

FOREST MANAGEMENT AND STUMP-TO-FOREST GATE CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY CERTIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT

Skogscertifiering Prosilva AB

SCS-FM/COC-00153G

Box 26055, S-750 26 Uppsala, Sweden
info@skogscertifiering.se
www.prosilva.se

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
21 October 2011	20 October 2016

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
May 31; June 1, 3, 7, 8, 28 and 29; July 4, 7 and 13, 2016
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
24 October 2016

SCS Contact:
Brendan Grady | Director
Forest Management Certification
+1.510.452.8000
bgrady@scsglobalservices.com

SCS global
SERVICES
Setting the standard for sustainability™

2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600, Emeryville, CA 94608 USA
+1.510.452.8000 main | +1.510.452.8001 fax
www.SCSglobalServices.com

Foreword

SCS Global Services (SCS) is a certification body accredited by the Forest Stewardship Council to conduct forest management and chain of custody evaluations. Under the FSC / SCS certification system, forest management enterprises (FMEs) meeting international standards of forest stewardship can be certified as “well managed,” thereby permitting the FME’s use of the FSC endorsement and logo in the marketplace subject to regular FSC / SCS oversight.

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams of natural resource specialists and other experts in forested regions all over the world to conduct evaluations of forest management. SCS evaluation teams collect and analyze written materials, conduct interviews with FME staff and key stakeholders, and complete field and office audits of subject forest management units (FMUs) as part of certification evaluations. Upon completion of the fact-finding phase of all evaluations, SCS teams determine conformance to the FSC Principles and Criteria.

Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate Database (<http://info.fsc.org/>) no less than 30 days after issue of the certificate. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use of by the FME.

Table of Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1 Certificate Registration Information	4
1.2 FSC Data Request	5
1.3 Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification (Partial Certification and Excision)	8
1.4 Social Information	8
1.5 Pesticide and Other Chemical Use	8
1.6 Standards Used	9
1.7 Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units.....	9
2. DESCRIPTION OF FOREST MANAGEMENT	10
2.1 Management Context	10
2.2 Forest Management Plan.....	11
2.3 Monitoring System.....	11
3. CERTIFICATION EVALUATION PROCESS	12
3.1 Evaluation Schedule and Team	12
3.2 Evaluation of Management System	15
3.3 Stakeholder Consultation Process	15
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION	16
4.1 Notable Strengths and Weaknesses of the FME Relative to the FSC P&C.....	16
4.2 Process of Determining Conformance	17
5. CERTIFICATION DECISION	25

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Certificate Registration Information

1.1.1.a Name and Contact Information

Organization name	Skogscertifiering Prosilva AB		
Contact person	Patrik Vendel		
Address	Box 26055,	Telephone	+ 46 (0)18-46 06 60
	S-750 26 Uppsala,	Fax	-
	Sweden	e-mail	info@skogscertifiering.se
		Website	www.prosilva.se

1.1.1.b FSC Sales Information

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales contact information same as above.			
FSC salesperson			
Address	Telephone		
	Fax		
	e-mail		
	Website		

1.1.2 Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Single FMU		<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Group			
SLIMF (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate		<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate			
# Group Members (if applicable)	555			
Number of FMUs in scope of certificate	555			
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	Latitude & Longitude: n/a			
Forest zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Boreal		<input type="checkbox"/> Temperate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical		<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical	
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is: Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac				
privately managed	73623 ha			
state managed	0 ha			
community managed	67180 ha			
Number of FMUs in scope that are:				
less than 100 ha in area	355	100 - 1000 ha in area	193	
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	5	more than 10 000 ha in area	2	

Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:		Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
are less than 100 ha in area	Prosilva has records of every property and the total areas. However, the organization does not have a system to (easily) aggregate the numbers for this question.	
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	See above.	
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs	See above.	
Division of FMUs into manageable units:		
n/a		

1.1.3 Non-SLIMF Group Members

Name	Contact information	Latitude / longitude of Non-SLIMF FMUs	
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

