



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

Audit Managed by:
Canada Regional Office
P.O. Box 1771
Chelsea, QC, Canada
J9B 1T9
Tel: 613-422-5291
Fax: 866-438-1971
Contact person: Yves Bouthillier
Email: ybouthillier@nepcon.org



The mark of
responsible forestry

Rainforest Alliance is an
FSC® accredited certifier

FM-06 - 01 March 2017



Forest Management **2019 Annual audit** Report for:

Eastern Ontario Forest Group
In
Kemptville, Ontario, Canada

Report Finalized:	January 15, 2019
Audit Dates:	December 3-6, 2018
Audit Team:	Darren Johnson
Certificate code:	RA-FM/COC-0000232
Certificate issued:	January 28, 2018
Certificate expiration:	January 27, 2023
Organization Contact:	Jim Hendry
Address:	10-3 Campus Dr., Kemptville, ON, K0J 1J0, Canada

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS.....	3
1. INTRODUCTION.....	4
2. AUDIT FINDINGS AND RESULTS	4
2.1. AUDIT CONCLUSION.....	4
2.2. CHANGES IN FMEs' FOREST MANAGEMENT AND ASSOCIATED EFFECTS ON CONFORMANCE TO STANDARD REQUIREMENTS:.....	5
2.3. EXCISION OF AREAS FROM THE SCOPE OF CERTIFICATE	5
2.4. STAKEHOLDER ISSUES (<i>COMPLAINTS/DISPUTES RAISED BY STAKEHOLDERS TO FME OR RAINFOREST ALLIANCE SINCE PREVIOUS EVALUATION</i>):	6
2.5. CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE NONCONFORMITY REPORTS.....	7
2.6. NEW NONCONFORMITY REPORTS ISSUED AS A RESULT OF THIS AUDIT	9
2.7. AUDIT OBSERVATIONS	9
3. AUDIT PROCESS	10
3.1. AUDITORS AND QUALIFICATIONS:	10
3.2. AUDIT SCHEDULE	10
3.3. SAMPLING METHODOLOGY:	11
3.4. STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION PROCESS.....	13
3.5. CHANGES TO CERTIFICATION STANDARDS	13
3.6. REVIEW OF FME DOCUMENTATION AND REQUIRED RECORDS	13
APPENDIX I: FSC Annual Audit Reporting Form:	15
APPENDIX II: List of visited sites (confidential).....	18
APPENDIX III: List of stakeholders consulted (confidential)	21
APPENDIX IV: Forest management standard conformance (confidential).....	27
APPENDIX V: Chain-of-Custody Conformance (confidential).....	35
APPENDIX VI: Rainforest Alliance Database Update Form	41
APPENDIX VII: Group management conformance checklist <i>FSC-STD-30-005 v1-0</i> (confidential).....	42
APPENDIX VIII: NTFP Certification standard conformance checklist (confidential)	49
APPENDIX VII-a: Certified Group Member/FMU List	62

LIST OF ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

AOC	Areas of Concern
AR	Annual Report
AWS	Annual Work Schedule
CoC	Chain of Custody
CWG	Certification Working Group
EA	Environmental Assessment
ELC	Ecological Land Classification
EMS	Environmental Monitoring System
ENGO	Environmental Non-Governmental Organization
EOCWG	Eastern Ontario Certification Working Group
EOFG	Eastern Ontario Forest Group
EOMF	Eastern Ontario Model Forest
FME	Forest Management Enterprise
FMP	Forest Management Plan
FMPM	Forest Management Planning Manual
FMU	Forest Management Unit
FRI	Forest Resource Inventory
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
GCF	Grey County Forest
GLSL	Great Lakes - St. Lawrence
GSCA	Grey Sauble Conservation Authority
ha	Hectares
HCV	High Conservation Value
HCVF	High Conservation Value Forest
HRF	Halton Region Forest
LPRCA	Long Point Region Conservation Authority
MFTIP	Managed Forest Tax Incentive Plan
MNO	Métis Nation of Ontario
MNR	Ministry of Natural Resources
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NCR	Non-Conformance Report
NRVIS	Natural Resource Values Information System
OBS	Observation
RA	Rainforest Alliance
SAR	Species at Risk
SOCWG	Southern Ontario Certification Working Group
SOP	Standard Operating Procedures
SVCA	Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority
WHMIS	Workplace Hazardous Materials Information System

