

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

## *Hancock Forest Management NZ Ltd*

Rotorua, NZ

**SCS-FM/COC-00066P**

Client Address	Unit 5, 120 Hamilton Street, Tauranga, 3110, New Zealand
Client Contact	<u>Kerry Ellem, General Manager</u>
Client Website	<u><a href="http://hfm.nz/">http://hfm.nz/</a></u>

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
28 September 2018	27 September 2023

DATE OF FIELD EVALUATION
10 to 14 May 2021
DATE OF REPORT FINALIZATION
22 Sep 2021

SCS Contact:

**Brendan Grady** | Director  
Forest Management Certification  
+1.510.452.8000  
[bgrady@scsglobalservices.com](mailto: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](http://www.SCSGlobalServices.com)

## Foreword

Cycle in annual surveillance evaluations				
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <sup>st</sup> annual evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <sup>nd</sup> annual evaluation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <sup>rd</sup> annual evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <sup>th</sup> annual evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (expansion of scope, Major CAR audit, special audit, etc.):
<b>Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:</b>				
Hancock Forest Management NZ Ltd - HFM				

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual evaluations to ascertain ongoing conformance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the FSC Certificate Database <http://info.fsc.org/>.

Pursuant to FSC and SCS guidelines, annual / surveillance evaluations are not intended to comprehensively examine the full scope of the certified forest operations, as the cost of a full-scope evaluation would be prohibitive and it is not mandated by FSC evaluation protocols. Rather, annual evaluations are comprised of three main components:

- A focused assessment of the status of any outstanding conditions or Corrective Action Requests (CARs; see discussion in section 4.0 for those CARs and their disposition as a result of this annual evaluation);
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior to this evaluation; and
- As necessary given the breadth of coverage associated with the first two components, an additional focus on selected topics or issues, the selection of which is not known to the certificate holder prior to the evaluation.

### 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 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 90 days after completion of the on-site evaluation. Section B contains more detailed results and information for required FSC record-keeping or the use by the FME.

## Table of Contents

---

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY .....	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION .....	4
1.1 Evaluation Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation .....	4
1.3 Applicable Standards .....	4
1.4 Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units.....	5
2. CERTIFICATION EVALUATION PROCESS .....	5
2.1 Evaluation Itinerary, Activities, and Site Notes.....	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems .....	8
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES .....	8
4. RESULTS OF EVALUATION .....	8
4.1 Definitions of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations .....	8
4.2 History of Findings for Certificate Period.....	9
4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	9
4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations .....	13
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS .....	15
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted .....	16
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses .....	16
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION .....	20
7. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE .....	20

## SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

### 1. General Information

#### 1.1 Evaluation Team

<b>Auditor name:</b>	Tuesday Phelan	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Audit Team Leader
<b>Qualifications:</b>	Tuesday Phelan is a Senior FSC® CoC Lead Auditor and FSC and Responsible Wood® Forest Management Lead Auditor. She has a Bachelor of Forest Science and over 25 years' experience in forest and fire management in Australia. Tuesday has worked in plantation, native forest and biodiversity management, including forest establishment and regeneration, silviculture, roading and harvesting, environmental policy and regulation, and community engagement. Tuesday completed Forest Management and CoC auditor training in 2014 and has since worked on Forest Management, Controlled Wood and Chain of Custody audits under both FSC and RW®/PEFC® schemes. In 2019 Tuesday completed training as a lead auditor for ISO 9001, 14001 and 45001.		
<b>Auditor name:</b>	Kimberly Robertson	<b>Auditor role:</b>	Team Auditor
<b>Qualifications:</b>	Kimberly is a Lead auditor for FSC FM and Senior Lead auditor for FSC COC/CW. Kimberly has 22 years of experience in forestry in New Zealand. She has a Bachelor of Science in Ecology/Zoology and a Masters in Forestry Science. She has worked on environmental impacts of forestry and forest products including carbon sequestration, and across the supply chain from nursery to sawmilling. Kimberly is a qualified verifier for the Australasian EPD Programme and is ISO 14001 EMS qualified in 2015. Kimberly has carried out 40+ FSC CoC audits and been part of 15 FM audit teams since June 2015.		

