



Forest Certification Surveillance Report

1st, surveillance

Prepared by:

Sylvain Frappier
QMI-SAI Global
20 Carlson Court
Suite 100
Toronto, Ontario
M9W 7K6
CANADA
Tel: (416) 401-8700
1 800 465-3717
Fax: (416) 401-8710
www.qmi.com

for:

Corner Brook Pulp and Paper (Kruger)
Woodlands Operations
Mill Road
P.O. Box 2001
Corner Brook, Newfoundland, A2H 6J4
Att. Faron Knott 709-637-3155

for the following certified forest area(s):¹

Forests management districts no. 5, 6, 9, 14, 15 and 16 in Newfoundland

File number: 011643-09

Date of surveillance evaluation: (08/07/2013)

Date of finalized report: (06/10/2013)

FSC[®] Registration Code: QM-FM/CoC-001506

Date of Certificate Issue: July 5, 2012

Validity of the certificate: From (05/07/2012) to (04/07/2017)

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION	3
1.1.1 <i>Itinerary</i>	4
1.1.2 <i>Approach</i>	4
1.1.3 <i>Selected FMUs and Rationale</i>	4
1.1.4 <i>Sites Visited</i>	5
1.1.5 <i>Stakeholder Consultation</i>	5
1.1.6 <i>Additional Evaluation Techniques</i>	6
2.0 STANDARD(S).....	6
2.1 STANDARD USED	6
2.2 DESCRIPTION OF LOCAL ADAPTATION OF GENERIC STANDARD.....	6
3.0 OBSERVATIONS	7
3.1 OBSERVATIONS ON REVIEW AND RESOLUTION OF COMPLAINT	17
3.2 SUMMARIZED PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE CONDITIONS RELATED TO ANY APPROVED PESTICIDE DEROGATION	17
4.0 SURVEILLANCE DECISION.....	17
4.1 NON-COMPLIANCES	17
4.2 DIFFICULT ASSESSMENTS	18
4.3 STATUS OF PREVIOUS NON-COMPLIANCES	18
4.4 OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT	29
4.5 RECOMMENDATION TO MAINTAIN THE CERTIFICATE	40
5.0 GROUP MEMBERSHIP LIST (UPDATE).....	40
6.0 FSC COMPLAINTS, DISPUTES AND APPEALS	40

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION

Evaluation dates:	July 8, 2013
Task	Person days (excluding travel)
Pre-evaluation	0
Preparatory Work	2
Documents, Records and Fieldwork	11
Stakeholder Interviews	2
TOTAL	15

EVALUATION TEAM
Lead auditor: Sylvain Frappier
<p>Senior Forestry Manager Engineer with 28 years of experience in project management of public, private and urban forestry. Preparation of budget forecasts and management of logging operations budget. Proven capacity in managing capital forestry assets (purchase, sale, rental of lands). Annual negotiations of several timber procurement contracts. Supervised forestry operations on public and private lands in Quebec, Vermont and New York. Developed a strategy to access timber supply sources from Russia to support a pole export market in Asia and the Middle East.</p> <p>Negotiated with various groups of interested parties (Ministry of Natural Resources, Environmental groups, Aboriginal communities, Wildlife sanctuary managers,). Auditor for ISO 9001, OHSAS 18001, lead auditor for International forestry management standards such as SFI (Sustainable Forestry Initiatives). CSA Z809, CSA Z804 and FSC (Forestry Stewardship Council) as well as for Chain of custody for, PEFC ST, SFI and FSC.</p> <p>Sylvain is currently the technical manager for the forestry sector for QMI-SAI Global Member of the Ordre des ingénieurs forestiers du Québec.</p>
Auditor: François Grimard
<p>FSC and ISO14001 Lead auditor.</p> <p>François is a Registered Professional Forester from Quebec with over 28 years of experience. He has been involved in international forestry projects in Chile, France, Argentina Ecuador and Madagascar. He also has expertise in Aboriginal consultation. He has a large experience in forest management auditing against various standards (including ISO 14001, CSA Z809, FSC) in Québec</p>
Auditor: Daniel Martin
<p>Forest engineer with a more than 14 years of experience in the forest industry as a supervisor and manager, specifically in silviculture, harvesting and fiber procurement for sawmills in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. This has allowed for development of skills ranging from budgeting, negotiating and human resource management. Furthermore, Daniel has cumulated experience in the management of an engineered wood products facility in the province of Quebec. Daniel has negotiated collective bargaining agreements in both the forest harvesting industry and wood products manufacturing in the provinces of New Brunswick and Quebec. He has also been a lecturer at the Université de Moncton. Daniel is an ISO 14001 assessor and a FSC FM lead auditor and has conducted field work in the Maritimes, Boreal and Great Lakes/St-Lawrence forest types.</p>

1.1.1 Itinerary

Day 1	Evaluators arrive at the site Kick-off meeting Introduction of the audit team Introduction of CBPPL representatives Field visit preparation Evaluation of principles 1-2-6-7 + Meeting with stakeholder group
Day 2	Evaluation principles (cont.) 3-6 Stakeholder interviews Field visits Districts 9-15-16 Review of 2012 NCs
Day 3	Stakeholder interviews Meeting with Science working group on HCVF
Day 4	Evaluation principles (cont.) 4-5-6-8-9
Day 5	Auditors complete assigned principles\indicators and prepare for closing meeting Closing meeting

1.1.2 Approach

The evaluation consisted in:

- Document reviews and interviews with management personnel at the Corner Brook office (administration)
- Field visits where meetings were held with field supervisors and operators; for logistical reasons and travel efficiency, a helicopter was used
- Meetings with stakeholders.

1.1.3 Selected FMUs and Rationale

CBPPL had made the list of all activities that were taking place at the time of the audit as well as location of HCVF present in the different FMU's. The sites were selected by the audit team based on the activity type and the location that would allow covering all selected sites in the most efficient way. The table below presents the active sites per district at the time of the audit. On active sites workers performing task were interviewed as well as contractor supervisors and CBPPL staff. The scope of the interviews covered the workers knowledge of the work instructions applicable to their activities, Health and Safety, working conditions and knowledge of FSC.

1.1.4 Sites Visited

Sites visited				
Management unit	Site #	Location	Activities audited	Indicators assessed
16		Hughes Brook – North West Forest Resources	Mechanical logging	P4-P5-P6-P7-P8
16		Weasel Pond – Major’s logging	Mechanical logging	P4-P5-P6-P7-P8
	Block K-05-07	Home Pond H&B Silviculture	Scarification	P4-P5-P6-P7-P8
	Block 21	Home Pond Arthur Fowlow Ltd	Mechanical logging	P4-P5-P6-P7-P8
	Block 23	Home Pond Arthur Fowlow Ltd	Mechanical logging, Log loading/trucking	P4-P5-P6-P7-P8
	Block K-06-03	Careless Cove - Arthur Fowlow Ltd	Road construction	P4-P5-P6-P7-P8

1.1.5 Stakeholder Consultation

Interest group of stakeholders contacted	# of stakeholders contacted	# of stakeholders having made comments	Observations resulting from stakeholder consultation
Individuals and enterprises	8		None
Municipalities	4		None
First Nations	5	2	Expressed the need to reduce access to the land (roads). CBPPL represent a good Steward of the land. Looking for in kind support from CBPPL.
Contractors	3		None
Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)	14	3	Good progress has been made since the process started. Consider that the company has been proactive in the consultation process. Implementation of the CBFA is an important part to ensure continued cooperation in the process. Protected areas will be the first area to focus on followed by the caribou situation. Expect CBPPL to endorsed large landscape habitat. CBBPL must review the distribution list for the PAC meeting minutes. Some NGOs consider that Old Growth should be evaluated first for the entire Island and then overlapped the results with the DFA

			information. NGO that own private land want to be notified when the operations are coming close to the properties (less than 500 m)
Associations	15		None
Governments	12		None
Education	4		None

1.1.6 Additional Evaluation Techniques

No other evaluation techniques were used other than field visits and interviews.

1.1.7 Update on any changes to the scope of the certificate

There are no changes in the scope of the evaluation. Only the format has changed.
Forest management activities on forest management districts no. 5, 6, 9, 14 and 16
Products: softwood pulp (W1.1), softwood sawlogs (W1.1), hardwood fuel wood (W1.2) and softwood and hardwood hog fuel (W1.2).