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to document annual audit conformance of Eastern Ontario Forest Group, hereafter referred to as Forest Management Enterprise (FME). The report presents the findings of Rainforest Alliance auditors who have evaluated company systems and performance against the Forest Stewardship Council™ (FSC®) forest management standards and policies. Section 2 of this report provides the audit conclusions and any necessary follow-up actions by the company through nonconformity reports.

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

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

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

2. AUDIT FINDINGS AND RESULTS

2.1. Audit conclusion

Based on Company's conformance with FSC and Rainforest Alliance requirements, the audit team makes the following recommendation:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Certification requirements <u>met</u>, certificate maintenance recommended No NCR(s) issued
<input type="checkbox"/>	Certification requirements <u>not met</u>:
Additional comments:	
Issues identified as controversial or hard to evaluate.	

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

There have been no significant changes since last audit.

2.3 Excision of areas from the scope of certificate

<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable. Check this box if the FME has not excised areas from the FMU(s) included in the certificate scope as defined by FSC-POL-20-003. <i>(delete the rows below if not applicable)</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The FME has excised areas from FMU(s) included in the scope of the certificate since the last assessment/audit? If yes complete sections A, B and C below
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The FME excised areas from FMU(s) included in the scope of the certificate prior to the last assessment/audit, and conformance with FSC-POL20-003 was evaluated? If yes complete sections B and C below.
A. Rationale for excision of area from FMU(s) included in scope of evaluation: <i>Note: Rationale shall be consistent with one of the permitted conditions specified in FSC-POL-20-003, under which such certifications may be permitted.</i>
<p>Finding: The excision of 1.26 ha out of the 665 ha total certified area of Halton Community Forest is required for a road widening project to address traffic demands along Trafalgar Regional Road. The excised area is to be converted to non-forest use. The excision is due to factors beyond the control of the forest managers. The Halton Region Environmental Assessment for this project is available at: http://www.halton.ca/cms/One.aspx?portalId=8310&pageId=116135.</p> <p>EOFG managers, through extensive documentation and stakeholder engagement, demonstrated that they have made all reasonable efforts to avoid any negative impacts taking place as a result of the excision. The remaining area constitutes a viable FMU subject to a long-term management plan in accordance with FSC Principle 7. In addition, the excised area is well defined, artificially demarcated on the ground, mapped and is clearly distinguishable from the remaining FMU. Finally, there are systems in place to ensure that wood harvested from the excised area is identified and treated as "non-FSC-certified" source, for the purpose of chain of custody labeling. This is in conformance with Section 2.1 and 2.2 as specified in FSC-POL-20-003.</p>
B. Summary of conformance evaluation against requirements of FSC-POL-20-003
<p>Finding: Excision of the 1.26 ha from the scope of this certificate is consistent with and meets the requirements of FSC-POL-20-003 Section 2.1 and 2.2.</p>
C. Control measures to prevent contamination of certified wood with wood from excluded/excised forest areas.
<p>Finding: Wood harvested within the 1.26 ha excised area will be clearly marked and segregated resulting in a low risk of contamination with certified wood.</p>

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

FSC Principle	Stakeholder comment	Rainforest Alliance response
P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance	No comment received	No response required
P2: Tenure & Use Rights & Responsibilities	No comment received	No response required
P3 – Indigenous Peoples’ Rights	No comment received	No response required
P4: Community Relations & Workers’ Rights	No comment received	No response required
P5: Benefits from the Forest	No comment received	No response required
P6: Environmental Impact	No comment received	No response required
P7: Management Plan	No comment received	No response required
P8: Monitoring & Assessment	No comment received	No response required
P9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forest	No comment received	No response required
P10 - Plantations	No comment received	No response required

2.5. Conformance with applicable nonconformity reports

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

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

Check if N/A (there are no open NCRs to review)

