

Forest Certification Reregistration Audit Report

Prepared by:

Dominic Lessard, Lead Auditor
SAI Global
20 Carlson Court, Suite 200
Toronto, Ontario, M9W 7K6
CANADA
Tel: (416) 401-8700
1 800 465-3717
www.saiglobal.com

for:

Federation of Nova Scotia Woodland Owners
c/o John MacDougall
P.O Box 358
Brookfield
Nova Scotia, B0N 1C0

for the following certified forest area(s):

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

File Number: 1607495-03

Date of evaluation: September 26 to 29, 2016

Date of report: October 13, 2016

Certificate Issued date: December 22, 2016

Certificate Expiry date: January 2, 2022

FSC® Certificate Code: SAI-FM/COC-001680



The mark of
responsible forestry

FSC® A000519

SAI Global is an FSC® accredited certification body

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF FOREST MANAGEMENT	4
1.1 BASIC QUANTITATIVE INFORMATION.....	4
1.2 LEGISLATIVE, ADMINISTRATIVE AND LAND USE CONTEXT	6
1.3 DESCRIPTION OF LAND OWNERSHIP AND USE	6
1.3.1 <i>Ownership and Use Rights of Parties Other than the Certificate Holder</i>	6
1.3.2 <i>Summary of Non-forestry Activities</i>	6
1.4 DESCRIPTION OF AREA(S) EXCLUDED FROM SCOPE OF CERTIFICATION.....	7
1.4.1 <i>Excision of areas from the scope of certification</i>	7
1.4.2 <i>Partial certification of large ownership</i>	7
1.5 MANAGEMENT PLAN SUMMARY	7
1.5.1 <i>Management Objectives</i>	7
1.5.2 <i>Forest resources</i>	7
1.5.3 <i>Silvicultural Systems</i>	7
1.5.4 <i>Management strategy for the identification and protection or rare, threatened and endangered species</i>	7
1.5.5 <i>Management Structures</i>	8
1.5.6 <i>Monitoring Procedures</i>	8
1.5.7 <i>Environmental safeguard</i>	8
1.6 MAXIMUM SUSTAINED YIELD FOR MAIN COMMERCIAL SPECIES.....	8
1.6.1 <i>Assumptions</i>	8
– <i>AAC calculation example from FNSWO management plan</i>	8
1.6.2 <i>Source Data</i>	8
1.7 CURRENT AND PROJECTED ANNUAL HARVEST BY SPECIES (MAIN COMMERCIAL).....	9
1.8 ELIGIBILITY AS A SLIMF	9
1.9 CERTIFICATE SCOPE	9
2.0 THE STANDARD	9
2.1 STANDARD USED.....	9
3.0 EVALUATION	9
3.1 DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION.....	10
3.1.1 <i>Itinerary</i>	10
3.1.2 <i>*Approach</i>	10
3.1.3 <i>*Selected FMUs and Rationale</i>	11
3.1.4 <i>*Sites Visited</i>	11
3.1.5 <i>*Stakeholder Consultation</i>	13
3.1.6 <i>*Additional Evaluation Techniques</i>	14
4.0 OBSERVATIONS.....	14
4.1 OBSERVATIONS ON REVIEW AND RESOLUTION OF COMPLAINT RAISED BY STAKEHOLDER WITH THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER OR WITH THE CERTIFICATION BODY SINCE THE PREVIOUS EVALUATION	23
4.2 SUMMARIZED PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE CONDITIONS RELATED TO ANY APPROVED PESTICIDE DEROGATION	23
5.0 TRACKING OF CERTIFIED FOREST PRODUCTS	23
5.1 RISK	23
5.2 CONTROL SYSTEM.....	23
6.0 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR GROUP CERTIFICATIONS.....	24
6.1 DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES AND COMPLIANCE	24
6.2 FMUs SELECTION	24
6.3 LIMITS TO GROUP SIZE	24

6.4 SURVEILLANCE SCHEDULE.....	24
6.5 NON-SLIMF GROUP MEMBERS.....	24
6.6 GROUP MEMBERSHIP (SEE THE TABLE BELOW).....	24
7.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION	29
7.1 FOLLOW-UP ON NON-CONFORMITIE(S) FROM PREVIOUS AUDIT	29
7.2 NON-CONFORMITIE(S) FROM PRESENT AUDIT	29
7.3 POSITIVES.....	31
7.4 ELEMENT DIFFICULT TO ASSESS.....	31
7.5 OBSERVATIONS ON ELEMENTS TO BE FOLLOWED AT THE NEXT AUDIT.....	31
7.6 CERTIFICATION DECISION STATEMENT.....	31
8.0 COMPLAINTS, DISPUTES AND APPEALS.....	32
9.0 NEXT AUDIT	32
APPENDIX 1 – HISTORY OF NON-CONFORMITIES	33

SLIMFs –The element mark with an asterisk (*) in the table are not required in the case of certificates issued to single SLIMF FMUs but are required for all other certificates.

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF FOREST MANAGEMENT

1.1 Basic Quantitative Information

Type of certificate					
Single UAF		Multiple UAF		Group	
Small SLIMF		Low intensity SLIMF		Group SLIMF	x
Number of Group Members or Group SLIMF					
		Number	Area (ha).		
Less than 100 ha		94	4,836		
100-1,000 ha		38	7,965		
1,000-10,000 ha					
More than 10,000 ha					
Total		132	12,801		
FMUs list					
Name/Description		Area. (ha).	Forest Zone	Location Latitude N/S - Longitude E/O	
Small Private		12,801	Temperate Boreal Subtropical Tropical		
Tenure			Area (ha)		
Private			11,847.8 Ha		
Public			532.7 Ha		
Community			420.5 Ha – Bear River First Nations		
Area			Area (ha)		
Natural Forest			12,801		
Plantation			0		
Conservation Forest			0		
Total certified area (FSC Database)			12,801 Ha.		
					Area (ha)
Production forest (from which timber may be harvested)					12,801 Ha
Forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting and managed primarily for conservation objectives					0
Protected from commercial harvesting and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services.					0
Classified as 'high conservation value forest'					58.0 Ha
Production forest classified as 'plantation'					0
Production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems					Specific to each WMP
Production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems					Specific to each WMP

List of High Conservation Values:		
Categories	Description	Area ha.
1 - Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, and refugia).	Riparian Zones with Species at Risk Identified.	58.0
2 - Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.		
3 - Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.		
4 - Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).		
5 - Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		
6 - Forest areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).		

