T	ection headings in a indication of the type he response of the
NCR Status:		Closed		
Comments (optional):		The organization was not pa NCR, because there was a gre an overview of their WMP's o refuse. The concern that land basic information as woodlot a wish to mention on its web site of landowners to maintain a lev	eat reluctance to ask land line, and the sense owners may not even area is reasonable. To that disclosure will be	andowners to provide was the most would wish to divulge such he organization may

NCR#:	05/11	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requir	rement:	Group Certification Checklist 6 procedures the maximum num the management system and t Group entity.	ber of members that ca	an be supported by

Report Section:	Appendix IX		
Description of Non-conformance	e and Related Evidence:		
The requirement that the Group entity specify the maximum number of members that can be support the management system and human and technical capacities is not met.			
Corrective Action Request: Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonst conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.			
Timeline for Conformance:	By the next annual audit		
Evidence Provided by Organization:	 A program structure feasibility study produced by the Mersey Tobeatic Research Institute, dated October 2010; and Interview with the Projects Coordinator. 		
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	A program structure feasibility study produced by the Mersey Tobeatic Research Institute, dated October 2010, estimated that once a group reached 50 woodlots, a full-time coordinator (or two part-time coordinators) were needed. The analysis was found to be reasonable. The relevant section of the referenced report has been added to the FNSWO system document.		
NCR Status:	Closed		
Comments (optional):			

2.6. New nonconformity reports issued as a result of this audit

NCR#:	01/13	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:		FSC-STD-CAN-Maritimes-SLIMF-2008 Indicator 1.3.1. The applicant is aware of and understands their legal and administrative obligations with respect to international agreements.		
Report Section:		Appendix II.		
Description of No	onconforma	nce and Related Evidence:		
	lerstanding of	e a listing or documentation of in the relevance of various binding		
Corrective Action Request:		Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the nonconformance.		
Timeline for Con	formance:			
Evidence Provided Organization:	Evidence Provided by PENDING Organization:			
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:		PENDING		
NCR Status:		OPEN		
Comments (option	nal):			

NCR#:	02/13	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:		FSC-STD-CAN-Maritimes-SLIMF-2008 Indicator 6.3.5. Harvesting, site preparation, and other forest operations should be undertaken in a manner that minimizes site and soil damage and soil nutrient loss.		ndertaken in a
Report Section:		Appendix II.		

Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:

One of the sites (the Miller woodlot) visited by the auditor had been harvested during the fall 2012, which included a period of record rainfall. While there was no rutting observed in the forest due to operations, a significantly long section of the access/haul road had been heavily damaged by rutting created during a harvesting operation undertaken by Conform, a local medium-scale harvest contractor. The heavy rutting including a road section that ran straight up a medium-sized hill. While the uphill section was likely rutted prior to harvest operations, the conduct of harvest operations during a month of record rainfall led to ruts on the order of 2-3 feet deep and an on-going erosion problem. The landowner is aware of the damage and Conform has promised to repair the road in spring. The owner had been issued an NCR by FNSWO, with follow up inspection scheduled for August 31, 2013.

Operations undertaken by Conform in the fall of 2011 led to a previously issued NCR, from January 6, 2012, on a second woodlot (different owner) for another occurrence of much the same issue. The NCR issued on Jan 6 had been closed by FNSWO on July 20, following confirmation via a phone call with Conform.

There is no evidence that Conform or FNSWO have altered their approaches in response to these NCR's. Moreover, despite an on-going erosion problem that will persist all winter, there are no plans to undertake any corrective actions until spring 2013.

any controller actions and	g _c . c.	
Corrective Action Request:	Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.	
Timeline for Conformance:	By the next annual audit.	
Evidence Provided by Organization:		
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:		
NCR Status:	OPEN	
Comments (optional):		

NCR#:	03/13	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:		FSC-STD-CAN-Maritimes-SLIM Assessment to determine the properties of the properties	resence of the attribute ts will be completed, ap	s consistent with
Report Section:		Appendix II.		

Description of Nonconformance and Related Evidence:

The organization does not have a systematic methodology for identifying potential HCV's that is consistent with generally accepted methodologies on the woodlots under management or a methodology for assessing the presence of HCV's on member woodlots. This is considered a minor NCR, rather than a major, since there was no evidence that there were features that should have been declared as HCVF's and were not. In fact, the opposite was true – there were a number of areas that were valued by woodlot owners and which were declared as HCVF's even though they did not meet the HCVF criteria.

Corrective Action Request:	Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the nonconformance.
Timeline for Conformance:	
Evidence Provided by Organization:	PENDING
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	PENDING
NCR Status:	OPEN
Comments (optional):	

NCR#:	04/13	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:		FM-35 - RA CoC Standard for FMEs: CoC 5.1. FME shall have procedures in place that ensure all on-product and promotional FSC/Rainforest Alliance trademark use follows the applicable policies		
Report Section:		Appendix V.		
Description of No	on-conforma	nce and Related Evidence:		
of the trademark and logo, both is required to have appropriate		Systems Manual do not addres n on-product and off-product, is procedures in place. Moreover odlots, hence there is further re	within scope for FNSW , the organization is in	O, the organization terested in using the
Corrective Action Request:		Organization shall implemed conformance with the requirem Note: Effective corrective a occurrence described in evideliminate and prevent recurrence.	nent(s) referenced abo ctions focus on add ence above, as well	ve. Iressing the specific as the root cause to
Timeline for Con	formance:	By the next annual audit.		
Evidence Provided by Organization:				
Findings for Evalue Evidence:	uation of			
NCR Status:				
Comments (optional):				

2.7. Audit observations

Observations can be raised when issues or the early stages of a problem are identified which does not of itself constitute a nonconformance, but which the auditor considers may lead to a future nonconformance if not addressed by the client. An observation may be a warning signal on a particular issue that, if not addressed, could turn into a NCR in the future (or a pre-condition or condition during a 5 year re-assessment).

OBS 01/13 Reference Standard & Requirement:

Description of findings leading to observation: Rainforest Alliance will be issuing new codes for all clients, changing from a "SW" identifier to a "RA" identifier. I.e., SW-COC-123456 will change to RA-COC-123456.

Observation: Organization should update all documents, including sales invoices and shipping documents, to reflect the new certificate code prior to the expiration of the certificate in July 15, 2015.

2.8. Notes from Previous Audits

Notes for Future Audits are recorded for the benefit of future audit teams. They are items that were not fully addressed in this audit/assessment and do not constitute non-conformance. They warrant monitoring by future audit teams.

NOTE 01/11		rd and Requirement: FSC-STD-CA	
Note for Future Annual Audits: FNSWO had not completed annual inspections or other inspections at the time of the assessment due to the infancy of the FSC program. Indicator 1.1.5 should be assessed during the next annual audit.			
		☐Followed-up but still open	☐Not followed-up this year
is to be inspectively risk assessments of the potential	eted once every three ent score. At the time I for problems and no	VO does not do annual inspections of years, or more frequently depending when the management plan is develon-compliances to arise in the woodlen be accelerated. The FNSWO has	g on operations undertaken and eloped, a risk assessment is made ot - if the risk level is medium to
Risk Assessm	ent Form – as descri	ibed above (at least 17 risk assessm	ents undertaken in 2012)
Post-Operatio feasible after t inspector can	ns inspection sheet (he operation, and it is	5 completed in the past year) – inspensive seven better to get there when the cay assessment at the same time. The	ection is undertaken as soon as operation is in progress since the
Legal and BM	P – applied at harves	st time – the BMP only can be done o	during or after harvest.
	• , .	ations inspections completed in the p	- '
in the woodlot		ne past year) the checklist is used who prepared – the checklist looks at the saspect.	
Coordinator kr		orm that is done for all woodlots inspe going with a different sheet – and if r as well.	
In addition, the woodlot owners are likely to call FNSWO if they see something that is a concern and FNSWO might have a staff person take a look at the issue, so that monitoring is actually more intensive than is portrayed by the completed inspection forms.			
NOTE 02/11		rd and Requirement: FSC-STD-CA gram, including the targets and obje	
		public summary of the program, inc	
		ed in conjunction with the preparation be assessed during the next annual a	
		☐Followed-up but still open	☐Not followed-up this year
however the u	se of herbicides and	e is no formalized IPM program that he pesticides was zero since the asses	sment. The FNSWO Projects
Coordinator informed the auditor that 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. In the absence of any spruce budworm population build-up, pesticide use is expected to be zero for the foreseeable future. The same text is present in the WMP's as cited in the assessment report: ``herbicide use will be limited as much as possible and used prudently with a commitment from the landowner to attain pesticide free management with a specific target date and interim targets and objectives documented where possible.``

The FNSWO Projects Coordinator informed the auditor that some manual cleaning or PCT was undertaken, instead of herbicide application – herbicide application is not appropriate in many woodlots and is also very expensive.

The certification annual report states how much herbicide and pesticide was used on the woodlots in the group during the past year.