NCR#:	01/18	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:	Rainforest Alliance/SmartWood Locally adapted Standards for Assessing Forest Management in the Great Lakes/Saint-Lawrence region, Indicator 6.4.1, 6.4.2 and 6.4.3			
Report Section:	Appendix II, section 6.4			
Description of Nonconformance and Related Evidence:				
<p>This NCR applies to all the non-SLIMF group members:</p> <p>The context of protection area requirements on the EOFG FMUs with a majority of small privately-owned lands and community forests presents a limited scope for addressing the requirements of this criterion. Indicators 6.4.1 – 6.4.4 do not apply to SLIMF properties. Past audits have found conformance through the protection of special sites and designated protection zones on community forests to meet the intent of the standard. (6.4.1, 6.4.2, 6.4.3, 6.4.4).</p> <p>However, the community forests (not qualified as SLIMF) have not properly documented gaps in the representative completeness of protected areas in the appropriate ecological unit(s) contained on the community forests. Hence, it is not clear to the auditor if there are gaps or not in the appropriate ecological units (6.4.1).</p> <p>Moreover, since the identification of gaps is not clearly documented, the auditor was not able to determine the need for candidate protected areas (6.4.2).</p> <p>Finally, no evidence was provided to demonstrate that there was cooperation of interested parties and qualified experts in carrying out a gap analysis or identification of candidate protected areas (6.4.3).</p> <p><u>Evidence</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews - Forest Management Plans 				
Corrective Action Request	<p>Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above.</p> <p>Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the nonconformance.</p>			

Timeline for Conformance:	12 months following the report finalization date
Evidence Provided by Organization:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GIS GapTool report and its associated landform/vegetation data sets developed by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources in 2004 and 2005. map delineating eco-districts of Southern Ontario (Ecoregions 6E and 7E). Further broken down into eco-districts by each FMU (13) greater than 1000 ha in area. - Community Forests-Candidate Protected Area Summary (disaggregated by eco-district). - Candidate protected areas – record of cooperation of interested parties documentation
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	<p>EOFG has taken the following steps to address this NCR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of GIS GapTool and its associated updated landform/vegetation data sets. The tool was initially developed by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources in 2004 and 2005. The gap analysis of representative ecosystems at the eco-district level was completed with assistance from a Senior Analyst from the Protected Areas Section of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. - Use of map delineating eco-districts of Southern Ontario (Ecoregions 6E and 7E). Further broken down into eco-districts by each FMU (13) greater than 1000 ha in area. 12 community forests (minus Town of Oakville and Halton) plus 1 private woodlot (Murray Brothers) - Development of a Community Forests-Candidate Protected Area Summary (disaggregated by eco-district). <p>Combined these initiatives and associated documentation meet the requirements of 6.4.1 and 6.4.2.</p> <p>Candidate protected areas – records of cooperation of interested parties have been documented and made publicly available for all non-SLIMF members. This meets the requirements of 6.4.3.</p>
NCR Status:	CLOSED
Comments (optional):	

NCR#:	02/18	NC Classification:	Major	Minor X
Standard & Requirement:	Rainforest Alliance/SmartWood Locally adapted Standards for Assessing Forest Management in the Great Lakes/Saint-Lawrence region, Indicator 9.1.2 and 9.1.3			
Report Section:	Appendix II, section 9.1			
Description of Nonconformance and Related Evidence:				
This NCR applies to all the non-SLIMF group members:				
The non-SLIMF group members were not able to provide evidence of a credible external review of their HCVF assessments (9.1.2). Hence, the members were not able to demonstrate that a summary of how the concerns raised during the review process were addressed (9.1.3).				
Corrective Action Request:	<p>Organization shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above.</p> <p>Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the nonconformance.</p>			
Timeline for Conformance:	12 months following the report finalization date			

Evidence Provided by Organization:	-Bruce County HCV report review -Link to the summary of the review
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	Since the last audit, a credible external review of HCVF assessments for each of the non-SLIMF FMU's has been conducted since the last audit. These reviews were completed by experts including members of academia, foresters and biologists and have been made available to the auditor for review. Requirements for 9.1.2 have been met. To date there have been no concerns raised as a result of these external reviews. Each of the 12-community forest FMU websites provides the public access to a copy of the respective High Conservation Value Forest Report and Review. The only non-SLIMF private woodlot has made available a public notice, which is located at the front counter of Murray Brothers Lumber Company Ltd. office
NCR Status:	CLOSED
Comments (optional):	

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

There are no new nonconformities issued as a result of this audit.