The update shall include;

a) Changes in the basic quantitative information as collected at the initial audit(Section 1 of main assessment report):
No changes
b) List of chemical pesticides used within the forest area since the last audit, summarized quantitative data on their use (amount and area) and reason for use;
Vision Max, 991 liters in 2013, to to prepare sites for tree planting by controlling the growth of herbaceous plants, mainly raspberry.
c) Number of accidents in forest work (serious / fatal) since the last audit.
None

2.0 STANDARD(S)

2.1 Standard Used

For this audit we have used the National Boreal Standard August 6, 2004

You may get a copy of the standard at the following address:
www.fsccanada.org/fmstandards.htm

2.2 Description of Local Adaptation of Generic Standard

Not applicable

3.0 OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE #1: COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS AND FSC PRINCIPLES	
Criterion 1.1 Compliance with national and local laws and administrative requirements.	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 1.2 Payment of fees, taxes etc.	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 1.3 Compliance with international agreements	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 1.4 Documenting of conflicts with laws.	
<p>The company has documented the situations in which the compliance with the laws or regulations conflicts with compliance with FSC principles, criteria, or indicators. Indicators 6.6.2, 6.6.3, 6.6.4, 6.3.5 and 6.9.1 were found to be conflictual. Letter was sent to FSC Canada to identify those elements. These issues were also presented at the 2012 Annual General meeting of the Canadian Institute of Forestry on October 3rd 2012 in a presentation entitled "Managing our Forest for Forest Stewardship Council Certification at Corner Brook Pulp and Paper".</p>	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 1.5 Protection from illegal activities	
<p>A verification item is present in the Environmental incident report to document illegal activities (EMS reference 4.5.2) EMS`SFM handbook Manual 1 Section 15 documents the purpose of this procedure to document and report illegal activities. Incidents would be treated through the Corrective actions process.</p> <p>Review of records indicates no incident related to illegal activities.</p> <p>Whistleblower policy in place also to encourage workers to inform proper supervisor of any illegal activities that may take place.</p>	
Strength Whistleblower policy	Weakness
Criterion 1.6 Adherence to FSC principles.	
Document signed by VP and General manager and Woodlands Manager August 2011. The policy clearly identifies the company's commitment to FSC and its intention to protect and maintain the ecological integrity of the forest in the long-term.	
Strength	Weakness Knowledge of the rules for use of FSC [®] trademarks
PRINCIPLE #2 TENURE AND USE RIGHTS AND REPSONSIBILITIES	

Criterion 2.1 Evidence of forest use rights.	
CBPPL has exclusive ownership of the timber resource on the FMUs. This right originates from several sources, a series of agreements, purchases, deeds, grants, and licenses dating from 1922 to 1994. The Bowater's Newfoundland Act of 1938 amended the term and conditions of all timber licenses currently held and subsequently acquired by CBPPL. By this Act, the term of all licenses held by CBPPL at that time and any future licenses subsequently acquired by the Company was extended to 99 years, commencing on the 29th day of November 1938	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 2.2 Local communities with use rights can protect their rights and resources.	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 2.3 Appropriate mechanisms to resolve disputes.	
No dispute of any kind on the territory. Five year plan consultation process generates comments and request that are documented in a register for each of the FMD. Comments and request from stakeholders or general public are addressed and responded by CBPPL. MOU are agreed and signed with some stakeholders (ex: outfitters)	
Strength	Weakness
PRINCIPLE #3 INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' RIGHTS	
<p>The following conclusion for the application of P3 in this case of certification for the FMUs in the province of Newfoundland is based on:</p> <p>Interviews with the Federation of Newfoundland Indians representative Interviews with the Conne River band representative (Miawpukek) CBPPL's lawyer from the firm McInnes Cooper Supreme Court of Canada, Appeal dismissed May 3 2007 Newfoundland and Labrador - Heard: January 23 - February 6, 2006 / Judgment: October 11, 2006</p> <p>Information gathered through the court decision review and interviews confirm that the Mi'kmaq have no special Aboriginal rights to hunt, fish, or trap in forested areas.</p> <p>Although the Aboriginal People on the island of Newfoundland have no special rights to Crown land, their knowledge of sustainable forest management will be taken into account in the development of CBPPL's Sustainable Forest Management Plan. This will be achieved through active participation of Aboriginal People on the Public Advisory Committee (PAC) or other direct involvement with the interested communities. It is important, therefore, that the target of representation of the Aboriginal People on the PAC is maintained or other means of communication are put in place.</p> <p>We conclude that the court ruling makes C3.1 and C3.2 not applicable. C3.1 makes a clear reference to the lands and territories. The intent of C3.1 defines Land and territories of the indigenous people as: 1) Those areas where Aboriginal title still exists, that is where no treaties are in place (such lands may be subject to a formal land claim); and, 2) Those areas subject to historical (pre-Confederation and post-Confederation) or modern-day treaties. Our understanding of C3.1 is to the effect the no land title exists, no treaties are in in place and there</p>	

<p>is no land claim. C3.2 relates to the impact that forest management may have on the resources or tenures right. The court ruling is clear about the rights of indigenous tenures rights and resources. QMI SAI Global is not making at this point an interpretation of the Court ruling but only considers it as valid and unbiased information to make its decision. C3.3 and C3.4 are found to be applicable in the context of the related scope of certification because they are not linked directly to Aboriginal titles/Treaty rights It is understood that the possibility of future interpretations of Aboriginal rights may require CBPPL to review its approach accordingly. Any new interpretations/Court ruling will be evaluated by CBPPL and QMI SAI Global will ensure that CBPPL is in compliance with any changes.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	
<p>NA see introduction under P3 above</p>	
<p>Strength</p>	<p>Weakness</p>
<p>Criterion 3.2 Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of Indigenous Peoples.</p>	
<p>NA see introduction under P3 above</p>	
<p>Strength</p>	<p>Weakness</p>
<p>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.</p>	
<p>CBPPL has met with, and continue to meet with the Conne River (Miawpukek) band. Initial meeting with the Chief and council was held on October 19 2011, and a follow-up meeting to present maps to the Band Council was held on November 14, 2011.</p> <p>Band Elders in the community reviewed the maps, and on September 24 2012 another meeting between CBPPL and Miawpukek First Nations was held. Mapped values were presented to CBPPL. At that time a request for GIS shape files was made so that CBPPL could evaluate the impacts to wood supply and where possible incorporate these values into forest management planning in the area.</p> <p>In addition, a representative of the Miawpukek Indian band council gave a presentation to the CBPPL Woodlands Public Advisory Committee (PAC) on March 14 2012. The representative of the Miawpukek Indian band council was invited to become an active member of the PAC. On October 11, 2012, the Forestry Manager with Miawpukek First Nations officially became a member of the CBPPL woodlands Public Advisory committee. The Corner Brook Indian Band Council have been a member of the Public Advisory Committee since it was formed in 2003</p> <p>Also Aboriginal groups in Newfoundland will be invited to participate in the Canadian Boreal Forest Agreement Process.</p> <p>The representative from the Qalipu FN indicated that they are working on refreshing that data to of spiritual and cultural values that will be shared with CBPPL.</p>	
<p>Strength</p>	<p>Weakness</p>

Improved communication between CBPPL and FN communities.	
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.	
<p>A representative of the Miawpukek Indian band council gave a presentation to the CBPPL Woodlands Public Advisory Committee (PAC) on March 14 2012. The representative of the Miawpukek Indian band council was invited to become an active member of the PAC. A member of the Corner Brook Indian Band Council is a regular member of the CBPPL PAC.</p> <p>Whenever guests are invited to give a presentation to the PAC they are compensated for travel, meals and accommodations. Regular PAC members are compensated for meals, travel and accommodations as per the CBPPL standard practice.</p> <p>Miawpukek First Nations were compensated for travel and meals to compile information for the values mapping exercise</p>	
Strength	Weakness
PRINCIPE 4 COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND FOREST WORKERS' RIGHTS	
Criterion 4.1 The communities within or adjacent to the forest management area should be given the opportunity for employment, training, and other services.	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 4.2 Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.	
<p>Health and safety Policy in place and signed by Woodland manager December 7. 2010. Monitoring for OH&S is done through the number 2 inspection. Annual schedule is divided by quarter. All contractors are visited 3 times a year. All workers are covered by the provincial WHSCC. The collective agreement has provision for extra provincial coverage such as dental plan, life insurance and short term disability.</p>	
Strength Improvement in OSHA rate from 4.99 in 2012 to 0 as of June 22 2013	Weakness
Criterion 4.3 The rights of workers to organize and voluntarily negotiate with their employers shall be guaranteed as outlined in Conventions 87 and 98 of the International Labour Organization (ILO).	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 4.4 Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups directly affected by management operations.	

Public consultations are conducted for the five year operating plan. Requests are documented and can be found in the operating plan binder for each operating plan. DNR and CBPPL conduct the consultation jointly for each district (FMU). DNR sends the public invitation and make publicity in local paper. The report issued by DNR following the environmental assessment contains comments/recommendations/concerns issued by government agencies. CBPPL must ensure to document consistently how these issues are being addressed. CBPPL must ensure to seek inputs from all Indigenous forest users.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 4.5 Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed for resolving grievances and for providing fair compensation in the case of loss or damage affecting the legal or customary rights, property, resources, or livelihoods of local peoples. Measures shall be taken to avoid such loss or damage.	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
PRINCIPE 5 BENEFITS FROM THE FOREST	
Criterion 5.1 Forest management should strive toward economic viability, while taking into account the full environmental, social, and operational costs of production, and ensuring the investments necessary to maintain the ecological productivity of the forest.	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 5.2 Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest’s diversity of products.	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 5.3 Forest management should minimize waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources.	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 5.4 Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, avoiding dependence on a single forest product.	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 5.5 Forest management operations shall recognize, maintain, and where appropriate, enhance the value of forest services and resources, such as watersheds and fisheries.	
Through its environmental management system and its sustainable forest management plan, CBPP has put in place a monitoring program that allows to control and measure the effectiveness of the various protection measures put in place to protect non-timber forest values.	