#### 1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site for evaluation	6.5
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation	2
C. Number of days spent by any technical experts (in addition to amount in line A)	0
D. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and follow-up	4.75
<b>E. Total number of person days used in evaluation</b>	<b>11.25</b>

#### 1.3 Applicable Standards

All applicable FSC standards are available on the websites of FSC International ([www.fsc.org](http://www.fsc.org)) or SCS Global Services ([www.SCSglobalServices.com](http://www.SCSglobalServices.com)). All standards are available on request from SCS Global Services via the comment form on our website. When no national standard exists for the country/region, SCS Interim Standards are developed by modifying SCS's Generic Interim Standard to reflect forest management in the region and by incorporating relevant components of any Draft Regional/National Standard and comments from stakeholders. More than one month prior to the start of the field evaluation, SCS Draft Interim Standards are provided to stakeholders identified by FSC International, SCS, forest managers under evaluation, and the FSC National or Regional Office for comment. SCS's COC indicators for FMEs are based on the most current versions of the FSC Chain of Custody Standard, FSC Standard for Group Entities in Forest Management Groups (FSC-STD-30-005), and FSC Accreditation Requirements. "Applicable standards" are all FSC standards with which the certified entity must comply, not just the standards selected for evaluation this year.

Standards applicable <i>NOTE: Please include the full standard name and Version number and check all that apply based on type of certificate.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest Stewardship Standard(s), including version: National Standard for Certification of Plantation Forest Management in New Zealand v5.7, 27th September 2013
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC Trademark Standard (FSC-STD-50-001 V2-0)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SCS COC indicators for FMEs, V8-0
	<input type="checkbox"/> FSC standard for group entities in forest management groups (FSC-STD-30-005), V1-1
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

## 1.4 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 <sup>2</sup> )	0.09290304
Acre (ac)	Hectare (ha)	0.4047
Volume Conversion Factors		
To convert from	To	multiply by
Cubic foot (cu ft.)	Cubic meter (m <sup>3</sup> )	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. Certification Evaluation Process

### 2.1 Evaluation Itinerary, Activities, and Site Notes

<b>Date:</b> 10 May 2021	
FMU / location / sites visited	Activities / notes
HFM Rotorua Office	Opening Meeting: Introductions; client summary of land sales/acquisitions, annual management activities, and stakeholder issues; review scope of evaluation; finalize audit plan; intro/update to FSC and SCS standards; confidentiality and public summary; conformance evaluation methods and review of open CARs/OBS; emergency and security procedures for evaluation team; final site selection.

Remote auditor 10.00 am to 5.00 pm	Review of FSC FM P&C and staff interviews.
Onsite auditor 10.00 am to 5.00 pm	<p>Site visits to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kinleith Log Yard and interview with the checkpoint operator</li> <li>• Athol Fire and Agrichemical store and interview with Forest Protech Services contractor.</li> <li>• Cougar Park Mountain Bike track and interview with the HFM Harvest planner, Mountain bike club president and treasurer.</li> <li>• Lake Rd HCV</li> <li>• Totara Legacy Project collaboration with local iwi Raukawa</li> </ul>
<b>Date: 11 May 2021</b>	
<b>FMU / location / sites visited</b>	<b>Activities / notes</b>
Remote auditor 9.00 am to 5.00 pm	Review of FSC FM P&C, stakeholder and staff interviews.
Onsite auditor OTPP – Te Waka HA 7986, crew 38, clearfell, mechanized and manual felling, hauler harvesting.	Interviewed operations manager and crew supervisor, and document review re Pre Op site inspection, emergency procedures, RTE species, harvest management along neighboring property, fuel storage, rock bluffs, unions, water management, communications with HFM
Onsite auditor OTPP – Te Waka HA 7987, crew 40, clearfell, mechanized and manual felling, hauler harvesting.	Interviewed foreman and crew , and document review re Pre op risk assessment, streamside harvesting, daily tail gate H&S meetings, H&S incidents, crew travel times, fuel storage, chemical containers, training records, communication with HFM and unions
Onsite auditor OTPP – Wainui HA 82, crew 15 Windthrow roadline salvage, mechanised ground based harvesting	Interviewed H&S Manager and loader driver and document review re Induction, windthrow operation, HFM EMS Manual for contractors, emergency procedures, RTE species, cut plan, fuel management, crew travel, training records, union, H&S incident reporting, work hours, daily tool box meetings
<b>Date: 12 May 2021</b>	
<b>FMU / location / sites visited</b>	<b>Activities / notes</b>
Remote auditor 9.00 am to 5.00 pm	Review of FSC FM P&C, stakeholder and staff interviews.
Onsite auditor Taumata Central, Kinleith, Hickory Rd, HA 4506. Crew 14. Mechanised clearfell, hauler harvesting	<p>Interview with contractor and crew supervisor re prestart risk assessment, daily operation hazards, felling plan, breaking out plan, cut plan, bluffs, training record of learning and for working around bluffs, monthly environmental audit, contractor rates, unions, communication with HFM, crew travel,</p> <p>Interview with HFM harvest forester re neighbor communication, road management, working with HFM, contractor signage</p>
Onsite auditor Taumata Central, Kinleith, Owen Rd, HA 4503. Crew 53, mechanized clearfell, hauler harvesting	Interview with the contractor and foreman re harvest plan, pre op risk assessment, fire extinguishers, first aid kits, first aiders on site, H&S incidents and reporting, security on site, production targets and rates, communication with HFM, fuel, chemical and paint storage, empty containers, spill kit and unions
Onsite auditor Taumata Central, Kinleith, Atlantic, HA 4491.	Interview with Contractor, document review and site inspection re: Induction, slash management, road engineering culverts, soak