List of main commercial timber and non-timber species included in scope of certificate:			
Common Name	Scientific Name	Approximate AAC (m3)	Non-timber (✓)
Red Spruce	<i>Picea rubens</i>	Specific to each WMP	
Balsam Fir	<i>Abies balsamea</i>	Specific to each WMP	
White Pine	<i>Pinus strobus</i>	Specific to each WMP	
Red maple	<i>Acer rubrum</i>	Specific to each WMP	
Sugar maple	<i>Acer saccharum</i>	Specific to each WMP	
White birch	<i>Betula papyrifera</i>	Specific to each WMP	
White ash	<i>Fraxinus americana</i>	Specific to each WMP	
Larch	<i>Larix laricina</i>	Specific to each WMP	
White spruce	<i>Picea glauca</i>	Specific to each WMP	
Black spruce	<i>Picea mariana</i>	Specific to each WMP	
Red pine	<i>Pinus resinosa</i>	Specific to each WMP	
Poplar	<i>Populus spp</i>	Specific to each WMP	
Red oak	<i>Quercus rubra</i>	Specific to each WMP	
White cedar	<i>Tsuga canadensis</i>	Specific to each WMP	

Non-timber forest products included in scope:	
Product	Approximate Annual Commercial Production
0	0

List of product categories included in the certificate scope:			
Product description	FSC Claim	Product type L1	Product type L2
Round Wood (logs)	FSC 100%	W1 - Rough Wood	W1.1 - Roundwood Logs
Fuel wood	FSC 100%	W1 - Rough Wood	W1.2 - Fuelwood
Wood Chips	FSC 100%	W3 - Wood in Chips or particles	W3.1 Wood Chips
Solid Wood (sawn)	FSC 100%	W5 – Solid wood sawn	W5.2 Solid wood boards rough-cut

Note: These products are available for sale as FSC® certified products (include basic description of product - e.g. round wood, pulp wood, sawn timber, kiln-dried sawn timber, chips, resin, non-timber forest products, etc.

List of chemical pesticides used within the forest area:			
Product name	Quantity (l or Kg)	Treated areas ha.	Reason for use
none	0	0	0

Workers (includes employees, seasonal workers of certificate holder and contractors)					
Men	1	Women		Total	1
Number of accidents in since last audit			Serious	0	Fatal
					0

1.2 Legislative, Administrative and Land Use Context

FMUs are privately owned. Owners have the opportunity to join one of three woodlot owner groups in Nova Scotia. These groups do not have the right to bargain with mills but do provide extension support to landowners. These groups all receive a portion of their funding from Nova Scotia Dept. of Natural Resources. FNSWO is one of these groups.

1.3 Description of Land Ownership and Use

1.3.1 Ownership and Use Rights of Parties Other than the Certificate Holder

All woodlot are privately held with the exception of Bear River First Nations and Prince Edward Island Public Forests.

1.3.2 Summary of Non-forestry Activities

Recreational uses are very important to private woodlot owners. These can include hunting, fishing, hiking, ATVs use etc.

1.4 Description of Area(s) Excluded from Scope of Certification

1.4.1 Excision of areas from the scope of certification

Agricultural land, residential area and christmas tree plantation are always excluded from the certified area of a woodlot.

1.4.2 Partial certification of large ownership

Not applicable.

1.5 Management Plan Summary

1.5.1 Management Objectives

The Federation of Nova Scotia Woodland Owners is committed to promoting forest management practices that contribute to the long-term health and productivity of Nova Scotia's privately owned woodland. As a representative of small-private woodland owners, FNSWO provides training and resources to help them manage their forests for a balance of ecological and economic potential. The programs administered by the Federation of Nova Scotia Woodland Owners is based on the following forest management goals:

1. Follow the FSC Ten Principles of Forest Management as outlined on the Forest Stewardship Council's website <https://ic.fsc.org/the-10-principles.103.htm>
2. Encourage multiple use of woodland
3. Protect biological diversity
4. Maintain forest soil productivity and water quality
5. Conserve identified species-at-risk and significant habitat
6. Protect areas of cultural, historical, geological or archaeological significance

FNSWO will meet these goals by ensuring that any staff, contractors, operators or woodland owners that are enrolled in the Federation programs have access to competency and awareness training. Our target is to have program participants performing forest management activities in compliance with applicable federal, provincial and municipal laws, acts and regulations; and in conformance with provincial Best Management Practices and the FSC Standard

1.5.2 Forest resources

Acadian forests are a temperate broadleaf and mixed forest ecoregion.

1.5.3 Silvicultural Systems

Prior to any harvest, the Nova Scotia Forest Ecosystem Classification System is used to determine the best harvest system to use (clear cut/shelterwood/unevenaged management etc.) and also the preferred form of reforestation (natural or planting).

1.5.4 Management strategy for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species

A Significant Habitat Database is consulted during preparation of all management plans.

1.5.5 Management Structures

FNSWO has one full time employee, the Executive Director. A Certification Program Coordinator is hired on an annual contract basis. A part time clerical staff is also employed as needed.

1.5.6 Monitoring Procedures

Annual Monitoring responsibilities (Landowner or Land Manager) are clearly designated in the Woodlot Management Plan. FNSWO also carries out monitoring of any woodlot that has scheduled harvest or road work. If no activities are reported by the landowner, monitoring is carried out by FNSWO no less than every 3 years, depending on established risk factors.

1.5.7 Environmental safeguard

FNSWO ensures that woodlot owner follow the Nova Scotia's Wildlife Habitat and Watercourses Protection regulations. In addition, FNSWO has developed its own Standard Operating Procedures :

12.12	PROTECTING WILDLIFE AND HABITATS
12.13	PROTECTING SPECIES AT RISK
12.14	PROTECTING SPECIAL FEATURES IN THE FOREST
12.15	CONSERVING BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY IN THE FOREST
12.16	INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT

1.6 Maximum Sustained Yield for main commercial species

1.6.1 Assumptions

– AAC calculation example from FNSWO management plan

- Von Mantel's formula for AAC is : $Y_a = 2 \times G_a / R$
- $Y_a = \text{AAC}$ $G_a = \text{growing stock or total forest inventory (cords)}$
- $R = \text{Rotation age in years (80)}$ $Y_a = 2 \times 7739 / 80 = \underline{\underline{193 \text{ cords/year}}}$
- 5% Reduction Factor = $193 \times .05 = 9.6 \text{ cords}$
- Adjusted AAC = 184 cords/year

Total Allowable Harvest over a 10 year period = 1,840 cords

1.6.2 Source Data

AAC calculation for each woodlot is based on an inventory perform on the woodlote and the standard yield curves for the Acadian forest. Sample rate is based on each delineated stand on the defined woodlot at the following rate:

Stand Area (ha)	# Cruise Points/ha
< 3 ha	1
3-10 ha	1/2
>10 ha	1/4

1.7 Current and Projected Annual Harvest by Species (main commercial)

Annual Allowable Cut is calculated by total woodlot volume.

1.8 Eligibility as a SLIMF

All group members meet the small forest definition of less than 1,000 hectares

1.9 Certificate scope

“Forest management activities: planning, harvesting, transportation and silviculture on defined private woodlots enrolled in the group certification program. Product type: W1.1 Roundwood (logs); W1.2 Fuel wood; W5.2 Solid wood sawn.”