NOTE 03/11	Reference Standard and Requirement: FSC-STD-CAN-Maritimes-SLIMF-2008 6.6.5. The manager makes publically available detailed and timely information about the total amount of pesticide use each year on the management unit, including data on at least one year prior to initial certification.		
	re Annual Audits: Information on the amount of pesticide use is to be included in the		
FNSWO Annu	al Report (June 2012). Criterion 6.6.5 should be assessed during the next annual audit.		
	Followed-up but still open Not followed-up this year		
the provincial sure to mean is little opportu subsidized, bu	am response: There was no use of pesticides or herbicides by anyone in the program and government this year discontinued subsidization of herbicide use for tending, and this will be no tending will be undertaken in the future. Given the reliance on selection harvesting, there unity to use herbicides anyways. Still some manual tending – PCT – because that is still at little of this on FSC program woodlots.		
	on annual report states how much herbicide and pesticide was used on the woodlots in the		
group during t	he past year.		
NOTE 04/11	Reference Standard and Requirement: FSC-STD-CAN-Maritimes-SLIMF-2008 8.5.1. A		
	regular summary is compiled of the results of monitoring activities on the indicators listed in 8.2, and is made publicly available.		
	re Annual Audits: The 2012 annual audit team should verify that a summary of monitoring compiled and made publically available during the next annual audit.		
	☐Followed-up but still open ☐Not followed-up this year		
undertaken du	am response: The 2012 Certification Annual Report lists the number of inspections uring the year, the number and description of NCRs that were issued, and plans for the r. In addition, the area treated by major treatment type is also reported.		
NOTE 05/11	Reference Standard and Requirement: FSC-STD-CAN-Maritimes-SLIMF-2008 9.1.4. The owner/manager shall make the assessment documents, associated maps and external review report available.		
	re Annual Audits: Assessment documents will be part of the Annual Report which has yet due to the infancy of the FSC program. Criterion 9.1.4 should be assessed during the next		
□ Closed	⊠Followed-up but still open □Not followed-up this year		

NOTE 06/11 Reference Standard and Requirement: FSC-STD-CAN-Maritimes-SLIMF-2008 9.4.1. Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes. Note for Future Annual Audits: Annual monitoring had not been undertaken as the program was less than a year old at the time of the audit. A monitoring schedule was developed. Criterion 9.4.1 should be assessed during the next annual audit. ⊠ Closed Followed-up but still open Not followed-up this year 2013 audit team response: The FSC program co-ordinator of FNSWO inspected all HCV's during the past year. Note that the FMU's approach to HCVF's needs to be overhauled – see NCR 02/13. **NOTE 07/11** Reference Standard and Requirement: FSC-STD-CAN-Maritimes-SLIMF-2008 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. Note for Future Annual Audits: The non-plantation designation of 14 hectares Norway Spruce on FSC pool properties needs to be confirmed during the 2012 annual audit. ☐ Closed Followed-up but still open ⊠Not followed-up this year 2013 audit team response: Did not inspect the plantation and so was unable to close this note. 2.9. **Notes for Future Audits NOTE 01/13** Reference Standard and Requirement: FSC-STD-CAN-Maritimes-SLIMF-2008 page 6 - definition of large and small groups Note for Future Annual Audits: It is anticipated that by the next annual audit, the FNSWO group will be larger than 50 members, and so will become a large group according to the standard. At that time, indicators 6.3.7, 6.3.8, 6.3.10, 6.4.1, 6.4.2, 7.1.12, and 7.2.1. □Not followed-up this year Followed-up but still open ☐ Closed 2014 audit team response: **NOTE 02/13** Reference Standard and Requirement: FSC-STD-30-005 v 1-0 Group management conformance checklist 3.2: The Group entity's procedures shall be sufficient to establish an efficient internal control system ensuring that all members are fulfilling applicable requirements. **Note for Future Annual Audits:** Future audits should review whether NCR's issued by FNSWO to its members have been closed off in the required time frame, and should sample some of these woodlots. The Tom Miller woodlot should be viewed in the 2012 audit to examine the mediation work undertaken on the rutted roadway. Closed Followed-up but still open Not followed-up this year 2014 audit team response:

2013 audit team response: The FMU's approach to HCVF's needs to be overhauled – see NCR 02/13.

NOTE 03/13 Reference Standard and Requirement: FSC-STD-30-005 v 1-0 Group management conformance checklist 1.4: The Group entity shall define training needs and implement training activities and/or communication strategies relevant to the implementation of the applicable FSC standards. Note for Future Annual Audits: Conform operations led to two NCRs being issued by FNSWO during 2012, both for rutting of access /haul roads, as a result of the conduct of harvest operations during very wet conditions (See NCR 02/13). The arrangement between FNSWO and the member woodlot owners entails that the owners undertake to select and hire contractors to perform all forest operations, including harvesting. While FNSWO does provide training, primarily directed at members, regarding best management practices and other aspects of forest management, FNSWO does not undertake training specifically designed for contractors, or participate in contractor training sessions that may be organized by other agencies. FNSWO also does not have regular (e.g. annual) meetings involving all members, which can provide a forum to review issues, challenges etc. The FNSWO Projects Coordinator makes an effort to visit all sites during active operations, however this is not always possible. As the size of the group expands, the extent of control over operations on the part of FNSWO could become increasingly problematic. Rather than require FNSWO to re-structure the balance of duties between itself and the woodlot owner, Rainforest Alliance has chosen to provide a note that future audit teams monitor the elements that can contribute to addressing this concern, including training of woodlot owners, training or other forms of working with or meeting contractors, and the record of NCRs that FNSWO may issue during 2013..

Followed-up but still open

3. AUDIT PROCESS

2014 audit team response:

☐ Closed

3.1. Auditors and qualifications

Auditor Name	Jeremy Williams	Auditor role	Lead auditor
Qualifications:	effectiveness of forest management	iditor for ISO 140 ated in conducting NBS, and has rec nt planning proce	00, and has extensive forestry

3.2. Audit schedule

Date	Location /Main sites	Principal Activities
Nov 13	Stewiacke	Auditor traveled from home to FNSWO offices; reviewed audit plan, schedule for the week, and overview of FNSWO.
Nov 14	Stewiacke	Auditor spent morning reviewing NCR's and Notes with the FNSWO Projects Coordinator and in the afternoon, went to

☐ Not followed-up this year

		visit the Redden woodlot and meet owner.
Nov 15	Annapolis Valley	The FNSWO Projects Coordinator and auditor travelled to view three woodlots in this region; met with MTRI rep and the consultant who writes many of the forest management plans in the region on site.
Nov 16	Stewiacke	The FNSWO Projects Coordinator and auditor viewed last woodlot (Miller), reviewed status of audit and auditor returned home.
Dec 2	Rainforest Alliance offices	Draft report provided to Rainforest Alliance for review.
Dec 14	Rainforest Alliance offices	Draft report delivered to FNSWO for review and comment.

Total number of person days used for the audit:6,5

3.3. Sampling methodology

At the time of audit planning FNSWO had 40 members with a total of 45 forest management units. It was determined that each woodlot owner with multiple parcels was a Resource Manager as they managed the operations on their personal woodlots; thus there were 40 FMUs. The sample was not stratified for parcels greater or less than 100 ha as the SLIMF Maritime Standard applies to parcels less than 1000 ha and all parcels meet this requirement.

Of the 40 FMUs, 19 were part of the group prior to the 2012 assessment and 21 are new members. Thus, the group was stratified into two subsets, "existing" members (FMU = 19) and "new" (FMU = 21).

The formula for small forests less than 1000 ha (sample size = 0.3 * square root [FMU], rounded to the next highest whole number), was applied to existing members. The formula for small forests less than 1000 ha (sample size = 0.6 * square root [FMU], rounded to the next highest whole number) was applied to new members.

Existing: sample size = 0.3 * square root [19] = 1.3 rounded up = **2** New: sample size = 0.6 * square root [21] = 2.7 rounded up = **3**

The auditor spoke with the group manager and from a list of sites with active harvesting and maintenance operations in the last year, 5 sites were chosen. The sites were chosen in order to provide the auditor with exposure to a range for forest types in the FSC program, in the regions of the province where the majority of FSC members are located. Sites were also select with some regard to logistics, so that travel time would be used efficiently.

3.3.1 List of FMUs selected for evaluation

FMU/Group Member Name	Rationale for Selection
Redden woodlot (1115)	Woodlot newly added to program; dominated by balsam fir with some red spruce; minimal hardwood presence. Woodlot shows a range of precommercial thinning, selection and clearcut harvest.
Berry woodlot (1111)	Woodlot newly added to program; mixed softwood and hardwood with abundant balsam fir an early successional hardwoods – landowner has

⁼ number of auditors participating **1 X** average number of days spent in preparation, on site and post site visit follow-up including stakeholder consultation **6.5**

	been introducing and encouraging red spruce and maintaining white pine, however this is an on-going effort against natural trends.
Daly and Benjamin woodlot (1110)	See above.
Proulx woodlot (1073)	A member of the FSC group prior to the assessment, this hardwood dominated woodlot was recently pre-commercially thinned for hardwood, especially diseased beech as well as some maple and white birch.
Miller woodlot (1068)	A member of the FSC group prior to the assessment, the site was chosen because there was extensive recent harvesting and because there was also extensive damage to the access road and haul trail that occurred during harvest.

3.4. Stakeholder consultation process

Stakeholder type (i.e. NGO, government, local inhabitant etc.)	Stakeholders notified (#)	Stakeholders consulted or providing input (#)
Local NGO	1	1

One NGO, that is a partner of FNSWO's, participated on one day of the field visits – they were asked to participate due to their partnership status. Further consultation was not required because this was an annual audit with a limited scope of Principles 1 and 7, rather than an assessment.