<p>Table 7 of the HCVF report includes for each HCV: Management objectives Indicators and threshold Operational monitoring Monitoring of management strategies effectiveness</p>	
Strength	Weakness
<p>Criterion 5.6 The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.</p>	
<p>CBPPL is committed to the application of the Forest management strategy in order to respect the AAC estimate and is applicability. The audit found that CBPPL respects the rate of harvest and do not exceed the level that can be permanently sustained.</p>	
Strength	Weakness
<p>PRINCIPE 6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</p>	
<p>Criterion 6.1 Environmental impact assessments.</p>	
<p>Not audited during the S1 audit</p>	
Strength	Weakness
<p>Criterion 6.2 Safeguards must exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas).</p>	
<p>When Management activities are approved by Wildlife division, special considerations as outlined in DNR certificate of Managed Lands are adhered to. CBPPL has provided training to all relevant forest workers on the identification of species at risk, appropriate measures are taken when a species at risk or sign of a species at risk (e.g., a nest) is identified during field operations. Field audit confirmed that workers are aware of the species at risk.</p>	
<p>Strength New cue cards on Species at risk were distributed personnel</p>	<p>Weakness While some mapping does exist on numerous sheets and in the HCVF report, it appears at a rather coarse scale, and might not be useful in judging the need to do anything at a stand level.</p>
<p>Criterion 6.3 Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced or restored.</p>	
<p>CBPPL use the spatial modeling software Woodstock and Stanley for long term planning. The system allows taking into consideration, forest age, intact habitat, species composition, remoteness. Field audit and inspection report demonstrate field maps indicate that planning takes into consideration the vegetation types, soil types etc. CBPPL has an Access Management Plan, where the values of the forest identified by all stakeholders, the impact of forest access roads on these values, and a management strategy to eliminate or minimize any negative impacts are listed. Regeneration is assed for all areas being harvested and timely regeneration occurs. Wildlife habitat and other resources are taken into account at the planning level and however the group of 3 EMS and harvest area compliance sheets and utilization tally sheet do not well cover the intent of this entire indicator.</p>	

Strength	Weakness Operational activities needed to be spatially depicted over the long-term planning horizon are not available. The Department of Environment and Conservation is developing a Natural Areas System Plan (NASP) which will “establish a comprehensive system of publicly supported parks and protected areas. The NSAP has not been released yet, therefore the Gaps are not publically known.
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.	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 6.5 Written guidelines shall be prepared and implemented to: control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbances; and protect water resources.	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 6.6 Management systems shall promote the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management and strive to avoid the use of chemical pesticides.	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 6.7 Chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes including fuel and oil shall be disposed of in an environmentally appropriate manner at off-site locations.	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
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.	
All applications of Biological control agents are carried out by the Provincial Department of Natural Resources in accordance with all applicable laws. Records of application rest with DNR as they are responsible for the pest management program for the province.	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 6.9 The use of exotic species is carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.	
Norway spruce, an exotic tree, has been planted on about 1000 ha to date, trees are not yet seed-bearing age, and the species is not considered invasive. Nevertheless, there may be subtle effects	

<p>over the long term from planting any tree on an area for which it would not colonise naturally. CBPPL will stop planting Norway Spruce. Foresters in NL. (CIF) feels that there will be no impact to the provincial wood supply if CBPPL takes this action. Minutes of EMS management review committee Jan 14 and Feb 12 2013 confirms this.</p> <p>A list of non-invasive exotic species from the Canadian Botanical Conservation Network “Invasive Plant List” was used to generate a seed mix for CBPPL Forestry Operations. Contractors have been notified of a supplier and will purchase only the seed mix specified. “seed mix ”</p>	
<p>Strength CBPPL has found a source of seed mix for NL. It is a custom mix for CBPPL and does not contain invasive plants. The road SOPs was changed to allow the use of this seed mix.</p>	<p>Weakness</p>
<p>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.</p>	
<p>Not audited during the S1 audit</p>	
<p>Strength</p>	<p>Weakness</p>
<p>PRINCIPE 7 MANAGEMENT PLAN</p>	
<p>Criterion 7.1 Content of management plan.</p>	
<p>Not audited during the S1 audit</p>	
<p>Strength</p>	<p>Weakness</p>
<p>Criterion 7.2 The management plan shall be periodically revised to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances.</p>	
<p>Not audited during the S1 audit</p>	
<p>Strength</p>	<p>Weakness</p>
<p>Criterion 7.3 Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plan.</p>	
<p>Not audited during the S1 audit</p>	
<p>Strength</p>	<p>Weakness</p>
<p>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.</p>	

Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
PRINCIPE 8 MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT	
Criterion 8.1 Frequency and intensity of monitoring.	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 8.2 Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators:	
<p>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.</p>	
<p>Every year, there is a series of report by licence being process and transmitted to the DNR reporting all volume by species and categories of product. Collection of information is done through the past annual operations report, that integrate fire wood, exchanges volumes, and transfer to other parties. For the forest inventory regeneration, there is a financial contribution from CB to the DNR for the management of the program of regeneration and growth rate improvement of the database. Thus a lot of monitoring is being planned and done.</p>	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 8.3 Documentation shall be provided by the forest manager to enable monitoring and certifying organizations to trace each forest product from its origin, a process known as the "chain of custody."	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 8.4 The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 8.5 While respecting the confidentiality of some information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.	
Not audited during the S1 audit	
Strength	Weakness
PRINCIPE 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.	
<p>An HCVF assessment has been conducted according to the FSC recommended National Framework (D. Hearn 2011, High Conservation Value Forest Assessment Report, Hearn Consulting Inc.). CBPPL has met with, and continue to meet with the Conne River (Miawpukek) band. Initial meeting with the Chief and council was held on October 19 2011, and a follow-up meeting to present maps to the Band Council was held on November 14, 2011.</p> <p>Band Elders in the community reviewed the maps, and on September 24 2012 another meeting between CBPPL and Miawpukek First Nations was held. Mapped values were presented to CBPPL. At that time a request for GIS shape files was made so that CBPPL could evaluate the impacts to wood supply and where possible incorporate these values into forest management planning in the area.</p> <p>In addition, a representative of the Miawpukek Indian band council gave a presentation to the CBPPL Woodlands Public Advisory Committee (PAC) on March 14 2012. The representative of the Miawpukek Indian band council was invited to become an active member of the PAC. On October 11, 2012, the Forestry Manager with Miawpukek First Nations officially became a member of the CBPPL woodlands Public Advisory committee. The Corner Brook Indian Band Council have been a member of the Public Advisory Committee since it was formed in 2003</p> <p>Also Aboriginal groups in Newfoundland will be invited to participate in the Canadian Boreal Forest Agreement Process.</p> <p>The representative from the Qalipu FN indicated that they are working on refreshing that data to of spiritual and cultural values that will be shared with CBPPL.</p>	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 9.2 The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.	
<p>The report describes in details the purpose and methodology used in the process of the identification for HCVF. Following the release of the HVCF report, several stakeholders have recently sent comments to CBPPL and some stakeholders shared their concerns with the audit team. CBPPL will have to demonstrate that these concerns are evaluated and responses are documented.</p>	
Strength	Weakness
Criterion 9.3 The management plan shall include and implement specific measures that ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. These measures shall be specifically included in the publicly available management plan summary.	
<p>The HCVF report has been reviewed and republished in July 2013. Management objective and strategies were reviewed, indicator and threshold added and monitoring reviewed or added for some values. Means of verification of the effectiveness of the strategies were also added (see table 7 of the report). Many provincial and local experts have contributed to this review.</p>	
Strength	Weakness

HCV Science committee	
Criterion 9.4 Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.	
The modification and improvement of section 7 demonstrate the link and relation between the management strategies and measures selected to maintain or restore High Conservation Values are consistent with a precautionary approach, and with respect to each conservation attribute.	
In 2012, CBPPL reported on its monitoring of every measure applied to protect HCV during its forest management activities. Report is entitled "2012 Monitoring of HCVs".	
Strength	Weakness
PRINCIPE10 – PLANTATIONS	
Principle 10 does not apply to the operation of CBPPL. None of the forest practices are considered to be plantation according to the FSC definition.	

3.1 Observations on review and resolution of complaint

No complaint were received since the initial audit

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

Not applicable – No pesticide derogation.

4.0 SURVEILLANCE DECISION

4.1 Non-Compliances

NC #:	2013-01	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Major
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.3.17		
Non-compliance:			
Minor NC 2012-22 Upgraded to Major Although the current documentation (SOP and 5 year plan) includes provisions for the protection of riparian zones it does not reflect the same verbiage as found in the indicator 6.3.17 and 6.3.18 to ensure that when required the additional 45 meters measured from the end of the inner riparian reserve is applied at the operational level and that when required adequate measure are applied to ephemeral stream and not only those visible on a 1:50,000 map.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
NC Status:	Open		

NC #:	2013-02	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.3.1		
Non-compliance:			
The information about forest condition (forest age, intact habitat, species composition, remoteness) and the results of operational activities needed to be spatially depicted over the long-term planning horizon are not available.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
NC Status:	Open		

NC #:	2013-03	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 1.6.3		
Non-compliance:			
The applicant did not submit to SAI Global documents with FSC trademarks for approval as required by FSC-STD-50-001 V1-2			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
NC Status:	Open		

NC #:	2013-04	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.3.1		
Non-compliance:			
The information about forest condition (forest age, intact habitat, species composition, remoteness) and the results of operational activities needed to be spatially depicted over the long-term planning horizon are not available.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
NC Status:	Open		

4.2 Difficult Assessments

No specific aspects were difficult to assess during this audit.