1.2 FSC Data Request

1.2.1 Production Forests There is much variation within the group; replanting and natural regeneration are used.

Timber Forest Products	Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
-------------------------------	---

Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	140803
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	0
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	There is much variation within the group; replanting and natural regeneration are used.
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	There is much variation within the group; replanting and natural regeneration are used.
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range 0-10 ha)	140803
Shelterwood	0 ha
Other:	0 ha
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	0 ha
Group selection	0 ha
Other:	0 ha
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	Management by clearcut is by far the predominant management scheme within the group. However, alternative methods in terms of shelterwood and uneven-aged management do occur within the group but only to a low extent.
The sustainable rate of harvest (usually Annual Allowable Harvest or AAH where available) of commercial timber (m ³ of round wood)	Approximately 507000 m ³
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0 ha
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	0 ha
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	0
Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:	
<p>AAH Average growth rate of about 4 m³ per hectare/year. Usually only 90% of the growth rate can be accessed due to age structure constraints. Thus it is assumed that 3,6 m³ per hectare/year can be harvested at a sustainable rate, which is the figure that was used for the AAH calculation above. General data on silvicultural systems in Sweden may be available from the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (http://www.slu.se/sv/webbtjanster-miljoanalys/statistik-om-skog/avverkning/) or from the Swedish Forest Agency (http://www.skogsstyrelsen.se/en/, last accessed 9 September 2016).</p>	

AAH is seldom mentioned explicitly in Swedish FMPs. Forest growth rate and total harvest volume derived from individual stand management suggestions can be compared. For SLIMF as well as non-SLIMF forest owners there are constraints in the Forestry Act on lowest final harvest age for different tree species and <50% of the productive forest area should be in the age range 0-20 years. For non-SLIMF forest owners additional constraints apply that regulate annual harvest areas in order to even out harvest levels over time.

NTFP

Commercial production of non-timber forest products is unusual in Sweden. Audited group members are not involved in any such business, as confirmed in interviews and the group manager is not aware of any NTFP operations among its group members. Berry and mushroom picking is free on any forest land holdings and owners are not able to collect any fees etc.

Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)

Picea abies/Spruce, Pinus sylvestris/Pine, Betula pendula/Betula pubeschens/Birch, Populus tremula/Aspen

1.2.2 FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
W1 Logs	W1.1 Roundwood	All
	W1.2 Fuel Wood W1.3 Twigs	All
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species
n/a	n/a	n/a

1.2.3 Conservation Areas

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives		Approximately 8480 ha		
High Conservation Value Forest / Areas				
High Conservation Values present and respective areas:				Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
	Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain	Each of the 555 FMUs has at	8480 in

		rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	least 5% of the production forest set aside. This area can often be classified as HCV3. But HCV3-areas vary in sizes and figures are constantly updated by the Swedish Forest Agency.	total. Figures included in each group member's FMP
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).		
Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest / Area'				

1.3 Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification (Partial Certification and Excision)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.</i>
Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:	
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):	

1.4 Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):	
0,7 of male workers	1,5 of female workers

1.5 Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>FME does not use pesticides.</i>
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

1.6 Standards Used

1.6.1 Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC National Standard for Sweden including SLIMF	V2-1	05/05/10
FSC-STD-30-005	V1-0	31 August, 2009
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International (www.fsc.org), the FSC-US (www.fscus.org) or the SCS Standards page (www.scsglobalservices.com/certification-standards-and-program-documents). Standards are also available, upon request, from SCS Global Services (www.SCSglobalServices.com).		

1.7 Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units

Length Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Mile (US Statute)	Kilometer (km)	1.609347
Foot (ft)	Meter (m)	0.3048
Yard (yd)	Meter (m)	0.9144
Area Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Square foot (sq ft)	Square meter (m ²)	0.09290304
Acre (ac)	Hectare (ha)	0.4047
Volume Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Cubic foot (cu ft)	Cubic meter (m ³)	0.02831685
Gallon (gal)	Liter (l)	4.546
Quick reference		
1 acre	= 0.404686 ha	
1,000 acres	= 404.686 ha	
1 board foot	= 0.00348 cubic meters	
1,000 board feet	= 3.48 cubic meters	
1 cubic foot	= 0.028317 cubic meters	