3.5. Changes to Certification Standards

Forest stewardship standard used in audit:	FSC-STD-CAN-Maritimes - SLIMF
Revisions to the standard since the last audit:	☑ No changes to standard.☐ Standard was changed (detail changes below)
Changes in standard:	
Implications for FME:	Conformance to new requirements verified

3.6. Review of FME Documentation and required records

a) All certificate types

Required Records	Reviewed	
Complaints received by FME from stakeholders, actions taken, follow up communication	Y 🛛 N 🗌	
Comments: No complaints were received from stakeholders.		
Accident records	Y 🛛 N 🗌	
Comments: No accidents were reported by FNSWO staff or contractors, and no accidents are known to have occurred on the part of the harvesting and silvicultural contractors.		
Training records	Y 🛛 N 🗌	
Comments: Training records provided by the FMU showed attendance by members at various workshops, there is no compilation of training records for staff of FNSWO and appears to be no		

training plan.		
Operational plan(s) for next twelve months	Y 🛛 N 🗌	
Comments: The operational plans were viewed for each of the five sites inspected ten years and they are straightforward spreadsheets listing stand numbers, plantarget date, and other relevant information.		
Inventory records	Y 🛛 N 🗌	
Comments: The WMPs each contained inventory maps developed for the plan, based on stand cruise undertaken during plan development. These were reviewed for the sample woodlots and found to be accurate.		
Harvesting records	Y 🛛 N 🗌	
Comments: FNSWO maintains harvesting records from the FSC certified woodle are summarized and reported annually.	ots, and these	

b) Group Certificates

Required Group Records	Reviewed	
Group management system	Y 🛛 N 🗌	
Comments: Reviewed systems manual.		
Rate of membership change within the group	Y 🛛 N 🗌	
Comments: The current list of members identifies members who are new since t and those who had been members at the time of assessment.	he assessment,	
Formal communication/written documentation sent to members by the group entity during the audit period	Y 🛛 N 🗌	
Comments: Quarterly newsletter to all members, notice of the annual meeting, certification updates included in the annual report and sometimes in the quarterly newsletter		
Records of monitoring carried out by the group entity	Y 🛛 N 🗌	
Comments: Completed monitoring sheets were reviewed and the annual summary summarizes the monitoring that was undertaken in the year.		
Records of any corrective actions issued by the group entity	Y 🛛 N 🗌	
Comments: Register of corrective actions was reviewed – two NCR's were registered as having been issued in the past year (both closed by time of audit), and a third was issued just before the audit and was still open at the time of the audit. (see NCR 02/13).		
Updated list of group members	Y 🛛 N 🗌	
Comments: The current list of members was reviewed.		

APPENDIX I: FSC Annual Audit Reporting Form

(NOTE: form to be prepared by the client prior to audit, information verified by audit team)

Forest management enterprise information:			
FME legal name:	Federation of Nova Scotia Woodland Owners		
FME Certificate Code:	SW-FM/CoC - 005735		
Reporting period	Previous 12 month period	Dates	

1. Scope Of Certificate					
Type of certificate: group, Maritime SLI	MF	SLIMF	Certificate:	not applicable	
New FMUs added since previous eva	aluation	Yes x No			
Group Certificate: Updated of FMU and group member list provided in Appendix VII-a:				ndix VII-a:	
Multi-FMU Certificate: List of new FM	Us added to	the certificate	scope:		
FMU	Area	Forest Location			
Name/Description		Type	Latitu	de/Longitude ¹	
Karen Miller and Elma Dickie, 1080	40.0 ha				
Stewart Fotheringham and Nicole	71.7ha				
Burkhard, 1103					
Dave Thomas, 1106	167.8 ha				
Lyman Huskins, 1108	192.4 ha				
Lyman Huskins, 1109	158.8 ha				
Tom Daly and Robin Benjamin, 1110	90.2 ha				
Tom Berry, 1111	25.3 ha				
Don Munroe, 1117	93.0 ha				
Lyman Huskins, 1119	127.9 ha				
Lyman Huskins, 1120	66.9 ha				
Brian Lorber, 1121	147.2 ha				
Real Thibault, 1127	87.5 ha				
Greg and Catherine Sheffer, 1113	137.74 ha				
Harley Redden, 1115	45.6 ha				
Scott & Stewart Forestry, 1132	77.63 ha				
Scott & Stewart Forestry, 1135 27.6					
Real Thibault, 1127	13.25 ha				
	ha				
	ha				

2. FME Information		
No changes since previous report (if no changes since previous report leave section blank)		
Forest zone	Acadian	
Certified Area under Forest Type		
- Natural	3273.61 hectares	
- Plantation	14.59 hectares	
Stream sides and water bodies	Linear Kilometers	

¹ The center point of a contiguous FMU or group of dispersed properties that together comprise a FMU in latitude and longitude decimal degrees with a maximum of 5 decimals.

_

3. Forest Area Classification				
☐ No changes since previous report (if no changes si	No changes since previous report (if no changes since previous report leave section blank)			
Total certified area (land base)			3504.85 ha	
Total forest area			3273.61 ha	
a. Total production forest area 2847.77 ha				
b. Total non-productive forest area (no harvesting) 426.07 ha		426.07 ha		
 Protected forest area (strict reserves) 	26.63 ha			
Areas protected from timber harvesting ha				
and managed only for NTFPs or services				
 Remaining non-productive forest 				
2. Total non-forest area (e.g., water bodies, wetlands, fields, rocky outcrops, etc.)			231.24 ha	

	Conservation Values identified via formal HC tive areas	V assessment by the FME	and
☐ No	changes since previous report (if no changes since pr	revious report leave section blank)	
Code	HCV TYPES ²	Description:	Area
HCV1	Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	Areas containing habitat suitable for use by Blanding Turtle and/or Eastern Ribbonsnake (WMP # 1037) Areas containing habitat suitable for use by Blanding Turtle and/or Eastern Ribbonsnake (WMP # 1105)	65.4ha
HCV2	Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.		ha
HCV3	Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	Old growth red spruce and yellow birch stand, adjacent to lakeshore (WMP # 1103) Mature hemlock, black spruce, yellow birch, white ash and white pine along brook. Shallow soils. (WMP #1101)	6.68 ha
HCV4	Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).		ha
HCV5	Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		ha
HCV6	Forest areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance		ha

² The HCV classification and numbering follows the ProForest HCVF toolkit. The toolkit also provides additional explanation regarding the categories. Toolkit is available at http://hcvnetwork.org/library/global-hcv-toolkits.

	identified in cooperation with such local communities).		
Number of sites significant to indigenous people and local communities			

5. Workers		
Number of workers including employees,	part-time and seasona	al workers:
Total number of workers	5 workers	
- Of total workers listed above	4 Male	1 Female
Number of serious accidents	0	
Number of fatalities	0	

6. Pesticide Use
X FME does not use pesticides. (delete rows below)

APPENDIX II: List of visited sites (confidential)

FMU or other Location	Compartment/ Area	Site description / Audit Focus and Rationale for selection
Redden woodlot (1115)		This 98 acre woodlot was newly added to the program. The WMP was complete and the forest is carefully managed – there was a range of recent selection. clearcut and commercial thinning harvest, older and very old PCT, as well older partial harvest. The recent harvest took place in Feb 12-14, 2012, at the time that the WMP was being prepared.
Berry woodlot (1111)		This 62.8 acre (23.33 ha) woodlot has a heavy concentration of balsam fir, with moderate amounts of red spruce, poplar, white birch, and some larch, red oak and beech. There was a range of operations that had been undertaken on the forest, including PCT and commercial thinning of various ages, partial harvests, and one small clearcut with residuals. Shelterwood harvest under white pine were also viewed on the forest. This woodlot is a new entrant to the program.
Daly and Benjamin woodlot (1110)		This 233-acre (90.27 ha) woodlot is composed of two parcels that are separated by the Berry woodlot. The forest type and treatments are similar to those described for the Berry woodlot. This woodlot is a new entrant to the program.
Proulx woodlot (1073)		This 89.6 acre (36.28 ha) woodlot is mainly in hardwood forest, with small amounts of fir and red spruce. The dominant hardwoods are beech, white birch, silver and sugar maple, and poplar, with some white ash, red oak and yellow birch present. The beech is heavily affected by the beech dieback and virtually all of the stems are less than four inches dbh and heavily damaged. The forest has recently been thinned to remove some of the diseased beech, as well as maple and white birch, and some of the balsam fir understory was also removed. The woodlot was in the program at the time of the assessment
Miller woodlot (1068)		This larger property is 562.5 acres (227.6 ha) was in the program at the time of the assessment. The woodlot was heavily damaged by Hurricane Juan in 2005 and much of the blowdown was salvaged and the result is a considerable area of young forest. An extensive recent harvest had been undertaken and there was severe damage to part of the access route and one of the tote trails. (see NCR 02/13) Despite an on-going erosion problem that will persist all winter, there are no plans to undertake any corrective actions until spring 2013. (NCR 07/13)

APPENDIX III: List of stakeholders consulted (confidential)

List of FME Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Contact	Type of Participation
Cochrane, Logan	FNSWO Projects Coordinator	lcochrane@fnswo.org	Document review, discussion, viewing field sites
Fedora, Andrew	FNSWO Manager	afedora@fnswo.org	Interview
Berry, Tom	FNSWO consultant	trberry@eastlink.ca	Viewed field sites in Annapolis Valley, interview

List of Group Members Consulted

Name	Organization	Contact	Type of Participation	Follow up req ³
Redden, Harlen	Woodlot owner and member of FNSWO	Contact through FNSWO	Met auditor and FNSWO staff at woodlot at start of site visit	No
Virginia (Gini) Proulx	Woodlot owner and member of FNSWO	Contact through FNSWO	Accompanied auditor and FNSWO staff during tour of woodlot	No
Tom Miller	Woodlot owner and member of FNSWO	Contact through FNSWO	Met auditor and FNSWO staff at woodlot at start of site visit	No
Tom Berry	Woodlot owner, member of FNSWO and management plan writer for FNSWO	trberry@eastlink.ca	Accompanied auditor and FNSWO staff during tour of woodlot	No

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

ziot di dinoi dianondiadio di	oniountou			
Name	Organization	Contact	Type of	Follow
			Participation	up req ⁴

³ To indicate if the stakeholder has requested documented follow up on how their comments were addressed during the evaluation. TM shall provide public summary to stakeholders that request documented follow-up within 3 months of the closing meeting..