2.7. Audit observations

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

OBS 01/19	Reference Standard & Requirement: Rainforest Alliance/SmartWood Locally adapted Standards for Assessing Forest Management in the Great Lakes/Saint-Lawrence region, Indicator 6.5.1
<p>[Description of findings leading to observation]: C 6.5: <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>Indicator 6.5.1) All forest operations with the potential for negative environmental impact (as identified in 6.1) shall have written guidelines defining acceptable practices which are available to forest managers and supervisors. Such operational guidelines shall meet or exceed national or regional best management practices.</i></p> <p>Knowledge of provincial best management practice (BMP) requirements is lacking. The L. Heideman & Sons forester interviewed on-site by the auditor did not seem to be aware of specific provincial regulations with respect to BMPs specific to riparian management zone (RMZ) buffers. Apart from several trees that had been blown down during a recent windstorm and a single pine tree that had been cut, the buffer surrounding the wetland feature observed on Compartment 3 of the Eddie Quadeville property was intact but was not clearly demarcated or flagged. Written guidelines are in place and forest operations conducted on-site do meet the requirements of this standard, therefore only an observation is made.</p> <p>The certificate holder should ensure that all its members are kept up-to-date and aware of provincial best management practices.</p>	

3. AUDIT PROCESS

3.1. Auditors and qualifications:

Auditor Name	Darren Johnson	Auditor role	In charge of all aspects in audit scope
Qualifications:	Darren is a Licensed Professional Forester with more than 20 years experience in North America, Asia and Africa working with government, the private sector, indigenous groups and civil society. Areas of expertise include forest management policy & planning, conservation and climate change related activities. Darren holds a MS in Forest Ecology from Edinburgh University in Scotland and a HBS in Forestry from Lakehead University in Canada. He has completed the FSC FM and CoC Lead Auditor training course and conducted more than 5 FSC FM audits and multiple COC audits.		

3.2. Audit schedule

Date	Location /Main sites	Principal Activities
Nov 12, 2018	Remotely	Preparation call
Nov 22, 2018	Remotely	Preparation call
Nov 30, 2018	Remotely	OPENING meeting (webinar conference call)
Dec 3- 6, 2018	Eastern Ontario	Field visits, interviews and documentation analysis
Dec 6, 2018	Office	CIOSING meeting
Dec 30, 2018	Remotely	Audit team provides report to NEPCon for review
Jan 4, 2019	Remotely	Report provided to EOFG for review
Jan 9, 2019	Remotely	EOFG comments provided to NEPCon
Jan 15, 2019	Remotely	Final report and certification decision

Total number of person days used for the audit:8.75

= number of days spent in preparation, on site and post site visit follow-up including stakeholder consultation

3.3. Sampling methodology:

On-site sampling followed the guidance outlined in FSC-STD-20-007 (V3-0). Subsets were classified based on the forest size and type. No new members were added since the last annual audit. In total, 3 subsets were identified (private SLIMF below 1000 ha, 1,000 - 10,000 ha and above 10,000 ha). Rainforest Alliance then determined the minimum number of sites to be evaluated per subset by applying the sampling calculation formula based on the characteristics of the subsets (see FSC-STD-20-007 Annex 1 for formulas).