2. Description of Forest Management

2.1 Management Context

2.1.1 Regulatory Context

Pertinent Regulations at the National Level	Skogsvårdslag (Forestry Act) Kulturmiljölagen (Protection of Culture Heritage Act) Miljöbalken (Environmental Act) Artskyddsförordningen Timmerförordning (EUTR) et al, see the Swedish FSC standard for a full list
Pertinent Regulations at the State / Local Level	n/a

Regulatory Context Description

The Swedish Forest Agency (Forest Service) is responsible for enforcing the forest law and to provide services and advice to the forest owners. The forest law sets the production and the environmental goals of equal importance. The Agency has control functions for final felling and regeneration results. Fees for violations are issued in some rare cases.

The agency does much monitoring, especially on regeneration after logging and nature conservation measures.

The agency has done a woodland key habitat inventory of all private forest land. The protection of such sites is voluntary, but most forest owners do protect such sites.

2.1.2 Environmental Context

Environmental safeguards:
Protection of certain forest types, protection during a certain season, buffer zones around protected areas, site adapted logging technology, training of all types of staff and workers.
Management strategy for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered (RTE) species and their habitats:
Identification of protection needs through the key biotype inventory and nature value assessment before logging operations.

2.1.3 Socioeconomic Context

About 50% of the forestland in Sweden is owned by private persons. The forest is sometimes combined with agriculture, but most forest owners have other full time jobs. In many areas, forestry and forest industry is an important business sector and often the main employer. Most of the private forest owners have grown up with forest and inherited forest. The typical forest owner has good knowledge of nature conservation issues and takes interest in the ownership.

The sami people, the indigenous people within Sweden, occur in the northern regions of Sweden. Very few of the group members of Prosilva occur within these regions. There are regions with indigenous people.

2.1.4 Land Use, Ownership, and Land Tenure

The forest owner has the right to extract timber and conduct game hunting and fishing. Both hunting and fishing can be leased to clubs and private persons. For moose hunting, most forest owners are member in “moose hunting areas”, where government agency sets the maximum animals to be shot.

The Swedish customary rights give all people the right to pick berries and mushrooms and also the rights to access all parts of the forest.

2.2 Forest Management Plan

Management Objectives:
High and valuable forest timber production and conservation of biodiversity.
Forest Composition and Rationale for Species Selection:
Pine and spruce are about 85 %, Birch and aspen are about 15 %. All species have commercial value.
General Description of Land Management System(s):
The typical system is final felling, regeneration and 2-4 thinnings. Regeneration is mostly done through soil preparation and planting of a single species. Seed trees are used on dry and mesic pine sites.
Harvest Methods and Equipment used:
Harvester and forwarder.
Explanation of the management structures:
Group Entity (GE) is responsible for information to all group members (GM) on FSC requirements.

2.3 Monitoring System

Growth and Yield of all forest products harvested:
Growing stock is estimated every 10 years for management plan revision.
Forest dynamics and changes in composition of flora and fauna:
Some protected areas are monitored by the local government agency and sometimes also by local NGOs.
Environmental Impacts:
Monitored by the regional Forest Service and County board.
Social Impacts:
Regular contacts with local people and associations. The FSC Sweden standard does not require extensive social impacts monitoring for SLIMF FMUs.
Costs, Productivity, and Efficiency:
Book keeping and tax declaration.

