



## FOREST MANAGEMENT CERTIFICATION REPORT

### SECTION A: PUBLIC SUMMARY

<b>Project Nr.:</b>	<b>7071 CA</b>		
<b>Client:</b>	<b>Westwind Forest Stewardship Inc.</b>		
<b>Web Page:</b>	<b>www.westwindforest.ca</b>		
<b>Address:</b>	74 Church Street, Parry Sound, Ontario, P2A 1Z1		
<b>Country:</b>	CANADA		
<b>Certificate Nr.</b>	SGS-FM/COC-0931	<b>Certificate Type:</b>	<b>Forest Management</b>
<b>Date of Issue</b>	14.02.2007	<b>Date of expiry:</b>	13.02.2012
<b>Forest Zone:</b>	Temperate		
<b>Total Certified Area</b>	421 683 ha		
<b>Scope:</b>	<b>Forest management of 421 683 ha of mixed conifer and hardwood forests, Ontario, Canada.</b>		
<b>Company Contact Person:</b>	Steve Munro, General manager		
<b>Address:</b>	74 Church Street, Parry Sound, Ontario, P2A 1Z1		
<b>Tel:</b>	(705) 746-6832		
<b>Fax</b>	(705) 746-6162		
<b>Email:</b>	stevemunro@westwind forest.ca		
<b>Evaluation dates:</b>			
<b>Main Evaluation</b>	23-27 October 2006 (re-certification)		
<b>Surveillance 1</b>			
<b>Surveillance 2</b>			
<b>Surveillance 3</b>			
<b>Surveillance 4</b>			

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.</b>	<b>SCOPE OF CERTIFICATE .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>COMPANY BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Ownership .....	6
2.2	Company Key Objectives .....	6
2.3	Company History .....	7
2.4	Organisational Structure.....	7
2.5	Ownership and Use Rights.....	7
2.6	Other Land Uses .....	7
2.7	Non-certified Forests .....	7
<b>3.</b>	<b>Group Management (delete the whole section if this is not a group).....</b>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
3.1	Group Management System.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
3.2	Membership of the Group.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
3.3	Monitoring of Group Members.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM .....</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1	Bio-physical setting (Not required for SLIMF) .....	7
4.2	History of use (Not required for SLIMF).....	8
4.3	Planning process.....	8
4.4	Harvest and regeneration .....	8
4.5	Monitoring processes .....	10
<b>5.</b>	<b>SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT .....</b>	<b>10</b>
5.1	Social aspects .....	10
5.2	Environmental aspects (Not required for SLIMF) .....	11
5.3	Administration, Legislation and Guidelines (Not required for SLIMF) .....	12
<b>6.</b>	<b>CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT, HARVESTING, SILVICULTURE AND MONITORING .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>PREPARATION FOR THE EVALUATION .....</b>	<b>14</b>
7.1	Schedule .....	14
7.2	Team .....	14
7.3	Checklist Preparation .....	14
7.4	Stakeholder notification .....	14
<b>8.</b>	<b>THE EVALUATION .....</b>	<b>14</b>
8.1	Opening meeting .....	14
8.2	Document review.....	14
8.3	Sampling and Evaluation Approach.....	14
8.4	Field assessments.....	14
8.5	Stakeholder interviews (Not required for SLIMF).....	14
8.6	Summing up and closing meeting .....	14
<b>9.</b>	<b>EVALUATION RESULTS.....</b>	<b>14</b>
9.1	Findings related to the general QUALIFOR Programme .....	14

---

PRINCIPLE 1:	Compliance with law and FSC Principles .....	14
PRINCIPLE 2:	Tenure and use rights and responsibilities .....	14
PRINCIPLE 3:	Indigenous peoples' rights.....	14
PRINCIPLE 4:	Community relations and workers rights .....	14
PRINCIPLE 5:	Benefits from the forest .....	14
PRINCIPLE 6:	Environmental impact.....	14
PRINCIPLE 7:	Management plan .....	14
PRINCIPLE 8:	Monitoring and evaluation .....	14
PRINCIPLE 9:	High Conservation Value Forests.....	14
PRINCIPLE 10:	Plantations .....	14
<b>10.</b>	<b>CERTIFICATION DECISION.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>11.</b>	<b>MAINTENANCE OF CERTIFICATION .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>12.</b>	<b>RECORD OF CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS (CARs) .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>13.</b>	<b>RECORD OF OBSERVATIONS .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>14.</b>	<b>RECORD OF STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS AND INTERVIEWS .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>15.</b>	<b>RECORD OF COMPLAINTS .....</b>	<b>14</b>

## COMPLAINTS AND DISPUTES

Procedures for submitting complaints, appeals and disputes, and the SGS processing of such are published on [www.sgs.com/forestry](http://www.sgs.com/forestry). This information is also available on request – refer contact details on the first page.



## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the evaluation was to evaluate the operations of **company name** against the requirements of the QUALIFOR Programme, the SGS Group's forest certification programme accredited by Forest Stewardship Council.

### 1. SCOPE OF CERTIFICATE

The scope of the certificate falls within the **Temperate** Forest Zone and includes **1 Forest Management Unit** as described below.

Description of FMUs:				
Description	Ownership	Area (ha)	Longitude E/W	Latitude N/S
<p>The New FMP As a consequence of the new FMP, the total crown forest area was revised from 884 586 hectares down to <b>703 591</b> hectares of which <b>317 752</b> hectares are managed production forest while <b>33 397</b> ha is under protection, <b>70 534</b> ha is non-productive forest and <b>128 325</b> ha is non-forested.</p> <p>For FSC certification purposes the forest area considered is 317 752 ha + 33 397ha + 70 534ha = 351 149 ha.</p>	Government of Ontario	421 683 (forest area)	Westwind office : 80° 02'11.42 W	45° 21'03,63 W

Size of FMUs:		
	Nr of FMUs	Area (ha)
Less than 100ha		
100 to 1000 ha in area		
1001 to 10000 ha in area		
More than 10000 ha in area	1	
<b>Total</b>		703 591 (total crown including agriculture and lakes)

Total Area in the Scope of the Certificate that is:	
	Area (ha)
Privately managed	351 149
State Managed	na
Community Managed	na

### Composition of the Certified Forest(s)

	Area (ha)
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives	33 397
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for production of NTFPs or services	NA
Area of forest classified as "high conservation value forest"	
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	317 752
Area of production forest classified as "plantation"	
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting	
Area of production forest regenerate primarily by natural regeneration	

List of High Conservation Values	
Description	Notes
Moose Aquatic Feeding Areas (MAFAs) Mineral licks Calving sites White-tailed Deer Wintering Areas Red shouldered-Hawk Eastern Massassauga Rattlesnake Great Blue Herons Protected areas	HCV category 1
Hemlock Late seral White and Red Pine Great Lakes Heritage Coast Provincially Significant Wetlands Major water bodies with cultural and historic significance	HCV category 3

Annual Timber Production				
Species (botanical name)	Species (common name)	Area (ha)	Maximum Annual Sustainable Yield (m <sup>3</sup> )	
			Projected (2004-2009)	Actual (2005)
	Tolerant hardwood (Maple, Beech)		776 063	98 486
	White Pine and Red Pine		348 059	80 317
	Spruce, Pine and Fir		92 879	3 052
	Other Conifer (hemlock, Cedar)		48 414	1 281
	Intolerant Hardwood (White Birch, Poplar)		149 511	11 385
<b>Totals</b>			<b>1 414 926</b>	<b>194 521</b>

List of Timber Product Categories	
Product	Notes
List the products that are included in the scope of the joint FM/CoC	Round wood, fire wood

List of Timber Product Categories	
Product	Notes
certificate (e.g. round wood, pulp wood sawn timber, kiln dried timber, chips, resin, firewood, poles, etc)	
Totals	

Approximate Annual Commercial Production of Non-Timber-Forest-Products				
Product	Species		Unit of measure	Total units
	Botanical Name	Common Name)		
Taxol	<i>Taxus canadensis</i>	Canada Yew – Ground hemlock	Not available	
Fire wood	Various		Not available	

## 2. COMPANY BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Ownership and company history

The company is governed by a local Board of Directors that includes four community and three forest industry representatives. The community directors are independent and represent a broad range of community interests from across the District. The industry directors represent the two largest partners as well as the independent partners.

Westwind Forest Stewardship Inc. with its office based in the town of Parry Sound, Ontario, was incorporated in 1997. It is a not-for-profit, community-based forest management company that does not harvest timber but does hold the Sustainable Forest License since 1998 (SFL#542411) for the area. The SFL which Westwind holds is for a twenty-year period and includes all tree species on 5455 square kilometers of crown land, 3453 square kilometers of which is considered productive forest.

### 2.2 Company Key Objectives

Objective	Notes
<b>Commercial and social</b>	
<u>Broad Economic and Social Objectives</u>	
<b>To provide society with a sustainable harvest of forest-based material while considering the diversity of social, cultural and environmental values present in the forest, in order to provide all users and citizens with the opportunity to benefit from the available products and services that the forest provides.</b>	
<b>Environmental</b>	
<u>Broad Objective for Forest Diversity</u>	
<b>To ensure that forest diversity is maintained over the long term through sustainable forest management practices</b>	
<u>Broad Objective for Natural Values dependent on Forest</u>	

Objective	Notes
<p><u>Cover</u></p> <p><b>To protect and maintain natural values dependent upon forest cover while enabling the sustainable use of forest resources.</b></p> <p><b>To maintain a forest landscape that will supply suitable current and future habitat for selected wildlife species over time, within the bounds of natural variation.</b></p>	

### 2.3 Company History

Westwind Forest Stewardship Inc. is a not for profit community based forest management company. Their purpose is to manage certain aspects of forest management on the publicly owned French /Severn Forest on behalf of and according to the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (OMNR) forest management program. This is carried out under the authority of a Sustainable Forest Licence (SFL) signed in 1998.

Westwind delivers management planning, compliance, and silvicultural operations on the French/Severn Forest but does not harvest timber. Timber is harvested by a few large and medium sized forest industry partners and by a range of independent operators. OMNR retains management responsibility for some aspects of forest management as well as ultimate responsibility for the entire forest management package. Westwind is funded by the forest industry and also receives funding from private sources to undertake special projects.