2.0 THE STANDARD

2.1 Standard Used

FSC-STD-CAN Maritimes-SLIMF-2008

You may get a copy of the standard at the following address:

<https://ca.fsc.org/fr-ca/fsc-certification/policy-and-standard-documents/forest-management-standards>

Revision to the standard since last audit:	none
Implication for the FMU:	none

3.0 EVALUATION

Evaluation dates:	September 26 to 29, 2016
Task	Person days (excluding travel)
Pre-evaluation	0
Preparatory Work	1
Documents, Records and Fieldwork	10.25
Stakeholder Interviews	1.5
TOTAL	12.75

EVALUATION TEAM
Lead auditor: Dominic Lessard
Dominic Lessard is the Technical Manager - FSC Program for SAI Global. He holds a Bachelor's degree in forestry from Laval University and completed a master's degree in Environmental Science at the University of Québec in Montréal. He is a registered forest engineer with 10 years of experience working in the provinces of Quebec and British Columbia. Prior to joining SAI Global,

Dominic successfully ran his own consulting firm offering forest certification services to a broad range of private companies and NGOs. He is a qualified Professional Project Manager (PMP) and lead auditor for the verification of FSC forest management and chain of custody standard, having performed more than 80 audits in the last five years.

Auditor: Francois Grimard

François Grimard has over thirty years of experience as a Forest engineer in the related fields of forestry and environment. Since 1995, he has a consultant office where he carries out mandates primarily associated with the certification of sustainable forest management and environmental management systems. He has acquired over the years a solid practical expertise in forestry as Chief Forester and Forestry Supervisor allowing him to master the requirements of the Quebec forestry regime and appreciate the challenges posed by the management of public and private forest. His work as lead auditor of forest management and environmental management systems led him to be constantly at the heart of the forest practices evolution and make critical and rigorous judgments on their actual or potential impacts.

Technical expert:

NA

Observer:

NA

Peer reviewer(s)

NA

3.1 Description of Evaluation

3.1.1 Itinerary

Activities	Date
Start of Stakeholders Consultation	Aug 23, 2016
Audit plan send to certificate holder	Aug 25, 2016
Offsite document review	NA
Opening meeting	Sept 26, 2016
On site audit (field visit, interview and stakeholders meetings)	Sept 26 to 29, 2016
Closing meeting	Sept 29, 2016
Public Report (90 days following closing meeting)	Dec 29, 2016

3.1.2 *Approach

The following elements represented the basis for the audit:

- Follow-up of non-conformances from the 2014 surveillance audit.
- Meetings and interviews with stakeholders and parties that expressed an interest in meeting with the auditors
- Site visits to meet operators, assess their performance and training and assess the quality of the operations.

- Audit of compulsory principles and criteria and sample of other indicators under the FSC Maritimes standard.

3.1.3 *Selected FMUs and Rationale

Four sets of FMU was identified and sample size was calculated using the FSC formulas listed in FSC-STD-20-007 V3.

	Actual number	Sample size
Old members 100 -1,000 ha	24	3
Old members < 100 ha	58	3
New members 1 00 -1,000 ha	14	3
New members < 100 ha	37	4

3.1.4 *Sites Visited

FMU	Site	Activities audited
Current members 100 -1,000 ha		
Jim Crooker	WMP #1105	Woodlot Management Plan (WMP) Selective and group selective cuttings Turtle and snake (HCV) Invading species problem (Glossy leaf buckthorn)
Lymen Huskins	WMP#1108	Woodlot Management Plan (WMP) Selective cuttings Old hemlock forest (+++) Road construction and water crossings Maintenance of ecological functions of the ecosystem (+++)
Mersey River Chalets & Nature Retreat Ltd.	WMP #1191	Woodlot Management Plan (WMP) Objectives of recreation and conservation Recreational resort with cottages Selective cuttings Old hemlock stands (+++) Blanding turtle (HCV) Maintenance of ecological functions of the ecosystem (+++)
Current members < 100 ha		
Century Forestry	WMP#1166	Woodlot Management Plan (WMP) Recent Commercial thinning Recent smal Clearcut
MacLean	WMP#1204	Woodlot Management Plan (WMP) Young fir with rot problem
New Graffton Cattle Cie	WMP#1113	Woodlot Management Plan (WMP) Dual objectives: forest management and beef cattle farming Group selective cuttings

		Fuel storage tank Potential conversion to non-forest use – to be followed up over the years.
New members 100 -1,000 ha		
Scott and Stewart	WMP#1029	Woodlot Management Plan (WMP) Active selection cutting Interview with contractor Inspection of machinery Water crossing inspection MDR management
Alan & Gretchen Peveril	WMP#1017	Woodlot Management Plan (WMP) Group selective cuttings in mixed stand Commercial thinning (white Pine) Camp site Snag trees Water crossing Affected parties (neighbours)
Robert Mitchell	WMP#2001	Woodlot Management Plan (WMP) Group selective cuttings Commercial thinning (white Pine) Sugar bush management Camp site Water crossing Affected parties (neighbours)
MacLean	WMP#1039	Woodlot Management Plan (WMP) Selective and group selective cuttings
New members < 100 ha		
Century Forestry	WMP#1206	Woodlot Management Plan (WMP) Recent road building Temporary water crossing Interview with owner
Mrs. Amanda Lavers & Mr. Jonathan Sheppard	WMP#1200	Woodlot Management Plan (WMP) Objectives of conservation Selective cuttings Old hemlock stands (+++) Ribbon snake, black ash, Blanding turtle (HCV) Maintenance of ecological functions of the ecosystem (+++)
Rex Veinot	WMP#1215	Woodlot Management Plan (WMP) Selective cuttings Pre-commercial thinning Sugar bush management Fuel storage tank Wild life protection - wood duck (HCV) Water crossing (+++) Bridge Spring water source (HCV)

3.1.5 *Stakeholder Consultation

A public notice was posted on the FSC Canada website 30 days prior to the audit. Emails were sent to all First Nation Communities to invite them to provide input. Emails were sent to all national, provincial and regional interested parties identified by the company and by SAI Global. Phone interviews and in-person meeting were held prior and during the audit.

Stakeholders contacted	Number contacted	Provided input	Stakeholders contacted	Number contacted	Provided input
FSC National Initiative	1	0	Representatives of forest-dwelling or forest-using communities	1	0
Provincial Department of Natural Resources / State Forest Service or equivalent	0	0	Labour organizations or unions of forestry sector workers	3	0
Federal/National Agencies such as the Department of Fisheries and Oceans or equivalent.	0	0	Contractors who provide services to the forest operation to be assessed	1	1
Associations / Clubs / Outfitters	2	0	Employees	2	2
Private stakeholders	0	0	Municipalities	0	0
NGOs that are active in respect to social or environmental aspects of forest management – National or Regional	14	1	International NGOs that have requested to be contacted in respect of evaluations in particular regions or countries	0	0
Representatives of Indigenous Peoples	6	0	University/College	6	0
Other(specify)					

Comments from stakeholders and SAI Global's response

Comments from stakeholder:

One stakeholder provided comments on the HCV report and the 2015 audit report. He is concerned that not all HCVF have been identified by FNSWO due to a lack of data and capacity. The total HCVF areas declared in the 2015 audit report (26 ha) represent only 0.32% of the total certified area (8053 ha), which is way below the provincial average.