Barker, Jane	MTRI	jane.baker@merseytob eatic.ca	Viewed field sites in Annapolis Valley, interview	Barker, Jane	
Miller, Karen	Conform	902-384-2788	Telephone interview		

⁴ To indicate if the stakeholder has requested documented follow up on how their comments were addressed during the evaluation. TM shall provide public summary to stakeholders that request documented follow-up within 3 months of the closing meeting..

APPENDIX IV: Forest management standard conformance (confidential)

The table below demonstrates conformance or nonconformance with the Forest Stewardship Standard used for evaluation as required by FSC. The Rainforest Alliance Task Manager should provide guidance on which sections of the standard should be evaluated in a particular audit. Rainforest Alliance may evaluate only a subset of the criteria or principles of the standard in any one particular audit provided that the FME is evaluated against the entire standard by the end of the certificate duration. Findings of conformance or nonconformance at the criterion level will be documented in the following table with a reference to an applicable NCR or OBS. The nonconformance and NCR is also summarized in a NCR table in Section 2.4. All nonconformances identified are described on the level of criterion though reference to the specific indicator shall be noted. Criteria not evaluated are identified with a NE.

P&C	Conform ance: Yes/No/ NE	Findings	NCR OBS (#)
		1. COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS AND FSC PRINCIPLES	
1.1	Yes	The FMU and group members are in compliance with provincial forest regulations, as a number of them are required elements of the management plans prepared for the woodlots. There is also compliance with federal and municipal regulations.	
1.2	Yes	There are no fees or taxes that are to be paid by the FMU	
1.3	No	FME does not have a good understanding of what international agreements are relevant to the group and these are not available	NCR 01/13
1.4	Yes	No conflicts between laws and FSC principles é requirements have been identified.	
1.5	Yes	The presence of numerous rural dwellers limits the ability of anyone to perpetrate illegal activities on member woodlots.	
1.6	Yes	The manager requires each forest woodlot owner to sign off on a commitment to FSC principles in the WMP's.	
		Principle 7. MANAGEMENT PLAN	
7.1	Yes	The template for the woodlot management plans contains the elements specified in criterion 7.1, and all FSC group members must have an approved plan before they become a member of the FSC group.	
7.2	Yes	Each WMP is to be reviewed after five years and updates and revisions made as applicable – since the oldest plans date from 2011, no reviews or revisions have yet taken place.	
7.3	No	The Nova Forest Alliance has prepared a list of contractors for a wide range of operations that all are required to meet specific certifications. Other involved forest management companies, such as Conform, have requirements for their staff as well. The FMU does not have responsibility for undertaking operations and so does not get involved in training forest operators. FNSWO issued two NCRs to Conform for rutting roads and trails during harvest operations; one NCR was closed the other has been left open until Aug 31, 2013.	NCR 02/13 and NCR 07/13
7.4	Yes	Consistent with how other groups of private woodlot owners have addressed this indicator, portions of individual management plans are available upon request.	

APPENDIX V: Chain-of-Custody Conformance (confidential)

Note: This CoC Appendix is used for FMEs only selling standing timber, stumpage, logs, chips and/or non-timber forest products (NTFPs) produced within a FMU covered by the scope of the certificate. FME certificate scopes that include primary or secondary processing facilities shall include an evaluation against the full FSC CoC standard: FSC-STD-40-004. Refer to that separate report Appendix.

Definition of Forest Gate: (check all that apply)	
Standing Tree/Stump: FME sells standing timber via stumpage sales.	
★ The Log Landing: FME sells wood from the landing/yarding area.	
On-site Concentration Yard: Transfer of ownership occurs at a concentration control of the FME.	n yard under the
Off-site Mill/Log Yard: Transfer of ownership occurs when offloaded at purchaser's	s facility.
Other: explanation	
Comments: Note changes from assessment report – this does not indicate a change in rassessment report was not correct.	management; the
Scope Definition of CoC Certificate:	
Does the FME further process material before transfer at forest gate? (If yes then processing must be evaluated to full CoC checklist for CoC standard FSC-STD-40-	Yes ☐ No ⊠
Comments:	
Is the FME a large scale operation (>10,000 hectares) or a Group Certificate? (If yes then CoC procedures for all relevant CoC criteria shall be documented.)	Yes ⊠ No □
Comments: The FME is a group certificate.	
Does non-FSC certified material enter the scope of this certificate prior to the forest gate, resulting in a risk of contamination with wood/NTFPs from the evaluated forest area (e.g. FME owns/manages both FSC certified and non-FSC certified FMUs)?	Yes ☐ No ☒
Comments:	
Does FME outsource handling or processing of FSC certified material to subcontractors (i.e. milling or concentration yards) prior to transfer of ownership at the forest gate? (If yes a finding is required for criterion CoC 4.1 below.)	Yes ☐ No ⊠
Comments:	
includes a full evaluation of the operation against FSC-STD-40-004 v2.).	Yes ☐ No ⊠
Comments:	
criteria checklist below.)	Yes ⊠ No □
Comments: FNSWO is interested in having signage made up for some of the member wo would identify that they were certified to FSC. At the time of the audit, there had been no trademarks for promotion or product labeling.	

Annual Sales Information

Total Sales/ Turnover	109640 Cdn\$
Volume of certified product sold as FSC certified (i.e. FSC	3968 m3

claim on sales documentation) (previous calendar year)	
Total volume of forest products harvested from certified forest	3968 m3
area.during reporting period defined in Appendix I above.	

Chain-of-Custody Criteria [FM-35 Rainforest Alliance Chain-of-Custody Standard for Forest Management Enterprises (FMEs)]

1. Quality Management	
COC 1.1: FME shall define the personnel/position(s) responsible for implementing the CoC control system.	Yes ⊠ No □
Findings: The FNSWO Projects Coordinator is responsible for CoC matters.	
COC 1.2: All relevant staff shall demonstrate awareness of the FME's procedures and competence in implementing the FME's CoC control system.	Yes ⊠ No □
Findings: The FNSWO Projects Coordinator is the relevant person and he was awa	are of the FME's
procedures and was competent in implementing the CoC control system.	
 COC 1.3: FME procedures/work instructions shall provide effective control of FSC certified forest products (including NTFPs)from standing timber until ownership is transferred at the forest gate. Note: For large scale operations (>10,000ha) and Group Entities, CoC procedures covering all relevant CoC criteria shall be documented. Including: a) Procedures for physical segregation and identification of FSC certified from non-FSC certified material. (If applicable) b) Procedures to ensure that non-FSC certified material is not represented as FSC certified on sales and shipping documentation. (If applicable) c) Procedures to include the FME's FSC certificate registration code and FSC claim (FSC 100%) on all sales and shipping documentation for sales of FSC certified products. d) Recordkeeping procedures to ensure that all applicable records related to the production and sales of FSC certified products (e.g. harvest summaries, sales summaries, invoices, bills of lading) are maintained for a minimum of 5 years. e) Procedures to ensure compliance with all applicable FSC/Rainforest Alliance trademark use requirements. 	Yes ⊠ No □
Note 1: In the case of group certificates, the Group Manager must ensure Group Members implement CoC control system as defined in documents procedures/work instruction. Note 2: In cases where it is not possible or practical to include the FME's certificate registration code on shipping documents, the FMEs procedures shall provide for a clear, auditable link between the material included in the shipment, a FMU included in the scope of the certificate and the applicable sales documentation (i.e. harvest or procurement contract) that includes the required information detailed in c) above.	
Findings: The current CoC system is largely out of the control of FNSWO and its men	nbers, due to the
lack of bills of lading or other documentation that accompanies wood shipments from the mill. The only wood buyer in the area where FNSWO's woodlots are located who is certification is Taylor's (a local sawmill that is not part of the group) and they keep record received from FNSWO members in the FSC group- these records are provided to FNSW While this system appears to work well, it is largely due to the presence of only one mill the motivated to do the right thing. In the Maritimes, there is no system for tracking wood she forest to the mill, hence the certificate registration code is not associated with a wood sconsidered to be an issue for the CoC of the wood using mills, rather than the woodlot ow	ne woodlot to the interested in the ds of the volumes VO upon request, nat happens to be ipments from the shipment. This is
2. Certified Material Handling and Segregation	
COC 2.1: FME shall have a CoC control system in place to prevent the mixing of non-	Yes 🗌 No 🗍