See 2.1

### 2.4 Organisational Structure

Westwind is community - based as it is governed by a seven-member Board of Directors, three of whom represent forest companies. This makes Westwind a unique forest company in Ontario, if not in all of Canada. Westwind directly employs 11 employees.

### 2.5 Ownership and Use Rights

Westwind holds a Sustainable Forest License since 1998 (SFL#542411) to produce a Forest Management Plan and perform silvicultural activities on a crown forest.

### 2.6 Other Land Uses

Numerous non-forestry activities are undertaken on this crown land such as : agriculture, tourism, hunting and fishing. The crown land covers a vast area, larger than the forest land itself. Within the forest under management, only compatible activities are allowed such as hunting, fishing hiking...

### 2.7 Non-certified Forests

The entire SFL under Westwind Forest Stewardship inc. responsibility is FSC certified.

## 3. FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

**Note : the sections below represent an excerpt from Westwind Forest Management Plan 2004-2024**

### 3.1 Bio-physical setting

The French/Severn Forest is located in the Parry Sound District in south/central Ontario, two hours north of Toronto. It occurs on a gently sloping plain rising from Georgian Bay to Algonquin Provincial Park. The total area is 1.4 million hectares, of which 884,586 ha is public Crown land (including 27,875 ha of parks, with significant additional areas now being created through the Ontario Living Legacy exercise), and 514,473 is private (Patent) land. The private land is largely located along a

central corridor running north/south through the district and is interdispersed amongst the Crown land in a range of small and medium sized parcels. The scope of the certification assessment includes the Crown Land portion only.

The distinguishing landform is the Algonquin Dome in the eastern part of the forest rising to its summit in Algonquin Park. To the west of the forest area is Georgian Bay. Within the southern reaches of the forest, soil formation is limited as a result of glaciation and fire, with rocky outcrops being a common occurrence. Approximately half of the forest area is dominated by tolerant hardwoods (principally maple), 20% dominated by intolerant hardwoods and the remainder by conifer and mixed conifer/hardwood stands. Spatially, forest cover is characterised by stands of mixed conifer (mainly white and red pine) in the western townships and areas dominated by mixed tolerant hardwoods in the eastern townships. Stands are predominantly un-evenaged with the age class structure skewed towards the older age classes.

### **3.2 History of use**

There is a long and varied history of Aboriginal use of this area. Their direct influence on the forest includes the use of deliberate forest fires to create new growth favourable to browsing game animals. European influence on the forest was dramatic, as extensive logging occurred since the mid-1880's. Early logging focussed on the white pine that was used in the rapid building expansion of the northeast US. All merchantable trees were harvested with no regeneration efforts. Forest fires from accumulation of slash were common. Later logging focussed on hemlock (Toronto subways and tannins), yellow birch (veneer for Mosquito Bomber in late 1930's and early 1940's) and quality sugar maple (furniture, flooring). Some maple stands were clearcut for a chemical-charcoal industry. Many stands have been logged two and three times with no regard to future harvests. This has left the forest in an unnatural state with a reduction in species such as yellow birch within stands, fewer stands of white and red pine, fewer stands of hemlock, more hardwoods, particularly maple growing on sites not well suited to maple, and a much higher proportion of poor quality stems than would normally exist. However, these facts are not evident to the layperson and the aesthetics of the forest still provides for a vibrant tourism and cottaging environment.

### **3.3 Planning process**

Westwind is responsible for all aspects of forest management planning, including preparation of this FMP, annual work schedules, annual reports, plan amendments and revisions and the planning and coordinating of all silvicultural activities such as tree marking, tree planting, tending and site preparation. Westwind is also responsible for the collection, recording and reporting of forest resource information and updating inventories. This includes monitoring of the effectiveness of silvicultural treatments. Compliance activities are also undertaken by Westwind with an emphasis on communication and education for logging and silvicultural contractors and companies.

Westwind does not harvest trees, nor buy or sell timber. The SFL document issued by the Minister of Natural Resources (MNR) specifies how allocation volume is to be disposed of among a list of two dozen logging companies. These companies hold Overlapping License Agreements (OLAs) with Westwind and receive cutting licenses from MNR. These companies are integral to completing silvicultural treatments, especially in partial harvesting management. They also play a vital, day to day function of self compliance.

MNR continues to be a partner in preparing forest management plans but most emphasis on planning is on review and approval of FMPs, annual work schedules and reports, amendments and revisions. MNR conducts audits of forest management activities for compliance to operating conditions and decides on enforcement strategies. Licensing is also an MNR responsibility.

### **3.4 Harvest and regeneration**

The general silvicultural strategy is to match tree species to the site and silvicultural system. Each stand is assigned a forest unit that is to be managed under one of the three silvicultural systems: selection (uneven-aged), shelterwood (even-aged) and clearcut (even-aged). These silvicultural systems determine the method and extent of light manipulation and the provision of growing space. Many different combinations of silvicultural treatments (e.g. site preparation, planting, tending) can be

part of a planned sequence of activities so that the future desired forest condition for that stand can be met. For example, a poor quality hardwood stand that is to be restored to white spruce may be mechanically site prepared, planted to spruce and tended. There are a series of silvicultural ground rules that provides the appropriate choices of these combinations for each forest unit to achieve this future forest condition. The silvicultural ground rules also define how success will be measured (e.g. stocking and height of desirable and acceptable species, such as 50% stocked to white spruce of 1 m tall and free from competing vegetation). In partial harvesting systems selection and shelterwood, certified tree markers identify each tree to be retained and each tree to be harvested. Tree marking is the process that provides the platform for the successful implementation of a silviculture program. Tree markers also identify and protect other forest values such as hawk nests and streams.

### **Selection**

Selection management is the preferred management system for tolerant hardwood (i.e. hard maple-beech) forest stands. It is a form of uneven-management in which approximately one third of the trees in the stand are removed at one time. Trees of all sizes are marked for removal with an ideal stand structure as a target as defined by silvicultural guides. A main focus with selection management is to improve the quality of the stands by mainly removing trees of poor quality, low vigour and disease. This is defined as "reverse-highgrading". Selection management does not provide a great deal of light into the stand so only species that are tolerant of shade can be managed with this system.

### **Shelterwood**

Shelterwood can best be described as a clearcut that requires two or three stages to complete. The first cut is a seeding cut to create the proper light conditions for regeneration of mid-tolerant species such as white pine, spruce, red oak, black cherry, yellow birch and white ash. After the regeneration is established, they will eventually require more space and light at which time a removal cut will take place. Depending on the forest type, one or more removal cuts will be required. Therefore, when the final removal harvest is complete, there is already a well established new generation of trees. Although best suited to species that are moderately tolerant of shade, shelterwood management is also appropriate for tolerant hardwood stands.

### **Clearcut**

Clearcutting is a silvicultural system that removes most of the overhead canopy in one harvest. Clearcutting is best suited to managing tree species that are intolerant of shade and therefore cannot be successfully regenerated by utilizing a partial harvest system such as selection or shelterwood. Aspen and jack pine are two examples of such species. Clearcutting is also used in degraded and mixedwood stands where stocking is too low to utilize shelterwood as the management system. Clearcuts are generally small in this management unit and, as previously noted, only 7% of the planned harvested are slated for clearcut management.

### **Disturbances**

Natural Disturbance Pattern Emulation Guidelines that were approved in 2001 require that clearcuts be planned so that there are residual patches of unharvested trees. Depending on forest type, up to 36% of the clearcut area may have to be left unharvested. Further, an average of 25 stems per hectare must be left standing, of which 6 must be live trees of larger dimension. A range of disturbance patch sizes must be planned. These disturbance areas can include past forest fire areas and clearcuts up to 20 years old that are within 200 m of each other. Scientific experts provide a template that must be considered in planning clearcuts so that there are a few very large disturbances and many smaller disturbances. These guidelines are addressed at the planning stage (size of clearcuts/disturbances as well as identifying some residual patches), prescription stage (fine tuning of residual patches), and tree marking stage (identifying residual individual trees). Analyses showed that the allocations in this FMP show movement towards the natural disturbance template in over 50% of the size classes as is required.

### **Roads**

Access roads are required for the transport of people, equipment and wood. There are three types of access roads; primary, secondary and tertiary. The Forest Management Planning Manual says:

*Primary Roads are constructed, maintained and used as the main all-weather road system providing access to the whole management unit. Primary roads are essentially permanent roads, and are regularly maintained with an expected life in excess of 15 years These roads are used continuously*

and frequently for the transport of personnel and equipment to and within the management unit and for the transport of wood from the unit to wood processing facilities.

*Secondary Roads* are designed for use as all weather access for a period of 5 to 15 years and are essentially branches off primary roads, providing access to areas of operations. These roads are not considered permanent and are not normally maintained beyond the 5 to 15 year period of their use.

*Tertiary Roads* are built for short-term use of up to five years and are specifically designed for harvest, renewal and maintenance operations. These roads are usually not surfaced or thinly surfaced, and are not maintained beyond the period of their use and are often reforested.

Roads in the French/Severn Forest do not exactly meet the definitions in the manual listed above. The landscape is fragmented in ownership with over half the landbase being private. There is an extensive existing network of provincial highways (including 2 4-lane highways), municipal and local roads. The primary roads listed in table FMP 26 begin at one of these types of roads. Large contiguous blocks of productive crown forest are relatively small by northern Ontario standards. The 2 main blocks are found along Algonquin Park in the east and in the north west section of this forest. Because the majority of harvest is based on a 20 to 25 year return cycle (selection and shelterwood) approx. 80 % of this forest already has a road system developed in it. The remaining 20% will require tertiary roads only to complete harvest operations.

Conditions for road building vary greatly across the district, running from west to east. This is based on topography, water sheds, soils, fish habitat, and land use designations. This creates many additional problems including the maintenance of consistency across the forest for road construction and use.

### 3.5 Monitoring processes

There are a number of objectives for monitoring and assessment programs as they relate to forest management planning. The first is to ensure compliance of forest operations with the forest management plan, with particular emphasis on prescriptions for operations and restrictions to protect other forest values. The second objective is to observe the effectiveness of forest management and the different types of protection measures to assess the success of the prescriptions. In short, monitoring is used to ensure that prescriptions are being carried out properly and that the prescriptions work.