3. Certification Evaluation Process

3.1 Evaluation Schedule and Team

3.1.1 Evaluation Itinerary and Activities

Date: 31 May 2016	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Member number S-2265	Reviewed of forest management plan. Assessment of forest owners' awareness of standard requirements. Evaluation of the information provided by the group entity to the forest owner when signing the contract to join the forest management group, in November 2013. Field control of silvicultural/harvesting operations performed during the last year and selected HCVF areas.
Date: 1 June 2016	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Member number S-2440	Reviewed of forest management plan. Assessment of forest owners' awareness of standard requirements. Evaluation of the information provided by the group entity to the forest owner when signing the contract to join the forest management group, in March 2014. Field control of silvicultural/harvesting operations performed during the last year and selected HCVF areas.
Date: 3 June 2016	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Member number S-2467	Reviewed of forest management plan. Assessment of forest owners' awareness of standard requirements. Evaluation of the information provided by the group entity to the forest owner when signing the contract to join the forest management group, in April 2014. Field control of silvicultural/harvesting operations performed during the last year and selected HCVF areas.
Date: 3 June 2016	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Member number S-3430	Reviewed of forest management plan. Assessment of forest owners' awareness of standard requirements. Evaluation of the information provided by the group entity to the forest owner when signing the contract to join the forest management group, in December 2015. Field control of silvicultural/harvesting operations performed during the last year and selected HCVF areas.
Date: 7 June 2016	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Member number S-2266	Reviewed of forest management plan. Assessment of forest owners' awareness of standard requirements. Evaluation of the information provided by the group entity to the forest owner when signing the contract to join the forest management group, in December 2013. Field control of silvicultural/harvesting operations performed during the last year and selected HCVF areas.

Date: 7 June 2016	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Member number S-1924	Reviewed of forest management plan. Assessment of forest owners' awareness of standard requirements. Evaluation of the information provided by the group entity to the forest owner when signing the contract to join the forest management group, in November 2015. Field control of silvicultural/harvesting operations performed during the last year and selected HCVF areas.
Date: 8 June 2016	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Member number S-2317	Interview by phone due to practical reasons. Reviewed of forest management plan. Assessment of forest owners' awareness of standard requirements. Evaluation of the information provided by the group entity to the forest owner when signing the contract to join the forest management group, in December 2013.
Date: 28 June 2016	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Member number S-3472	Reviewed of forest management plan. Assessment of forest owners' awareness of standard requirements. Evaluation of the information provided by the group entity to the forest owner when signing the contract to join the forest management group, in February 2016. Field control of silvicultural/harvesting operations performed during the last year and selected HCVF areas.
Date: 28 June 2016	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Member number S-3498	Reviewed of forest management plan. Assessment of forest owners' awareness of standard requirements. Evaluation of the information provided by the group entity to the forest owner when signing the contract to join the forest management group, in February 2016. Field control of silvicultural/harvesting operations performed during the last year and selected HCVF areas.
Date: 29 June 2016	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Member number S-1163	Reviewed of forest management plan. Assessment of forest owners' awareness of standard requirements. Evaluation of the information provided by the group entity to the forest owner when signing the contract to join the forest management group, in September 2015. Field control of silvicultural/harvesting operations performed during the last year and selected HCVF areas.
Date: 4 July 2016	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Member number S-2942	Reviewed of forest management plan. Assessment of forest owners' awareness of standard requirements. Evaluation of the information provided by the group entity to the forest owner when signing the contract to join the forest management group, in December 2014. Field control of silvicultural/harvesting operations performed during the last year and selected HCVF areas.

Date: 7 July 2016	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Member number S-3403	Reviewed of forest management plan. Assessment of forest owners' awareness of standard requirements. Evaluation of the information provided by the group entity to the forest owner when signing the contract to join the forest management group, in December 2015. Field control of silvicultural/harvesting operations performed during the last year and selected HCVF areas.
Date: 13 July 2016	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Member number S-2706	Reviewed of forest management plan. Assessment of forest owners' awareness of standard requirements. Evaluation of the information provided by the group entity to the forest owner when signing the contract to join the forest management group, in April 2015. Field control of silvicultural/harvesting operations performed during the last year and selected HCVF areas.
Date: 29-30 August 2016	
FMU / Location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Group entity head office, Uppsala, Sweden	Opening meeting: Introductions, FSC update, summary of group member/forest owner field visits, audit scheduling Group entity audit: general topics, CoC routines, internal audit results. Closing meeting: Summary of preliminary findings, discussion, questions, next steps, audit scheduling

3.1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	6
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	2
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	4
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	10