FSC certified materials with FSC certified forest products from the evaluated forest area, including:	N/A 🖂
a) Physical segregation and identification of FSC certified from non-FSC certified material.	
 A system to ensure that non-FSC certified material is not represented as FSC certified on sales and shipping documentation. 	
Note: If no outside wood/NTFP is handled by FME within scope of certificate,	
mark as N/A.	
Findings: According to the FNSWO Projects Coordinator, even if a landowner had a w	
program and one outside it, there is no real risk of contamination because the wood is	hauled when it is
cut and brought to roadside, and there would not be any mixing because of the sec	quential timing of
activities. Also, there are many participants who have woodlots both in and out, although	
owner the auditor visited in this annual audit has one in the program and would like	•
others in as soon as they can be accommodated, but they are 3 hrs away from the one t	ilat was visiteu.
COC 2.2: FME shall identify the sales system(s) or "Forest Gate", for each FSC certified	
product covered by the Chain of Custody control system: i.e. standing stock; sale from	Yes ⊠ No 🗌
log yard in the forest; sale at the buyer's gate; sale from a log concentration yard, etc.	
Findings: Sales are at roadside in the forest. Therefore, the forest gate is considered	the log landing at
roadside.	
COC 2.3: FME shall have a system that ensures that FME products are reliably	
identified as FSC certified (e.g. through documentation or marking system) at the forest	Yes ☐ No ☒
gate.	163 🗀 140 🖂
	or writton rocardo
Findings: The log hauling industry in the Maritimes does not use bills of lading or oth	
that accompany a load of logs or other products from the forest roadside to the mill – th	
rely on the honesty of the haulers and the mills to ensure that wood volumes and c	
recorded and paid for, and that a given load of wood is actually sent where the woodlo	
told it will be sent to. While this situation allows for risks of contamination, this is consid	larad on igaya far
told it will be sent to. While this situation allows for fishes of containination, this is consit	iered arrissue ior
the purchasing mill's chain of custody.	iered ari issue ioi
the purchasing mill's chain of custody.	Yes No
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as	
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A.	Yes No No
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as	Yes No No
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1.	Yes No No
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping	Yes No No
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1.	Yes No No
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following	Yes No No
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation:	Yes No No
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation: a) FME FSC certificate registration code, and	Yes No No
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation: a) FME FSC certificate registration code, and b) FSC certified claim: FSC 100%	Yes No No N/A
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation: a) FME FSC certificate registration code, and b) FSC certified claim: FSC 100% Note: In cases where it is not possible or practical to include the FME's certificate	Yes No No
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation: a) FME FSC certificate registration code, and b) FSC certified claim: FSC 100% Note: In cases where it is not possible or practical to include the FME's certificate registration code on shipping documents, the FMEs shall ensure there is a clear,	Yes No No N/A
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation: a) FME FSC certificate registration code, and b) FSC certified claim: FSC 100% Note: In cases where it is not possible or practical to include the FME's certificate registration code on shipping documents, the FMEs shall ensure there is a clear, auditable link between the material included in the shipment, a FMU included in	Yes No No N/A
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation: a) FME FSC certificate registration code, and b) FSC certified claim: FSC 100% Note: In cases where it is not possible or practical to include the FME's certificate registration code on shipping documents, the FMEs shall ensure there is a clear, auditable link between the material included in the shipment, a FMU included in the scope of the certificate and the applicable sales documentation (i.e. harvest	Yes No No N/A
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation: a) FME FSC certificate registration code, and b) FSC certified claim: FSC 100% Note: In cases where it is not possible or practical to include the FME's certificate registration code on shipping documents, the FMEs shall ensure there is a clear, auditable link between the material included in the shipment, a FMU included in the scope of the certificate and the applicable sales documentation (i.e. harvest or procurement contract) that includes the required information detailed above.	Yes No No N/A
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation: a) FME FSC certificate registration code, and b) FSC certified claim: FSC 100% Note: In cases where it is not possible or practical to include the FME's certificate registration code on shipping documents, the FMEs shall ensure there is a clear, auditable link between the material included in the shipment, a FMU included in the scope of the certificate and the applicable sales documentation (i.e. harvest	Yes No No N/A
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation: a) FME FSC certificate registration code, and b) FSC certified claim: FSC 100% Note: In cases where it is not possible or practical to include the FME's certificate registration code on shipping documents, the FMEs shall ensure there is a clear, auditable link between the material included in the shipment, a FMU included in the scope of the certificate and the applicable sales documentation (i.e. harvest or procurement contract) that includes the required information detailed above. Findings: See COC 2.3 above.	Yes No No N/A
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation: a) FME FSC certificate registration code, and b) FSC certified claim: FSC 100% Note: In cases where it is not possible or practical to include the FME's certificate registration code on shipping documents, the FMEs shall ensure there is a clear, auditable link between the material included in the shipment, a FMU included in the scope of the certificate and the applicable sales documentation (i.e. harvest or procurement contract) that includes the required information detailed above. Findings: See COC 2.3 above. COC 3.2: FME shall maintain certification production and sales related documents (e.g.	Yes No Yes No
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation: a) FME FSC certificate registration code, and b) FSC certified claim: FSC 100% Note: In cases where it is not possible or practical to include the FME's certificate registration code on shipping documents, the FMEs shall ensure there is a clear, auditable link between the material included in the shipment, a FMU included in the scope of the certificate and the applicable sales documentation (i.e. harvest or procurement contract) that includes the required information detailed above. Findings: See COC 2.3 above. COC 3.2: FME shall maintain certification production and sales related documents (e.g. harvest summaries, invoices, bills of lading) for a minimum of 5 years. Documents shall	Yes No No N/A
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation: a) FME FSC certificate registration code, and b) FSC certified claim: FSC 100% Note: In cases where it is not possible or practical to include the FME's certificate registration code on shipping documents, the FMEs shall ensure there is a clear, auditable link between the material included in the shipment, a FMU included in the scope of the certificate and the applicable sales documentation (i.e. harvest or procurement contract) that includes the required information detailed above. Findings: See COC 2.3 above. COC 3.2: FME shall maintain certification production and sales related documents (e.g. harvest summaries, invoices, bills of lading) for a minimum of 5 years. Documents shall be kept in a central location and/or are easily available for inspection during audits.	Yes No No Yes No No Yes No No
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation: a) FME FSC certificate registration code, and b) FSC certified claim: FSC 100% Note: In cases where it is not possible or practical to include the FME's certificate registration code on shipping documents, the FMEs shall ensure there is a clear, auditable link between the material included in the shipment, a FMU included in the scope of the certificate and the applicable sales documentation (i.e. harvest or procurement contract) that includes the required information detailed above. Findings: See COC 2.3 above. COC 3.2: FME shall maintain certification production and sales related documents (e.g. harvest summaries, invoices, bills of lading) for a minimum of 5 years. Documents shall be kept in a central location and/or are easily available for inspection during audits. Findings: FNSWO maintains summaries received from Taylors and Taylors will maintain the sale of the certification of the certification of the certification and the production and the pr	Yes No No Yes No No Yes No No
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation: a) FME FSC certificate registration code, and b) FSC certified claim: FSC 100% Note: In cases where it is not possible or practical to include the FME's certificate registration code on shipping documents, the FMEs shall ensure there is a clear, auditable link between the material included in the shipment, a FMU included in the scope of the certificate and the applicable sales documentation (i.e. harvest or procurement contract) that includes the required information detailed above. Findings: See COC 2.3 above. COC 3.2: FME shall maintain certification production and sales related documents (e.g. harvest summaries, invoices, bills of lading) for a minimum of 5 years. Documents shall be kept in a central location and/or are easily available for inspection during audits. Findings: FNSWO maintains summaries received from Taylors and Taylors will mecords for at least five years.	Yes No No Yes No No Yes No No
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation: a) FME FSC certificate registration code, and b) FSC certified claim: FSC 100% Note: In cases where it is not possible or practical to include the FME's certificate registration code on shipping documents, the FMEs shall ensure there is a clear, auditable link between the material included in the shipment, a FMU included in the scope of the certificate and the applicable sales documentation (i.e. harvest or procurement contract) that includes the required information detailed above. Findings: See COC 2.3 above. COC 3.2: FME shall maintain certification production and sales related documents (e.g. harvest summaries, invoices, bills of lading) for a minimum of 5 years. Documents shall be kept in a central location and/or are easily available for inspection during audits. Findings: FNSWO maintains summaries received from Taylors and Taylors will m records for at least five years. COC 3.3: FME shall compile an annual report on FSC certified sales containing monthly	Yes No No Yes No No Yes No No
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation: a) FME FSC certificate registration code, and b) FSC certified claim: FSC 100% Note: In cases where it is not possible or practical to include the FME's certificate registration code on shipping documents, the FMEs shall ensure there is a clear, auditable link between the material included in the shipment, a FMU included in the scope of the certificate and the applicable sales documentation (i.e. harvest or procurement contract) that includes the required information detailed above. Findings: See COC 2.3 above. COC 3.2: FME shall maintain certification production and sales related documents (e.g. harvest summaries, invoices, bills of lading) for a minimum of 5 years. Documents shall be kept in a central location and/or are easily available for inspection during audits. Findings: FNSWO maintains summaries received from Taylors and Taylors will m records for at least five years. COC 3.3: FME shall compile an annual report on FSC certified sales containing monthly sales in terms of volume of each FSC certified product sold to each customer. This	Yes No No Yes No No aintain all of the
the purchasing mill's chain of custody. COC 2.4: FME shall ensure that certified material is not mixed with non-FSC certified material at any stage, up to and including the sale of the material. Note: If no outside wood is handled by FME within scope of certificate, mark as N/A. Findings: See finding under COC 2.1. 3. Certified Sales and Recordkeeping COC 3.1: For material sold with FSC claim the FME shall include the following information on sales and shipping documentation: a) FME FSC certificate registration code, and b) FSC certified claim: FSC 100% Note: In cases where it is not possible or practical to include the FME's certificate registration code on shipping documents, the FMEs shall ensure there is a clear, auditable link between the material included in the shipment, a FMU included in the scope of the certificate and the applicable sales documentation (i.e. harvest or procurement contract) that includes the required information detailed above. Findings: See COC 2.3 above. COC 3.2: FME shall maintain certification production and sales related documents (e.g. harvest summaries, invoices, bills of lading) for a minimum of 5 years. Documents shall be kept in a central location and/or are easily available for inspection during audits. Findings: FNSWO maintains summaries received from Taylors and Taylors will m records for at least five years. COC 3.3: FME shall compile an annual report on FSC certified sales containing monthly	Yes No No Yes No No Yes No No