There are four levels of monitoring to ensure adherence to the Forest Management Plan. First, the companies who actually harvest timber or conduct other forest operations are responsible for compliance on their own operations on a day to day basis. Second, Westwind staff will perform site visits and report findings to MNR through the computer program, FOCIS (Forest Operations Compliance Information System). When instances of non-compliance are observed, reporting of occurrences must be reported to MNR in a timely manner as defined in the compliance plans. MNR constitutes the third level of compliance monitoring by conducting random audits and by becoming involved if instances of non-compliance are reported by Westwind. Westwind and MNR staff will often perform joint inspections and Westwind will be given the opportunity to accompany MNR staff on MNR random audits. The fourth level of monitoring is not planned at the management unit level but at the provincial level by means of independent audits.

#### Silviculture Effectiveness Monitoring

Silviculture effectiveness monitoring is required under this Forest Management Plan in accordance with the *Silvicultural Effectiveness Monitoring Manual for Ontario* (SEMMO) and *Forest Information Manual* (FIM). The primary formal effectiveness monitoring program is the regeneration success assessment procedures to reclassify not-satisfactorily regenerated lands (NSR) as production forest. This reclassification will occur when managers are confident that the current condition of the regeneration (artificial or natural) will allow for the area to meet the regeneration standards of this FMP's silvicultural ground rules without additional treatments.

## 4. SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT

### 4.1 Social aspects

<b>Number of own workers</b>	11
<b>Number of contract workers</b>	500-1000
<b>Minimum daily wage for agricultural/forestry workers</b>	\$60 CAD
<b>Infant mortality rates (under 5 years)</b> Canada Stats available is the number of deaths of children less than one year of age per 1,000 live births	5.3
<b>Proportion of workers employed from the local population (%)</b>	Most workers

### First Nations Communities

There are six aboriginal 'First Nations' Communities living on reserve lands within the Forest District. These communities have not historically had much involvement in the forest sector but have started to express more interest in forest values, planning and in employment opportunities from forestry. Westwind's mission is to involve First Nations in forestry and has signed an MOU with the Tribal Association representing 4 out of 6 of the groups that focuses on training, involvement in planning, and shared opportunities to do silviculture work.

### Demography and migrations

The permanent population of the French/Severn area is 32, 477 (49 % male and 51% female). The population has been increasing since 1981 at a rate slightly higher rate than the provincial average. This trend is predicted to continue until 2009. There is a large cottage population in the area and during a long weekend in the summer the population would be in the range of 200 to 300 thousand. As most of these cottages are built to a building code they are available for use year-round. Many people who have their cottages located on year round roads take advantage of their cottage through out the year. A percentage of them plan on retiring in these cottages.

The average individual income for people who live here year round is 22,225 dollars for household it is 43,814 dollars. There is an unemployment rate of 11 %. The communities in the area depend on the forest industry for 4 % of the total employment. It is difficult to determine the non- industrial and non-commercial dependence of the crown forest given the amount of private land. Businesses and individuals do not differentiate between the two.

### Tourism

There are 52 resource-based tourism licensed facilities that use crown land in the French/Severn Forest in one form or another. Seven of the 52 are not physically located in the forest (resorts on the north shore of the French River and in the Loring area). There are 4 resorts that have some type of remote tourism establishment associated with them. Two resorts use floatplanes for their business. Two have remote cabins situated on crown land accessible only by all terrain vehicles (ATV). Four resorts were considered semi remote (boat access only). The remaining resorts are all accessible by road. All the remote and semi remote operators use the northwest part of the crown forest. Snowmobiling is a key winter tourism activity for a number of establishments to prolong the tourism season.

## 4.2 Environmental aspects

### Wildlife

The French/Severn Forest is home to a wide variety of birds, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, insects, plants and a host of other organisms too numerous to list. A principle of forest management is to sustain healthy forest ecosystems, which includes consideration of the habitat needs of all native wildlife species as well as biodiversity. Wildlife concerns in forest management were formerly dealt with through a featured species approach, which was based on the premise that managing for the habitat needs of a featured species (primarily deer and moose, both animals of early successional forests) satisfied the habitat requirements of most wildlife species. Now it is understood that a more appropriate goal of forest management is to create a diversity of habitat conditions at a variety of spatial and temporal scales by attempting to emulate, through forest management activities, the type of habitat diversity that would have occurred under a natural disturbance regime. This should provide for the habitat of a majority of forest-dependent wildlife in the forest. However, special consideration is

given to the needs of provincially or locally featured species that have complex habitat requirements, or have special status. The following locally or provincially featured species are addressed in this forest management plan.

### **Fisheries**

There are thousands of lakes, rivers and streams located in the management unit. Because of the rugged relief, shallow sandy soils, good drainage characteristic of the eastern part of the forest unit there are several deep, and many small coldwater lakes with low productivity. Relief in the western portion of the management unit decreases toward Georgian Bay, resulting in a change to many more warmwater lakes and small wetland systems.

Forestry activities can impact fish habitat through direct alteration by improper stream crossings, skid trail crossings and culvert installation. The Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources has developed specific regulations in order to minimize such impacts. Westwind is making sure that the regulation is implemented by monitoring the contractors activities and monitoring compliance through the province monitoring system (FOIP).

### **Natural Heritage Protection**

The Ministry has defined overall goals and objectives for protecting our natural heritage in the *Nature's Best Ontario Parks and Protected Areas: A Framework and Action Plan*. The Framework and Action Plan provides the umbrella policy for natural heritage in Ontario. Goals and objectives for Provincial Parks have been established under the Provincial Parks Act. While both policies stress identification, protection and management; parks policy also contains objectives for heritage appreciation, tourism and recreation. Provincial Parks Policy is defined in the Ontario Provincial Parks Planning and Management Policies. Provincial policies on wilderness, old growth, Vulnerable, Threatened and Endangered Species, wetlands and fish and wildlife habitats are other important aspects of the policy environment.

On the landscape level, *Ontario's Living Legacy* is the key mechanism which seeks to complete Ontario's parks and protected areas as part of a comprehensive system of protected, representative and special natural areas. *Ontario's Living Legacy* is the result of an extensive planning process that was carried out from February 1997 to May 1999. It culminated in the release of *Ontario's Living Legacy Land Use Strategy* which outlined the intended strategic direction for the management of crown lands in the province.

Another land use category identified through Ontario's Living Legacy is called Enhanced Management Areas (EMAs). It was established to provide more detailed land use direction in areas of special features or values. In the French/Severn Forest, for example, EMAs were identified for areas of remote access and recreation. EMAs may lead to modifications in resource management practices, including timber harvest, in order to recognize other land use values. These adjustments are to be implemented with no impact on wood supply.

### Old Growth Forest

Due to the long history of logging in this area, and the fire history associated with logging and settlement, there is very little forest left in this management unit that could be defined as old growth. Some residual patches exist here and there where logging was not feasible, mostly due to the terrain. Since the first wave of European loggers came, the forest has changed from one largely dominated by conifers, especially white pine, to one dominated by a combination of white pine stands and tolerant hardwood stands. In previous plans, some areas, notably the Cardwell old growth site, were set aside to become old growth in the future (this site became a conservation reserve through *Ontario's Living Legacy*).

## **4.3 Administration, Legislation and Guidelines**

There is a wide range of applicable regulations at both federal and provincial levels. At provincial level the *Crown Forest Sustainability Act* provides for the regulation of forest planning, public involvement, information management, operations, licensing, trust funds for reforestation and processing facilities such as sawmills. The legislation also has sanctions and penalties for non-compliance. Forestry activities on Crown lands in Ontario are also subject to the *Environmental Assessment Act*. Ontario also has laws concerning hunting and fishing, provincial parks, prevention of forest fires and protection of endangered species. In addition, Ontario fosters good management of private land through tree

cutting by-laws and land-use planning legislation and supports stewardship efforts with programs such as the Conservation Land Tax Incentive Program and the Managed Forest Tax Incentive Program.

The following table lists the key national legislation, regulations, guidelines and codes of best practice that are relevant to forestry in the commercial, environmental and social sectors. This list does not purport to be comprehensive, but indicates information that is key to the forestry sector.

Legislation and regulation	Notes
Aggregate Resources Act * Beds of Navigable Waters Act * Crown Forest Sustainability Act * Dangerous Goods Transportation Act * Endangered Species Act Energy Efficiency Act Environmental Assessment Act * Environmental Bill of Rights Environmental Protection Act * Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act* Forest Fires Prevention Act Forest Tree Pest Control Act Forestry Act Gasoline Handling Act * Health Protection and Promotion Act Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act * Occupational Health and Safety Act * Ontario Waste Management Act Ontario Water Resources Act Pesticides Act Planning Act Provincial Land Tax Act Public Lands Act * Trespass to Property Act * Wilderness Areas Act Workers Compensation Act *	
Guidelines and Codes of Best Practice	Notes
Various guidelines for good forest management and wildlife protection are developed by the Ontario government such as : Code of Practice for Timber Management Operations in Riparian Areas Environmental Guidelines for Access Roads and Water Crossings Forest Management Guide for Natural Disturbance Pattern Emulation Forest Management Guide for the Protection of Osprey Nests in Ontario Forest Management Guidelines for the Provision of Pileated Woodpecker Habitat Forest Management Guidelines for the Provision of White-Tailed	

Deer Habitat

## 5. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT, HARVESTING, SILVICULTURE AND MONITORING

The following table shows significant changes that took place in the management, monitoring, harvesting and regeneration practices of the certificate holder over the certificate period.

Description of Change	Notes
<b>SURVEILLANCE 1</b>	
<b>SURVEILLANCE 2</b>	
<b>SURVEILLANCE 3</b>	
<b>SURVEILLANCE 4</b>	

## 6. PREPARATION FOR THE EVALUATION

### 6.1 Schedule

No pre-évaluation was needed considering this audit is a re-certification.

### 6.2 Team

The table below shows the team that conducted the main evaluation and the independent specialist(s) that were selected to review the main evaluation report before certification is considered.