FMU category by area	# of FMUs	# of FMUs to visit during this audit (rounded up)
Above 10,000 ha	Existing: 2	$0.8 * 2 = 2$
1,000 – 10,000 ha	Existing: 11	$0.6 * \sqrt{10} = 3$
Below 1,000 ha	Existing: 111	$0.3 * \sqrt{127} = 4$
Total	124	9

Once the number of sites per subset was determined, site selection focused on evaluating active operations or operations that had had activity over the audit period, group members not visited previously, and sites that specifically related to the Principles and Criteria being evaluated this year (Principles 1, 4 & 10 and annual mandatory criteria). Other sites were selected based on their proximity to other sites being visited as to maximize the number of sites to be visited over the course of the on-site evaluation. The town of Oakville was selected this year to follow-up on conversions of forests to non-forest use that were disclosed during the last audit period.

3.3.1 List of FMUs selected for evaluation

FMU/Group Member Name	Rationale for Selection
On-the-Bend Sugar Shack Gary Gallinger - Private	Maple syrup production (NTFP) – SLIMF < 1,000 ha
Larose Forest Community Forest	Non-SLIMF >10,000 ha Uniform shelterwood removal harvest recently completed. Observed riparian management zones intact and in compliance with provincial regulations.
Michael and Pattie Dolan Private	SLIMF < 1,000 ha Commercial thinning planned (2019) for a 31-year old red pine plantation on the woodlot. The woodlot provides a high level of habitat for wildlife species including grey wolves, coyotes, fisher, white tailed deer, black bear, red-tailed hawks and porcupines.
Lavern Heideman & Sons Private	SLIMF < 1,000 ha Commercial thinning in 2015 which removed approximately 30% of the existing basal area. The next harvest entry, another commercial thinning, is scheduled for 2023.
John Stuart Private	SLIMF < 1,000 ha The stand is scheduled for a commercial thinning (20% basal area removal) in late 2018. Advanced hardwood and White Pine regeneration is present in the understory of the plantation.

<p>Grey County Community Forest</p>	<p>Non-SLIMF 1,000 – 10,000 ha (Dornoch - Compartment #20) Selection harvest (20% basal area removal). The harvesting prescription resulted in removal of 90% of the White Ash (<i>Fraxinus Americana</i>) as a pre-emptive strategy against an expected Emerald Ash Borer (<i>Agilus planipennis</i>) infestation.</p> <p>(White/Red Pine Plantation) A commercial thinning was recently completed in the plantation resulting in a 30% basal area removal. Some minor rutting was observed but was well within mandated BMP guidelines. Adequate amounts of woody debris was observed on site in addition to an intact 30 m buffer along a cedar bog adjacent to the plantation.</p>
<p>Grey Sauble CA Community Forest</p>	<p>Non-SLIMF > 10,000 ha (Sydenham Falls – Compartment #164) Scheduled for a selection harvest (30% basal area removal) in late 2018. The stand was previously harvested in 2002 (30% basal area removal). A portion of the Bruce Trail runs through the site and is protected by a 30m buffer.</p> <p>(Bognor Marsh) Management area used primarily for recreation including hiking, biking, bird watching, hunting etc. A 4-hectare portion of the management area was designated as 'no management' in 1998 by the Forest Advisory Committee. Commercial thinning (30% basal area removal) in late 2018.</p>
<p>Saugeen Valley CA Community Forest</p>	<p>Non-SLIMF 1,000 – 10,000 ha (Tract 42-360-35) Single tree selection harvest resulting in a 30% basal area removal.</p> <p>(Tract 42-320-15) Stand received its second commercial thinning, which was completed in November 2018. The next harvest entry is scheduled for 2038.</p>
<p>Bruce County Community Forest</p>	<p>Non-SLIMF 1,000 – 10,000 ha (BCF-16-02) This plantation was harvested in 2015. A protected Blue Beech (<i>Carpinus caroliniana</i>) was observed on the site.</p> <p>Immediately adjacent to the softwood plantation is a mixed hardwood stand that was harvested in early 2018. The prescription resulted in a 25% basal area removal selection harvest.</p>

3.4. Stakeholder consultation process

Stakeholder type (i.e. NGO, government, local inhabitant etc.)	Stakeholders notified (#)	Stakeholders consulted or providing input (#)
Environmental NGO	31	0
Federal Government	5	0
Provincial Government	25	5
Municipal Government	3	1
First Nations	24	2
Recreation	10	2
EOFG Staff/Members	14	14
Forest Products Industry	21	0
Community Member	2	2
Academia	2	0
Forest Owner	4	4