Findings: This report is being prepared on an annual basis – the monthly sales are so small it is not worthwhile tracking them at that frequency. 4. Outsourcing COC 4.1: FME shall obtain approval from Rainforest Alliance prior to initiating Yes No No outsourcing of handling (e.g. storage concentration yards) or processing of FSC N/A certified material to subcontractors. CoC 4.2: FME control system shall ensure that CoC procedures are followed at subcontracted facilities for outsourcing and FME shall collect signed outsourcing agreements covering all applicable FSC outsourcing requirements per FSC--40-004 FSC Standard for Chain of Custody Certification. Yes No Note 1: If FME outsources processing or handling of FSC certified material the N/A outsourcing report appendix is required. Note 2: Check N/A If FME does not outsource processing or handling of FSC material. Findings: 5. FSC/Rainforest Alliance Trademark (TMK) Use Criteria **Standard Requirement:** The following section summarizes the FME's compliance with FSC and Rainforest Alliance trademark requirements. Trademarks include the Forest Stewardship Council and Rainforest Alliance names, acronyms (FSC), logos, labels, and seals. This checklist is directly based on the FSC standard.FSC-STD-50-001 FSC Requirements for use of the FSC trademarks by Certificate Holders. References to the specific FSC document and requirement numbers are included in parenthesis at the end of each requirement. (Rainforest Alliance Certified Seal = RAC seal). General COC 5.1: FME shall have procedures in place that ensure all on-product and Yes \(\subseteq \text{No } \subseteq \) promotional FSC/Rainforest Alliance trademark use follows the applicable policies: Findings: FNSWO has basic procedures in place regarding trademark use on product. Section 9.9.1 of the FNSWO Systems Manual states, "This code [the FM code for the woodlot] must be prominently displayed by the producer or woodlot owner on all wood piled at roadside that goes to a customer that has requested chain-of-custody. The customer can use this code in their internal system to identify wood from individual woodlots." There are no procedures regarding promotional use of the trademark/logo. These procedures do not really address this part of the standard, since there is no requirement that the FM code be 'displayed' at roadside. If a customer is requesting FSC wood, then the trademark needs to be on the sales or shipping documentation, or equivalent. As a result, the auditor concludes that FNSWO does not meet this part of the CoC requirements. NCR 04/13 has been issued. COC 5.2: FME shall have procedures in place and demonstrate submission of all FSC/Rainforest Alliance claims to Rainforest Allaince for review and approval prior to use, including" Yes ☐ No ☒ a) On-product use of the FSC label/RAC seal; b) Promotional (off-product) claims that include the FSC trademarks ("Forest Stewardship Council", "FSC", checkmark tree logo) and/or the Rainforest Alliance trademarks (names and seal)(50-001, 1.1.6). Findings: Not yet applicable COC 5.3: FME shall have procedures in place and demonstrates that all trademark Yes No 🗌 review and approval correspondence with Rainforest Alliance is kept on file for a minimum of 5 years: **Findings:** Procedures are in place – all correspondence is retained. Off-product / Promotional ☐ Check if section not applicable (FME does not, and does not plan to use the FSC trademarks off-product or in promotional pieces)

Note: promotional use items include advertisements, brochures, web pages, catalogues, press releases, tradeshow booths, stationary templates, corporate promotional items (e.g., t-shirts, cups, hats, gifts). When applicable to the FME's promotional/off-product use of the trademarks, the Yes No No criteria below shall be met: Findings: The FME does not currently use the trademarks, however it would like to use the FSC trademarks on signage in the future. See NCR 04/13. COC 5.4: If the FSC trademarks are used for promotion of FMUs, FME shall limit promotion to FMUs covered by the scope of the certificate. COC 5.5: In cases that the Rainforest Alliance trademarks are used (50-001, 6.2): a) The FSC trademarks shall not be at a disadvantage (e.g., smaller size); b) The FSC checkmark tree logo shall be included when the RAC seal is in place. COC 5.6: If the FSC "promotional panel" is used, the following elements shall be included: FSC checkmark logo, FSC trademark license code, FSC promotional statement, FSC web site address (50-001, 5.1). Note: the promotional panel is a prescribed layout with a border available to certificate holders on the FSC label generator site. COC 5.7: In cases that the FSC trademarks are used with the trademarks (logos, names, and identifying marks) of other forestry verification schemes (SFI, PEFC, etc.), Rainforest Alliance approval shall be in place (50-001, 7.2). COC 5.8: Use of the FSC trademarks in promotion of the FME's FSC certification shall not imply certain aspects are included which are outside the scope of the certificate (50-001, 1.9). COC 5.9: Use of the FSC trademarks on stationery templates (including letterhead, business cards, envelopes, invoices, paper pads) shall be approved by Rainforest Alliance to ensure correct usage (50-001, 7.3, 7.4 & 7.5). COC 5.10: In cases that the FSC trademarks are used as part of a product name, domain name, and/or FME name, R approval shall be in place (50-001, 1.13). **On-product** Check if section not applicable (FME does not, and does not plan to apply FSC labels on product) COC 5.11: FME shall have a secure system in place for labeling products that ensures the following (50-00,1 1.19): a) Only those products originating from forests covered by the scope of a valid FSC certificate are FSC-labeled: Yes No No b) Only those products that meet the eligibility requirements per CoC standard requirements for FSC-labeling are FSC-labeled; c) Only the FSC 100% label is used. Findings: See NCR 04/13. When applicable to the FME's on-product labeling, the criteria below shall be met: Yes \(\square\) No \(\square\) Findings: See NCR 04/13. COC 5.12: The FSC trademark license code assigned by FSC shall be used in the FSC label (50-001, COC 5.13: FME shall not use the FSC labels together with the logos or names of other forestry verification schemes (50-001, 2.6). COC 5.14: The FSC label shall be applied to products in such a way that it is clearly visible (50-001, 2.3).

APPENDIX VI: Rainforest Alliance Database Update Form (confidential)

<u>Instructions</u>: For each FSC certificate, Rainforest Alliance is required to upload important summary information about each certificate to the FSC database (FSC-Info). During each annual audit RA auditors should work with the certificate holder to verify that the information posted on FSC-Info is up to date as follows:

- 1. Print out current Fact Sheet prior to audit from FSC-Info website or direct link to fact sheets (http://www.fsc-info.org)
- 2. Review information with the FME to verify all fields are accurate.
- 3. If changes are required (corrections, additions or deletions), **note only the changes** to the database information in the section below.
- 4. The changes identified to this form will be used by the RA office to update the FSC database.

Is the FSC database accurate and up-to-date?	YES	NO \boxtimes
(if yes, leave section below blank)		

Client Information (contact info for *FSC* website listings)

	(
Organization name	Federation of Nova Scotia Woodland Owners		
Primary Contact	Logan Cochrane	Title	Certification Coordinator
Primary Address	P.O. Box 208, 285 George Street Stewiacke, NS, B0N-2J0	Telephone	(902) 289-3048
Address		Fax	(902) 639-2041
Email	lcochrane@fnswo.ca	Webpage	Fnswo.ca

Forests

Change to Group Certificate	⊠ Yes □ No	Change in # of parcels in group	34 total members
Total certified area		3504.85 Hectares (or)	Acres

Species (note if item to be added or deleted)

Scientific name	Common name	Add/Delete

Products

FSC Product categories added to the FM/CoC scope (FSC-STD-40-004a)		
Level 1	Level 2	Species

APPENDIX VII: Group management conformance checklist *FSC-STD-30-005 v1-0* (confidential)

Group Certification Division of Responsibilities

Type of Forest Management Group:	Type I group	
Forest Management Activity	Group Entity	Group Member
Forest management planning		
FMU monitoring activities		\boxtimes
Forest and resource inventory		
Harvest planning		
Harvesting		\boxtimes
Training of forest workers		
Legal compliance (taxes, permitting, etc)		\boxtimes
Timber Sales		\boxtimes
Marketing		
FSC/RA trademark use (if applicable)		
Summary of division of responsibilities:		
The FMU undertakes tasks related to management a	and operational planning on woo	odlots, training and

The FMU undertakes tasks related to management and operational planning on woodlots, training and management of the certification process and system; the FMU's manage the operations that are undertaken on their forests, although FNSWO will provide some advice. Note 03/13 was issued with respect to training.