Evaluation Team	Notes
<b>Team Leader</b>	The team leader has graduated from the French forestry school, has a Master degree in ecology (Montpellier University, France) and a Master degree in forest sciences (Laval University, Canada) and has over 12 years of experience in forestry and related field (forest management, ecology, social issues). He was involved as a lead auditor in forest auditing related projects internationally (USA, Eastern Europe, UK, France, South Africa, Congo, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Indonesia, Chile, Papua New-Guinea, Solomon Islands...), regionally (Ontario) and nationally (British Columbia, Quebec). He has over 100 days auditing against FSC, ISO 14001, SFI and CERTFOR. Speaks French and English.
<b>Local Forester (Qualifor auditor)</b>	Registered Professional Forester who has worked 20 years for the Ministry of Natural Resources and is now the owner of a forestry consulting and logging company. Through his career with the Ministry he has worked in various positions in forestry, parks, and administration. As a consultant he has worked to develop shareholders agreements for 3 SFL's in Southern Ontario and has assisted a number of Tourist operators to develop resource management agreements with Forest Companies across Ontario. He has worked on preparing four companies for ISO 14001 certification and has been on involved in all annual audits since the beginning of Westwind FSC certification back in 2001.
<b>Local Social and First Nations</b>	Since 2000, this expert has participated in over 25 forestry audits and certifications. He has been a team member on 6 FSC certification assessments, 6 FSC annual audits, the

<b>Specialist</b>	Test Audit of the FSC Draft Ontario Boreal Standard and an Assessment of the National Boreal Standard on Wood Supply, Biodiversity, Wood Costs and Community Stability. Phil has also been a team member on approximately 12 Independent Forest Audits in Ontario. He has managed or been a team member on a number of economic studies of forest management, the forest industry and crown land recreational use in Ontario, including the Study of the Social and Economic Benefits of the Nine Ontario Living Legacy Signature Sites. He has also undertaken other socio-economic studies on environmental projects and resource use, co-ordinates environmental assessments on energy and infrastructure projects and undertakes environmental audits.
<b>Peer Reviewers</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Peer Reviewer 1</b>	This re-certification report was not submitted for peer review as it is a reassessment.

### 6.3 Checklist Preparation

A checklist was prepared that consisted of the documents listed below. This checklist was prepared using the FSC-endorsed national or regional standard. This standard went through a thorough stakeholder consultation process and field tests organized by FSC Canada.

A copy of this checklist is available on the SGS Qualifor website, [www.sgs.com/forestry](http://www.sgs.com/forestry).

Standard Used in Evaluation	Effective Date	Version Nr	Changes to Standard
The generic SGS Qualifor checklist adapted to include the FSC Advanced Draft for National Standard for Great Lakes St-Lawrence Region of Canada - AD 33-CA-GLSL-01	1 June 2006	01	Advance FSC draft – after stakeholder input and public consultation.

### 6.4 Stakeholder notification

A wide range of stakeholders were contacted by mail 4 weeks before the planned evaluation to inform them of the evaluation and ask for their views on relevant forest management issues. These included environmental interest groups, local government agencies and forestry authorities, forest user groups, and workers' unions. The full list of stakeholders that were contacted is available from SGS. Responses received and comments from interviews are recorded under paragraph 13 of this Public Summary.

## 7. THE EVALUATION

The Main Evaluation was conducted in the steps outlined below.

### 7.1 Opening meeting

An opening meeting was held at **Parry Sound**. The scope of the evaluation was explained and schedules were determined. Record was kept of all persons that attended this meeting.

### 7.2 Document review

A review of the main forest management documentation was conducted to evaluate the adequacy of coverage of the QUALIFOR Programme requirements. This involved examination of policies, management plans, systems, procedures, instructions and controls.

### 7.3 Sampling and Evaluation Approach

A detailed record of the following is available in section B of the evaluation report. This section does not form part of the public summary, but includes information on:

- Sampling methodology and rationale;

- FMUs included in the sample;
- Sites visited during the field evaluation; and
- Man-day allocation.

This re-certification audit was organized over a 5 days period by 3 auditors. General Management, Management Foresters, Operation and Technician Foresters were interviewed. Key stakeholders were also met, such as the Ontario MNR. Two days of Field visits were organized.

**7.4 Field assessments**

Field assessments aimed to determine how closely activities in the field complied with documented management systems and QUALIFOR Programme requirements. Interviews with staff, operators and contractors were conducted to determine their familiarity with and their application of policies, procedures and practices that are relevant to their activities. A carefully selected sample of sites was visited to evaluate whether practices met the required performance levels.

**7.5 Stakeholder interviews**

Meetings or telephone interviews were held with stakeholders as determined by the responses to notification letters and SGS discretion as to key stakeholders that should be interviewed. These aimed to:

- clarify any issues raised and the company’s responses to them;
- obtain additional information where necessary; and
- obtain the views of key stakeholders that did not respond to the written invitation sent out before the evaluation.

Nr of Stakeholders contacted	Nr of Interviews with		
	NGOs	Government	Other
<b>MAIN EVALUATION</b>			
100	5	2	5
<b>SURVEILLANCE 1</b>			
<b>SURVEILLANCE 2</b>			
<b>SURVEILLANCE 3</b>			
<b>SURVEILLANCE 4</b>			

Responses received and comments from interviews are recorded under paragraph 13 of this Public Summary.

Local stakeholders were invited to a information meeting during the audit (information about the meeting was provided through the FSC Canada News Letter and through local newspapers).

**7.6 Summing up and closing meeting**

At the conclusion of the field evaluation, findings were presented to company management at a closing meeting. Any areas of non-conformance with the QUALIFOR Programme were raised as one of two types of Corrective Action Request (CAR):

- Major CARs - which must be addressed and re-assessed before certification can proceed

- ❑ Minor CARs - which do not preclude certification, but must be addressed within an agreed time frame, and will be checked at the first surveillance visit

A record was kept of persons that attended this meeting.

## 8. EVALUATION RESULTS

Detailed evaluation findings are included in Section B of the evaluation report. This does not form part of the public summary. For each QUALIFOR requirement, these show the related findings, and any observations or corrective actions raised. The main issues are discussed below.

### 8.1 Findings related to the general QUALIFOR Programme

<b>PRINCIPLE 1: Compliance with law and FSC Principles</b>	
<b>Criterion 1.1 Respect for national and local laws and administrative requirements</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	Westwind has an excellent record with respect to forest industry operations compliance. Over the last couple of years the percentage of non-compliances was very low, with no major non-compliances, only 2 moderate non-compliances and 12 minor compliances. This is a small number of compliance-related issues given the size of forest and number of different operators within it.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	Westwind respects and complies with all national, provincial and local laws and regulations and has an excellent record of forest compliance.
<b>Criterion 1.2 Payment of legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	Westwind is up to date in the payment of legally prescribed fees, taxes and charges, the key ones of which are the Goods and Services Tax and the Workers Safety Insurance Board Payments. Stumpage fees are paid directly by the Overlapping Licence holders.
<b>Criterion 1.3 Respect for provisions of international agreements</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	Canada is a signatory to all the international agreements identified in the Standard. Canada's compliance to these agreements is done through federal and provincial laws that Westwind adheres to.
<b>Criterion 1.4 Conflicts between laws and regulations, and the FSC P&amp;C</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	There are no conflicts between laws and regulations governing Westwind's operations and the FSC Principles and Criterion. It should be noted that Westwind management have participated in the development of the regional standard and therefore have monitored for potential conflicts.
<b>Criterion 1.5 Protection of forests from illegal activities</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	The Ministry of Natural Resources is charged with the responsibility of preventing illegal harvesting on the French-Severn Forest. Westwind's staff inform MNR staff of incidences of

	<p>illegal harvesting, settlement, occupation or other unauthorized activities. The MNR can charge individuals with theft of wood under the Crown Forest Sustainability Act. MNR has indicated that it pursues 3-4 incidences of illegal harvest per year of varying degrees. Illegal harvest has ranged from minor infringements onto the crown to cuts of up to one hundred acres. Given the size of the FSF and the patchwork of crown and private land, the actual amount of illegal harvesting is small. There is little to no illegal settlement or occupation of land within the forest. There may also be unauthorized use of certain access roads, but MNR enforces access issues. Significant fines for theft of wood can be laid under the Crown Forest Sustainability Act and a portion of these fines are paid to Westwind. In summary, an excellent system is in place for documenting, managing and reporting on illegal activities.</p>
<b>Criterion 1.6 Demonstration of a long-term commitment to the FSC P&amp;C</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	<p>Westwind has been a leader in Ontario and Canada in its commitment to FSC. Westwind was the first Sustainable Forest Licence certified in Ontario to the FSC standard and has been active in standards development, public relations and marketing of FSC products. Furthermore, Westwind has been promoting FSC to other SFLs in the Province.</p>
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	As indicated above Westwind has been exemplary in their commitment to FSC.
<b>PRINCIPLE 2: Tenure and use rights and responsibilities</b>	
<b>Criterion 2.1 Demonstration of land tenure and forest use rights</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>Westwind is the Sustainable Forest Licence (No. 542411) holder to the French-Severn Forest. This was approved by an Order-In-Council by the Government of Ontario as No. 1006/98 (May 6, 1998). Maintenance of the licence is subject to requirements under the Crown Forest Sustainability Act, which requires a number of commitments from Westwind with respect to planning, stumpage and forest renewal charges silviculture, use of herbicides, compliance, operations, Aboriginal participation, natural disturbances and salvation, forest protection, independent forest audits, etc. Westwind has the legal right to use all the tree species. The Licence also identifies the original Overlapping Licence holders who are shareholders of Westwind. Westwind signs Overlapping Licence Agreements which specifies the responsibilities for the forest harvesters with its shareholders who cut wood on the forest, which to operate within.</p> <p>The French-Severn Forest is located in an area of diverse land tenure with a patchwork of private and public lands. Therefore it is quite common for harvesting on the crown land to occur adjacent to private lands and the potential for cutting on to private land. Westwind has a written procedure for this, "Field Procedure for Locating Forest Management Boundaries Adjacent to Private Land." Contact is also established with the landowners and consent as to the boundaries is required prior to harvest. A procedure is in place for absentee landowners. Field observations in annual audits have confirmed the boundary marking that delineates between the crown and private land.</p>
<b>Criterion 2.2 Local communities' legal or customary tenure or use rights</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>The French-Severn Forest is a highly used public forest supporting tourism and recreation uses, non-timber forest products, and other industrial and non-industrial economic uses. Most of the other uses of the forest such as recreation or tourism are permitted activities across most of the forest via the crown land-use planning designations. Some specific tenures such as trappers or prospectors require individual licence or permit requirements that are obtained through the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. The administration of these other use rights is not a Westwind responsibility. These other uses of the forest are identified and documented in the forest management plan on maps and in MNR records. First Nations and Aboriginal people maintain rights to fish, hunt, gather and trap in the French Severn Forest.</p> <p>While communities do not hold customary tenure or resource rights, the general public does for</p>

