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**Standard Conversions**

Delete if all only metric units are used

1 acre = 0.405 hectares
1 foot = 0.3048 Meters
1 mile = 1.60934 Kilometers

1 mbf = 5.1 m³
1 cord = 2.55 m³
1 Gallon (US) = 3.78541 Liters
1. AUDIT PROCESS

1.1. Auditors and qualifications:
Rob Keen, B.Sc.F, RPF. is a forester with twenty five years experience in forestry in Ontario. He has participated in five audits for SmartWood as well as Independent Forest Audits in Ontario using the provincial protocol. Keen has spent most of his career providing forest management services to landowners predominately in the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Forest Region. He has also participated in the development of four Crown forest management plans and served on the technical advisory committee that developed the FSC Standards For Well Managed Forests In The Central And Southern Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Forests Of Ontario, March 2001.

1.2. Audit schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location /main sites</th>
<th>Main activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 26, 2006</td>
<td>Larose Forest Station, Administration office</td>
<td>Morning meeting to discuss and review roles, responsibilities and reporting relationships between EOMF, South Nation Conservation, Larose forest, and EOMF’s program progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 26, 2006</td>
<td>Stormount, Dundas and Glengarry (SD&amp;G) Comp 24</td>
<td>View harvesting and marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 26, 2006</td>
<td>SD&amp;G Comp 2</td>
<td>View marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27, 2006</td>
<td>Gerry Lee property</td>
<td>View property where activities had recently occurred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of person days used for the audit: 2
= number of auditors participating 1 times total number of days spent for the audit 2

1.3. Sampling methodology:

The audit started with a meeting at the Larose headquarters with EOMF staff and representatives from the various groups included in the EOMF FSC certification. The meeting provided an opportunity to review EOMF’s progress regarding the recruitment of additional groups, issues addressed since the last audit and general comments from the umbrella organizations regarding the program and FSC.

Scott Davis provided the audit team with several binders containing summary information describing EOMF structure, how the 2005 CARs have been addressed as well as information on EOMF progress.

The afternoon was spent in the field visiting sites where operations had occurred or were planned to occur. Assessing a representative sample of sites was difficult since the level of operational activity (i.e. harvesting) on EOMF FSC properties is limited. Therefore sites were selected based on the occurrence of some level of
activity. A total of four sites were inspected, providing examples of recent tree marking, values protection and harvesting.

1.4. Stakeholder consultation process
Public meetings were not considered for this audit, however, individual interviews were conducted with staff and Group members while on route to various sites. One-on-one time with staff members provided an excellent opportunity to discuss any issues or concerns regarding the program.

1.5. Changes to Standards (if applicable)
The following standard was used:

The Standards For Well Managed Forests In The Central And Southern Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Forests Of Ontario, March 2001.

No changes to the standard have occurred since the last evaluation.

2. AUDIT FINDINGS AND RESULTS

2.1. Changes in the forest management of the FMO
There were no significant changes in EOMF’s management system, harvesting methods or silvicultural systems used. There was however discussion regarding the inclusion of the Larose forest in the EOMF certified properties.

The Larose forest is over 10,400 hectares of forest lands and was established in 1928 by Ferdinand Larose, Prescott-Russell's first agricultural representative. The Larose forest is the second largest plantation forest in Southern Ontario.

The Larose Forest currently has three full time staff overseeing the operations with the Forest Manager of the South Nation CA overseeing the operations. The selection management system is the predominate silvicultural system.

Four contractors work in the Larose and they harvest approx. 170 ha per year. A tender process is used that provides for equal opportunities for different sized operators.

A number of recreational clubs use the Larose’s trail systems as well a many naturalists. The forest has over 124 bird species, 512 different plant species and 22 mammals.

2.2. Stakeholder issues
No issues were presented or received at or prior to the 2006 audit. It should be noted that the EOMF does an outstanding job of involving stakeholders in the development and implementation of its operations.
2.3. Compliance with applicable corrective actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAR Status Categories</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Certified operation has successfully met the CAR and addressed the underlying noncompliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Certified operation has not met the CAR; underlying noncompliance is still present. CAR becomes a Major CAR with a 3 month deadline for compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAR #: CAR 2-2004**

Reference Standard #: Principle 8.0

Non-compliance: Major ☐ Minor ☒

Corrective Action Request:

As part of the administration of their system EOMF will not include properties of greater than 5,000 ha in the certified pool unless explicitly approved in writing by SmartWood.

**Note:** CAR 2 – 2004 was established because of the lack of a significant level of harvesting activities occurring on EOMF FSC properties that would demonstrate the EOMF’s abilities to properly monitor activities on larger properties. This CAR was therefore established as a precautionary measure.

Timeline for Compliance: On-going

Audit findings:

Findings in 2005: No properties were included in EOMF’s FSC pool in 2005 greater than 5,000 ha. The only potential large property was the Limerick forest but was only 3,700 ha.

In anticipation of EOMF acquiring a larger property in its FSC pool, CAR 1 – 2005 was written to address the monitoring of multiple properties especially larger properties that may be included in EOMF’s FSC pool.