3.1.3 Evaluation Team

Auditor Name:	Karin Tormalm	Auditor role:	Lead Auditor, FMU field auditor
Qualifications:	6 months of experience in auditing PEFC (FM/CoC), FSC (CoC), ISO 14001 certification. Witnessed for FSC FM during the audit. M.Sc. Forestry		
Auditor Name:	Björn Nilsson	Auditor role:	FMU field auditor
Qualifications:	Five years of experience in auditing PEFC (FM/CoC), FSC (FM/CoC), ISO 14001 and ISO 9001 certification. M.Sc. Forestry.		
Auditor Name:	Melissa Gutheil, SCS	Auditor role:	Whitnesser
Qualifications:	XXXXX		

3.2 Evaluation of Management System

3.2.1 Methodology and Strategies Employed

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams with expertise in forestry, social sciences, natural resource economics, and other relevant fields to assess an FME’s conformance to FSC standards and policies. Evaluation methods include document and record review, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of forest cover and harvest prescription types, observation of implementation of management plans and policies in the field, and stakeholder analysis. When there is more than one team member, team members may review parts of the standards based on their background and expertise. On the final day of an evaluation, team members convene to deliberate the findings of the assessment jointly. This involves an analysis of all relevant field observations, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus between team members cannot be achieved due to lack of evidence, conflicting evidence or differences of interpretation of the standards, the team is instructed to report these in the certification decision section and/or in observations.

3.2.2 Pre-evaluation

A pre-evaluation of the FME *was not* required by FSC norms.

A pre-evaluation of the FME was conducted as required by and in accordance with FSC norms.

3.3 Stakeholder Consultation Process

In accordance with SCS protocols, consultation with key stakeholders is an integral component of the evaluation process. Stakeholder consultation takes place prior to, concurrent with, and following field evaluations. Distinct purposes of such consultation include:

- To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the FME’s management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the company and the surrounding communities.
- To solicit input on whether the forest management operation has consulted with stakeholders regarding identifying any high conservation value forests (HCVFs).

Principal stakeholder groups are identified based upon results from the pre-evaluation (if one was conducted), lists of stakeholders from the FME under evaluation, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources (e.g., chair of the regional FSC working group). The following types of groups and individuals were determined to be principal stakeholders in this evaluation:

3.3.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted During Evaluation for Certification

FME Management and staff
Contractors
Adjacent property owners

Purchasers of logs harvested on FME forestlands

Stakeholder consultation activities are organized to give participants the opportunity to provide comments according to general categories of interest based on the three FSC chambers, as well as the SCS Interim Standard, if one was used. A public notice was sent to stakeholders at least 6 weeks prior to the audit notifying them of the audit and soliciting comments. The table below summarizes the major comments received from stakeholders and the assessment team’s response. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS are noted below.

3.3.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable

Stakeholder Comments	SCS Response
Economic Concerns	
No concerns were raised	
Social Concerns	
No concerns were raised	
Environmental Concerns	
No concerns were raised	

4. Results of The Evaluation

Table 4.1 below, contains the evaluation team’s findings as to the strengths and weaknesses of the subject forest management operation relative to the FSC Principles of forest stewardship. Weaknesses are noted as Corrective Action Requests (CARs) related to each principle.

4.1 Notable Strengths and Weaknesses of the FME Relative to the FSC P&C.

This was an audit of the group entity, and strengths and weaknesses are not noted for each of the 555 connected FME’s. The system in place of group entity consists of an ISO 14001-certified system for connecting members to the group, define share of responsibilities, internal control system and corrective actions as well as processes for exclusion of members.