SAI Global's response:

The FNSWO has developed a HCVF identification framework based on provincial GIS layers and the woodlot owner knowledge of his land. Even though the framework has been applied for each woodlot and some HCVF have been identified, the audit team consider that the scoring system can potentially fail at identifying some crucial HCV. Non-conformance 2016-02 has been raised at indicator 9.1.1. In addition, there is no public summary of the framework being used to identify HCVF and their respective management strategies. Non-conformance 2016 has been raised at indicator 9.1.4

The list of stakeholders is a confidential document. The list is on file with SAI Global.

3.1.6 *Additional Evaluation Techniques

No other techniques used.

4.0 OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE #1: COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS AND FSC PRINCIPLES	
Criterion 1.1 Compliance with national and local laws and administrative requirements.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Verified the list of laws in the entry package for woodlot owners who are joining the program, as well as laws listed on the FNSWO website. Forest workers and program participants are made aware of applicable legislation through annual FNSWO workshop. A list of legal requirements is also provided at the pre-entry meeting. A pre-entry summary sheet is used to ensure no elements are forgotten. Compliance inspections are adequately planned and conducted in a timely manner. The schedule is based upon the FNSWO risk assessment.
Criterion 1.2 Payment of fees, taxes etc.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	The audit team confirmed that the applicant is effective at controlling its finances. Evidences that all prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges had been paid were provided.
Criterion 1.3 Compliance with international agreements	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	FNSWO has a good knowledge of International conventions and of federal/provincial regulations, into which the conventions' requirements are integrated
Criterion 1.4 Documenting of conflicts with laws.	
Comments	FNSWO has not identified any conflicts between laws, regulations and the

(strengths/weakness)	FSC Principle and Criteria.
Criterion 1.5 Protection from illegal activities	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	No documented incident at the time of the audit. As per the applicant procedure, the woodlot owner needs to call either the DNR or the contact person at the Federation of Nova Scotia Woodland Owners to declare any sign of illegal activities. However, the system for reporting illegal activities to the authorities is not documented in the "Systems Manual". A minor non-compliance was raised at 1.5.1.
Criterion 1.6 Adherence to FSC principles.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	FNSWO has a Sustainable Forest Management Policy, signed by the Project Coordinator, the Executive Director as well as the Chairman of the Board of the FNSWO. Each woodlot owner is required to sign the "Commitment to Sustainable Forest Management".
PRINCIPLE #2 TENURE AND USE RIGHTS AND REPSONSIBILITIES	
Criterion 2.1 Evidence of forest use rights.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	The pre-entry package requires proof of land ownership. Deeds of the woodlots visited during the audit where all in file.
Criterion 2.2 Local communities with use rights can protect their rights and resources.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Even though no legal, customary, or traditional use rights are actually identified on the certified private woodlots, owners are required to forward any new request to the FSC certification program managers, who will amend the management plan if needed. Some owners have already acknowledged some access right to snowmobile and ATV users. A procedure to consult adjacent landowners prior to starting major harvesting work is in place. DNR has also a 30 day notice on the website.
Criterion 2.3 Appropriate mechanisms to resolve disputes.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	The dispute resolution process is described in the procedures manual. There are currently no complaints and no complaint was received since the program is in place.
PRINCIPLE #3 INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' RIGHTS	
Criterion 3.1 Indigenous peoples shall control forest management on their lands and territories unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	FNSWO is in direct contact with the Confederacy of Mainland Mi'kmaq and with Bear River First Nation, whose community forest is certified under the program. The relationship is positive and Mi'kmaq representatives have been met at multiple times to share information about forest management activities and to organize workshops. If a conflict should occur, a clear dispute resolution process is defined in the procedures manual, section 9.3.4.
Criterion 3.2 Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	There are no certified forest management activities overlapping established Aboriginal and Treaty rights, with the exception of Bear River's community woodlot located on their reserve. Each woodlot is analyzed prior to joining the group certificate with GIS layers that include Indian Reserves lands and Archeological remains.

Criterion 3.3 Sites of special cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance to Indigenous People(s) shall be clearly identified in cooperation with such Peoples, and recognized and protected by forest managers.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Provincial layer of aboriginal values and traditional land use is part of the HCVF shapefile layers, which allows FNSWO to incorporate this information on the Woodlot Management Plan. The woodlot owner is also asked, through the pre-entry checklist, to declare any HCVF related to aboriginal values.
Criterion 3.4 Indigenous Peoples shall be compensated for the application of their traditional knowledge regarding the use of forest species or management systems in forest operations. This compensation shall be formally agreed upon with their free and informed consent before forest operations commence.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	There is no use of traditional knowledge regarding the use of forest species or management systems in forest operations.
PRINCIPLE 4 COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND FOREST WORKERS' RIGHTS	
Criterion 4.1 The communities within or adjacent to the forest management area should be given the opportunity for employment, training, and other services.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	FNSWO has partnered with the Mersey Tobeatic Research Institute (MTRI), which has organized numerous workshops to inform and support the local communities and certified woodlot owners: Species at risk awareness session, Partial cut training, Forestry for Women workshop, Best management practices workshop, Mentorship program, etc. In addition, FNSWO annual FSC Training Sessions are held annually both in the Western and Eastern part of the Province and are open to the public (local citizens, contractors, etc.).
Criterion 4.2 Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	The FNSWO has a Health and Safety policy and has defined minimum requirements for woodlot owners and contractors operating on certified woodlots. Compliance with H&S is monitored by the FSC coordinator and recorded in the monitoring form. The audit team inspected one active harvesting operation and verified compliance with all H&S regulations.
Criterion 4.3 The rights of workers to organize and voluntarily negotiate with their employers shall be guaranteed as outlined in Conventions 87 and 98 of the International Labour Organization (ILO).	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Canada is a signatory of the ILO conventions. The right of worker to organize and voluntary negotiate is guaranteed by law.
Criterion 4.4 Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups directly affected by management operations.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	FNSWO considers social impacts when developing Woodlot Management Plan. Neighbors, visual impacts and noise are all taken into account. FNSWO has a procedure in place that requires a 30 day notice prior to carrying out major harvesting operations or when working on the woodlot boundary line. FNSWO has partnered with MTRI to develop the Western Woodlot Services Cooperative Ltd and Medway Community Forest Coop, two initiatives that will benefit small woodlot owners and small communities.