	uses such as fishing, hunting trapping and traditional gathering. The Forest Management Plan and its associated planning process is the forum for identifying if any of the rights may be impacted by operations. Forest Management on the FSF very rarely will impact these other uses but aspects of forest management such as road building may impact on them (enhance or degrade). These aspects of forest management are then therefore addressed publicly through the forest management planning process which allows numerous opportunities for public participation.
<b>Criterion 2.3 Disputes over tenure claims and use rights</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>There is no evidence of disputes over title, tenure or rights within the French-Severn Forest. Two conflict resolution processes are built into the Ontario Forest Management Planning process which is the required planning process for the French-Severn Forest. The two processes are the Issue Resolution Process and the Request for Individual Environmental Assessment (bump-up). There are very clearly established procedures for both these processes.</p> <p>These processes were initiated once in the last forest management plan over the concerns of one tourist outfit with respect to a harvest prescription near a trail. This dispute was previously investigated in two annual audits and it is the opinion of the assessment team that Westwind acted appropriately and has been very proactive on the issue of trails in the French-Severn Forest by facilitating a Trails Sub-Committee of the Local Citizens Committee. The intention of this group is to find ways in which the forest industry and trail organizations and groups can work together to ensure each others interests are met.</p>
<b>PRINCIPLE 3: Indigenous peoples' rights</b>	
<b>Criterion 3.1 Indigenous peoples' control of forest management</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	<p>Westwind is a leader in Ontario in involving First Nations peoples in decision-making. One position on the Board of Directors is reserved for a First Nations representative and a First Nations Steering Committee has been established. The First Nations Steering Committee was particularly effective at promoting dialogue among the First Nations, MNR and Westwind on interests of First Nations with respect to forest management. Much have this has been focused on economic opportunities.</p> <p>Westwind has developed a very good working relationship with a number of First Nation individuals in the forest.</p>
<b>Weaknesses</b>	<p>At the time of the re-certification, Westwind's interactions with First Nations were in somewhat of a lull. There would appear to be a number of reasons for this but the major one is that most of the Aboriginal individuals Westwind had been working with are no longer involved in forestry related issues (for reasons that have nothing to do with forestry or Westwind). It is important that Westwind maintain its connections with the First Nations and identify a group of interested individuals who want to identify mutual opportunities and benefits for both Westwind and the First Nations.</p> <p><b>Observation – Provided there is interest on the part of First Nations, Westwind needs to re-kindle its First Nations Steering Committee and should visit with the First Nations in and adjacent to the forest to identify issues of common interest. This could be done in conjunction with consultation on the next forest management plan.</b></p>
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>First Nations control forest management on Reserve lands in Canada. While there are Reserves within the French-Severn Forest, forest management laws, policies and guidelines do no apply to these areas. On lands that are managed by Westwind First Nations and Aboriginal peoples maintain historic rights to trap, hunt, fish and gather. There is no evidence to suggest that these rights are degraded by Westwind activities. There are legal requirements in Canada and Ontario to consult with First Nations with respect to forest management planning and these consultation requirements were followed through in the preparation of the 2004 forest management plan. No opposition to this plan was voiced by First Nations. For the upcoming 2009 forest management plan, two First Nations have put forward representatives to sit on the planning team. While there has been no record of disputes involving First Nations and the forest management plan, there are two dispute resolution mechanisms built into the forest management planning process should such an issue arise.</p>

	Westwind has supported a number of First Nation forestry projects. These projects have included: individual and community fuelwood projects; a First Nations youth employment silviculture project ; a Canada Yew collection project ; and, a harvest opportunity for Dokis First Nation near the north end of the forest. Westwind's support of these projects have included: training, direct contract award, facilitation of partnerships and business issues; free provision of maps and information; and free advisory services. More importantly, Westwind was the initiator of these projects through its First Nations Steering Committee. Westwind has indicated to the assessment team that it intends to continue to pursue these opportunities and the observation noted above is intended to re-inforce this effort.
<b>Criterion 3.2 Maintenance of indigenous peoples' resources or tenure rights</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	MNR undertakes an assessment of First Nations resources and tenure rights as well as values and traditional use as part of the Forest Management Planning process. This is done through the reports that are known as the Native Background Information Report ; the Identification and Protection of Identified Native Values Report, which has resulted in the identification of specific point values on the landbase ; and, through the Native Consultation Process. A description of community and individual use of the forest is described in the Background Information Report. There is no evidence to suggest that management activities have threatened or diminished indigenous resources or tenure rights. Any resources of significance can and are protected through Area of Concern Planning which establishes buffers around resources of importance.
<b>Criterion 3.3 Protection of sites of special cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance to indigenous peoples</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	The Ministry of Natural Resources has provided funds during two previous forest management planning processes to assist First Nations in identifying and mapping traditional use areas and values (cultural, social, spiritual, resource harvesting, etc.). Interviews with First Nation representatives have indicated satisfaction with the identification and protection of values on the land base. Maps showing traditional use, land claim and trapping areas are appended to the Forest Management Plan. Maps showing identified First Nations values are not publicly disclosed and are generally held by the First Nations and by the MNR. First Nations have not identified a need for monitoring the impacts of forestry operations on values. Anywhere where there is an identified First Nations (point value) value then this location is protected.
<b>Criterion 3.4 Compensation of indigenous peoples for the application of their traditional knowledge</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	Westwind has had discussions with First Nations and Aboriginal people about the use of non-timber forest products and traditional knowledge, but that knowledge has not been used in any form of commercial exploitation and has rather been shared as a way of two cultures learning from each other. Forest management licence holders in Ontario hold no rights to products in the forest other than timber and therefore there is no potential economic gain to Westwind from even discussing the use of these resources. However Westwind has facilitated discussions on the use of NTFPs and assisted in the development of the Canada Yew project. These projects are very positive initiatives in creating economic opportunities for First Nations and fostering the relationship. Westwind has done this as it sees it as part of its larger community development mandate.
<b>PRINCIPLE 4: Community relations and workers rights</b>	
<b>Criterion 4.1 Employment, training, and other services for local communities</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	One of the central strengths of the Westwind organization is its commitment to local people and communities. Westwind is comprised of a large number of small loggers who are located in many small communities and rural areas throughout the Forest. These small loggers provide

	<p>wood to local mills and therefore provide excellent economic opportunities in these rural areas. Westwind is also a strong community supporter and promoter providing charitable donations, presentations, educational opportunities, etc.</p> <p>Westwind's staff are well trained and Westwind encourages further training for its staff. Westwind has also encouraged the overlapping licence holders to become better trained and qualified.</p> <p>It should be noted that the forest industry is in challenging economic times and that puts strains on the various employees, overlapping licence holders and others who are part of the Westwind organization. Despite these challenging times Westwind continues to provide livelihoods for the individuals involved.</p> <p>Westwind has also taken a lead in economic development and value-added opportunities in the forest.</p>
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>Westwind is an important contributor to the economic and social life of the communities and rural areas of the French-Severn Forest. Most of the forest resources create significant economic opportunities in the local communities. Westwind provides excellent training opportunities to staff and is very supportive of community institutions and development projects.</p>
<b>Criterion 4.2 Compliance with health and safety regulations</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>Westwind has a comprehensive program of worker safety. The worker safety program exceeds the requirements identified in the Standard. The program includes a comprehensive policy, compliance requirements and safety monitoring, procedures for operations including equipment, the appropriate use of personal protective equipment, identification of safety training needs and safety responsibilities.</p> <p>It should be noted that the standard only speaks of workers and contractors and Westwind has moved further educating overlapping licence holders on their health and safety responsibilities.</p> <p>At the time of the re-certification there were few active operations in the woods and therefore there were no observations of actual operations. Therefore a note is made that one of the next two annual audits should occur at a time when seasonal issues will not prevent several visits to active harvest operations.</p> <p><b>Note for Annual Audit : Audit should occur at a time of the year where field visits of active operations can occur.</b></p> <p>Westwind holds liability insurance and is required by law to have WSIB insurance in place for workers compensation. A review of the Westwind files indicated that the policies and payments are up to date.</p>
<b>Criterion 4.3 Workers' rights to organise and negotiate with employers</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>Westwind is a small organization and there is no union in place, however the rights to organize and negotiate have not been interfered with.</p>
<b>Criterion 4.4 Social impact evaluations and consultation</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	<p>Ontario has a robust system of public consultation in forest management planning that includes both a permanent local citizens advisory committee, open houses during forest management planning, dispute resolution processes and an open door policy on public inquiries. Westwind follows this process and through direct contact with stakeholders and in review of stakeholder comments Westwind is well respected with how it works with the public.</p> <p>Any private landowner with lands adjacent to crown forest that is to be harvested is contacted and sign-off required prior to the commencement of forest operations. Westwind has clearly established procedures and forms for such operations.</p>
<b>Weaknesses</b>	<p>Westwind has a fairly minimal mailing list of stakeholders with an interest in the forest. In</p>