3.5. Changes to Certification Standards

Forest stewardship standard used in audit:	Rainforest Alliance/Rainforest Alliance Locally adapted Standards for Assessing Forest Management in the Great Lakes/Saint-Lawrence region
Revisions to the standard since the last audit:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No changes to standard. <input type="checkbox"/> Standard was changed (detail changes below)
Changes in standard:	
Implications for FME:	Not applicable - no new requirements

3.6. Review of FME Documentation and required records

a) All certificate types

Required Records	Reviewed
Complaints received by FME from stakeholders, actions taken, follow up communication	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: No complaints were received by the FME since last annual audit.	
Accident records	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Health and safety records were provided to the audit team prior to the audit. No major accident occurred during the audit period. Minor injuries reported include: 1. A back injury resulting from an individual attempting to lift a snowmobile and; 2. A finger laceration resulting from an individual using a thickness planer.	
Training records	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: FME provides training on a continuous basis to forest managers and members.	
Operational plan(s) for next twelve months	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Documents provided by forest managers for planned activities.	
Inventory records	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

Comments: Inventory records were seen in individual management plans for field sites visited.	
Harvesting records	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Pre and post-harvest checklists were reviewed for harvests during the audit period for field sites visited.	

b) Group Certificates

Required Group Records	Reviewed
Group management system	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Policies and Procedures manual was reviewed. No major changes since previous audit.	
Rate of membership change within the group	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: List of current members provided. No change since previous audit.	
Formal communication/written documentation sent to members by the group entity during the audit period	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: MOUs with forest managers and correspondence on particular issues addressed through the CWG was reviewed. Most correspondence with group members occur verbally as needed.	
Records of monitoring carried out by the group entity	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Monitoring reports were reviewed through documentation provided by EOFG.	
Records of any corrective actions issued by the group entity	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: The Group Manager maintains a list of corrective actions issued to group members.	
Updated list of group members	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Updated list of group members was provided during the audit.	

APPENDIX I: FSC Annual Audit Reporting Form:

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

Forest management enterprise information:			
FME legal name:	Eastern Ontario Forest Group (EOFG)		
FME Certificate Code:	RA-FM/CoC – 0000232		
Reporting period	Previous 12 month period	Dates	January 28, 2018 - December 3, 2018

1. Scope Of Certificate			
Type of certificate: group	SLIMF Certificate: Small SLIMF		
New FMUs added since previous evaluation	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Group Certificate: Updated of FMU and group member list provided in Appendix VII-a:			
Multi-FMU Certificate: List of new FMUs added to the certificate scope:			
FMU Name/Description	Area	Forest Type	Location Latitude/Longitude ¹
	ha		
	ha		
	ha		

2. FME Information	
<input type="checkbox"/> No changes since previous report (if no changes since previous report leave section blank)	
Forest zone	Temperate
Certified Area under Forest Type	
- Natural	83,221.6 hectares
- Plantation	0 hectares
Stream sides and water bodies	140 Linear Kilometers

3. Forest Area Classification		
<input type="checkbox"/> No changes since previous report (if no changes since previous report leave section blank)		
Total certified area (land base)	83,221.6 ha	
1. Total forest area	62,659 ha	
a. Total production forest area	53,073 ha	
b. Total non-productive forest area (no harvesting)	9,586 ha	
- Protected forest area (strict reserves)	5,464 ha	
- Areas protected from timber harvesting and managed only for NTFPs or services	4,122 ha	
- Remaining non-productive forest	0 ha	
2. Total non-forest area (e.g., water bodies, wetlands, fields, rocky outcrops, etc.)	20,562.6 ha	

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

4. High Conservation Values identified via formal HCV assessment by the FME and respective areas

No changes since previous report (if no changes since previous report leave section blank)

Code	HCV TYPES ²	Description:	Area
HCV1	Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).		ha
HCV2	Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.		ha
HCV3	Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.		ha
HCV4	Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).		ha
HCV5	Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		ha
HCV6	Forest areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).		ha
Number of sites significant to indigenous people and local communities			