Crew 77, mechanized clearfell, ground based harvesting	holes, cell phone coverage, RTE species guide and sightings, resource consent, H&S incidents and reporting, training, production targets and rates, HFM communication, fuel/and empty containers management, spill kit, use of rubber mats for machines to cross road, slash management, crew hours and HFM Safety alerts,
Onsite auditor Taumata Central, Kinleith, Murray Rd, HA 3591. Crew 33, mechanized clearfell, ground based harvesting. Manual felling on steep slopes	Interview with Foreman/Skidder driver contractor operations manager (for all 7 crews the contractor operates), document review and site inspection re: Pulling plan, daily plan, skid plan, RTE species guide and reporting, HFM EMS contractor summary, H&S Management System Manual, ACOP, harvesting around 5L stream and SNA, road conditions, water controls, slash management request to HFM for gravel, production targets, cut plan, austrack electronic system for maintaining records, drug testing, training and HFM communication
Onsite auditor Taumata Central, Kinleith, Waipa Rd, HA 3067. Crew 68, ground based, mechanized felling and harvesting, roadline salvage.	Interview with Foreman and H&S rep/machine operator document review and site inspection re mechanised planter trial, working alone requirements, pre-op plan, HFM pre op hazard id, contractor hazard id, daily hazard, signage, fuel and chemical storage, HFM Safety Alerts, Contractor incident summary, RTE species guide and reporting, HFM Safety champs meeting, high wind conditions, communication with HFM, Cut plan, union, first aiders on site.
<b>Date:</b> 13 May 2021	
<b>FMU / location / sites visited</b>	<b>Activities / notes</b>
Remote auditor 9.00 am to 5.00 pm	Review of FSC FM P&C, stakeholder and staff interviews.
Onsite auditor Taumata Central Aramiro Forest	Road line harvest finished last week. Site inspection and interview with the Environmental forester re roading, bridges, water monitoring, streamside harvesting, hydroseeding, summer harvesting. Interview with the Engineering/roading crew re water controls, slash management around stream, installation of roads and skids, site hazard identification, daily toolbox, emergency instructions, communication with farm manager (forest owner and access to forest is through farm)
Onsite auditor Taumata Central, Morrison forest, Aotea	Site has significant archeological features and parts are registered historical sites, is due for harvest and HFM are undertaking stakeholder consultation with land/tree owners, local towns people and iwi. Site inspection and interview with the HFM Environmental forester re archeological/wahi tapu sites, stakeholder consultation with locals and iwi, harvesting options transport route, forest access, adjacent public walkway
<b>Date:</b> 14 May 2021	
<b>FMU / location / sites visited</b>	<b>Activities / notes</b>
Remote auditor 9.00 am to 12.30 pm	Review of FSC FM P&C, stakeholder and staff interviews.

Onsite auditor OTPP Tokerau wetland HCVF	Site inspection and interview with HFM Environmental Forester re wetland management and monitoring, wilding control, neighbour/landowner access, stock access.
Onsite auditor OTPP Tokerau A11, thinning to waste crew	Interview with contractor re change from a seasonal planting crew to a 2 year contract for silvicultural work including planting, thinning to waste, forest maintenance (spraying and track clearing), HFM support for that change, HFM communication, training, wilding control at Tokerau Wetland, thinning to waste operation, union, First aiders on site, first aid kits and fire extinguishers,
	Closing Meeting Preparation: Auditor(s) consolidate notes, deliberate, and confirm evaluation findings.
	Closing Meeting: Review preliminary findings (potential non-conformities and observations) and discuss next steps.

## 2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

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 reviewing documents and records, interviewing FME personnel and contractors, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of forest cover and harvest prescription types, observing implementation of management plans and policies in the field, and collecting and analyzing stakeholder input. When there is more than one team member, each member 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, interviews, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus among 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. Changes in Management Practices

- There were no significant changes in the management and/or harvesting methods that affect the FME’s conformance to the FSC standards and policies.
- Significant changes occurred since the last evaluation that may affect the FME’s conformance to FSC standards and policies (*describe*):

## 4. Results of Evaluation

### 4.1 Definitions 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 evaluation 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 History of Findings for Certificate Period