	<p>Ontario, the Ministry of Natural Resources maintains these lists for forest management planning and will not release them for reasons under the privacy act. For future re-certifications the mailing list should be expanded to include a broader range of stakeholders. At the same time it should be noted that the re-certification was widely published in local newspapers and in FSC Canada communications</p> <p><b>Observation: Westwind should build its own stakeholder mailing list.</b></p>
<b>Compliance</b>	An excellent system of public consultation is in place and Westwind has an excellent record of dealing with public concerns and comments. Westwind also put together a good summary of the economic impact of the forest industry and other forest uses in its 2004 forest management plan.
<b>Criterion 4.5</b>	<b>Resolution of grievances and settlement of compensation claims</b>
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>Westwind has a well developed system to ensure that there is no trespassing on private land and associated damage to resources. This process is documented in 2.1.1. In order to ensure there is no damage to other resources or rights in the forest, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Westwind identify, map and protect key values on the land base such as trappers cabins or hunt camps. These resources are typically protected through MNR's Area of Concern planning. There areas are then identified prior to operations commencing within the forest. A strong compliance system is in place to check, assess and penalize trespassing into these areas. Discussions held with operators demonstrate a high level of knowledge of other users, rights and resources in the areas that they cut.</p> <p>Environmental resources such as streams, certain bird nests, moose aquatic feeding areas, deer yards, etc. are also protected via the same area of concern planning.</p> <p>Two conflict resolution processes are built into the Ontario Forest Management Planning process which is the required planning process for the French-Severn Forest. The two processes are the: Issue Resolution Process and the Request for Individual Environmental Assessment (bump-up). There are very clearly established procedures for both these processes</p>
<b>PRINCIPLE 5: Benefits from the forest</b>	
<b>Criterion 5.1</b>	<b>Economic viability taking full environmental, social, and operational costs into account</b>
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	Westwind had a balanced budget in 2005. The budget covers all costs including costs associated to the Forest Management Plan (development and implementation), silviculture activities, administration. Funding sources are diversified and mostly come from the shareholders and the Forestry Trust Fund. Additional income is sought from NGOs and charity foundation such as Ivy for special FSC certification related projects.
<b>Criterion 5.2</b>	<b>Optimal use and local processing of forest products</b>
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	All forest products are sold within Ontario. Utilization of forest products to Scaling Manual requirements is directed in operational plans. Compliance inspections check on utilization, log specifications, and transport. FOIP reports provide a record of inspections and recommend action required.
<b>Criterion 5.3</b>	<b>Waste minimisation and avoidance of damage to forest resources</b>
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	The Compliance program focuses on utilization of forest products. Operators are required to

	clean up operations before they move on to other areas.
<b>Criterion 5.4 Forest management and the local economy</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	FMP recognizes a wide range of non-timber values and adjusts forest operations to accommodate these values. There is contact with and support for local community programs. Directors of the Company are drawn from the Community. There are a wide range of supported and/or accommodated uses; recreational trails, hunting, fishing, trapping, camping, educational use.
<b>Criterion 5.5 Maintenance of the value of forest services and resources</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>FMP process identifies a wide range of values and specific areas and species that are of concern, including; Eastern Massassauga rattle snake wintering areas, deer wintering areas, moose calving sites, moose aquatic feeding areas, warm and cold water fisheries, raptor nests, heronries, recreational trails, portages, canoe routes, recreation camps, rare plant communities, scenic vistas, sensitive sites.</p> <p>Inventories of these values are maintained by MNR. Company and MNR staff do provide input to this data base on a regular bases between formal planning periods. FMP public process provides opportunity through open houses and consultation to update this information every 5 years. The FMP provides direction for the protection of these values. There are a wide variety of provincial guides that describe values and provide direction on management:</p> <p>Forest Operations and Silviculture Manual</p> <p>Timber Management Guidelines for the Protection of Tourism Values</p> <p>Timber Management Guidelines for the Provision of Moose Habitat.</p> <p>Code of Practice for Timber Management Operations in Riparian Areas.</p> <p>Forest Management Guidelines for the Provision of Marten Habitat.</p> <p>Forest Management Guidelines for the Provision of White-Tailed Deer Habitat.</p> <p>Forest Management Guidelines for the Protection of the Physical Environment.</p> <p>Forest Management Guidelines for the Provision of Pileated Woodpecker Habitat.</p> <p>The FMP establishes Area of Concern Guidelines (AOC's) to provide direction for operations to protect other values. Directions on AOC's from the FMP are included in the Cut Approval for operations to provide legal grounds for enforcement.</p>
<b>Criterion 5.6 Harvest levels</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	Allowable harvest levels are not being exceeded.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Observation: Without a substantial change in the market situation in the area for low quality hardwood and/or poplar white birch, the economic sustainability of the Company will be threatened. Contingency plans should be developed to deal with a decline in the AAH for PINE and Tolerant Hardwoods as the amount of mixed wood working groups continues expand.
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>The process and procedure for calculating allowable harvest levels is complete and reasonable. While there are some issues with under harvest of some working groups, the calculation does appear to support a sustainable approach to the in-demand working groups, PINE and tolerant hardwood.</p> <p>Harvest level determination uses the best information that they have available and is based on Forest Resources Inventory (FRI) with updating based on field inventory of a portion of the eligible stands. General Percent Reductions are made in the calculations to allow for AOC's,</p>

	inoperable areas, roads and landings, and natural disturbance.
<b>PRINCIPLE 6: Environmental impact</b>	
<b>Criterion 6.1 Environmental impacts evaluation</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	The FMP contains data that provides an opportunity for the Planning team to make decisions and provide direction within the Plan that deals with regional and landscape level issues. Maps of values, soil, forest cover, and sensitive areas are all part of data that is used.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	The explanation and description of how environmental impacts are accessed is hard to follow in the FMP and is incomplete.  Observation : Section 3.2.1 in the FMP is not complete and it is not clear whether the 6 criteria identified in the Plan have met the test of sustainability.
<b>Compliance</b>	The FMP does assess environmental impact using 6 criteria. Both the Company and MNR staff as the landlord of the forest, spend a considerable amount of time during the FMP development, concerned about harvesting impacts on the environment. Both groups of staff try to ensure that the impact of harvesting is minimized. The intent of the protecting the environment is adequately dealt with through actions taken on the ground.
<b>Criterion 6.2 Protection of rare, threatened and endangered species</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	FMP has an updated list of RTE species. This List is updated annually or as the list changes.  On the sites that the SFL is responsible for they are dealing with all sites being harvested and trying to treat at least 60 to 70% of the sites that are being harvested. For the backlogged sites that the SFL is responsible for, they are making progress on treating and getting a portion of the sites to regenerate to white pine..
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Observation : The eastern flying squirrel is an animal of concern in t he GLSTF. The FMP does not provide a reference to this animal through a target or an AOC. While protection appears to be provided for, through the Cavity tree AOC's, the rareness of this animal justifies some specific mention in the FMP.  Observation: The Company meets the standard presently by having a 13% of their forest in the white pine 120+ age class. 10% of the PINE working group has to be maintained in the 120+ age class to meet the standard. Shelterwood management of the PINE working group will mean that this level should be maintained or increase over time until the final removal harvests are started in a portion of the older stands. This will affect the % of stands in the 120+ age class. This issue coupled with the density levels used to declare stands free to grow, will have to be monitored to ensure compliance with the standard.
<b>Compliance</b>	Rare and uncommon species are identified and provided for within the FMP. i.e. pileated woodpecker, red shouldered hawk, raptors, eastern massasauga rattlesnake.  AOC's are being actively used in the development of prescriptions that are used in the field. Compliance programs focus on adherence to AOC requirements. Compliance records are kept on all operations.  The FMP target for white pine is to maintain and where possible to increase this level. On the Crown Productive Forest, 120yr old and older stands represents 13% of land area for the White pine working group. The FMP has a target to maintain 10% of the PINE Unit in the 150+ age class by 2034. Care is taken to manage small groups of Pw to ensure that the Pw stays as a portion of the stand. Removal is based on cutting trees that are in severe decline or where the removal will assist the retained stems or help existing regeneration. Isolated white pine trees are only harvested where they are in severe decline or pose a hazard.

<b>Criterion 6.3 Maintenance of ecological functions and values</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	<p>Prescriptions are well done and the prescription writers use a wide range of data and information to complete the prescriptions : examples ; FEC classifications, soils information, silvicultural guides.</p> <p>FMP identifies featured species and provides direction and targets to protect relevant habitats.</p> <p>There is an issue of connectivity within winter deer yards and the FMP provides direction and targets to guide the development of prescriptions to ensure access for deer to both cover and feeding areas.</p> <p>All areas that need protection and/or are identified values are taken into consideration in development of the roads plan.</p> <p>Water quality is the focus of the development of reserves, not necessarily whether fish are present in the water body.</p>
<b>Weaknesses</b>	<p>Observation: There is no AOC for intermittent streams in the existing FMP. The next plan should have specific requirements for intermittent streams.</p>
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>The FMP provides direction and guidance on regeneration methods. Natural regeneration is there first choice as an option for regeneration. Prescriptions take into account FMP direction on : AOC's, silvicultural ground rules, and minimizing impacts.</p> <p>The FMP provides the ground rules for each harvesting system and this is based on provincial silvicultural guidelines plus local experience. Each harvesting system has a strategy and target within the FMP that is reasonable and appears to be attainable.</p> <p>There is no wildlife fragmented areas within this forest.</p> <p>The FMP proposes a road location for all primary and secondary roads. These locations are checked in the field and issues are identified and dealt with prior to a work permit being issued for that area. The MNR provides direction through their land use plan for which roads are to be closed.</p> <p>AOC's in the FMP provide direction on riparian reserves based on slope and type of water system. Prescriptions and work approvals reflect the direction in the FMP.</p> <p>Reserves are developed, marked on the ground in the field prior to operations beginning. Compliance inspections focus on water quality issues.</p> <p>Presently protection for non permanent streams is dealt with through direction in cutting approvals. Adequate protection is a day to day requirement and is part of the compliance program.</p>
<b>Criterion 6.4 Protection of representative samples of existing ecosystems</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>A gap analysis has been completed for the Forest. There are no significant changes that the analysis has identified. The gaps that have been identified that are outside of the existing protected areas, will be protected as part of normal operations through ANSI and AOC directives.</p>
<b>Criterion 6.5 Protection against damage to soils, residual forest and water resources during operations</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	<p>Company has guidelines and best management practices for the protection of soils and residual stems; Slope buffers, sensitive sties, rutting, skidding damage, stream crossings.</p>
<b>Weaknesses</b>	<p>Observation: Surface water is well protected within the Forest but little consideration has or is being given to ground water issues and water recharge sources. Efforts</p>