4.3 Status of previous non-compliances

NC #:	2012-01	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 1.4.1		
Non-compliance:			
The evidence provided by the company to ensure that the compliance with the law and other regulations do not conflict with the FSC principles, criteria or indicator is not sufficient to address this criterion.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			

No new regulations applicable to the forestry operations. The company has documented the situations in which the compliance with the laws or regulations conflicts with compliance with FSC principles, criteria, or indicators. Indicators 6.6.2, 6.6.3, 6.6.4, 6.3.5 and 6.9.1 were found to be conflictual. Letter was sent to FSC Canada to identify those elements. These issues were also presented at the 2012 Annual General meeting of the Canadian Institute of Forestry on October 3rd 2012 in a presentation entitled "Managing our Forest for Forest Stewardship Council Certification at Corner Brook Pulp and Paper".	
NC Status:	Closed

NC #:	2012-02	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 1.6.3		
Non-compliance:			
The use of FSC trademark in documents without the appropriate subscript was observed on some of the training material.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
Organization will stop producing training material without appropriate subscript. All material with the scheme trademarks will be submitted for approval by the Environmental Management Representative.			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-03	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 2.1.1		
Non-compliance:			
No clear evidence exists to ensure that hardwoods management activities comply with applicable FSC requirements and don't threaten the maintenance of the identified HCVF or protected areas.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
Information has been added to the firewood permits (for districts 15, 16, 5 & 6) to indicate yellow birch and black ash are HCVs. District 14 is conducting surveys in the district to determine the value of Yellow birch over 50cm. Distribute FAC training brochure with Commercial Hardwood Permits. Discussed with District Eco System Manager best Management strategy approach for Yellow Birch Verified the cutting permit issued by CBPPL for districts 15, 16, 5 & 6 – Restriction added to the permit "Cutting of yellow birch greater than 50 cm (dbh), White pine, Red pine and black ash is not permitted. Communication and discussion with DNR rep for district 9 and 14. DNR will include the CBPPL brochure on Species at risk and HCVF that includes restriction of cutting Yellow birch.			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-04	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 3.3.1		
Non-compliance:			
No evidence that CBPPL supports the efforts of the Conne river band (Miawpukek) to conduct land use studies and mapping for aboriginal values.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
CBPPL has met with, and continue to meet with the Conne River (Miawpukek) band. Initial meeting with the Chief and council was held on October 19 2011, and a follow-up meeting to present maps to the Band Council was held on November 14, 2011.			

Band Elders in the community reviewed the maps, and on September 24 2012 another meeting between CBPPL and Miawpukek First Nations was held. Mapped values were presented to CBPPL. At that time a request for GIS shape files was made so that CBPPL could evaluate the impacts to wood supply and where possible incorporate these values into forest management planning in the area.

In addition a representative of the Miawpukek Indian band council gave a presentation to the CBPPL Woodlands Public Advisory Committee (PAC) on March 14 2012. The representative of the Miawpukek Indian band council was invited to become an active member of the PAC. On October 11, 2012, Forestry Manager with Miawpukek First Nations officially became a member of the CBPPL woodlands Public Advisory committee. The Corner Brook Indian Band Council have been a member of the Public Advisory Committee since it was formed in 2003

Also Aboriginal groups in Newfoundland will be invited to participate in the Canadian Boreal Forest Agreement Process.

NC Status:	Closed
-------------------	--------

NC #:	2012-05	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 3.4.1		
Non-compliance:			
<p>CBPPL does not have in place an agreement that would cover the compensation for the use of traditional knowledge that leads to the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commercial use of a forest species, in particular non-timber forest products; - Improved management plans; or - Improved operations 			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
<p>A representative of the Miawpukek Indian band council gave a presentation to the CBPPL Woodlands Public Advisory Committee (PAC) on March 14 2012. The representative of the Miawpukek Indian band council was invited to become an active member of the PAC. A member of the Corner Brook Indian Band Council is a regular member of the CBPPL PAC.</p> <p>Whenever guests are invited to give a presentation to the PAC they are compensated for travel, meals and accommodations. Regular PAC members are compensated for meals, travel and accommodations as per the CBPPL standard practice.</p> <p>Miawpukek First Nations were compensated for travel and meals to compile information for the values mapping exercise.</p> <p>Auditor interviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conne River (Miawpukek) band representative - Qalipu first Nation representative 			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-06	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 4.4.2		
Non-compliance:			
The report issued by DNR following the environmental assessment contains comments/recommendations/concerns issued by government agencies. CBPPL did not ensure to document consistently how these issues are being addressed.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
CBPPL has develop a <u>file/table of documentation</u> for each Five Year Plan detailing comments/recommendations/ concerns issued by Government Agencies and other parties how the issues are being addressed. Auditor has reviewed the tables and contents.			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-07	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 4.4.3		
Non-compliance:			
The company did not seek inputs from all Indigenous forest users and communities affected by or interested in forest management in the area under certification.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
CBPPL has met with, and continue to meet with the Conne River (Miawpukek) band. Initial meeting with the Chief and council was held on October 19 2011, and a follow-up meeting to present maps to the Band Council was held on November 14, 2011.			
Band Elders in the community reviewed the maps, and on September 24 2012 another meeting between CBPPL and Miawpukek First Nations was held. Mapped values were presented to CBPPL. At that time a request for GIS shape files was made so that CBPPL could evaluate the impacts to wood supply and where possible incorporate these values into forest management planning in the area.			
In addition a representative of the Miawpukek Indian band council gave a presentation to the CBPPL Woodlands Public Advisory Committee (PAC) on March 14 2012. The representative of the Miawpukek Indian band council was invited to become an active member of the PAC. On October 11, 2012, Forestry Manager with Miawpukek First Nations officially became a member of the CBPPL woodlands Public Advisory committee. The Corner Brook Indian Band Council have been a member of the Public Advisory Committee since it was formed in 2003			
Also Aboriginal groups in Newfoundland will be invited to participate in the Canadian Boreal Forest Agreement Process.			
The audit team met with the representative of the Miawpukek Indian band council during this surveillance audit to confirm the above statements.			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-08	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 4.4.5		
Non-compliance:			
The Ground rules for the Planning Team do not include all the required clause of the standard i.e. conflict of interest, Access to information (including the FSC Boreal Standard)			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
<p>CBPPL worked with DNR Ecosystem planners to develop Ground Rules that satisfy the FSC Boreal Standard i.e. Conflict of Interest and Access to information. Arrange a meeting with Ecosystem planners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clause in the Terms of Reference to clarify Conflict of Interest • Clause in the Terms of Reference to make available Certification schemes including FSC boreal standard <p>In the revision of the 5 year operating plan under section 5 a paragraph was added to cover the Conflict of interest “ <i>The CBPPL representative also spoke on the issue of the need for a conflict of interest process to address occasions when team members other than a specific land use stakeholder (not including CBPPL or DNR) may be in a personal conflict of interest situation on a particular matter before the planning team. In such an occasion, the person or group with the personal conflict should remove himself from the final decision. There was general agreement from all at the meeting. It was suggested by a DNR representative that CBPPL write a letter to the person at DNR responsible for modifying the planning team ground rules to suggest this addition.</i></p>			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-09	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 5.5.1		
Non-compliance:			
Some monitoring strategies described in the HCVF assessment report are not yet integrated in the various EMS field inspection forms (e.g. protection of PIR, PIB, FRN, BOJ, aboriginal sacred sites, salmon habitat protection measure, etc.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
<p>The HCVF report has been reviewed (dated July 2013).</p> <p>Table 7 of the HCVF report now includes for each HCV: Management objectives Indicators and threshold Operational monitoring Monitoring of management strategies effectiveness</p> <p>The modification and improvement of section 7 demonstrate the link and relation between the management strategies and measures selected to maintain or restore High Conservation Values are consistent with a precautionary approach, and with respect to each conservation attribute.</p> <p>In 2012, CBPPL reported on its monitoring of every measure applied to protect HCV during it forest management activities. Report is entitled “2012 Monitoring of HCVs”.</p> <p>The EMS compliance inspection instruction (HR-02) now includes HCV monitoring and allow for reporting level of compliance after forest management activities.</p>			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-10	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.1.6		
Non-compliance:			
CPAWS has commented on the PIC report following the peer review process. Although a meeting is to take place with the authors. CBPPL has not yet responded to CPAWS comments.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
Documentation submitted by CBPPL showed that the authors of the PIC analysis (Wayne A. Brown and E. Doyle Wells) have responded and reply to every questions and comments received from the representatives of CPAWS. Therefore procedure complies with the requirements of clause 6.1.6 on public review of the PIC analysis.			
Ref: Comments from CPAWS on the PIC analysis			
e-mails between CPAWS, CBPPL and PIC analysis authors between February 2013 and June 2013.			
Responses to CPAWS from PIC analysis authors and CBPPL			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-11	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.1.9		
Non-compliance:			
No clear evidence that data collected at the landscape level were used, discussed with regards to modifications to practices/plans			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
When data is collected (Landscape PSPs) it is used in the provincial wood supply analysis. This data is used to determine landscape level management of the provincial forest. Data collected include; Growth and Yield (G&Y) and wildlife information, (song bird and scat info) ground vegetation, soil profiles, woody debris, and forest growth info.			
Forestry - Growth & Yield (G&Y) data such as Permanent Sample Plots (PSPs) & Temporary Sample plots (TSPs) are measured on a 5year rotation with 1/5 th of the Province remeasured and volume recorded annually. There are currently 930 PSPs and 9,300 TSPs occurring throughout the provincial G&Y database database. The inventory growth and yield database is updated and recompiled every five years producing Eco region based yield curves used in the provincial wood supply analysis. Results from the provincial wood supply analysis include 1) Provincial Annual Allowable Cuts (AAC) (by owner by District) and 2) 25year spatial harvest schedule. (where to harvest by owner) The first ten years of the 25 year harvest schedule forms the basic building blocks upon which the proposed 5yr plan harvest operating areas are built. Nontraditional forestry type attributes are also included in the PSP remeasurement and include: songbird surveys, rabbit surveys and coarse woody debris however it is unclear how or to what extent this data is being compiled or used. No clear evidence of such.			
Wildlife –			
Pine Marten - Marten modeling and subsequent hair snag work is currently ongoing has proven to be a useful tool for managers in determining habitat preferences and presence absence at the landscape level. These results have been used by the wildlife division and several planning teams in determining harvest priorities, habitat avoidance and in the case of Zone 6 volume caps for particular operating areas. In recent years CBPPL has contributed financially and operationally by taking part in such hair snag work.			
Caribou – The provinces Department of E&C has developed and spatially defined core and secondary			

caribou areas for managers to use and guide them when developing 5yr plans. Currently core and secondary caribou areas have been spatially identified and associated with timing of harvest constraint or in some cases no development or activity.