FM Principle	Cert/Re-cert Evaluation (year)	1 <sup>st</sup> Annual Evaluation (year)	2 <sup>nd</sup> Annual Evaluation (year)	3 <sup>rd</sup> Annual Evaluation (year)	4 <sup>th</sup> Annual Evaluation (year)
No findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P1	1.5.1,				
P2					
P3					
P4	4.2.1; 4.3.1	4.2.4, 4.24 Obs	4.2.4 Minor	4.2.3 Minor 4.3.4 Minor	
P5	5.3.1				
P6		6.6.4 Obs	6.6.4 Obs		
P7					
P8			8.3.1 Minor 8.3.1 Obs		
P9		Obs 9.1.2			
P10				10.5.12 Obs	
COC for FM					
Trademark					
Group					
Other					

### 4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 2020:01</b>
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):
<b>Deadline</b>

<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit, whichever comes first ( <i>surveillance or re-evaluation</i> ) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
<b>Primary standard reference:</b>	Indicator 8.3.1
<b>Non-Conformity</b> ( <i>or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations</i> ): Taumata customer electronic delivery information (generated by the Trimble database) doesn't include the applicable FSC material claim or the HFM certificate code. Taumata customer invoices do include the required FSC material claim and certificate code and can be considered supplementary information. HFM doesn't have SCS approval for the use of supplementary information to provide the FSC claim and certificate code.	
<b>Corrective Action Request</b> ( <i>or Observation</i> ): Taumata delivery documents (including electronic) shall include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the organization's FSC certificate code associated to FSC-certified products</li> <li>• a clear indication of the FSC claim for each product item or the total products.</li> </ul> If HFM is unable to include the FSC claim and/or certificate code in delivery documents, the required information can be provided to the customer through supplementary documentation (e.g. supplementary letters). In this case, HFM shall obtain permission from SCS to implement supplementary documentation.	
<b>FME response</b> ( <i>including any evidence submitted</i> )	The electronic docket report has now been updated to include the certification status for each load. We are also sending a letter to each of our suppliers that claims certification, to confirm that at present all logs supplied by Taumata, Tiaki and OTPP are 100% certified, and we will endeavour to let them know if for any reason that is going to change. A copy of the report has been sent through as evidence.  10/5/21 update: The Trimble electronic docket report was updated after the audit to include the required information.
<b>SCS review</b>	14.5.21: During the onsite audit the auditor reviewed electronic delivery information in the Trimble database (for Taumata Plantations ED #3041433354 dated 15.4.21 and ED# 3090360145 dated 4.9.20) and it now includes the FSC 100% material claim and code for each log load. CAR Closed
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision ( <i>refer to description above</i> )

<b>Finding Number: 2020:02</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit, whichever comes first ( <i>surveillance or re-evaluation</i> ) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	

<b>Primary standard reference:</b>	8.3.1
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): AVA Timber have very recently (27 August) become responsible for HFM Chain of Custody from the port to international customers. They aren't currently FSC COC certified and no FSC sales have been made through AVA yet. Therefore this is graded as an observation.	
<b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation): Before any FSC material sales are made through AVA they must have FSC Chain of Custody certification.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	HFM NZ staff have been working with Rayonier (JV partner in AVA) to come up with the best system for managing COC. The proposal was originally that both Rayonier and Hancock would maintain CoC certification over the logs through the AVA process to the point of sale and VA would manage the logs at the port on their behalf. After discussion with CB's this plan was changed for AVA to obtain COC certification. This has now occurred. Until COC was in place for AVA, no HFM NZ export logs were sold as certified.  10/5/21 update: AVA timber have sought FSC CoC and successfully completed their certification audit in Mid-April
<b>SCS review</b>	HFM haven't sold any export with an FSC claim since last audit. AVA Timber Group Ltd attained FSC CoC certification on 6/5/21 enabling them to now handle logs at the Port on behalf of HFM as a certified outsourcer.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2020:03</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit, whichever comes first ( <i>surveillance or re-evaluation</i> ) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
<b>Primary standard reference:</b>	National Standard for Certification of Plantation Forest Management in New Zealand v5.7, 27 <sup>th</sup> September 2013. 4.2.4.
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): The auditor site induction at one (DK Logging) of the eight harvesting crews visited didn't include all HFM H&S Manual section 6.2.7.2 requirements. The crew had finished harvesting for the day and correctly noted no machinery hazards but didn't cover emergency and evacuation procedure or workplace layout.	
<b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation): HFM shall ensure contractor staff cover all HFM requirements during site inductions.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	This has been followed up with the crew involved. The contractor felt that given the auditor was fully accompanied by him at all times it was not necessary to cover the evacuation procedure, given that in the event of an emergency he could directly supervise the auditor. However this has been noted.