Quality System Requirements

Quality System Requirements	
1.0 General Requirements	
1.1 The Group entity shall be an independent legal entity or an individual acting as a legal entity.	Yes ⊠ No □
Findings required if No: FNSWO is a non-profit organization.	
1.2 The Group entity shall comply with relevant legal obligations, as registration and payment of applicable fees and taxes.	Yes ⊠ No □
Findings required if No: FNSWO is not required to pay any fees, royalties or taxes.	
1.3 The Group entity shall have a written public policy of commitment to the FSC Principles and Criteria.	Yes ⊠ No □
Findings required if No: The membership of FNSWO includes woodlot owners in the FSC pool, as well as woodlot owners in the pool that are CSA certified, and those who are not certified at all. The uncertified woodlots make up a large majority of the membership (i.e. the entire membership is 1200). Thus, while FNSWO looks favourably upon the FSC principles, it has not taken a public position of commitment to FSC principles for all members. However, it has expressed support in general terms, and this is considered to be a reasonable stance for the FNSWO.	
1.4 The Group entity shall define training needs and implement training activities and/or communication strategies relevant to the implementation of the applicable FSC standards.	Yes ☐ No ⊠
Findings: The Group does not provide training to members or forest workers who will be operating on member woodlots, nor is there any substantive degree of control on the part of FNSWO regarding who works on woodlots (FNSWO does provide to members a list of recommended contractors upon request as well as a contract template, if requested). Note 03/13 was issued in response to this situation.	
2.0 Responsibilities	

2.1 The Group entity shall clearly define and document the division of responsibilities between the Group entity and the Group members in relation to forest management activities (for example with respect to management planning, monitoring, harvesting, quality control, marketing, timber sale, etc). NOTE: The actual division of responsibilities may differ greatly between different group certification schemes. Responsibilities regarding compliance to the applicable Forest Stewardship Standard may be divided between the Group entity and Group members in order to take into account of a landscape approach.	Yes ⊠ No □	
Findings: The System Manual defines the responsibilities of the FME and the members.		
2.2 The Group entity shall appoint a management representative as having overall responsibility and authority for the Group entity's compliance with all applicable requirements of this standard.	Yes ⊠ No □	
Findings: The FNSWO Projects Coordinator is the manager of certification.		
2.3 Group entity staff and Group members shall demonstrate knowledge of the Group's procedures and the applicable Forest Stewardship Standard.	Yes ⊠ No □	
Findings: Staff are generally familiar with the FSC principles and standard – there wer where the FME was uncertain of requirements – this is viewed as part of the learning organization.		
3.0 Group Entity Procedures		
 3.1 The Group entity shall establish, implement and maintain written procedures for Group membership covering all applicable requirements of this standard, according to scale and complexity of the group including: I. Organizational structure; II. Responsibilities of the Group entity and the Group members including main activities to fulfill such responsibilities (i.e. Development of management plans, sales and marketing of FSC products, harvesting, planting, monitoring, etc); III. Rules regarding eligibility for membership to the Group; IV. Rules regarding withdrawal/ suspension of members from the Group; V. Clear description of the process to fulfill any corrective action requests issued internally and by the certification body including timelines and implications if any of the corrective actions are not complied with; VI. Documented procedures for the inclusion of new Group members; VII. Complaints procedure for Group members. 	Yes ⊠ No □	
Findings: In the system manual.		
3.2 The Group entity's procedures shall be sufficient to establish an efficient internal control system ensuring that all members are fulfilling applicable requirements.	Yes ⊠ No □	
Findings: The Group entity has a limited internal control system that provides management and operational planning, as well as advice on request, however FNSWO has no material involvement in training, hiring or supervising forest contractors and workers. See Note 03/13. FNSWO does undertake considerably more monitoring than required by the standard, especially since it oversees and approves the silvicultural funding program expenditures for its members. FNSWO staff attempt to visit sites during active operations, but this does not always happen. When an NCR is issued by FNSWO, there is a timeline for remediation and to date issues have been closed off with the specified timelines. Due to issues found at NSLFFPA, and the potential for similar issues to arise within this group, see. Note 02/13.		
3.3 The Group entity shall define the personnel responsible for each procedure together with the qualifications or training measures required for its implementation.	Yes 🛛 No 🗌	
Findings: The Projects Coordinator has overall responsibility for the certification system aspects of the work (e.g. management planning) are contracted out.	, however some	

3.4 The Group entity or the certification body (upon request of Group entity and at the Group entities expense) shall evaluate every applicant for membership of the Group and ensure that there are no major nonconformances with applicable requirements of the Forest Stewardship Standard, and with any additional requirements for membership of the Group, prior to being granted membership of the Group. NOTE: for applicants complying with SLIMF eligibility criteria for size, the initial evaluation may be done through a desk audit.	Yes ⊠ No □	
Findings: This pre-assessment is undertaken by the Projects Coordinator and is intendinclusion of members of FNSWO who may have a philosophy that is incompatible with FSO		
4.0 Group Member Informed Consent		
4.1 The Group entity shall provide each Group member with documentation, or access to documentation, specifying the relevant terms and conditions of Group membership. The documentation shall include:		
 I. Access to a copy of the applicable Forest Stewardship Standard; II. Explanation of the certification body's process; III. Explanation of the certification body's, and FSC's rights to access the Group members' forests and documentation for the purposes of evaluation and monitoring; 		
IV. Explanation of the certification body's, and FSC's requirements with respect to publication of information;	Yes ⊠ No □	
 V. Explanation of any obligations with respect to Group membership, such as: a. maintenance of information for monitoring purposes; b. use of systems for tracking and tracing of forest products; c. requirement to conform with conditions or corrective action requests issued by the certification body and the group entity d. any special requirements for Group members related to marketing or sales 		
of products within and outside of the certificate; e. other obligations of Group membership; and f. explanation of any costs associated with Group membership.		
Findings: Members are provided with access to FSC documentation and membership rec	quirements.	
4.2 A consent declaration or equivalent shall be available between the Group Entity and each Group member or the member's representative who voluntarily wishes to participate in the Group. The consent declaration shall:		
 I. include a commitment to comply with all applicable certification requirements; II. acknowledge and agree to the obligations and responsibilities of the Group entity; 		
III. acknowledge and agree to the obligations and responsibilities of Group membership;	Yes ⊠ No □	
 IV. agree to membership of the scheme, and V. authorize the Group entity to be the primary contact for certification and to apply for certification on the member's behalf. 		
NOTE: A consent declaration does not have to be an individual document. It can be part of a contract or any other document (e.g. meeting minutes) that specifies the agreed relationship between the Group member and the Group entity.		
Findings: Members have requested to join the FSC group, and are required to have a woodlot management plan in place before becoming a member. The owner must sign off on the plan, which includes a commitment to FSC principles.		
5.0 Group Records		
5.1 The group entity shall maintain complete and up-to-date records covering all	Yes 🛛 No 🗌	

applicable requirements of this standard. These shall include:	
I. List of names and contact details of Group members, together with dates of entering and leaving the Group scheme, reason for leaving, and the type of forest ownership per member;	
II. Any records of training provided to staff or Group members, relevant to the implementation of this standard or the applicable Forest Stewardship Standard;	
III. A map or supporting documentation describing or showing the location of the member's forest properties;	
IV. Evidence of consent of all Group members;V. Documentation and records regarding recommended practices for forest	
management (i.e. silvicultural systems);	
VI. Records demonstrating the implementation of any internal control or monitoring systems. Such records shall include records of internal inspections, non-compliances identified in such inspections, actions taken to correct any such non-compliance;	
VII. Records of the estimated annual overall FSC production and annual FSC sales of the Group.	
NOTE: The amount of data that is maintained centrally by the Group entity may vary from case to case. In order to reduce costs of evaluation by the certification body, and subsequent monitoring by FSC, data should be stored centrally wherever possible.	
Findings: These records all exist and are compiled annually by FNSWO, and proganization's web site.	ublished on the
5.2 Group records shall be retained for at least five (5) years.	Yes ⊠ No □
Findings: The FSC group has only been in existence since 2011, the plan is to retain releast five years.	evant records for
5.3 Group entities shall not issue any kind of certificates or declarations to their group members that could be confused with FSC certificates.	V. ZN.
NOTE: Group member certificates may however be requested from Rainforest Alliance.	Yes ⊠ No □
Findings: No certificates or declarations that could be confused with FSC certificates are	being issued.
Group Features	
6.0 Group Size	
6.1 The Group entity shall have sufficient human and technical resources to manage and control the Group in line with the requirements of this standard.	
NOTE: The number of Group members, their individual size and the total area will influence the evaluation intensity applied by the certification body in their annual audits.	Yes 🛛 No 🗌
Findings: The FME has estimated that one person can handle 50 woodlot members, incl and MTRI staff, plus the Projects Coordinator, the FMU has sufficient staff resources current size of the group.	
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.	Yes 🛭 No 🗌

Findings: See response to Note 05/11.