Tourism – Viewscapes and outfitter values are also considered. Landscape values are considered in the 5yr plan development. The current zone 6 plans provide a good example of this where a viewscapes analysis was completed and helped define the harvest design in and around the Corner Brook area.

NC Status:	Closed
-------------------	--------

NC #:	2012-12	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
--------------	---------	-------------------------------------	-------

Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.2.2
-------------------------------	-----------------

Non-compliance:

Five year operating plans do show support of the intent to manage carefully for identified species at risk; similarly for the HCVF report. Nevertheless, cover types (habitats) of these species are either not mapped or suitable cover type information is lacking, or (e.g., marten) structural forest conditions of critical forest are well described in operating plans but the link with locations and maps of the land base is yet missing.

Evidence provided to close the NC

Only G1 and G2 Plants are required by the Boreal Standard. CBPPL has begun to implement new initiatives related to management strategies to maintain attributes of species at risk HCVs. CBPPL staff members have begun training to identify suitable sites for Boreal Felt Lichen colonization. A brochure depicting species at risk and rare tree species on the DFA has developed and used to train CBPPL employees how to recognize these species, and what to do if one is seen. CBPPL is partnering with CFS, DNR and MUN to fund a graduate student research project that will develop a predictive model for boreal felt lichen occurrence. IBES

Other than the species designated at risk by legislation in the previous paragraph, there are a number of S1-S3 species that occur on the DFA: 6 rare birds, 12 listed plants (candidate species for COSEWIC), and 68 rare plants. During a recent meeting with the Endangered Species and Biodiversity Section, it was confirmed that any of these species that could be at risk from CBPPL’s harvesting, roads-building, or silviculture operations would be identified during the Environmental Assessment process, when the Wildlife Division reviews the 5-Year Operating Plans. The Wildlife Division also reviews CBPPL Annual Operating Plans (AOP), whereby areas are assessed for occurrence of these species. If any S1-S3 species occur inside areas that are proposed for harvest, protection measures are included in the conditions of approval to operate. Claudia Hanel, Botanist with the Endangered Species and Biodiversity section, has indicated that these S1-S3 species occur in very specific habitats; many are found along rivers and would be protected by the current minimum 20m buffers required in the Environmental Protection Guidelines (EPG). Others are found in serpentine or limestone areas (talus slopes) which have already been assessed as HCVs.

In future, the Planning Department of CBPPL will work closely with the Wildlife Division before the EA process, to identify potential areas of concern for rare species (legislated or not), so that mitigative measures can be built in to the 5-Year Operating Plans. A Meeting was held in October with Claudia Hanel before submitting the 2013 AOP

We will seek Shape files and protect this information with a confidentially agreement. The locations of rare plants will not appear on our maps, instead will be a layer used by the planners when determining harvest boundaries.

<p>Auditor has reviewed the report from Wildlife division NL Dept Env. and Conservation May 15 2013 – Rare vascular plants and CBPPL.</p> <p>The report presents a map of eighteen plants hotspot all located in Western NFL. The boundaries of the hot spots were often extended to encompass an entire ecosystem, such as a shoreline or chain of cliffs and talus slopes. In several cases, habitats are included in a single hotspot.</p>	
NC Status:	Closed

NC #:	2012-13	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.2.5		
Non-compliance:			
While attention is given to some species in 5 year operation plans, the new HCVF report and public review indicate that other species may need to be added to management plan guidelines.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
<p>There are a number of S1-S3 species that occur on the DFA: 6 rare birds, 12 listed plants (candidate species for COSEWIC), and 68 rare plants. During a recent meeting with the Endangered Species and Biodiversity Section, it was confirmed that any of these species that could be at risk from CBPPL’s harvesting, roads-building, or silviculture operations would be identified during the Environmental Assessment process, when the Wildlife Division reviews the 5-Year Operating Plans. The Wildlife Division also reviews CBPPL Annual Operating Plans (AOP), whereby areas are assessed for occurrence of these species. If any S1-S3 species occur inside areas that are proposed for harvest, protection measures are included in the conditions of approval to operate. Claudia Hanel, Botanist with the Endangered Species and Biodiversity section, has indicated that these S1-S3 species occur in very specific habitats; many are found along rivers and would be protected by the current minimum 20m buffers required in the Environmental Protection Guidelines (EPG). Others are found in serpentine or limestone areas (talus slopes) which have already been assessed as HCVs.</p> <p>In future, the Planning Department of CBPPL will work closely with the Wildlife Division before the EA process, to identify potential areas of concern for rare species (legislated or not), so that meditative measures can be built in to the 5-Year Operating Plans. A Meeting was held in October with Claudia Hanel before submitting the 2013 AOP</p> <p>Auditor has reviewed the report from Wildlife division NL Dept Env. and Conservation May 15 2013 – Rare vascular plants and CBPPL.</p> <p>The report presents a map of eighteen plants hotspot all located in Western NFL. The boundaries of the hot spots were often extended to encompass an entire ecosystem, such as a shoreline or chain of cliffs and talus slopes. In several cases, habitats are included in a single hotspot.</p>			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-14	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.3.4		
Non-compliance:			
The pre-industrial report does not show strong quantitative evaluations of the various forest communities across space, at least across the many ecological districts and ecotypes currently recognized on CBPPL land. It is important to develop the best means possible for judging whether pre-industrial communities are under-represented and where their retention is possible.			

Evidence provided to close the NC	
The evidence presented to address the NC remains incomplete since part of the information is on the Natural Areas System Plan (NASP) not available. The NSAP has not been released yet, therefore the Gaps are not publically known.	
NC Status:	Remains open for another 12 months / until next surveillance audit.

NC #:	2012-15	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.3.5		
Non-compliance:			
Even though the old forests (80+) in all FMUs represent 29% the current Province ecosystem policy sets a minimum threshold of 15% of old forest which is below the requirement of the indicator and on which AAC calculation are based. The applicant must take into consideration the intent of this indicator.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
CBPPL Woodlands will continue to harvest AAC in the DFA within the levels set forth by government (Indicator 2.2.2). Although AAC calculations are based on retaining a minimum of 15 % old forest, CBPPL will monitor the % old forest and retain a level above 20% as per FSC indicator 6.3.5 A 25-Year Spatial Plan is developed by CBPPL staff and submitted to the government for approval. This plan will ensure CBPPL stays within the assigned AAC levels. The government re-calculates the AAC every five years using the latest data possible to incorporate into the analysis. CBPPL, in conjunction with the government, will closely monitor regeneration assumptions used in the model to ensure that they are accurate. This continual improvement in regeneration assumptions ensures that future projections age classes are more reliable than in the previous model, thus providing a framework to manage this indicator more accurately with the development of each successive model. More reliable data will allow us to make better management decisions. A VOIT under CSA indicator 1.1.3 gas been developed to track the trend.			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-16	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.3.6		
Non-compliance:			
There are no documented management strategies or targets that has been set for landscape patterns (disturbed and undisturbed patches), based upon the characterization of the pre-industrial forest to demonstrate that actual management strategies that generates cluster of small to medium size cutover areas scattered in the landscape are in line with the results of the PIC analysis.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
Management strategies has been developed to generate where required clusters of small to medium size cutover areas scattered in the landscape as per PIF Report section 5.5.3 pg 102 and “ <i>Resultant Forest Mosaic</i> ” pg. 115 and summary on pg. 124 & 125			
Foremen have been trained in the use of GPS technology to plan for leave patches while doing reconnaissance work prior to harvest. These areas will be mapped prior to harvest; monitoring will consist of comparing planned vs. actual and copies of the maps will be kept on file with the planning department. SOP Woodland PL- 07 Pre-harvest residual retention planning.			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-17	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.3.7		
Non-compliance:			
Wood harvest block sizes appear to conform to Environmental Assessment Process/5 year planning documents. Nevertheless, evaluation is needed on the degree to which harvest/silvicultural operations compare with best estimates on sizes and spatial patterns in the pre-industrial era (PIF report) and sizes and patterns associated with ecological values.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
Management strategies has been developed to generate where required clusters of small to medium size cutover areas scattered in the landscape as per PIF Report section 5.5.3 pg 102 and “ <i>Resultant Forest Mosaic</i> ” pg. 115 and summary on pg. 124 & 125			
Foremen have been trained in the use of GPS technology to plan for leave patches while doing reconnaissance work prior to harvest. These areas will be mapped prior to harvest; monitoring will consist of comparing planned vs. actual and copies of the maps will be kept on file with the planning department. SOP Woodland PL- 07 Pre-harvest residual retention planning.			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-18	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.3.10		
Non-compliance:			
Work instructions do not specify objectives for the retention of stems or residual structure to be left after stand management activities in normal harvesting or salvage operations (following natural disturbances). Specific ranges for the various structural components are not described in the forest management plan or work instructions.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
Modify SOP H-06 Leaving Wildlife Trees for Biodiversity (Oct 26 2012) + Management strategies has been developed to generate where required clusters of small to medium size cutover areas scattered in the landscape as per PIF Report section 5.5.3 pg. 102 and “ <i>Resultant Forest Mosaic</i> ” pg 115 and summary on pg. 124 & 125			
Foremen have been trained in the use of GPS technology to plan for leave patches while doing reconnaissance work prior to harvest. These areas will be mapped prior to harvest; monitoring will consist of comparing planned vs. actual and copies of the maps will be kept on file with the planning department. SOP Woodland PL- 07 Pre-harvest residual retention planning.			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-19	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Major (precondition)
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.3.12		
Non-compliance:			
Large areas of contiguous forest do exist on the land base, much of it over 80 years old (>29%). Despite the value of the new HCVF Report (Hearn 2011), it has not yet effectively generated set-asides of large areas. It is necessary for the company to make formal decisions in accordance with P 6.3.12. This undoubtedly entails: further direct collaboration with external stakeholders, developing a clear set of			