	10/5/21 update: The crew was shut down for the day at the time of the audit and the auditor was fully accompanied at all times. However all crews have been reminded about the importance of completing a site induction at all times.
<b>SCS review</b>	14.5.21 Onsite visits to contractors during the 2021 audit covered all H&S Manual section 6.2.7.2 requirements including emergency and evacuation procedure or workplace layout. CAR closed
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

<b>Finding Number: 2020.04</b>	
<b>Select one:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Deadline</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
<b>FSC Indicator:</b>	6.6.4 and also refer to FSC-POL-30-001 V3-0 EN
<b>Non-Conformity</b> (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): An Environmental Social Risk Assessment (ESRA) for 1080 has been developed by the New Zealand forest industry but it doesn't incorporate conditions from the most recently approved New Zealand 1080 derogation. 1080 hasn't been applied within the HFM estate within the past year but it may be applied in the future.	
<b>Corrective Action Request</b> (or Observation): Prior to the use of 1080 HFM must incorporate into the ESRA the conditions from the most recently approved New Zealand 1080 derogation and the requirements from the most recent published draft of the International Generic Indicators.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	<p>The 1080 ESRA will be updated to include the NZ derogation obligations prior to applying any 1080 in the estate.</p> <p>10/5/21 update: The generic industry ESRA for 1080 has been amended to be specific to HFM NZ and includes the requirements of the most recent derogation (copy supplied).</p>
<b>SCS review</b>	14.5.21: Auditor reviewed the 1080 ESRA that HFM have developed and it now includes the conditions from the most recently approved New Zealand 1080 derogation and the requirements from the most recent published draft of the International Generic Indicators. CAR closed.
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

#### 4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<b>Finding Number: 1:2021</b>	
<b>Finding and Deadline</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Major CAR:</b> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Major CAR:</b> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Minor CAR:</b> 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit, whichever comes first ( <i>surveillance or re-evaluation</i> ) <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation</b> – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other</b> and deadline (specify):	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Standard and Indicator</b>	FSC-STD-NZL-01-2012 Indicator 4.2.3 The forest manager operates a health and safety management system that is consistent with the HSE Act, and records health and safety accidents and events, and trends of staff and contractor staff.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Non-Conformity Evidence</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation Justification and/or Explanation</b> In November 2020 1080 pellets were dropped by a Regional Council’s aerial baiting contractor onto a HFM dozer operator. An ICAM investigation was undertaken and accurately identifies the root cause and proposes appropriate corrective actions to prevent the incident reoccurring. The investigation has not yet been finalised as the Environment Protection Authority and Regional Council have not completed their investigations, which may reveal further considerations. The incident was not entered in the incident database, which risks that the incident is not closed or followed up.  HFM has revised its ESRA accordingly, which now specifically addresses risks associated with applications conducted by third party. The ESRA specifies under the topic pre-application assessment of options the following actions: ‘encourage third parties to follow risk assessment steps’ and to ‘have clear agreed processes for personnel working in the affected areas’ and ‘ensure no personnel are in the area’. At the time of the audit these processes had not clearly been integrated into the management system. There had not been any further third party 1080 applications since the incident.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Non-Conformity Corrective Action Request</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation; no Corrective Action is required</b> The organisation shall operate a health and safety management system that records all relevant health and safety incidents, and analyses and responds effectively to safety risks caused by external agencies operating within the estate.	
<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

<b>Finding Number: 2:2021</b>	
<b>Finding and Deadline</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Major CAR:</b> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Major CAR:</b> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Minor CAR:</b> 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit, whichever comes first ( <i>surveillance or re-evaluation</i> )	

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation</b> – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other</b> and deadline (specify):	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Standard and Indicator</b>	FSC-STD-NZL-01-2012 Indicator 4.3.2 Employers who directly employ labour shall establish policy and procedures that include provisions ensuring that: - The role and function of Unions is facilitated at all times. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff members with the responsibility/delegated authority to liaise/ negotiate with Union(s) are confirmed and identified. -Where workers are Union members, wage bargaining arrangements shall proceed on the basis of collective bargaining. - All employees shall be qualified in skills that are relevant to the tasks they are performing or be under training to acquire such skills, in line with relevant industry training organisations standards. - Issues raised by Unions are treated constructively, objectively and in the spirit of good faith. - Where workers are Union members, wage bargaining shall proceed on the basis of collective agreement/s. - Resolution procedures dealing with employment relationship problems shall contain provisions to handle such matters by allowing for both dialogue between staff, unions and management, as a means of resolution procedure, as well as independent third party mediation assistance.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Non-Conformity Evidence</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation Justification and/or Explanation</b> Through interview it was confirmed that the organisation has not established policy and procedures including provisions to facilitate the role and functions of unions and its dealings with workers. It was evident during the audit that union activities within the FMU are minimal but are accommodated when requested.  Workers of one contractor were not aware of their right to join a union and one worker reported union membership is actively discouraged by the employer. Workers at other sites were aware of their rights and in some instances were union members.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Non-Conformity Corrective Action Request</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation; no Corrective Action is required</b> Establish policy and procedures to facilitate union activities within the FMU. (See also 4.3.2)	
<b>FME response</b> <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