Criterion 4.5 Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed for resolving grievances and for providing fair compensation in the case of loss or damage affecting the legal or customary rights, property, resources, or livelihoods of local peoples. Measures shall be taken to avoid such loss or damage.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	FNSWO has a dispute resolution process in place for fairly resolving disputes with employees as well as disputes with other resource users and the general public.
PRINCIPLE 5 BENEFITS FROM THE FOREST	
Criterion 5.1 Forest management should strive toward economic viability, while taking into account the full environmental, social, and operational costs of production, and ensuring the investments necessary to maintain the ecological productivity of the forest.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	The FNSWO operates on funding from DNR. Numerous workshops and training sessions are provided to woodlot owners and the general public to promote sustainable forest management. Viability of forest management activities is ensured by additional silviculture funding reserved exclusively to the members of the program.
Criterion 5.2 Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest's diversity of products.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Woodlot owners are responsible for marketing their own wood products. The wood market provides the incentive for the land owner to capture the optimal value of forest products. The difficulty to find a destination for pulp quality wood creates a challenging situation in the western part of the province.
Criterion 5.3 Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Interview with forest manager, review of monitoring forms and field visit of 13 different woodlots has demonstrated that forestry operations have minimal damage to residual trees and that all the wood harvested is being salvaged and used.
Criterion 5.4 Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Opportunities exist to merchandize sawlogs, studwood, pulpwood and fuelwood. Non-timber use includes maple syrup production. Selling pulpwood is a challenge in the West of the Province.
Criterion 5.5 Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources, such as watersheds and fisheries.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	When relevant, management strategy is implemented to maintain or enhance other benefits from the forest. For instance, Mersey River Chalets & Nature Retreat Ltd's objective is to enhance wildlife habitat and recreational trails for nature retreat. Management strategy consists of excluding stands from forest management (HCVF), as well as implementing uneven age/selection management. Village of Lawrencetown (Watershed); objective is to maintain water quality.
Criterion 5.6 The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	The Annual Allowable Cut is calculated for each woodlot using the Von Mantel's formula ($Y_a = 2 \times G_a / R$). AAC shall not be exceeded over the 10-year course of the WMP and reductions in AAC are made to reflect the percentage of operable area within stands recommended for harvest. A pre-harvest assessment is performed prior to harvesting operations.

PRINCIPLE 6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	
Criterion 6.1 Environmental impact assessments.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Ecological Land Classification information is used to develop the Woodlot Management Plan. The Forest Ecosystem Classification system is used for stand prescriptions.
Criterion 6.2 Safeguards must exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas).	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Species at risk habitats are identified on a provincial map. Forest manager use the information on the map to verify presence of species at risk for a given woodlot. Woodlot is surveyed every time the forest management plan is reviewed and species at risk habitat location is part of the parameters being surveyed. Presence of species at risk habitat within 500 meters of the property limits is taken into consideration and protection measures are prescribed in the plan if presence is confirmed. Recommendations for protecting species at risk are included in the management plan when relevant. The recommendations are obtained from DNR biologists. There are no known forest stands that qualified as a Primordial forest within the certified land base.
Criterion 6.3 Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced or restored.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	On-site tour of various woodlots has shown that harvest and regeneration methods result in a mix of tree species, stand types, landscape ecology and stand structures that mimic the natural variability and historic local pattern of the Acadian Forest. Leaving coarse woody debris on-site is not a challenge and soil damage or nutrient losses are minimal. Plantation is mainly use to support pre-established natural regeneration. Planting decision is documented in the management plan. Field visits have also demonstrated that spatial patterns and distributions of forest communities on the woodlots are representative of natural forest characteristics at the landscape level. Forest fragmentation is minimized within woodlot and connectivity is maintained with neighbouring forests when possible.
Criterion 6.4 Representative samples of existing ecosystems within the landscape shall be protected in their natural state and recorded on maps, appropriate to the scale and intensity of operations and the uniqueness of the affected resources.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	The forest management units are inventoried according to the provincial Ecological Land Classification system in use in Nova Scotia. The land classification is documented on the management plan maps. The adjacent crown protected areas are identified but the maps shown makes it difficult to evaluate how the private woodlots included in the certification program could contribute to the actual network of protected areas. A minor non-compliance as raised.
Criterion 6.5 Written guidelines shall be prepared and implemented to: control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbances; and protect water resources.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Written guidelines (SOP's) and a BMP booklet are used to informed FSC program participant about criteria to control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting and road construction in order to protect water resources. The woodlot owners and/or contractors are required to makes periodic inspections of forest conditions and verified effectiveness of forest operations. Field visits during this audit have shown that water protection measures are

	known and implemented, except for one case where best practices pertaining to protection of water quality were not implemented during a commercial thinning operation. A minor NC is raised.
Criterion 6.6 Management systems shall promote the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management and strive to avoid the use of chemical pesticides.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Pesticide use is discussed with program participant at the Pre-entry meeting and before signature of the Woodlot Management Plan. There is an Integrated Pest Management program that has been developed and described in SOP 12.16 by FNSWO and which is aiming to zero usage of pesticides. The provincial subsidization of herbicide use in forestry has been eliminated, and this will ensure that the future use of herbicides will be near or, more likely, at zero. Finally, there is also a commitment to pesticide-free forest management in the WMP and the use of herbicides and pesticides has been zero since the very first assessment.
Criterion 6.7 Chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes including fuel and oil shall be disposed of in an environmentally appropriate manner at off-site locations.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Owners and contractors are responsible for the management of all fuels, oils and chemicals that may harm the environment. They are also responsible for recycling the products and goods used for forest management activities. Chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes are taken to provincial depot or service stations. Field visit and interviews with owners have confirmed proper implementation of the SOPs.
Criterion 6.8 Use of biological control agents shall be documented, minimized, monitored and strictly controlled in accordance with national laws and internationally accepted scientific protocols. Use of genetically modified organisms shall be prohibited.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	No recent use of BT. Anticipating a spruce budworm infestation in 2-5 years. Spraying and monitoring of effectiveness will be conducted by DNR if required. There is no use of genetically modified organisms.
Criterion 6.9 The use of exotic species is carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	There is no use of exotic tree species.
Criterion 6.10 Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion: a. Entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and b. Does not occur on high conservation value forest areas; (HCVF) and c. Will enable clear, sustainable, additional, secure long-term conservation benefits across the forest management unit.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Deforestation and conversion to non-forest use within the defined woodlot is minimized through careful planning of forest roads, landings, etc. There has been no conversion of forests to non-forest land use. As well, there are no examples of conversion back to forests. This requirement is covered during the pre-entry meeting with candidate land owners.
PRINCIPLE 7 MANAGEMENT PLAN	
Criterion 7.1 Content of management plan.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	All 13 Woodlot Management Plan (WMP) reviewed contain all items listed a) to i) of criteria 7.1. and were in conformance with the FSC requirements. The audit team found the WMP to be of very high quality. A field visit and an interview with the owner are performed prior to developing the WMP, which

	result in very accurate and practical WMP being presented to the owners.
Criterion 7.2 The management plan shall be periodically revised to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	WMPs is valid for 10 years, with a revision performed every 5 years to include results of monitoring and new knowledge available. The FNSWO FSC Coordinator use a summary spreadsheet to keep track of revision and renewal dates for each WMPs.
Criterion 7.3 Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plan.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Every woodlot owner meets with the FSC Coordinator and receives training prior to joining the group. The woodlot owner is required to warn the FSC Coordinator prior to starting any operations on their woodlot. If the operator or contractor is new, the mandatory entry training will be performed prior to starting the operation. Woodland owners and operators interviewed in the field had been trained. Training logs were verified by the audit team.
Criterion 7.4 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the primary elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	In respect of confidential information, woodlot management plans for each landowner are not made available on the FNSWO website. Woodlot management plans are available upon request, conditional to the landowner approval.
PRINCIPLE 8 MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT	
Criterion 8.1 Frequency and intensity of monitoring.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Risk level is established at the time of developing the WMP, and re-established every time monitoring is performed. Monitoring frequency is based on risk. Every active operation is visited at least once by the FSC Coordinator who conducts a complete monitoring of the activities. Every owner is required to produce an "Annual Update" declaration, which is used to report any activities or changes in forest conditions. An internal audit program is also in place. NCR can be issued at any time.
Criterion 8.2 Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators: a) Yield of all forest products harvested. b) Growth rates, regeneration and condition of the forest. c) Composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna. d) Environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations. e) Costs, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Every active operation is visited at least once by the FSC Coordinator who conducts a complete monitoring of the activities. Owners are required to produce an "Annual Update" declaration, which is used to report any changes in forest conditions (forest growth, regeneration, health, etc.), species at risk and environmental impacts.
Criterion 8.3 Documentation shall be provided by the forest manager to enable monitoring and certifying organizations to trace each forest product from its origin, a process known as the "chain of custody."	