representative large core forest patches, with attendant descriptions of necessary prescriptions and/or restrictions on them, and keeping abreast of developments coming from the FSC Guidance on Caribou in the National Boreal Standard DRAFT February 25 2011. Note that, while much of the public concern about this criterion is for the management of caribou, the emphasis in 6.3.12 is more directly on representative forest types/communities	
Evidence provided to close the NC	
Following the on-site audit CBPPL has held meetings with various ENGOs (CBI, CPAWS, Nature conservancy) as a result of those discussions CBPPL has designated five areas to be added to the Large Intact Landscape area being proposed by the provincial government: Cat Arm (27,487 ha) in District 16; Hampton Downs (32,550 ha) in District 9; Grand Lake South (1,334 ha) in District 15; Bay d'Espoir (79,796 ha) in District 6; and a block (10,790 ha) in District 14. This represents an addition of 151957 ha. Harvesting will be prohibited in these areas for 5 years.	
NC Status:	Closed June 6, 2012

NC #:	2012-20	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.3.13		
Non-compliance:			
The field audit did not raised an issue around connectivity however it is likely that cover type/community type mapping will help show the degree of connectivity for different forest types. CBPPL must clearly demonstrate that from normal silvicultural/harvest operations on managed land the connectivity of all patch types is not jeopardized.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
Management strategies has been developed to generate where required clusters of small to medium size cutover areas scattered in the landscape as per PIF Report section 5.5.3 pg 102 and “ <i>Resultant Forest Mosaic</i> ” pg. 115 and summary on pg. 124 & 125			
Foremen have been trained in <u>the use of GPS technology</u> to plan for leave patches while doing reconnaissance work prior to harvest. These areas will be mapped prior to harvest; monitoring will consist of comparing planned vs. actual and copies of the maps will be kept on file with the planning department. SOP Woodland PL- 07 Pre-harvest residual retention planning.			
Leave patches identified by contractors, buffer regimes, identified wildlife corridors, deferral areas, and other mandated leave areas (Caribou core areas, and Pine Martin habitat blocks) are used by CBPPL planners to maintain connectivity between important wildlife habitats.			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-21	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.3.14		
Non-compliance:			
Old conifer forest is not the only forest community type on the company land base, nor even in productive forest alone. Formal objectives are lacking for species representative of principal habitat types and/or conditions other than the generally old forest type represented by caribou and marten.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
Information has been gathered in the HCVF report. In addition to the Table 4 that describes the habitat of the species at risk occurring on CBBPL’s DFA, the Appendix 6 presents for the vascular plants (S1-S3) their habitats group(s). Habitats are identified as :			

Shoreline/Aquatic Wetlands Cliffs and Talus slopes Forest Alpine/Subalpine Roadsides/Ditches	
NC Status:	Closed

NC #:	2012-22	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.3.17		
Non-compliance:			
Although the current documentation (SOP and 5 year plan) includes provisions for the protection of riparian zones it does not reflect the same verbiage as found in the indicator 6.3.17 and 6.3.18 to ensure that when required the additional 45 metres measured from the end of the inner riparian reserve is applied at the operational level and that when required adequate measure are applied to ephemeral stream and not only those visible on a 1:50,000 map.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
The FSC standard requires protection to all permanent bodies of water. At the time of the audit the SOP had not been updated to reflect such protection, in particular for the permanent unmapped brook.			
NC Status:	Upgraded to a major NC. See NC 2013-01		

NC #:	2012-23	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.4.1		
Non-compliance:			
CBPPL relies at this time on the NSAP system used by DNR for the identification of the protected areas. Since the NSAP has not yet been released, CBPPL does not know where the candidate protected areas evaluated by DNR for the 11 ecoregions part of the FMUs are. This situation prevents CBPPL to fully evaluated its potential contribution to network of protected areas			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
The evidence presented to address the NC remains incomplete since part of the information is on the Natural Areas System Plan (NASP) not available. The NSAP has not been released yet, therefore the Gaps are not publically known.			
NC Status:	Open - Extended or another 12 months / until next surveillance audit		

NC #:	2012-24	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.5.1		
Non-compliance:			
The current work instructions do not ensure that sites of a cultural importance for aboriginal can be identified before or during on-going harvesting operation and appropriate protection measures be applied.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
Discussions and communications with first nation communities have led to different findings and solutions: Qalipu first nation community is working with CONA students to reconstruct their data base. Data are expected to be available during the summer 2013. Miawpukek representative has informed CBPPL that there was no record of the shape files at their office,			

but they will re-digitize them. General sensitive areas are known. Detailed mapping of cultural sensitive sites will provide additional relevant information.	
NC Status:	Closed

NC #:	2012-25	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.6.1		
Non-compliance:			
The current documentation does not allow a clear identification of the type of pesticide(s) currently used on the FMU's. The type of pesticide used by the Wooddale Provincial Tree Nursery that provides trees to CBBPL is also unknown.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
CBPPL is using glyphosate, which is not on the list of chemicals prohibited by FSC. The nursery outside the DFA is not subject to FSC FM requirements. Surface areas of the power line right of way will be removed for the DFA.			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-26	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.6.2		
Non-compliance:			
It is unclear how the integrated pest management plan developed by DNR is tied into the 5 year plan and into the annual operating plan including the avoidance of pesticide use whenever possible.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
<p>CBPPL has developed an Integrated Pest Management Plan (2013-2017) and has linked it to the five year and annual Operating plans. CBPPL works with the Provincial Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to experiment and develop alternate methods of vegetation control. CBPPL is committed to looking for ways to reduce and ultimately stop the use of herbicide as a vegetation control method. CBPPL is also committed to adhering to all provincial government requirements and DNR is the final decision maker on all silviculture proposals; therefore it is important that CBPPL work in consultation with DNR to test the alternative measures suggested in its plan.</p> <p>CBPPL also indicates in his plan that the Requirement of the FSC standard conflicts with the long term Forest Management strategies of the Newfoundland and Labrador provincial government. So CBPPL has included the use of chemicals in its list of conflictual requirements that was sent to FSC Canada. It is also noted that CBPPL is using pesticides on a very small surface area of its territory (300 to 500 ha treated every year 0.024% to 0.035% - decreasing tendency).</p> <p>In the conclusion of its pest management plan CBPPL states that: "CBPPL is committed to trying alternative methods of vegetation control with the goal of having a continual reduction of herbicide use with an eventual phase-out over time. CBPPL will only use herbicides when their use is essential to meet silvicultural objectives where non-chemical management practices are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Available • Ineffective in achieving silvicultural objectives: or • Prohibitively expensive, taking into account environmental and social cost, risks and benefits <p>Once an area is determined to be free to grow on the DFA, it is no longer managed unless attacked by a biological pest, in which case other management strategies are employed."</p>			