<b>Finding Number: 3:2021</b>
<b>Finding and Deadline</b>

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Major CAR:</b> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Major CAR:</b> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Minor CAR:</b> 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit, whichever comes first ( <i>surveillance or re-evaluation</i> ) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation</b> – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other</b> and deadline (specify):	
<b>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</b> (when more than one FMU):	
<b>Standard and Indicator</b>	10.5.12 Restoration programs identified in 6.4 shall be progressively commenced 15 years after these standards come into effect or from the date of first certification whichever is the later.
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Non-Conformity Evidence</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation Justification and/or Explanation</b> Indigenous habitats reserved for RTE species to meet reserve set-aside percentages and their respective management plans are documented in a range of reports including original assessment reports, the reserve management report (key reserves), the Reserve Analysis, Reserve Management Program and budget. It was confirmed through interview and review of multiple documents that the restoration programs have been progressively commenced. Documentation of priority reserves, current management plan and implementation status could be more clearly organized for oversight of reserve management and implementation status.	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Non-Conformity Corrective Action Request</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Observation; no Corrective Action is required</b> HFM could improve their ease of oversight of reserve management and implementation through improvements to organization of key documentation.	
<b>FME response</b> (including any evidence submitted)	
<b>SCS review</b>	
<b>Status of CAR:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

## 5. Stakeholder Comments

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 FME 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).

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.

### 5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

Principal stakeholder groups are identified based upon results from past evaluations, lists of stakeholders from the FME under evaluation, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources. Stakeholder groups who are consulted as part of the evaluation include FME management and staff, consulting foresters, contractors, lease holders, adjacent property owners, local and regionally-based social interest and civic organizations, purchasers of logs harvested on FME forestlands, recreational user groups, tribal members and/or representatives, members of the FSC National Initiative, members of the regional FSC working group, FSC International, local and regionally-based environmental organizations and conservationists, and forest industry groups and organizations, as well as local, state, and federal regulatory agency personnel and other relevant groups.

### 5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses

The table below summarizes the comments falling within scope of the standard 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.

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties (who are not members of the enterprise under evaluation) as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual evaluation.</i>	
<b>Summary of Outreach Activities Conducted (Check all that apply):</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Face to face meetings <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phone calls <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email, or letter <input type="checkbox"/> Notice published in the national and/or local press <input type="checkbox"/> Notice published on relevant websites <input type="checkbox"/> Local radio announcements <input type="checkbox"/> Local customary notice boards <input type="checkbox"/> Social media broadcast	
<b>Stakeholder Comment (Negative, positive, and neutral)</b>	<b>SCS Response</b>
HFM is planning harvest of a plantation at Aotea that was established on alienated land that is of very high significance to indigenous people of NZ. HFM have worked with local kaitiaki (guardians) representatives over a long period to ensure all sites of significance are identified and mapped. This process involved engagement of archaeology services, and resulted in discovery of new cultural sites which continue to be registered. Work is now	SCS reviewed legal documentation to confirm tenure, consultation records, archaeological information, maps and operational notes for the proposed operation. Interview with HFM staff and observations made at the site confirmed the organisation is engaging appropriately with tangata whenua to identify, describe and map sites of significance and develop management plans for their protection



<p>underway to develop appropriate management controls to protect physical values during and after harvest in consultation with indigenous representatives. There is further work to do on ensuring the social impacts of harvest, in particular noise, safety and roading, to the adjacent village community are minimized. The coastal, marine and freshwater environment conditions that prevail in Aotea region are changing constantly in response to natural climate change and of course this includes the human contribution too.</p> <p>With warmer conditions we can anticipate faster chemical reactions, greater biological activity, more energetic weather all leading to faster erosion of the landscape, more sediment transport in our waterways and higher sea levels. The engagement process has resulted in tangata whenua underpinning the Māori world view of their environment and knowledge exchange to further public recognition of the significance of the locality. Ngaati Te Wehi (kaitiaki representative) hopes other tangata whenua may access learnings from this process.</p>	<p>and the protection of any new sites discovered during operations.</p>
<p>HFM have a positive working relationship with one of its main iwi stakeholders. They work collaboratively on projects to identify and protect sites of significance and restore and enhance cultural resources for future harvest. Tangata whenua access to significant sites on HFM managed land is strongly supported. HFM also provide koha for participation in its activities as appropriate. HFM and Raukawa are working to identify work opportunities for the iwi to become involved in, however to date this has not been taken up to any significant degree. The iwi aspire to develop capability for greater involvement in the pest management program and are discussing this with HFM.</p>	<p>The auditors reviewed the HFM Forest Management Plan Public Summary 2021, noting the sections on the Totara Legacy Project, employment and HCV6 management are consistent with the stakeholder’s comments. These projects were also discussed with HFM staff, confirming the organisation’s commitment to consultation with tangata whenua regarding protection of sites of significance, restoration of traditional resources and indigenous employment. A field visit was made to the Totara Legacy Project confirming this project has been progressed. Additionally, HFM are involved in several initiatives to encourage local community employment in the timber industry through on the job training, mentoring and pastoral care.</p>
<p>HFM process recreation permit applications collated by a recreation club which has operated in the Kinleith Forest since the late 1990s. Members have used the forest for recreational hunting for at least half a century through multiple forest managers. The club is open to locals and was created to facilitate recreational access to the forest. The club meet annually with HFM discuss</p>	<p>The auditors interviewed HFM regional staff about the changes to deer hunting times and the dog exercise area. Deer hunting before 7.30am was a long established permit condition, however with increased operational activity occurring before 7.30am and the high number of operations in Kinleith Forest there had been increasing safety challenges with</p>