7.0 Multinational Groups	
7.1 Group schemes shall only be applied to national groups which are covered by the same Forest Stewardship Standard.	Yes ☐ No ☐ NA ⊠
Findings required if No:	
7.2 The Group entity shall request formal approval by FSC IC through their accredited Certification Body to allow certification of such a group scheme.	Yes ☐ No ☐ NA ⊠
Findings required if No:	
Internal Monitoring	
8.0 Monitoring Requirements	
 8.1 The Group entity shall implement a documented monitoring and control system that includes at least the following: I. Written description of the monitoring and control system; II. Regular (at least annual) monitoring visits to a sample of Group members to confirm continued compliance with all the requirements of the applicable Forest Stewardship Standard, and with any additional requirements for membership of 	Yes ⊠ No □
the Group.	
Findings: Monitoring system described in system manual; annual report lists monundertaken.	nitoring activities
8.2 The Group entity shall define criteria to be monitored at each internal audit and according to the group characteristics, risk factors and local circumstances.	Yes ⊠ No □
Findings: The Group undertakes a risk assessment of each member – while methodology may be fine-tuned to make it more variable by member, the system is in place	
 8.3. The minimum sample to be visited annually for internal monitoring shall be determined as follows: a) Type I Groups with mixed responsibilities (see FSC-STD-30-005 v-1 section D Terms and definitions) Groups or sub-groups with mixed responsibilities shall apply a minimum sampling of X = √y for 'normal' FMUs and X= 0.6 * √y for FMUs < 1,000 ha. Sampling shall be increased if HCVs are threatened or land tenure or use right disputes are pending within the group. b) Type II Resource Manager Groups (see FSC-STD-30-005 v-1 section D Terms and definitions) Group entities who also operate as resource managers may define the required internal sampling intensity at their own discretion for the forest properties they are managing, independent of their size and ownership (the minimum numbers as defined above do not apply here). NOTE: for the purpose of sampling, FMUs < 1,000 ha and managed by the same managerial body may be combined into a 'resource management unit' (RMU) according to the proposal made in FSC-STD-20-007 Annex 1. 	Yes ⊠ No □
Findings: FNSWO is a Type I Resource Manager Group and determines its intensity. The organization undertakes a risk assessment of each member, and those profiles are visited more frequently. At the minimum, each woodlot will be visited at least of years, with higher risk woodlots being visited more frequently. In addition, the Projects Coordinator visited all woodlots with HCVF's, and visits all that being undertaken within three months of the operation. The Coordinator also administers funding program for members and visits the participating woodlots before and after	with higher risk once every three have operations s the silvicultural

operations are undertaken.		
FSC-STD-30-005 recommendations for int	ernal monitoring.	
8.4 For monitoring purposes the Group entity defined by the certification body in their evaluation.	y should use the same stratification into sets or uation.	f 'like' FMUs as
	embers in their annual monitoring than the one ending corrective actions, complaints or risk fa	
8.6 In the selection process of members to b techniques.	e visited, the Group entity should include rand	lom selection
being undertaken within three months of the funding program for members and visits	ed all woodlots with HCVF's, and visits all that coperation. The Coordinator also administers the participating woodlots before and after woodlot will be visited at least once every thr	the silvicultural the silvicultural
8.7 The Group entity shall issue corrective as identified during their visits and monitor their	•	Yes ⊠ No □
Findings: The auditor viewed the NCR r monitoring records.	ecords associated with members, as well a	s the follow up
8.8 Additional monitoring visits shall be sche Group entity receives information from stake requirements by Group members.		Yes ⊠ No ☐ NA ☐
Findings: The organization undertakes a profiles are visited more frequently.	risk assessment of each member, and those	with higher risk
Group Assessment Requirements: (Comp	pleted by RA Task Manager/Lead Auditor)	
Group member size restriction:		
RA Certificate auditing strategy:		

APPENDIX VII-a: Certified Group Member/FMU List

(Insert additional rows as necessary for groups with more than 15 members).

1. Total # members in the certified pool: 33

2. Total area in Current Pool (ha. or acres): 3050 ha

CERTIFIED FMU TABLE (list all FMU included in certificate scope)

Landowner Code and Name	Location Of Property	Assigned WMO or Planner	Date Application Received	Date of Joining Program	Forested Area acres	ha	Date of Leaving or Decertification
1019: James Thibault	99 Thibault Road, St.Joseph, Digby County	Tom Berry	Oct.28	March 30, 2011	294	119	
1031: Kevin Clattenburg	16852 Highway # 7, Pleasant Harbour, Halifax County	Conform	Nov.06	June 20, 2011	205	83	
1037: Leslie Harlow	293 Harlow Road, North Brookfield, Queens County	Tom Berry	Nov.23	March 20, 2011	430	174	
1048: Paul and Dorothy McDonald	1778 Perotte Road, Annapolis County	Tom Berry	Jan. 05	March 16, 2011	104	42	
1049: Robert Barteaux	806 Hwy#201, Moschelle, Annapolis County	Tom Berry	Jan. 05	March 15, 2011	180	73	
1065: Terry Smith	838 Woodside Road, Chaplin, Halifax County	Conform	June 7, 2010	March 27, 2011	205	83	
1066: Elma Dickie and Karen Miller	"Home Lot" HWY # 336, Eastville, Colchester County	Conform	June 7, 2010	June 17, 2011	143	58	
1067: Ted McFetridge	Fraser Back Road, Fraser Settlement, Halifax County	Conform	June 7, 2010	Aug 29, 2011	205	83	
1068: Thomas and Sandra Miller	12 Miller Road, Devon, Halifax County	Conform	June 7, 2010	June 17, 2011	563	228	
1069: Jack Redden	Lindsay Lake, Halifax County	Conform	June 7, 2010	March 29, 2011	761	308	
1073: Virginia "Gini" Proulx	Grand Lake Road, Princedale, Annapolis County	Tom Berry	March 12, 2010	March 22, 2011	90	36	
1078: Albert Higgins	Brookvale, Halifax County	Conform	June 7, 2010	June 17, 2011	692	280	
1080: Elma Dickie and	Harrison Road, Eastville,	Conform	June 7, 2010	June 17, 2011	99	40	

Landowner Code and Name	Location Of Property	Assigned WMO or Planner	Date Application Received	Date of Joining Program	Forested Area acres	ha	Date of Leaving or Decertification
Karen Miller	Colchester County						
1101: Helen and George Uhlman	66 Chute Rd. West Caledonia, Queens Co.	Tom Berry-MTRI	Feb.28,2011	June 22, 2011	124	50	
1102: Stewart Fotheringham, Nicole Burkhard	HWY # 201, Round Hill, Annapolis Co.	Tom Berry-MTRI	April 11,2011	June 15, 2011	54	22	
1103: Stewart Fotheringham, Nicole Burkhard	186 Beach Point Rd., Newburne, Lunenburg Co.	Tom Berry-MTRI	April 11,2011	July 14, 2011	178	72	
1104: Peter Van Dyk	Milford, Annapolis Co.	Tom Berry-MTRI	Jan.24, 2011	June 21, 2011	91	37	
1105: L.J. Crooker Farm & Forest Ltd.	South Brookfield, Queens Co.	Tom Berry- MTRI	Feb.28, 2011	Sept.6, 2011	803	325	
1106: Dave Thomas	North Range, Digby Co.	Tom Berry-MTRI	March 20, 2011	Jan. 5, 2012	415	168	
1107: Dick Anthony	Mill Lake Road, Northfield, Annapolis County	Dan Pittman- MTRI		Nov 18, 2011	217	88	
1108: Lyman Huskins (lot #1)	Milton, Queens County	Tom Berry- MTRI	Sept. 06, 2011	Nov. 30, 2011	475	192	
1109: Lyman Huskins (lot #2)	Milton, Queens County	Tom Berry-MTRI	Sept. 06, 2011	Dec. 15, 2011	391	158	
1110: Tom Daly & Robin Benjamin	Perotte, Annapolis County	Tom Berry- MTRI	Sept.07, 2011	Dec. 31, 2011	222	90	
1111: Tom and Robyn Berry	Perotte, Annapolis County	Tom Berry- MTRI	Sept. 07, 2011	Dec. 30, 2011	62	25	
1113: Greg and Catherine Sheffer	New Grafton/Maitland Bridge, Queens/Annapolis Counties	Tom Berry-MTRI	Sept.16, 2011	Oct 2, 2012	341	138	
1115: Harley Redden	Markland, Halifax County	Conform Ltd.	January 2, 2012	Feb 9, 2012	114	46	
1117: Don Munro	Viewmount, Kings County	Tom Berry	March 20, 2012	June 22, 2012	230	93	
1119: Lyman Huskins (lot#3)	Milton, Queens County	Tom Berry-MTRI		July 4,2012	316	128	
1120: Lyman Huskins (lot#4)	Milton, Queens County	Tom Berry-MTRI		July 4,2012	166	67	
1121: Brian Lorber	Perotte, Annapolis County	Tom Berry-MTRI	NA	July 19,2012	364	147	
1127: Real Thibault	Isadore Thibault Road, Concession, Digby County	Tom Berry	May 8, 2012	Oct 27, 2012	32	13	

Landowner Code and Name	Location Of Property	Assigned WMO or Planner	Date Application Received	Date of Joining Program	Forested Area acres	ha	Date of Leaving or Decertification
1132: Scott and Stewart Forestry	Sutherland's River, Thorburn, Pictou County	Tony Mummery	May 7, 2012	Oct 16, 2012	193	78	
1135: Scott and Stewart Forestry	Lot # 2 Three Brooks, Pictou County	Tony Mummery	May 7, 2012	Oct 16, 2012	69	28	