	should be made in the future to incorporate ground water and water recharge concerns and directions into the FMP.
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>A review of compliance records and inspections in the field show strong adherence to FMP direction on protecting soil and surface water quality.</p> <p>Up to date best management practices are being followed for permanent and intermittent stream crossings.</p> <p>Work has been completed and reported in the FMP that indicates that all roads and landings cover less than 5% of the productive land area of their forest.</p>
<b>Criterion 6.6 Chemical pest management</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	<p>The Synthetic Chemical Reduction Strategy for the French Severn Forest (update 2006) is not finalized and the strategy is not clear whether the reduction is applicable to areas or to the quantities of herbicides used per hectares. Furthermore, there are no formal conclusions and evidence of discussion about the results of the use of chemical over time. <b>Minor CAR 1.</b></p> <p>There are discussions around considering the use of a herbicide with a longer residual effect than the one used currently for cost-saving reasons, however, this chemical appears to be listed on the revised FSC Annex 1 banned chemicals. Westwind needs to ensure that they consider the classification of the chemicals before taking any further decision. Observation.</p>
<b>Compliance</b>	Chemicals are used for the white and red pine silviculture. According to the forest managers, chemical application at an early stage is the most efficient means to improve the regeneration of the pines against hardwood and to comply with 6.2.3 requirements. The GLSL standard gives a provision for chemical use in case where <i>it is essential to attain silvicultural objectives (6.6.3).</i>
<b>Criterion 6.7 Use and disposal of chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	Contractors producing used oil have permits as required by the regulation . Waste including empty drums and used oils generated on site is disposed-off according to the Ontario requirements.
<b>Criterion 6.8 Use of biological control agents and genetically modified organisms</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	Biological agent was used (MicoTech) in the past on very small scale and on a trial basis. There are no project regarding any further extensive use of any biological agent in the near future.
<b>Criterion 6.9 The use of exotic species</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	No exotic species are used
<b>Criterion 6.10 Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	No conversion is done
<b>PRINCIPLE 7: Management plan</b>	
<b>Criterion 7.1 Management plan requirements</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	The FMP process is extensive and deals with all aspects of the effects of harvesting

	on the environment.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	<p>The FMP process is a very expensive process that constrains resources within the Company. Resources that could be used to provide more time in the field.</p> <p>Observation: As the cost and time requirements of the FMP process increases, Company Staff will not be able to spend time in the field. This will affect the Company's ability to meet the FSC standard on environmental and sustainable principles. There is a need to balance the FMP process and reduce the cost and time requirements of the process.</p>
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>The FMP process has been as followed: invitation letters, notice of open houses, 4 open houses, opportunity to comment on draft plan and review of final draft. The FMP process includes an integrated Planning Team and a district advisory committee, Local Citizens Committee. This committee is briefed throughout the FMP process and asked for input.</p> <p>The calculation of the Annual Available Harvest (AAH) in the FMP is extensive and complete. The FMP develops a number of Management Alternatives and provides a rationale for the one chosen for this management period. The variables used in the development of the AAH are reasonable and are supported with background data and philosophy.</p> <p>The developed management alternatives used a variety of different configurations for the modelling. Each management alternative went through a series of model runs to test various scenarios where a different set of parameters were used. The parameters used and the number of management alternatives tested were reasonable and defensible.</p> <p>FMP maps are extensive and provide information on a wide range of issues and values plus potential harvest areas and areas for proposed silvicultural activities.</p> <p>The FMP does contain a Compliance Plan that directs compliance programs for the period of the Plan.</p>
<b>Criterion 7.2 Management plan revision</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	Any changes to the FMP go through a series of steps depending upon the severity of the change: Major amendment, Minor amendment, Administrative amendment.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Observation: At times, the FMP system can be cumbersome and costly dealing with complaints. Because there are so few public complaints on this forest, a lot of time and money can be spent on frivolous or not supported issues.
<b>Compliance</b>	The Compliance program covers a variety of aspects of both forest operations and forest conditions. This program coupled with inventory programs within the forest provides opportunities for monitoring of management plan issues.
<b>Criterion 7.3 Training and supervision of forest workers</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	Staff and forest operators receive a variety of training on regular bases, i.e. tree marking, values, silvicultural workshops, rutting and logging damage, compliance inspections, chainsaw site preparation.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	The Company's Training Plan is extensive and deals with annual requirements plus long term concerns for staff recruitment, staff replacement, and changing issues for forest workers.
<b>Criterion 7.4 Public availability of the management plan elements</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	The FMP is available to the public at the Westwind's office, the MNR Regional Office,

	and MNR head office.  There is a summary of the FMP and this summary is available at the Westwinds office and available on the Westwinds website.
<b>PRINCIPLE 8: Monitoring and evaluation</b>	
<b>Criterion 8.1 Frequency, intensity and consistency of monitoring</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	The Compliance Plan is well done and covers all operating aspects of forest operations. The Compliance Plan deals with compliance with operational items : prescriptions, tree marking, AOC monitoring, road construction, stream crossings, boundary marking, skidding damage, rutting, trail management and with silvicultural effectiveness monitoring.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Observation: With the movement to a 10 year FMP, there will be a need to provide a periodic review during the 10 year period of the FMPs strategies, objectives, and targets and how they are being met on the ground. i.e. forest diversity is maintained, secure and maintain a minimum of 5% of old growth in the PWUS forest unit, minimize the impact of forest operations on the economic viability of the resource based tourism industry.
<b>Compliance</b>	A Compliance Plan has been developed and is an Appendix within the FMP. The Compliance Plan lays out direction for the regular checking of the detailed direction provided by the FMP. The compliance plan is being followed and records are on file of compliance inspections and actions  Compliance records are completed on a regular basis, filed in the Westwinds office, and are available to the public, subject to freedom of information guidelines.  The landscape level targets plus the FMPs overall goals and objectives have been reviewed every 5 years through the development of the next FMP.
<b>Criterion 8.2 Research and data collection for monitoring</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	The MNR biologists who sit on the Planning Team provide regular input related to changes in habitat and/ or concerns about species for both plant and animal.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	There is an extensive system in place to monitor and report all harvesting on their forest by work permit, and overlapping license. Additional work is being done on extracting data that provides information on yield /ha by species and product.  All company field staff are actively involved in the updating of data on forest health, age class distribution, stand makeup, and regeneration status. Compliance inspections are conducted on all operations and with a focus on minimizing erosion and damage to water resources.  The Company is assisted by staff from the Technical Development Unit to monitor and update growth rates. The TDU staff have a number of plots within the forest that provides the indication of growth. This data is incorporated into FMP as the AAH are recalculated every 5 years.  Workshops are being held as required, as part of staff training, to highlight new information on species that should be of concern : rare plants ginseng, indicator species martin, rare animals wood turtle.
<b>Criterion 8.3 Chain of custody</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	
<b>Compliance</b>	The mills that are accepting FSC certified products from the forest, have chain of custody processes in place to track and identify their products.

<b>Criterion 8.4</b>		<b>Incorporation of monitoring results into the management plan</b>
<b>Strengths</b>	There is strong support from senior Company staff to update data daily from field observations.	
<b>Weaknesses</b>		
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>Compliance reports are regularly monitored by Westwinds senior staff and by MNR staff. Trends or issues in compliance are a point of discussion by the Planning Team for the development of the next FMP.</p> <p>Other trends and issues that have been identify during the management period from field observations and inventory results are being incorporated into the next FMP.</p>	
<b>Criterion 8.5</b>		<b>Publicly available summary of monitoring</b>
<b>Strengths</b>		
<b>Weaknesses</b>		
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>MNR staff compile an annual report of Compliance issues and this is part of the Annual Plan that is available to the public.</p> <p>The FMP does identify specific issues that have come up through the planning period and these are dealt with through the development of strategies to deal with each issue.</p>	
<b>PRINCIPLE 9: High Conservation Value Forests</b>		
<b>Criterion 9.1</b>		<b>Evaluation to determine high conservation value attributes</b>
<b>Strengths</b>	Good and detailed HCVF report. Links are made with provincial HCVF compliant system (AOC).	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	None	
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>A thorough evaluation of High Conservation Values was done for the initial registration audit in 2001 : High Conservation Value Forest in the French Severn Forest SFL. This document was updated in October 2006 (version 1.3). The evaluation is based on the FSC HCVF identification requirements comprising the main 6 HCV categories, the ProForest HCVF guidance document and the WWF Canada HCVF toolkit. 11 main HCV were identified as part of this exercise. There a link with the Forest Management plan through the Areas of Concern (AOCs). See section 1 of this report for details on the HCV.</p>	
<b>Criterion 9.2</b>		<b>Consultation process</b>
<b>Strengths</b>	None	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	None	
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>There were four components to the consultation process: a broad view based on the Forest Management Process, a consultation with technical experts about species, ecosystems or values that are HCVF, consultation by regional and provincial stakeholders, open door policy where comments can be made at any time.</p> <p>First Nations were also consulted through the FMP. A selection of national environmental NGOs and the MNR were consulted on the strategy.</p>	
<b>Criterion 9.3</b>		<b>Measures to maintain and enhance high conservation value attributes</b>
<b>Strengths</b>		
<b>Weaknesses</b>	None	
<b>Compliance</b>	<p>A number of measures to maintain each of the HCV identified are described in the HCVF report. These measures address protection through AOCs sylvicultures guides and species guides. Management measures and prescriptions are implemented according to the MNR requirements.</p>	

<b>Criterion 9.4 Monitoring to assess effectiveness</b>	
<b>Strengths</b>	Systematic links between the HCV and the Ontario AOC methodology. This improves consistency and the efficiency of the protection approach.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	None
<b>Compliance</b>	Compliance reports (FOIP) address the implementation of the protection measures. Infractions, if any, are addressed and monitored.
<b>PRINCIPLE 10: Plantations</b>	
<b>There are no plantations in the French Severn Forest</b>	

## 9. CERTIFICATION DECISION

SGS considers that Westwind Forest Stewardship Inc's forest management of the French Severn Forest, Ontario, can be certified as:

- i. There are no outstanding Major Corrective Action Requests
- ii. The outstanding Minor Corrective Action Requests do not preclude certification, but Westwind is required to take the agreed actions before 26 October 2007. These will be verified by SGS QUALIFOR at the first surveillance to be carried out about 6 months from the date of the issuance of the certificate. If satisfactory actions have been taken, the CARs will be 'closed out'; otherwise, Minor CARs will be raised to Major CARs.
- iii. The management system, if implemented as described, is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the applicable standard(s) are met over the whole forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation;
- iv. The certificate holder has demonstrated, subject to the specified corrective actions, that the described system of management is being implemented consistently over the whole forest area covered by the scope of the certificate.

## 10. MAINTENANCE OF CERTIFICATION

During the surveillance evaluation, it is assessed if there is continuing compliance with the requirements of the Qualifor Programme. Any areas of non-conformance with the QUALIFOR Programme are raised as one of two types of Corrective Action Request (CAR):

- .01 **Major CARs** - which must be addressed and closed out urgently with an agreed short time frame since the organisation is already a QUALIFOR certified organisation. Failure to close out within the agreed time frame can lead to suspension of the certificate.
- .02 **Minor CARs** - which must be addressed within an agreed time frame, and will normally be checked at the next surveillance visit

The full record of CARs raised over the certification period is listed under section 11 below.