<p>updates on operations and any proposed changes. Their members are also asked to comment on issues and invited to attend environmental committee meetings. The relationship is good, however two issues have arisen in the past two years where the club considers HFM has not adequately considered their interests. Deer hunter access to the forest was ceased on weekdays in the morning and the Spence Road hunting dog exercise area was closed due to operations and no alternative has been offered as yet.</p>	<p>allowing hunting and production to occur in the forest concurrently. The changes were made to protect the safety of workers and hunters. The auditors accept that operational safety takes priority in a busy working forest. Records show that the hunting dog exercise area at Spence Road has been discussed at the last two annual meetings. Operational activity was busy in this locality, and initially an alternative exercise area was not able to be identified. HFM is currently working on finding another site, as operational activity has moved to other areas.</p>
<p>HFM have recently undertaken road construction work for a harvest operation on a farming property under iwi landownership. The planning has occurred over a period of four years, and has involved considerable engagement by multiple HFM personnel. The landowners key interests are that farming operations are able to continue in a safe and effective manner and that waterways on the property are protected. Additional environmental monitoring has occurred at 10 sites on a major waterway running through the property. The monitoring has so far demonstrated the effectiveness of management prescriptions in protecting the waterway and aquatic ecosystem. HFM staff and contractors had daily communication with the farm manager during the roading operation and this worked well to minimize impacts on farming operations. HFM have ongoing meetings with the landowner about rental, historic sites management, planning and employment opportunities. They also offer koha where appropriate, however this is not taken up. The communication and protection of landowner interests to date has been satisfactory.</p>	<p>SCS reviewed legal documentation to confirm tenure, consultation records, maps and operational notes for the roading operation and resource consent inspection records for the stream crossings. Interview with HFM staff and observations made at the site confirmed the organisation is engaging appropriately with the landowner to minimize social and environmental impacts of operations. Operational controls to protect the stream during roading and crossing construction are adequate and have been implemented effectively. Stream monitoring results were also reviewed, confirming the stakeholders comments.</p>
<p>In late 2020 Waikato Regional Council undertook an aerial 1080 baiting program that included some of HFM's estate. Bait was dropped on a HFM contractor's bulldozer while it was operating. The matter was investigated by the Environmental Protection Authority, the regional council and HFM. The stakeholder is concerned that the communication process for alerting workers and the public of the application of 1080 and its health dangers was ineffective and the health testing response for HFM's worker was insufficient.</p>	<p>SCS reviewed HFM's ICAM investigation report and communications records and interviewed staff involved in the incident. These show that HFM did act to avoid exposure of contractors and recreationalists to the bait drop, however these actions were not effective in this instance. HFM have conducted an analysis of the incident, and identified appropriate preventative actions to avoid recurrence of this issue. However, the incident was not recorded in the organisation's incident register and at the</p>