NC Status:	Closed
-------------------	--------

NC #:	2012-27	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.6.3		
Non-compliance:			
There is no evidence that CBPPL has in place a program to demonstrate continual reduction of chemical pesticide use with an eventual goal to their complete phase-out over time.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
<p>CBPPL has developed an Integrated Pest Management Plan (2013-2017) and has linked it to the five year and annual Operating plans. CBPPL works with the Provincial Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to experiment and develop alternate methods of vegetation control. CBPPL is committed to looking for ways to reduce and ultimately stop the use of herbicide as a vegetation control method. CBPPL is also committed to adhering to all provincial government requirements and DNR is the final decision maker on all silviculture proposals; therefore it is important that CBPPL work in consultation with DNR to test the alternative measures suggested in its plan.</p> <p>CBPPL also indicates in his plan that the Requirement of the FSC standard conflicts with the long term Forest Management strategies of the Newfoundland and Labrador provincial government. SO CBPPL has included the use of chemicals in its list of conflictual requirements that was sent to FSC Canada.</p> <p>It is also noted that CBPPL is using pesticides on a very small surface area of its territory (300 to 500 ha treated every year 0.024% to 0.035% - decreasing tendency).</p> <p>In the conclusion of its pest management plan CBPPL states that: “CBPPL is committed to trying alternative methods of vegetation control with the goal of having a continual reduction of herbicide use with an eventual phase-out over time. CBPPL will only use herbicides when their use is essential to meet silvicultural objectives where non-chemical management practices are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Available • Ineffective in achieving silvicultural objectives: or • Prohibitively expensive, taking into account environmental and social cost, risks and benefits <p>Once an area is determined to be free to grow on the DFA, it is no longer managed unless attacked by a biological pest, in which case other management strategies are employed.”</p>			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-28	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.6.4		
Non-compliance:			
There is no clear evidence demonstrating that CBPPL supports and/or participates in the development and / or the adoption of non-chemical methods of pest management			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
<p>CBPPL has developed an Integrated Pest Management Plan (2013-2017) and has linked it to the five year and annual Operating plans. CBPPL works with the Provincial Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to experiment and develop alternate methods of vegetation control. CBPPL is committed to looking for ways to reduce and ultimately stop the use of herbicide as a vegetation control method. CBPPL is also committed to adhering to all provincial government requirements and DNR is the final decision maker on all silviculture proposals; therefore it is important that CBPPL work in consultation with DNR to test the alternative measures suggested in its plan.</p>			

- Use Improved Seed
- Selection of Appropriate Species
- Selection of Appropriate Stock Type
- Minimizing Regeneration Delay
- Maximizing Seedling Performance
- Site Preparation

The topic of alternatives to herbicides was also discussed at the 2012 Annual General Meeting of the Newfoundland Section of the Canadian Institute of Forestry. The following are points and strategies that complement the above suggested measures:

- Plant sooner after harvest
- Consider hardwood may be other crop
- Use larger planting stock (not bare root)
- Focus on what is on site – judicious use of herbicides
- Northern Peninsula – success of hot planting; stock had outgrown raspberries in 2 years
- Currently spray less than 1000 ha/year on the island
- There are instances where herbicides are needed

It is also noted that CBPPL is using pesticides on a very small surface area of its territory (300 to 500 ha treated every year 0.024% to 0.035% - decreasing tendency). In the conclusion of its pest management plan CBPPL states that:

“CBPPL is committed to trying alternative methods of vegetation control with the goal of having a continual reduction of herbicide use with an eventual phase-out over time. CBPPL will only use herbicides when their use is essential to meet silvicultural objectives where non-chemical management practices are:

- Not Available
- Ineffective in achieving silvicultural objectives: or
- Prohibitively expensive, taking into account environmental and social cost, risks and benefits

Once an area is determined to be free to grow on the DFA, it is no longer managed unless attacked by a biological pest, in which case other management strategies are employed.”

NC Status:	Closed
-------------------	--------

NC #:	2012-29	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.8.1		
Non-compliance:			
Even if the program is carried out by DNR there is no clear documented evidence that biological control agent are used only where other non-chemical pest control methods are or can reasonably be expected to be ineffective			
Evidence provided to close the NC			

Contacted DNR Silviculture department for rationale for the use of biological control agents. (Cases where Bt is used, other non-chemical pest control methods are ineffective).

Rational from

Supervisor of Silviculture and research Department of Natural Resources NL

Virus (in case of BFS): Have used but only marginally effective

- Ground-based control is impractical: Must go aerial due to cost and access. Most forests being treated are semi-mature to mature and are essentially inaccessible due to no roads or long-term inactivity.
- Relatively small control programs: A one size fits all biological insecticide (Bt) is most efficient and cost-effective.
- DNR will continue to assess, on an annual basis, insect and disease threats to the Province's forest resource. If a threat is identified, control measures will be considered. That analysis will include consideration of options, cost-benefit, ecological consequences, public acceptability, etc.

Rational from

Supervisor - Forest Insect & Disease Control Department of Natural Resources NL

- DNR assesses major forest pest populations and potential threats to the Province's forest resource on an annual basis. This is done through the use of various surveys and tools to quantify impacts. These tools can also be used to assess how these impacts change under different protection scenarios. When protection is required, an analysis of various control options is conducted which includes cost-benefits, ecological consequences, public acceptability, etc. An integrated pest management approach is used to treat only the areas requiring protection. One or several treatments (e.g. salvage, change in harvest schedule, aerial control, ground control, mass trap-outs etc) methods may be used to minimize forest level impacts with due consideration given to also minimizing impacts to the environment.
- DNR and forest industry also continue to work closely with researchers and various groups to help develop new tools for monitoring and control of major forest pests. This has led to the use of naturally occurring narrow spectrum products like Bt (bacterium for control of Lepidopteran larvae) and more recently Abietiv (virus for control of balsam fir sawfly only).
- Aerial control to date has been the only practical means for wide-spread control of major forest pests over inaccessible and/or semi-mature/mature forest areas. Products used are registered for aerial use by Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency. The scientific evidence (health and environmental safety, proven effectiveness) for the safe use of these products is provided through this registration process. When practical (i.e. plantations with small trees and good access), ground-based control products also registered for use may also be used.

Information on the effectiveness and practicality of using other control methods (e.g. inundative release of pheromones for mating disruption) are still being evaluated and may provide additional tools in the future.

NC Status:	Closed
-------------------	--------

NC #:	2012-30	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.9.1		
Non-compliance:			
As of today CBPPL was adhering to the government strategy for the use of faster growing species that can be used in the wood supply to help offset future demand for land use. CBPPL did not show evidence that it will cease using Norway Spruce in its management strategy.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
The Requirement of the FSC standard conflicts with the long term Forest Management strategies of the Newfoundland and Labrador provincial government. FSC policy stating:			

<p>“In the event laws and regulations conflict with FSC principles, we will work with the national FSC body towards a resolution” Communications with FSC Canada has been initiated. Corner Brook Pulp and Paper will stop planting Norway Spruce. Foresters in NL (CIF) feel that there will be no impact to the provincial wood supply if CBPPL takes this action.</p>	
NC Status:	Closed

NC #:	2012-31	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.9.2		
Non-compliance:			
Evidence shows that the Highway mix used by CBBPL for erosion control or bank stabilization may contain exotic species.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
A list of non-invasive exotic species from the Canadian Botanical Conservation Network <u>“Invasive Plant List”</u> was used to generate a seed mix for CBPPL Forestry Operations. Contractors have been notified of a supplier and will purchase only the seed mix specified. <u>“seed mix ”</u> SOP was changed to include use of the FSC® seed mix			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-32	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 6.9.3		
Non-compliance:			
At this time there is no (formal) monitoring of species for this criterion.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
The Norway Spruce planted on CBPPL DFA have not reached maturity therefore cannot be monitored for invasiveness. Plantation started in 1991. Monitoring will be done visually once trees achieve maturity.			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-33	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 7.2.3		
Non-compliance:			
The AAC calculation for all districts has been completed in 2011 prior to the certification process. Therefore, all factors generated by the implementation of the FSC standard have not been introduced in the AAC calculation for the exercise completed in 2011 (i.e. preindustrial report strategy, HCVF management strategies) and their impact to the AAC has not been documented.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
In the current AAC period (2011-2015), data for harvesting in 2011 shows the same trend. After year 1 of the period, on average, only 11.4% of the AAC has been cut, compared to 20% if the total AAC was being cut each year. These three graphs illustrate that it is highly unlikely that CBPPL is overcutting their AAC because areas have been deferred from harvest.			

Corner Brook Pulp and Paper Limited				
Annual Allowable Cuts (m ³)				
2011-2015				
Forest Mgmt. District	Total Class I & Class III AAC Available (Net)	Harvested 2011	Harvested 2011 - 2015 (Average/Yr.)	% of 2011-2015 AAC Harvested
5	51,300	34,874	34,874	13.6%
6	76,600	65,897	65,897	17.2%
9	173,100	102,603	102,603	11.9%
14	115,000	2,857	2,857	0.5%
15	296,400	184,207	184,207	12.4%
16	132,100	68,213	68,213	10.3%
Total	844,500	483,266	483,266	11.4%

Since implementing the FSC standard, harvesting has been deferred in 151,957 ha. Although a figure of AAC available in these deferral blocks is not available, they equal ~10% of the total area on CBPPL limits, which includes productive and non-productive forest.

Further to this discussion on AAC, we include the following comments on the forest management plan, corresponding to the requirement of 7.2.3. A 5-Year Operating Plan is developed for each forest management district, outlining where the harvest will take place and the volume to be harvested. However, the 5-Year Operating Plan is subject to approval every year based on changes that have occurred since its completion. This is done through the preparation of an Annual Operating Plan (AOP), which involves a review of the harvesting areas in the 5-Year Operating Plan for the upcoming year and any adjustments required due to new constraints or commitments. The AOP must then be submitted for approval. When the deferred harvest areas were identified late in 2011, they were removed from any plans for harvest in the AOPS. Similarly, areas of Aboriginal interest have been added to the system to be considered in the AOPS. These examples illustrate how the management plan is revised periodically to incorporate changes and new information.