Comments (strengths/weakness)	FNSWO has a documented wood tracking procedure. Forest of origin (woodlot) is identified on the Bill of Lading. The audit team verified the use of bill of lading with contractor in the field. The audit team also verified the quarterly FSC deliveries summary issued by PHP. The summary acts as an invoice for FNSWO, but is missing the buyer and seller name, as well as the FSC claim. A major NC is raised at clause 9.3 of FSC-STD-30-005.
Criterion 8.4 The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	The annual update form is used to monitor any changes and activities that took place on the certified woodlot. Information is entered into the woodlot logbook and is used at the 5yrs review to update the management plan.
Criterion 8.5 While respecting the confidentiality of some information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	A summary of monitoring results is produced annually and is available upon request.
PRINCIPLE 9 HIGH CONSERVATION VALUE FORESTS	
Criterion 9.1 Assessment to determine the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests will be completed, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	FNSWO has developed a scoring system to evaluate the presence of HCVF on woodlots. In total, 56 ha of forest have been designated as HCVF and special protection measures have been developed. However, the HCVF identification framework developed (scoring system) can potentially fail at identifying some crucial HCV when the threshold score has not been reached. No such case has been detected, thus a minor NC is raised at indicator 9.1.1. In addition, a minor NC is raised at 9.1.4 because the HCVF assessment process has not been documented in a report available to the public.
Criterion 9.2 The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	High conservation values are identified through a collaborative effort between the woodlot owner, the FNSWO technician and MTRI scientists.
Criterion 9.3 The management plan shall include and implement specific measures that ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. These measures shall be specifically included in the publicly available management plan summary.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	The audit team was able to confirm through interviews and field visits that HCVF protection measures were implemented on all woodlots visited who had HCVF identified.
Criterion 9.4 Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	The effectiveness of each HCVF protection strategies is monitored once a year through various means, going from field visit to phone interviews. Result

	of this monitoring is compiled in an annual summary table.
PRINCIPLE10 – PLANTATIONS	
Criterion 10.1 The management objectives of the plantation, including natural forest conservation and restoration objectives, shall be explicitly stated in the management plan, and clearly demonstrated in the implementation of the plan.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Principle 10 is non-applicable. None of the 132 certified woodlots owners practice high intensity silviculture. Planted area are characterized with native species (white, red and black spruces) and managed in a way that promote tree species diversity, stand diversity, age diversity and the presence of coarse woody debris. This finding should be reviewed annually to ensure that new members do not practice high intensity silviculture.
Criterion 10.2 The design and layout of plantations should promote the protection, restoration and conservation of natural forests, and not increase pressures on natural forests. Wildlife corridors, streamside zones and a mosaic of stands of different ages and rotation periods, shall be used in the layout of the plantation, consistent with the scale of the operation. The scale and layout of plantation blocks shall be consistent with the patterns of forest stands found within the natural landscape.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Non-applicable. See finding at criteria 10.1 above.
Criterion 10.3 Diversity in the composition of plantations is preferred, so as to enhance economic, ecological and social stability. Such diversity may include the size and spatial distribution of management units within the landscape, number and genetic composition of species, age classes and structures.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Non-applicable. See finding at criteria 10.1 above.
Criterion 10.4 The selection of species for planting shall be based on their overall suitability for the site and their appropriateness to the management objectives. In order to enhance the conservation of biological diversity, native species are preferred over exotic species in the establishment of plantations and the restoration of degraded ecosystems. Exotic species, which shall be used only when their performance is greater than that of native species, shall be carefully monitored to detect unusual mortality, disease, or insect outbreaks and adverse ecological impacts.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Non-applicable. See finding at criteria 10.1 above.
Criterion 10.5 A proportion of the overall forest management area, appropriate to the scale of the plantation and to be determined in regional standards, shall be managed so as to restore the site to a natural forest cover.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Non-applicable. See finding at criteria 10.1 above.
Criterion 10.6 Measures shall be taken to maintain or improve soil structure, fertility, and biological activity. The techniques and rate of harvesting, road and trail construction and maintenance, and the choice of species shall not result in long term soil degradation or adverse impacts on water quality, quantity or substantial deviation from stream course drainage patterns.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Non-applicable. See finding at criteria 10.1 above.

Criterion 10.7 Measures shall be taken to prevent and minimize outbreaks of pests, diseases, fire and invasive plant introductions. Integrated pest management shall form an essential part of the management plan, with primary reliance on prevention and biological control methods rather than chemical pesticides and fertilizers. Plantation management should make every effort to move away from chemical pesticides and fertilizers, including their use in nurseries. The use of chemicals is also covered in Criteria 6.6 and 6.7.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Non-applicable. See finding at criteria 10.1 above.
Criterion 10.8 Appropriate to the scale and diversity of the operation, monitoring of plantations shall include regular assessment of potential on-site and off-site ecological and social impacts (e.g., natural regeneration, effects on water resources and soil fertility, and impacts on local welfare and social well-being), in addition to those elements addressed in Principles 8, 6 and 4. No species should be planted on a large scale until local trials and/or experience have shown that they are ecologically well-adapted to the site, are not invasive, and do not have significant negative ecological impacts on other ecosystems. Special attention will be paid to social issues of land acquisition for plantations, especially the protection of local rights of ownership, use or access.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Non-applicable. See finding at criteria 10.1 above.
Criterion 10.9 Plantations established in areas converted from natural forests after November 1994 normally shall not qualify for certification. Certification may be allowed in circumstances where sufficient evidence is submitted to the certification body that the manager/owner is not responsible directly or indirectly for such conversion.	
Comments (strengths/weakness)	Non-applicable. See finding at criteria 10.1 above.

4.1 Observations on review and resolution of complaint raised by stakeholder with the certificate holder or with the certification body since the previous evaluation

No complaint raised by stakeholders since the previous evaluation.

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

Not applicable. No derogation were approved.

5.0 TRACKING OF CERTIFIED FOREST PRODUCTS

5.1 Risk

The risk is low considering that Transportation law in Nova Scotia requires the truck driver to keep a logbook of his deliveries, which includes the origin and destination of the wood being delivered. In addition, if the forest of origin is not declared properly, the woodlot owner will not get paid, which reduces the risk of false or wrong declaration.