Principle / Subject Area	Strengths Relative to the Standard	Weaknesses Relative to the Standard
P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance	N/A	NA
P2: Tenure & Use Rights & Responsibilities	N/A	N/A
P3: Indigenous Peoples’ Rights	N/A	N/A
P4: Community	N/A	N/A

Relations & Workers' Rights		
P5: Benefits from the Forest	N/A	N/A
P6: Environmental Impact	N/A	N/A
P7: Management Plan	N/A	N/A
P8: Monitoring & Assessment	N/A	N/A
P9: High Conservation Value Forests	N/A	N/A
P10: Plantations	N/A	N/A
Chain of custody	N/A	N/A
Group Management	N/A	N/A

4.2 Process of Determining Conformance

4.2.1 Structure of Standard and Degrees of Nonconformance

FSC-accredited forest stewardship standards consist of a three-level hierarchy: principle, the criteria that correspond to that principle, and the performance indicators that elaborate each criterion. Consistent with SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluation protocols, the team collectively determines whether or not the subject forest management operation is in conformance with every applicable indicator of the relevant forest stewardship standard. Each nonconformance must be evaluated to determine whether it constitutes a major or minor nonconformance at the level of the associated criterion or sub-criterion. Not all indicators are equally important, and there is no simple numerical formula to determine whether an operation is in nonconformance. The team therefore must use their collective judgment to assess each criterion and determine if the FME is in conformance. If the FME is determined to be in nonconformance at the criterion level, then at least one of the applicable indicators must be in major nonconformance.

Corrective action requests (CARs) are issued for every instance of a nonconformance. Major nonconformances trigger Major CARs and minor nonconformances trigger Minor CARs.

4.2.1 Interpretations of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations

Major CARs: Major nonconformances, either alone or in combination with nonconformances of all other applicable indicators, result (or are likely to result) in a fundamental failure to achieve the objectives of the relevant FSC Criterion given the uniqueness and fragility of each forest resource. These are corrective actions that must be resolved or closed out before a certificate can be awarded. If Major CARs arise after an operation is certified, the timeframe for correcting these nonconformances is typically shorter than for Minor CARs. Certification is contingent on the certified FME's response to the CAR within the stipulated time frame.

Minor CARs: These are corrective action requests in response to minor nonconformances, which are typically limited in scale or can be characterized as an unusual lapse in the system. Most Minor CARs are the result of nonconformance at the indicator-level. Corrective actions must be closed out within a specified time period of award of the certificate.

Observations: These are subject areas where the audit team concludes that there is conformance, but either future nonconformance may result due to inaction or the FME could achieve exemplary status through further refinement. Action on observations is voluntary and does not affect the maintenance of the certificate. However, observations can become CARs if performance with respect to the indicator(s) triggering the observation falls into nonconformance.

4.2.2 Major Nonconformances

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Major CARs were issued to the FME during the evaluation. Any Minor CARs from previous surveillance audits have been reviewed and closed prior to the issuance of a certificate.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Major CARs were issued to the FME during the evaluation, which have all been closed to the satisfaction of the audit team and meet the requirements of the standards. Any Minor CARs from previous surveillance audits have been reviewed and closed prior to the issuance of a certificate.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Major CARs were issued to the FME during the evaluation and the FME has not yet satisfactorily closed all Major CARs.

4.2.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2015.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): FMU 1: Group member: S2208, compartment 3-18 FMU 2: Group member: S2353, compartment 23 FMU 3: Group member: S2772, compartments 9, 23, 31, 33 FMU 4: Group member: S2372, compartment 94	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-STD-SWE-02-02-2010 SW, 6.3.7S
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): No or too few high stumps or girdled trees left per hectare of areas harvested through regeneration felling (FMU 4) and thick-stem thinning (FMUs 1-3).	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): Managers shall create, in average, at least three high stumps or girdled trees per hectare of areas harvested through regeneration felling and thick-stem thinning, striving to select for this purpose equal numbers of coarse pine, spruce, birch and aspen trees without high biodiversity values.	