5. Workers

Number of workers including employees, part-time and seasonal workers:

Total number of workers	2 workers	
- Of total workers listed above	1 Male	1 Female
Number of serious accidents		
Number of fatalities		

6. Pesticide Use

FME does not use pesticides. (delete rows below)

FME has a valid FSC derogation for use of a highly hazardous pesticide YES NO

FSC highly hazardous pesticides used in last calendar year

Name	Quantity	# of Hectares Treated
		ha
		ha
		ha

Non FSC highly hazardous pesticides used in last calendar year

Name	Quantity	# of Hectares Treated
------	----------	-----------------------

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

Glyphosate	144.43 litres	80.34 ha
Glyphosate	11.52 kg ai	5.2 ha
Tricolpyr	1207.4 litres	63.62 ha
Tricolpyr	15.219 kg ai	3.0 ha
Tree Azin (EAB treatment)	13.8 litres	62 trees
Imazapyr	30.0 litres	5 ha

APPENDIX VI: Rainforest Alliance Database Update Form

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

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

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

Client Information (contact info for FSC website listings)

Organization name	Eastern Ontario Forest Group		
Primary Contact	Jim Hendry	Title	Coordinator, Forest Certification Program
Primary Address	10 Campus Drive, Unit 3 Kemptville, Ontario K0G 1J0	Telephone	613-258-8422
Address		Fax	
Email	jhendry@eomf.on.ca	Webpage	www.eomf.on.ca

Forests

Change to Group Certificate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Change in # of parcels in group	124 total members
Total certified area		83,221.6 Hectares (or)	Acres

Update based on Appendix VII-a below

Species (note if item to be added or deleted)

Scientific name	Common name	Add/Delete

Products

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

APPENDIX VII-a: Certified Group Member/FMU List

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

1. **Total # members in the certified pool:** 124
2. **Total area in Current Pool (ha. or acres):** 83,221.60 ha

NOTE: Full list of 124 FMUs, including private woodlots, is kept on file by NEPCon under “EOFG FSC FM audit 19_Members List.xlsx”

List of public FMUs (Community Forests) made available on info.fsc.org, per FSC requirements.

Name	Street	Town/City	State/County	Postal Code	Country or Area	Valid From	Valid To
Bruce County	30 Park St.	Walkerton	Ontario	N0G 2V0	CANADA	2017-12-01	
Grey County Forest	595 9th Ave East	Owen Sound	Ontario	N4K 3E3	CANADA	2011-09-24	
Grey Sauble Conservation Authority	237897 Ignlis Falls Road	Owen Sound	Ontario	N4K 5N6	CANADA	2014-11-03	
Lanark County Forest	99 Christie Lake Road	Perth	Ontario	K7H 3C6	CANADA	2007-12-17	
Larose Forest	59 Court Street, P.O Box 304	L'Orignal	Ontario	K0B 1K0	CANADA	2007-05-22	
Limerick Forest	25 Central avenue West, suite 100	Brockville	Ontario	K6V 4N6	CANADA	2017-01-28	
Long Point Region Conservation Authority	4 Elm street	Tillsonburg	Ontario	N4G 0C4	CANADA	2013-11-14	
Northumberland County Forest	555 Courthouse Road	Cobourg	Ontario	K9A 5J6	CANADA	2011-05-24	
Renfrew County Forest	9 International Drive	Pembroke	Ontario	K8A 6W5	CANADA	2009-05-02	
Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority	1078 Bruce Rd. #12, Box 150	Formosa	Ontario	N0G 1W0	CANADA	2014-10-23	
SD&G Forest	26 Pitt Street	Cornwall	Ontario	K6J 3P2	CANADA	2007-05-22	

Name	Street	Town/City	State/County	Postal Code	Country or Area	Valid From	Valid To
South Nation Conservation	38 Victoria street	Finch	Ontario	K0C 1K0	CANADA	2007-05-22	
Terry Murray (private)	P.O. Box 70	Madawaska	Ontario	K0J 2C0	CANADA	2009-03-05	