5.2 Control System

A documented CoC procedure can be found at section 9.9.1 of the FNSWO System Manual. Forest of origin is identified on the Bill of Lading. FSC claim for pulp wood sold to large mills is done after the wood has been delivered to the mill. The mill produces a quarter statement of deliveries, which is sent for review and approval by FNSWO.

6.0 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR GROUP CERTIFICATIONS

6.1 Description of Responsibilities and Compliance

The FNSWO is the Nova Scotia representative of the Canadian Federation of Woodlot Owners. It is a legal entity under the Societies Act of Nova Scotia. The Federation operates under a set of by-laws including its administration by an elected board of directors, officers, and executive director. At present, the Federation has one full-time employee – Executive Director and one contract employee - Project Coordinator for the certification program.

FNSWO carries out an annual internal audit to determine the level of conformance of the management and participants within the program. The timing will be at least 2- months prior to certifier audits to enable effective corrective action to be implemented where necessary.

6.2 FMUs Selection

FMUs are selected based on recent reported activities and risk factors from WMP. Selected FMUs represent new and old members. All parts and participants in the certification program are subject to internal auditing and will be audited on a sampling basis similar to the system used by the Registrar.

6.3 Limits to Group Size

FNSWO Staff requirements for SPWCP woodlots. One full time staff member is required per each 200 FMUs in the FSC program.

6.4 Surveillance schedule

FNSWO carries out an internal audit annually.

6.5 Non-SLIMF group members

None

6.6 Group Membership (See the table below).

Name and Contact Information	# of FMUs	Total forest area ha.	Location	Managed by:			Main products	FNSWO WMP #
				P	S	C		
James Thibault	1	112.6	Digby Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1019
Kevin Clattenburg	1	81.0	Halifax Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1031
Les Harlow	1	167.8	Halifax Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1037
Paul McDonald	1	40.6	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1048

Bob	Barteaux	1	72.7	Annapolis Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1049
Terry	Smith	1	80.7	Halifax Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1065
Karen	Miller	2	96.7	Halifax Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1066 1080
Ted	McFetridge	1	82.9	Halifax Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1067
Thomas	Miller	1	224.0	Halifax Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1068
Jack	Redden	1	245.9	Halifax Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1069
Gini	Proulx	1	36.3	Annapolis Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1073
Albert	Higgins	1	211.3	Halifax Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1078
George	Uhlman	2	81.4	Queens Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1101 1151
Stewart	Fotheringham	1	21.7	Annapolis Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1103
Peter	Van Dyk	1	13.7	Queens Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1104
Jim	Crooker	1	316.5	Queens Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1105
Dave	Thomas	1	167.8	Digby Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1106
Braydon	Anthony	1	56.9	Queens Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1107
Lyman	Huskins	4	546.0	Queens Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1108 1109 1119 1120
Tom	Daly	1	90.3	Annapolis Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1110
Tom	Berry	1	22.3	Annapolis Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1111
Greg	Seuffer	1	94.8	Annapolis Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1113
Jim	Todd	1	99.9	Annapolis Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1114
Harley	Redden	1	39.7	Halifax Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1115
Don&Sheila	Munroe	1	93.1	Kings Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1117
Rick	Hoffman	1	105.7	Inverness Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1118
Bryan	Lorber	1	147.2	Annapolis Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1121
Randy	Cameron	1	89.5	Annapolis Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1122
Murray	Crouse	1	35.0	Lunenburg Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1123
Adrian	Samson	1	58.0	Colchester Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1125
Real	Thibault	1	13.3	Digby Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1127
Herman	Berfelo	1	131.0	Colchester Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1128
Scott & Stewart Forestry Consultants Ltd.		5	275.7	Antigonish Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1132 1133 1135

								1134 1029	
Bear River	First Nations	1	420.5	Annapolis Co.			C	Non Timber Forest Products & Fuelwood	1138
Ian & Linda	MacLean	10	1,530.9	Pictou Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1142 1161 1038 1204 1039 1040 1042 1043 1044 1045
Century Forestry Ltd.		12	836.6	Pictou Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1056 1143 1144 1145 1165 1166 1167 1060 1207 1059 1206 1058
Scott & Lisa	MacEachern	1	283.0	Pictou Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1146
Frederick	Sweet	1	14.4	Lunenburg Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1147
Robin	Barrett	1	18.1	Halifax Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1148
John	Therault	2	223.8	Digby Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1149 1150
Town of Yarmouth Watershed		1	362.8	Yarmouth Co.			S	Sawlogs & fuelwood	1157
Greg	Jollymore	1	68.2	Lunenburg Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood Sawlogs & fuelwood	1160
Prince Edward Island Valleyfield Public Forest		1	82.0	Kings Co. PEI			S	Sawlogs & fuelwood	1162
Jane Barker & Richard Lane		1	25.8	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1163
Tom	Sheppard	1	34.8	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1172
Richard	White	1	48.7	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1173
David Small & Jaqueline Jorissen		1	56.6	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1174
Glen	Pulley	1	84.8	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1175
Hantford	Lewis	1	203.3	Digby Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1182
Daniel Deveau & Daniel Riley		1	15.7	Digby Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1185
Jonathan	Roach	1	67.8	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1188
Mersey River Chalets		1	139.6	Annapolis Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1191
Don	Kimble	1	31.7	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1192

Alex & Marie MacLeod	1	30.8	Queens Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1194
Royce Ford	1	28.3	Annapolis Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1196
John Tanner	2	100.0	Hants Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1129 1131
Mike Penny	1	72.1	Hants Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1124
Darren Hawkes	1	24.9	Queens Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1195
Daniel Deveau	1	21.2	Digby Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1197
Peter & Margaret Waterman	1	58.0	Queens Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1198
David Smith	1	56.9	Queens Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1199
Lloyde Blois	1	256.0	Hants Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1201
Herman & Elizabeth Huesker	1	38.3	Annapolis Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1178
Rod & Robin MacLennan	1	46.6	Pictou Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1205
Sharon Chisholm	1	8	Lunenburg Co	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1202
Pat & Doug MacKay	1	14.8	Halifax Co	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1209
Bill Amirault	2	37.8	Digby Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1010 1011
Amanda Lavers & Jonathan Sheppard	1	19	Queens Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1200
Donald Preeper	1	25.7	Halifax Co	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1219
Everett Emino	1	26.1	Queens Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1008
Andrew Crouse	1	28	Lunenburg Co	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1170
Mort Stewart	1	29.3	King's Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1024
Boyde Crouse	1	30.6	Lunenburg Co	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1171
David S. Wilson	1	31	Pictou Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1071
Jeffie McNeil	1	36	Annapolis Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1203
Doug Kemp	1	38	King's Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1001
David Fraser	1	50	Hants Co	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1003
Steve Kilb	2	203.2	Annapolis Yarmouth	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1007_1 1007_2
Selka Kind	1	59.9	Queens Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1217
Peter Francis	1	60	Annapolis Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	916
Keith Ring	1	68.4	Digby Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1021
Paul & Tracy Saunders	1	79	Queens Co.	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1072
Gary Baudoux	1	80	Pictou Co	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1095
Volker Rosenberger	1	80.9	King's Co	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1054
Mike Warner	1	81.6	Digby Co	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood Sawlogs & fuelwood	1064
Doug Keddy	1	87.3	Lunenburg Co	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1055
Village of Lawrencetown	1	87.9	Annapolis Co.		S	Sawlogs & fuelwood	1218
Pat O'Toole	1	91	Halifax Co	P		Sawlogs & fuelwood	1009