NC Status:	Closed
-------------------	--------

NC #:	2012-34	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 8.2.6		
Non-compliance:			
Thus a lot of monitoring is being planned and done, the applicant shall monitor environmental impacts of forest management activities in accordance with requirements of criterion 6.5 on residual structures in the harvested forest stands.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
Standard operating procedure (PL-07) has been developed to describe the method used to identify and record residual structures that should be maintained based on the geographical constraints, configuration of the cutover areas and presence of sensitive areas within the site. Method to report and mapped residual structures left after harvesting is also described. Four pilot projects to test the method were done in 2012 in collaboration with the operators (GPS on board the machinery) and the contractors. Supported by interviews with Faron Knot, Debby Hearn and field operators and supervisors during the field visits in districts of the Deer Lake and Gander regions.			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-35	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 8.2.7		
Non-compliance:			
The applicant monitoring program, for the impacts of forest management operations on High Conservation Value Forests does not yet covered all the HCVs (e.g. provincial and federal parks and reserves, Humber Valley regional plan, intact forest landscape, serpentine areas, etc)			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
Review of the HCVF report (dated July 2013).			
Table 7 of the HCVF report now includes for each HCV: Management objectives Indicators and threshold Operational monitoring Monitoring of management strategies effectiveness			
The modification and improvement of section 7 demonstrate the link and relation between the management strategies and measures selected to maintain or restore High Conservation Values are consistent with a precautionary approach, and with respect to each conservation attribute.			
In 2012, CBPPL reported on its monitoring of every measure applied to protect HCV during it forest management activities. Report is entitled “2012 Monitoring of HCVs”.			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-36	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 8.3.1		
Non-compliance:			
Chain of custody system is in place but the identification method used for the certified wood loads from the forest to the mill is not documented. FSC certification claim and certificate number will have to be added on the delivery documentation used from forest to mill. (FSC 100% - QMI-FM/COC-XXXXX).			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
A load slip is issued to the truckers by a computerized system allows tracking the trucks from their origin to the delivery point at the mill (truck scale). The load slip identifies the contract number, the contractor name, the Forest Management District of origin, the permit number and the geographical location of the cut blocks. By law, no deliveries from forest to mill can be made if a load slip is not issued and carried along with the wood load. Also, no receiving of raw material can be made at the mill if the trucker doesn't have a contract number.			
In addition to this a specific SOP G-04 has been written to cover the requirements to identify FSC wood coming from the different districts under the scope of certification.			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-37	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 9.1.2		
Non-compliance:			
CBPPL has not involved the First Nation community of Conne River in the assessment process.			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
<p>CBPPL have met with, and continue to meet with the Conne River (Miawpukek) band. Initial meeting with the Chief and council was held on October 19 2011, and a follow-up meeting to present maps to the Band Council was held on November 14, 2011.</p> <p>Band Elders in the community reviewed the maps, and on September 24 2012 another meeting between CBPPL and Miawpukek First Nations was held. Mapped values were presented to CBPPL. At that time a request for GIS shape files was made so that CBPPL could evaluate the impacts to wood supply and where possible incorporate these values into forest management planning in the area. They are having difficulty locating the shape files, so therefore to date we have not received them</p> <p>In addition a representative of the Miawpukek Indian band council gave a presentation to the CBPPL Woodlands Public Advisory Committee (PAC) on March 14 2012. The representative of the Miawpukek Indian band council was invited to become an active member of the PAC. On October 11, 2012, Gregory Jeddore Forestry Manager with Miawpukek First Nations officially became a member of the CBPPL woodlands Public Advisory committee. The Corner Brook Indian Band Council have been a member of the Public Advisory Committee since it was formed in 2003</p> <p>Also Aboriginal groups in Newfoundland will be invited to participate in the Canadian Boreal Forest Agreement Process.</p>			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-38	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 9.2.1		
Non-compliance:			
<p>Following the release of the HVCF report, several stakeholders have recently sent comments to CBPPL and some stakeholders shared their concerns with the audit team.</p> <p>CBPPL did not have at this time documented evidence that the demonstrated concerns have been evaluated and replied to. Re. Nature Conservancy Canada, CPAWS-NL, Atlantic Salmon Federation.</p>			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
<p>On the basis of the minutes of meetings of November 28 & 29, 2011 with CPAWS, CBI, Nature NL, and NCC. And the fact that the Atlantic Salmon Federation's concerns regarding habitat are now considered in the HCVF Report (even if ASF did not respond to invitation).</p> <p>And considering CBPPL, CPAWS and CBI are participating in the Canadian Boreal Forest Agreement process which addresses species at risk and protected areas and have had three face to face meetings and several conference calls.</p> <p>The audit team concluded that the applicant provides stakeholders and other interested parties with the opportunities to input into the identification of High Conservation Value Forests and into the development of management objectives that protect those identified values.</p>			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-39	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 9.3.1		
Non-compliance:			
<p>Some strategies are rather easily met given current practices and environmental inspections on practices, or by there being no direct use of a particular land base. However, some other FSC values in this criterion are either difficult to define or measure (e.g., genetic distinctness, genetic mixing). The management plan and supporting documents do not clearly specify how management strategies effectively attain all HCVF goals (more clearly link action with strategy).</p>			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
<p>Review of the HCVF report (dated July 2013). Table 7 of the HCVF report now includes for each HCV: Management objectives Indicators and threshold Operational monitoring Monitoring of management strategies effectiveness</p> <p>A meeting with the HCV Science committee has also allowed the audit team to discuss the review of the report with the participating experts and to share opinion and comments on the strategies suggested for specific given HCV.</p>			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-40	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 9.3.3		
Non-compliance:			
<p>Because the HCVF report is so new, there is no real evidence yet that conditions for maintaining these values are effective. No clearer link between strategy and efficacy in achieving the desired value (to show more explicitly how such assessment will be done).</p>			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
<p>Review of the HCVF report (dated July 2013). Table 7 of the HCVF report now includes for each HCV: Management objectives Indicators and threshold Operational monitoring Monitoring of management strategies effectiveness</p> <p>The modification and improvement of section 7 demonstrate the link and relation between the management strategies and measures selected to maintain or restore High Conservation Values are consistent with a precautionary approach, and with respect to each conservation attribute. In 2012, CBPPL reported on its monitoring of every measure applied to protect HCV during it forest management activities. Report is entitled “2012 Monitoring of HCVs”.</p>			
NC Status:	Closed		

NC #:	2012-41	Type of NC – Major or Minor:	Minor
Standard requirement :	Indicator 9.4.1		
Non-compliance:			
The applicant has not yet set up or implemented a program to monitor the status of some of the HCVs, including the effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or restoration. (e.g. provincial and federal parks and reserves, Humber Valley regional plan, intact forest landscape, serpentine areas)			
Evidence provided to close the NC			
Review of the HCVF report (dated July 2013). Table 7 of the HCVF report now includes for each HCV: Management objectives Indicators and threshold Operational monitoring Monitoring of management strategies effectiveness The modification and improvement of section 7 demonstrate the link and relation between the management strategies and measures selected to maintain or restore High Conservation Values are consistent with a precautionary approach, and with respect to each conservation attribute. In 2012, CBPPL reported on its monitoring of every measure applied to protect HCV during its forest management activities. Report is entitled “2012 Monitoring of HCVs”.			
NC Status:	Closed		

4.4 Opportunities for Improvement

1.4.2

Consider pursuing dialogue with FSC Canada.

FSC may choose to take action promptly to initiate negotiations with the appropriate government or other organizations to harmonize the legal system and the FSC standard, or FSC may build up a case file before proceeding. The applicant is expected to participate in harmonization efforts but not to initiate or lead them.

4.1.8

Consider pursuing the efforts to confirm that the operators and contractors are comfortable with the methods and procedures developed to maintain residual structures in the cutover areas.

4.2.1

Consider reviewing the need and risk to determine if a fire extinguisher is needed in the cabin of the fuel trucks.

6.8.1

Consider adding in the Five year operating plans a section describing the pest control strategy.

6.9.1

Consider updating the Five year operating plan to remove reference to Norway spruce as a possible choice to align with the corporation decision not to use Norway spruce.

6.9.3

Consider better defining in your SOP the extent of the monitoring program to verify the invasiveness of exotic species.

4.5 Recommendation to maintain the certificate

Corner Brook Pulp and Paper 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. The areas of non-conformance identified during the audit are documented in the attached Non-conformance reports. As discussed during the closing meeting, please submit a root cause analysis and an action plan within 30 days. Major non-conformance(s) must be closed within 90 days. Minor non-conformances will be reviewed at the time of the first surveillance audit. However, a root cause analysis an action-plan must be submitted for approval for each minor non-conformance within 30 days. The implementation of the actions will be verified at the next surveillance audit.

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-conformance(s).

5.0 GROUP MEMBERSHIP LIST (UPDATE)

Not applicable

6.0 QMI-SAI Global COMPLAINTS, DISPUTES AND APPEALS PROCESS

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

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

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

QMI-SAI Global will keep the complainants informed of progress in evaluating the complaint. An investigation of the allegations and all its proposed actions in response to the complaint/appeal will be dealt within three (3) months of receiving the appeal. Upon completion of the investigation a full report of the investigation and its findings are then sent to the complainant. Full implementation of actions and confirmation of implementation (e.g. correction and closing out of non-compliances that may have been identified as a result of the complaint) outlined in the final report will be completed.

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

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

END OF THE REPORT