The table below provides a progressive summary of findings for each surveillance. A complete record of observations demonstrating compliance or non-compliance with each criterion of the Forest Stewardship Standard is contained in a separate document that does not form part of the public summary.

<b>SURVEILLANCE 1</b>	
<b>Issues that were hard to assess</b>	
<b>Number of CARs closed</b>	__ Outstanding CARs were closed.
<b>Nr of CARs remaining open</b>	__ Outstanding CARs from previous evaluations were not closed.

<b>New CARs raised</b>	__ New Major CARs and __ Minor CARs were raised.
<b>Certification Decision</b>	<p>The forest management of the forests of _____ remains certified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The management system is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the applicable standard(s) are met over the whole forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation; and</li> <li>▪ The certificate holder has demonstrated, subject to the specified corrective actions, that the described system of management is being implemented consistently over the whole forest area covered by the scope of the certificate.</li> </ul>
<b>SURVEILLANCE 2</b>	
<b>Issues that were hard to assess</b>	
<b>Number of CARs closed</b>	
<b>Nr of CARs remaining open</b>	
<b>Nr of New CARs raised</b>	
<b>Certification Decision</b>	
<b>SURVEILLANCE 3</b>	
<b>Issues that were hard to assess</b>	
<b>Number of CARs closed</b>	
<b>Nr of CARs remaining open</b>	
<b>Nr of New CARs raised</b>	
<b>Certification Decision</b>	
<b>SURVEILLANCE 4</b>	
<b>Issues that were hard to assess</b>	
<b>Number of CARs closed</b>	
<b>Nr of CARs remaining open</b>	
<b>Nr of New CARs raised</b>	
<b>Certification Decision</b>	

**11. RECORD OF CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS (CARS)**

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
		Date Recorded>	27 Oct 06	Due Date>	Next surv	Date Closed>	dd MMM yy
01 2006	6.6.3	<b>Non-Conformance:</b>					
		The applicant does not demonstrate a continuous reduction of chemical pesticide use as required .					
		The chemical use reduction strategy is not clear and is not finalized.					
		<b>Objective Evidence:</b>					
		The Synthetic Chemical Reduction Strategy for the French Severn Forest (update 2006) is not finalized and the strategy is not clear whether the reduction is applicable to areas or to the quantities of herbicides used per hectares. Furthermore, there are no formal conclusions and evidence of discussions about the results of the use of chemical over time.					
		<b>Close-out evidence:</b>					
		Date Recorded>	dd MMM yy	Due Date>	dd MMM yy	Date Closed>	dd MMM yy
		<b>Non-Conformance:</b>					
		<b>Objective Evidence:</b>					
		<b>Close-out evidence:</b>					

## 12. RECORD OF OBSERVATIONS

OBS #	Indicator	Observation Detail			
		Date Recorded>	27 Oct 06	Date Closed>	dd MMM yy
1	8.3	Date Recorded>	27 Oct 06	Date Closed>	dd MMM yy
		<b>Observation:</b>			
		Update of FSC certified material sold was not available at the time of the audit. The Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources releases the volumes harvested in September-November. Westwind will have to update SGS QUALIFOR once the data are verified and made available at that time.			
		<b>Follow-up evidence:</b>			
2	General requirement	Date Recorded>	27 Oct 06	Date Closed>	dd MMM yy
		<b>Observation:</b>			
		The next surveillance visit needs to be organized either in August or February 2007 in order for the audit team to have the opportunity to visit active operations and discuss with more contractors.			
		<b>Follow-up evidence:</b>			
3	6.6.1	Date Recorded>	27 Oct 06	Date Closed>	dd MMM yy
		<b>Observation:</b>			
		There are discussions around considering the use of an herbicide with a longer residual effect than the one use currently for cost savings reasons, however, this chemical appears to be listed on the revised FSC Annex 1 banned chemicals. Westwind needs to ensure that they consider the classification of the chemicals before taking any further decision.			
		<b>Follow-up evidence:</b>			
4	3.1	Date Recorded>	27 Oct 06	Date Closed>	dd MMM yy
		<b>Observation:</b>			
		Provided there is interest on the part of First Nations, Westwind needs to re-ignite its First Nations Steering Committee and should visit with the First Nations in and adjacent to the forest to identify issues of common interest. This could be done in conjunction with consultation on the next forest management plan.			
		<b>Follow-up evidence:</b>			
	4.4	Date Recorded>	27 Oct 06	Date Closed>	dd MMM yy
		<b>Observation:</b>			
		Westwind should build its own stakeholder mailing list.			
		<b>Follow-up evidence:</b>			
	5.6	Date Recorded>	27 Oct 06	Date Closed>	dd MMM yy
		<b>Observation:</b>			
		Without a substantial change in the market situation in the area for low quality hardwood and/or poplar white birch, the economic sustainability of the Company will be threatened. Contingency plans should be developed to deal with a decline in the AAH for PINE and Tolerant Hardwoods as the amount of mixed wood working groups continues expand.			

OBS #	Indicator	Observation Detail			
		<b>Follow-up evidence:</b>			
	6.1	<b>Date Recorded&gt;</b>	27 Oct 06	<b>Date Closed&gt;</b>	dd MMM yy
		<b>Observation:</b>			
		Section 3.2.1 in the FMP is not complete and it is not clear whether the 6 criteria identified in the Plan have met the test of sustainability.			
		<b>Follow-up evidence:</b>			
	6.2	<b>Date Recorded&gt;</b>	27 Oct 06	<b>Date Closed&gt;</b>	dd MMM yy
		<b>Observation:</b>			
		The eastern flying squirrel is an animal of concern in t he GLSTF. The FMP does not provide a reference to this animal through a target or an AOC. While protection appears to be provided for through the Cavity tree AOC's, the rareness of this animal justifies some specific mention in the FMP.			
		<b>Follow-up evidence:</b>			
	6.2	<b>Date Recorded&gt;</b>	27 Oct 06	<b>Date Closed&gt;</b>	dd MMM yy
		<b>Observation:</b>			
		The Company meets the standard presently by having a 13% of their forest in the white pine 120+ age class. 10% of the PINE working group has to be maintained in the 120+ age class to meet the standard. Shelterwood management of the PINE working group will mean that this level should be maintained or increase over time until the final removal harvests are started in a portion of the older stands. This will affect the % of stands in the 120+ age class. This issue coupled with the density levels used to declare stands free to grow, will have to be monitored to ensure compliance with the standard.			
		<b>Follow-up evidence:</b>			
	6.3	<b>Date Recorded&gt;</b>	27 Oct 06	<b>Date Closed&gt;</b>	dd MMM yy
		<b>Observation:</b>			
		There is no AOC for intermittent streams in the existing FMP. The next plan should have a specific requirements for intermittent streams.			
		<b>Follow-up evidence:</b>			
	6.5	<b>Date Recorded&gt;</b>	27 Oct 06	<b>Date Closed&gt;</b>	dd MMM yy
		<b>Observation:</b>			
		Surface water is well protected within the Forest but little consideration has or is being given to ground water issues and water recharge sources. Efforts should be made in the future to incorporate ground water and water recharge concerns and directions into the FMP.			
		<b>Follow-up evidence:</b>			
	7.1	<b>Date Recorded&gt;</b>	27 Oct 06	<b>Date Closed&gt;</b>	dd MMM yy
		<b>Observation:</b>			

OBS #	Indicator	Observation Detail			
		<p>As the cost and time requirements of the FMP process increases, Company Staff will not be able to spend time in the field. This will affect the Company's ability to meet the FSC standard on environmental and sustainable principles. There is a need to balance the FMP process and reduce the cost and time requirements of the process.</p> <p><b>Follow-up evidence:</b></p>			
	7.2	<b>Date Recorded&gt;</b>	27 Oct 06	<b>Date Closed&gt;</b>	dd MMM yy
		<b>Observation:</b>			
		<p><b>At times, the FMP system can be cumbersome and costly dealing with complaints. Because there are so few public complaints on this forest, a lot of time and money can be spent on frivolous or not supported issues.</b></p>			
		<b>Follow-up evidence:</b>			
	8.1	<b>Date Recorded&gt;</b>	27 Oct 06	<b>Date Closed&gt;</b>	dd MMM yy
		<b>Observation:</b>			
		<p>With the movement to a 10 year FMP, there will be a need to provide a periodic review during the 10 year period of the FMPs strategies, objectives, and targets and how they are being met on the ground. i.e. forest diversity is maintained, secure and maintain a minimum of 5% of old growth in the PWUS forest unit, minimize the impact of forest operations on the economic viability of the resource based tourism industry.</p>			
		<b>Follow-up evidence:</b>			
		<b>Date Recorded&gt;</b>	27 Oct 06	<b>Date Closed&gt;</b>	dd MMM yy
		<b>Observation:</b>			
		<b>Follow-up evidence:</b>			

**13. RECORD OF STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS AND INTERVIEWS**

Nr	Comment	Response
<b>Main Evaluation</b>		
1	MNR area forester responded to a number of questions from the team with respect to the Local Citizens Committee, First Nations, the 2004 Forest Management Plan, land use policies, trail issues, the planning process for the 2009 Forest Management Plan, white pine management, compliance and environmental protection.	No responses needed
2	MNR district enforcement officer described the process for investigating and charging individuals with illegal harvesting on the forest.	No responses needed
3	3 contractors were met in the office. Discussions and comments were done over various issues such as training, Health and Safety, chain-of-custody, concerns over the financial sustainability of forestry, overwhelming administration requirements, delay in payment from the OMNR etc.	No responses needed
4	Generally, all stakeholders that responded to the SGS Stakeholder report had positive comments to make on Westwind management activities and communication.	No responses needed
<b>Surveillance 1</b>		
<b>Surveillance 2</b>		
<b>Surveillance 3</b>		
<b>Surveillance 4</b>		

**14. RECORD OF COMPLAINTS**

Nr	Detail		
	Complaint:	Date Recorded >	dd MMM yy
	No issues were submitted to SGS QUALIFOR.		
	Objective evidence obtained:		
	Close-out information:	Date Closed >	dd MMM yy

**End of Public Summary**