<p>FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i></p>	<p>The current forest owners have especially been contacted and informed of the certification requirement and the observed CAR of their forest holdings. We have ensured that they are aware of the requirement and that they intend to claim to be followed on their holdings ahead. The members do not carry out the forestry themselves, and the errors were made by contractors / purchasing organization.</p> <p>To prevent similar errors from occurring in the future, Prosilva made a special information mailing to all group of forest owners. Information summed up the results of the 2015 internal and external audits, in which CARs were identified and how they can be prevented by the members. The information also went out to our agents (which are themselves planning felling). By informing delegates on observed CAR and certification requirements increases the quality of the accession of new forest owners and the performance of forestry operations where our representative (in the form of wood buyers) are involved. We also raise our representative certification skills through special training and personal contact. In addition, information material for the connection of new forest owners improved in order to increase forest owners' knowledge regarding certification. At all internal audits (forest owners, entrepreneurs) we specifically addresses the certification requirement to further increase awareness and prevent future deviations.</p> <p>The creation of dead wood takes place primarily through hired by timber buyers and contractors, even if the deviation lies with the forest owner has his own little impact on performance. We believe it is particularly valuable to inform agents and contractors. During 2015/2016, a revision of all participating contractors. Under this is the creation of a dead wood certification requirements are reviewed</p>
<p>SCS review</p>	<p>Review of information procedures. Actions carried out are assessed as relevant and sufficient.</p>
<p>Status of CAR:</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)</p>

Finding Number: 2015.2	
<p>Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation</p>	
<p>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): FMU 1: Group member: S1890 FMU 2: Group member: S2372 FMU 3: Group member: S3128</p>	
<p>Deadline</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):</p>
<p>FSC Indicator:</p>	<p>FSC-STD-SWE-02-02-2010 SW, 6.3.9S</p>

<p>Non-Conformity <i>(or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</i></p>	<p>Less than 5 % of the total area of mesic and moist forest land, suitable for natural regeneration and growth of broadleaf trees, carry deciduous rich stands dominated by broadleaf trees. No strategy or plan on how to reach the 5% target.</p>
<p>Corrective Action Request <i>(or Observation):</i></p>	<p>Managers shall plan and manage the landholdings so that, over time, an area equivalent to at least 5 % of the total area of mesic and moist forest land, suitable for natural regeneration and growth of broadleaf trees, carry deciduous rich stands dominated by broadleaf trees during the major part of the rotation period. The stands shall be managed in order to promote favourable conditions for biodiversity associated with broadleaf trees.</p>
<p>FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i></p>	<p>The current forest owners have especially been contacted and informed of the certification requirement and the CAR of their forest holdings. We have ensured that they are aware of the goal of broadleaved area and that they have developed a plan (or take the help of other stakeholders to develop a plan) how adequate broadleaved area to be achieved.</p> <p>To prevent and similar discrepancies, we made a special information activity to all members. Information of the results of the 2015 internal and external audits, which CAR are identified and how they can be remedied or prevented by other members. The information also went out to contacts of our agents. By informing delegates on observed abnormalities and certification requirements, they attach particular importance to the accession process and to make an extra quality control of the quality of members' forestry plans (delegates are responsible in order and quality assessment of forest management plans) as far as the delegates themselves dealt with the order. We also raise our representative certification skills through special training and personal contact. In addition to this information, the material used in the connection of new forest owners improved in order to increase forest owners' knowledge certification. At all internal audits (forest owners, entrepreneurs), we talk also about the special certification requirement by members and any representatives to further raise awareness and prevent future deviations.</p> <p>Compliance with the certification requirement seems to be a question of lack of knowledge rather than an active desire to disadvantage broadleaved trees. At the information requirement is the overwhelming positive response and plans are generally on the same occasion where broad-leaved dominated areas may be appropriate. The certification adapted forest management plan in which existing and future broad-leaved dominated stocks mentioned is a valuable tool and the newer plans is the default. Our handling of the deviation aims to increase members' knowledge certification and improve the quality of members' forestry plans. The difference is not due to an unwillingness or conscious act of our members' site, instead of the partial non-certification skills. The difference will, because of the long lead times, are found in the future but we are working proactively with the issue and our assessment is that the deviation decreases among our members.</p>
<p>SCS review</p>	<p>Review of information procedures. Actions carried out are assessed as relevant and sufficient.</p>

Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed
	<input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2015.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): FMU 1: Group member: S2372	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-STD-SWE-02-02-2010 SW, 6.4.1S
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Only 2,4 % of the productive forest land area is exempt from measures other than management required to maintain or promote biodiversity conditioned by natural processes or traditional land use practices.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): Managers shall exempt a minimum of 5 % of the productive forest land area from measures other than management required to maintain or promote biodiversity conditioned by natural processes or traditional land use practices.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	<p>The current member was contacted and informed of the CAR and the certification requirements. It appeared then that set-aside areas exceeded certification requirements and definitions in the plan were incorrect.</p> <p>Special note was made of the forest management plan to avoid forestry actions in the subsequent sections. The plan will also be reviewed in the fall of 2016, two years ahead of schedule (plan period is from 2009 to 2018)</p>
SCS review	Notes made in the existing forest management plan and the planned new forest management plan is deemed sufficient steps to close the CAR.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

4.2.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2016.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): FMU 1: Group member: 2706 FMU 2: Group member: 1163	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): None
FSC Indicator:	FSC-STD-SWE-02-02-2010 SW, 4.4.6, 4.4.7, 4.4.8
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Awareness of requirements regarding communication and consultation. Consultation is carried out, but documentations and procedures could be improved.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): Update procedures regarding documentation of consultation processes. Detailed information to GM from Group Entity regarding the documentation requirements.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2016.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): FMU 1: Group member: 2706 FMU 2: Group member: 1163	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): None
FSC Indicator:	FSC-STD-SWE-02-02-2010 SW, 4.5.2
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Awareness of requirements regarding communication and consultation. Consultation is carried out, but documentations and procedures could be improved.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): Update procedures regarding documentation of consultation processes. Detailed information to GM from Group Entity regarding the documentation requirements.	

FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2016.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): FMU 1: Group member: 1163	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-STD-SWE-02-02-2010 SW, 7.1h,
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Forestry carried out with a landscape perspective, but no documented landscape plan could be shown.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): Managers shall document their landholdings in accordance with Annex 3A and 3B. Managers of major holdings shall make publicly available ecological landscape plans, or equivalent documentation, with accompanying rationales.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2016.4	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): FMU 1: Group member: 2706	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-STD-SWE-02-02-2010 SW, 7.3.1
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Evidence of enough knowledge for carrying out assessed environmental values as well as updating forest management plan could not be shown.	

Corrective Action Request (or Observation): Managers shall have education required to implement the forest management plan for example assess environmental values at stand level prior to any major forest management activities.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2016.5	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): None
FSC Indicator:	FSC-STD-SWE-02-02-2010 SW, 6.3.8, 6.3.9
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Interview with group members, GM, shows that the awareness of the requirements regarding broad leaved trees can be improved.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): Managers shall plan and manage the landholdings so that, over time, an area equivalent to at least 5 % of the total area of mesic and moist forest land, suitable for natural regeneration and growth of broadleaf trees, carry deciduous rich stands dominated by broadleaf trees during the major part of the rotation period. The stands shall be managed in order to promote favorable conditions for biodiversity associated with broadleaf trees. The requirement regarding amount of deciduous rich stands dominated by broadleaf trees as well as the requirement regarding volume of broadleaf trees in older stands needs to be discussed continuously. Prosilva should follow the trends regarding any CARS towards the requirements issued during internal audit as new members join the group and new forest management plans are developed.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2016.6	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU): Group Entity, Skogscertifiering Prosilva	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	FSC-STD-30-005 (V1-0) EN 9.4
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Use of the FSC logo on information sheets and contract templates without approval from SCS.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The Group entity shall ensure that all uses of the FSC Trademark are approved by the responsible certification body in advance.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

5. Certification Decision

Certification Recommendation	
FME be awarded FSC certification as a “Well-Managed Forest” subject to the minor corrective action requests stated in Section 4.2.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
The SCS evaluation team makes the above recommendation for certification based on the full and proper execution of the SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluation protocols. If certification is recommended, the FME has satisfactorily demonstrated the following without exception:	
FME has addressed any Major CAR(s) assigned during the evaluation.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
FME has demonstrated that their system of management is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the applicable standards (see Section 1.6 of this report) are met over the forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
FME has demonstrated that the described system of management is being implemented consistently over the forest area covered by the scope of the certificate.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: No Major CARs assigned	