Rex	Veinot	1	99	Lunenburg Co	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1215
Alan	Peveril	1	140.8	Queens Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1017
Rob	Moore	1	142	Hans Co	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	902
Tom	Ellis	1	146.5		P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1216
Ed	Corkum	2	444.6	King's Co.	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1035 1036
Robert	Mitchell	1	400.5	Lunenburg Co	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1201
Karen Elma	Miller & Dickie	2	96.7	Colchester Co	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1066 1080
Robert	Frame	1	233	Pictou Co	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1006
Chris	Hutchinson	1	204.6	King's Co	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1028
John	MacDougal Otterbrook Investments Ltd.	1	221	Colchester Co	P			Sawlogs & fuelwood	1208
98 members / 132 FMUs									
P: Private, S: State or Province, C: Community									

7.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION

7.1 Follow-up on Non-conformitie(s) from previous audit

NC#:	2015-01	Grade- Major/Minor:	Minor
Requirement:			
FSC-STD-30-005, Clause 9.4 The Group entity shall ensure that all uses of the FSC Trademark are approved by the responsible certification body in advance			
Non-conformance:			
There is no evidence that the logo used on the website has been submitted to SAI Global for approval.			
Justification for Major or Minor:			
Problem is limited in space and time			
Evidence provided to close the non-conformity:			
Approval document was presented and verified as evidence. Approval document is available in the objective evidence file.			
Status Closed/Open or Upgraded:		Closed	

7.2 Non-Conformitie(s) from present audit

NC#:	2016-01	Grade- Major/Minor:	Minor
Requirement:			
6.5.4 The owner/manager is implementing relevant best management practices pertaining to the protection of water quality.			
Non-conformance:			
Best practices pertaining to protection of water quality were not implemented during commercial thinning operations on woodlot #1029.			
Justification for Major or Minor:			
Problem is limited in space and time			
Evidence provided to close the non-conformity:			
Pending			
Status Closed/Open or Upgraded:		Open	

NC#:	2016-02	Grade- Major/Minor:	Minor
Requirement:			
9.1.1 Using the assessment framework in Appendix F, the owner/manager determines the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests.			
Non-conformance:			
The framework developed (scoring system) to identify HCVF on woodlots can potentially fail at identifying some crucial HCV when the threshold score (3 pts) has not been reached.			
Justification for Major or Minor:			
An HCVF identification methodology based on the assessment framework presented in Appendix F has been developed and is implemented. HCVF are being identified and protected in most cases. Issue does not prevent conformance at the criteria level.			

Evidence provided to close the non-conformity:	
Pending	
Status Closed/Open or Upgraded:	Open

NC#:	2016-03	Grade- Major/Minor:	Minor
Requirement:			
9.1.4 The owner/manager shall make the assessment document(s), associated maps, and external review report available to the public.			
Non-conformance:			
The HCVF assessment process has not been documented in a report available to the public			
Justification for Major or Minor:			
Limited impact. Does not prevent conformance at the criteria level.			
Evidence provided to close the non-conformity:			
Pending			
Status Closed/Open or Upgraded:	Open		

NC#:	2016-04	Grade- Major/Minor:	Major
Requirement:			
FSC-STD-30-005 V2-1 9.3 The Group entity shall ensure that all invoices for sales of FSC certified material are issued with the required information (see FSC-STD-40-004 V2-0 Clause 6.1.1) and are filed by the group members.			
Non-conformance:			
The information on the periodic deliveries statement is not sufficient to comply with clause 6.1.1 of FSC-STD-40-004 V2-1. The name and addresses of the seller and buyers are missing, as well as the FSC claim.			
Justification for Major or Minor:			
Major impact to the chain of custody.			
Evidence provided to close the non-conformity:			
Prior to report finalization, FNSWO has created a new template that will be used to confirm pulpwood deliveries in the futur (see "TEMPLATE_confirmation of delivery"). This template includes all information required by FSC-STD-40-004 V2-0 Clause 6.1.1. FNSWO has also provided evidence that they have corrected the latest PHP statement dated Apr 4, 2016.			
Status Closed/Open or Upgraded:	Closed		

NC#:	2016-05	Grade- Major/Minor:	Minor
Requirement:			
1.5.1 A system exists for documenting and reporting to the appropriate authorities instances of illegal harvesting, settlement, occupation or other unauthorized activities.			
Non-conformance:			
The system for reporting illegal activities to the authorities is not documented in the Systems Manual.			
Justification for Major or Minor:			
It does not result in a fundamental failure to achieve the objective of the FSC Criterion 1.5			
Evidence provided to close the non-conformity:			
Pending			

Status Closed/Open or Upgraded:	Open
----------------------------------------	------

NC#:	2016-06	Grade- Major/Minor:	Minor
Requirement:			
6.4.2 Representative samples of ecosystems that are present on the management unit and underrepresented in protected areas on the landscape are designated in the management plan and on maps and protected in their natural state.			
Non-conformance:			
The applicant's evaluation of how the private woodlots included in the certification program could contribute to the actual network of protected areas is incomplete.			
Justification for Major or Minor:			
It is a temporary lapse that does not result in a fundamental failure to achieve the objective of the FSC Criterion 6.4.			
Evidence provided to close the non-conformity:			
Pending			
Status Closed/Open or Upgraded:	Open		

7.3 Positives

-Woodlots management plan are based on a thorough forest inventory perform by FNSWO technician and are of very high quality

- Partnership with MTRI allows the applicant to broaden its outreach program.

7.4 Element difficult to assess

None

7.5 Observations on elements to be followed at the next audit.

None

7.6 Certification Decision Statement

Reregistration audit

FNSWO has demonstrated, subject to the correction of the non-conformities, that the described system of management is being implemented consistently over the whole forest area covered by the scope of the certificate with the exception of the non-conformances identified during the audit and documented in the attached Non-conformance Reports. As discussed during the closing meeting, please submit a root cause analysis and an action plan for approval within 30 days for both the major and minor non-conformances. Major non-conformances must be closed within 90 days. Implementation of corrective actions for Minor non-conformances will be reviewed at the time of the first surveillance audit or at the latest 12 months after the NC reports have been issued.

A recommendation to maintain the registration is on hold pending the receipt, review and acceptance of the corrective action plan for all non-conformances and the closure of the major non-conformances.

8.0 COMPLAINTS, DISPUTES AND APPEALS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9.0 NEXT AUDIT

Next Scheduled Audit:
Date: September 25-29, 2017

END OF REPORT

APPENDIX 1 – HISTORY OF NON-CONFORMITIES

NC #	Indicator	RR 2016	S1	S2	S3	S4
2016-01	6.5.4	Minor				
2016-02	9.1.1	Minor				
2016-03	9.1.4	Minor				
2016-04	FSC-STD-30-005, clause 9.3	Major				
2016-05	1.5.1	Minor				
2016-06	6.4.2	Minor				