Because CAR 1-2005 has addressed the same concerns but with more defined requirements as CAR 2-2004, CAR 2-2004 was closed in 2005 (see CAR 1-2005 for audit results).

Status: Closed

Follow-up Action (if applicable): not required

**CAR #: CAR 01/05**

Reference Standard #: P 8.0 Monitoring and Assessment - Criteria 8.1

Non-compliance: Major ☐ Minor ☒

Since 2004, the EOMF has expanded its FSC program to include forest groups that have their own manager, as is evident with the inclusion of the South Nation properties and the potential inclusion of the Limerick Forest. It is unlikely that the EOMF’s certification staff (Scott Davis) will be able to continue to have as much direct contact with individual operations as is currently occurring with the EOCFOG. Rather, it is more likely that he will be in contact with the managers of the community forest programs.
Currently, the forest groups are submitting their forest management plans and other associated documentation, to EOMF as part of the requirements under their MOU. However, further reporting and follow-up assessments by EOMF as to whether all activities are completed as planned and reported, is limited.

As per P 8.0, it is therefore necessary that the EOMF and its partners develop a monitoring system that will provide EOMF with assurances that their partner’s programs are meeting the conditions of their Memorandum of Understanding and thereby ensure that the EOMF’s FSC polices and procedures are being met.

Corrective Action Request:

By the next annual audit, EOMF shall develop a system of assessment and reporting by its partners who are working under the umbrella of the EOMF’s FSC certification to ensure that their activities are consistent with the goals and objectives identified in the EOMF’s Policies and Standard Operating Practices and the FSC Principles and Criteria.

Timeline for Compliance: One year

Audit findings:

EOMF has developed the appropriate infrastructure to adequately oversee and monitor their properties, including the larger properties. They have developed a system of reporting and an organizational chart that shows the relationships between the different entities of the program. EOMF provided a clear written description of the roles and responsibilities of each group along with associated documentation.

EOMF’s Procedure Manual includes Standard Operating Procedures that provide a detailed outline of the monitoring and assessment requirements by all program participants. EOMF has developed a Forest Operations Activity Assessment Report that will be incorporated into SOP 5.1 of the Policies and Procedures manual.

The development of these processes provides the necessary reporting mechanisms to ensure that monitoring is completed in a systematic method.

The next audit should assess whether these processes have been implemented satisfactorily.

Status: closed

Follow-up Action (if applicable): none

CAR #: CAR 02/05  Reference Standard #: P 6.3
Non-compliance: Major □ Minor ☒

The EOMF have been very active in addressing sensitive value (VTEs) as is evident from the workshops that they will be hosting, their involvement with the local First Nations and their SOPs associated with the inventory and protection of values.

There is however a growing concern by forest managers of the methods used to map and tract values that may be impacted by human disturbance should their location become known by the public e.g. eagle’s nests, wood turtle habitat, etc.

As stipulated in P 6.2.1 (May 2004 GLSL FSC guidelines) a precautionary approach should be developed that identify how these types of values will be addressed to ensure their protection e.g. maps could show the general locations...
Corrective Action Request:

By the next annual audit, EOMF shall develop a protocol for protecting sensitive values of known location (e.g. First Nation values, nest of rare birds, etc.) that may be compromised by having their location revealed.

Timeline for Compliance: One year

Audit findings:

The EOMF presented Standards Operating Procedure 1.8 which describes how sensitive values, that may be compromised if their location were made public, will be protected.

For private land – sensitive value information will not be made public but will be kept confidential by the forest manager and if mapped the exact location will not be given.

For Community Forests – the forest manager will determine the most appropriate method to ensure that sensitive values are not compromised.

These methods for dealing with sensitive values should provide adequate protection of the values.

Status: closed

Follow-up Action (if applicable): none

2.4. New CARs issued during this annual audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAR #: CAR 01/06</th>
<th>Reference Standard #: CoC 5</th>
<th>Non-compliance:</th>
<th>Corrective Action Request:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Major ☑ Minor ☒</td>
<td>By the next annual audit, EOMF shall develop a system to include their FSC certificate code and certified description of products on sales and shipping documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline for Compliance: One year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAR #: CAR 02/06</th>
<th>Reference Standard #: CoC 9</th>
<th>Non-compliance:</th>
<th>Corrective Action Request:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Major ☐ Minor ☒</td>
<td>By the next annual audit, EOMF shall develop a system to ensure that all use of the FSC/SW trademarks, as well as public information related to certification is submitted to SmartWood for review and approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline for Compliance: One year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5. Audit observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Reference Std #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- no observations noted at this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6. Audit decision

EOMF continues to provide outstanding structural organization and should be commended for the detailed documentation they have developed for their program. As well, EOMF brings many stakeholders together and have developed an excellent community forest model.

There are two new CARs issued for this audit, all related to the Chain of Custody. CARs are common for CoC since SW started auditing certified clients for CoC from forest to forest gate this year.

Forestry operations have been minimal to date. With the inclusion of the Larose forest, EOMF should have more operations available for future assessments. It is therefore recommended that future audits focus on the capacity of the EOMF’s staff and group managers to properly implement their procedural protocols for monitoring.

Based on this summary the auditor recommends that the Eastern Ontario Model Forest remain certified.