<p>Workers who are exposed to 1080 are normally required to have a urine test to ascertain levels of 1080 but this was not done. The stakeholder also questioned why FSC issued a 1080 derogation for such a dangerous pesticide, and is concerned that the new Predator Free NZ 2050 policy has increased the frequency and dosage of 1080 baiting, potentially increasing exposure incidents, and increasing the risk to workers and non-target wildlife, livestock and dogs.</p> <p>HFM environmental representatives engage through a Forest Industry Liaison Forum organized by the regional council, however the council has not held this forum in recent times and it is missed. HFMs representative on the forum is good to deal with and makes proactive contact on specific issues as they arise. The stakeholder would like to receive newsletters or other regular communication from HFM. The stakeholder confirmed that she was expressing her personal concerns as a councillor and not the view of the whole of Council.</p>	<p>time of the audit the investigation report had not been finalized, risking that the proposed corrective actions may not be implemented (See CAR 2021:1 against indicator 4.2.3). HFM has revised its Environmental Safety Risk Assessment for 1080 to specifically address risk associated with applications by third party, however these processes have not clearly been integrated into the management system as yet.</p> <p>SCS accepts HFMs decision not to test the contractor for poisoning, because the exposure of the contractor was well below the Workplace Exposure Standards prescribed in NZ safety regulations that would trigger health monitoring. Recognised exposures are through skin and ingestion. The HFM contractor was in a vehicle at the time of the 1080 drop, and did not come into contact with the baits.</p>
<p>HFM are harvesting a large plantation area surrounding a private property. They have been proactive in communicating about the planned operations, have worked to minimize operational inconvenience and have responded to queries about harvesting practices and re-establishment plans. Despite this, the bare earth and high level of landscape modification is of concern. It has also been observed that there is considerable amount of harvesting debris remaining around a stream of width around 3m, which has affected the stream habitat values. This was caused by the haulage of logs over the stream from a thin, isolated strip of plantation to the nearest skid. Branches and harvest debris fell into the stream and impacted its banks. There were native crayfish in the stream. HFM have provided the relevant Codes and other information on their stream management practices. Slash management, silt traps and sediment control should be applied as soon as practical, however it is unclear whether this has happened. HFM have verbally indicated they will not replant the isolated section of land to pines, and the stakeholder would like this confirmed more formally.</p>	<p>SCS reviewed photographs and operational monitoring documentation and interviewed the staff responsible for planning and management of the site. The area of plantation discussed is a reasonably flat valley with a small stream running through it which is consistent with the class 4L stream identified in the planning information. This stream classification indicates a low risk of slash movement and therefore slash is not required to be removed from the stream banks following harvest according to the NES. Waterway protections for this stream are a machine exclusion zone of 5m on each bank. Review of photos confirmed that slash build up on the stream banks was not excessive and that machinery exclusion zones had been applied in the view. The stream banks are vegetated with ground cover and there is no apparent dragging of logs or soil rutting through the stream that would require remediation. Interviews confirmed that the contractor had removed some slash from the stream banks following completion of harvesting in this area. Planning information for the replanting showed there</p>

	<p>was intention to not replant the isolated section of land to pines.</p> <p>It is also noted that HFM have been subject to many council monitoring activities during the audit period, specifically related to their implementation of the NES. They have been found to be fully compliant at all visits.</p>
--	---

## 6. Certification Decision

<p>The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship Council standards. The SCS annual evaluation team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual evaluations and the FME’s response to any open CARs.</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>	

## 7. Annual Data Update

<input type="checkbox"/> No changes since previous evaluation.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information in the following sections has changed since previous evaluation.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Name and Contact Information <input type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope of Certificate <input type="checkbox"/> Non-SLIMF FMUs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Social Information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pesticide and Other Chemical Use <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Production Forests <input type="checkbox"/> FSC Product Classification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conservation & High Conservation Value Areas <input type="checkbox"/> Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification

### Name and Contact Information

<b>Organization name</b>	Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd		
<b>Contact person</b>	Kerry Ellem		
<b>Address</b>	Unit 5, 120 Hamilton Street,	<b>Telephone</b>	+64 7 571 7915
	Tauranga, New Zealand 3110	<b>Fax</b>	+64 7 571 7920
	PO Box 13404, Tauranga,	<b>e-mail</b>	kellem@hrng.com
	New Zealand 3141	<b>Website</b>	Hfm.nz

### FSC Sales Information

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

### Scope of Certificate

<b>Certificate Type</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single FMU		<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group			
<b>SLIMF (if applicable)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate		<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate			
<b># Group Members (if applicable)</b>	NA			
<b>Number of FMUs in scope of certificate</b>	1			
<b>Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)</b>	<i>Latitude &amp; Longitude:</i> 38 degrees south, 176 degrees East			
<b>Forest zone</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical		<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical	
<b>Area in scope of certificate which is:</b> Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac				
privately managed	219570			
state managed	0			
community managed	0			
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate</b> <i>(Is also equal to [productive area] + [conservation area])</i>	208882 Remaining area is identified in system as Other (unstocked gap, restricted, etc). This is 10688ha.			
<b>Prior year total forest area in scope of certificate</b> <i>(from prior year report)</i>	226898			
<b>Has Total forest area changed from prior year?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No Change from prior year <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, there was a change from prior year. Explain change: <i>Expiring forestry rights and transition out of leases. Woodhill, Tarawera and OTPP as harvest handback land. Sold Torere lease.</i>			
<b>Number of FMUs in scope that are:</b>				
less than 100 ha in area	0	100 - 1000 ha in area	0	
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	0	more than 10 000 ha in area	1	
<b>Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:</b> Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac				
are less than 100 ha in area	0			
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	0			
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs	0			
<b>Division of FMUs into manageable units:</b>				
Regions – Northern, Central, Eastern and OTPP. Regions have a regional manager supported by central office staff for systems.				

### Non-SLIMF FMUs (Group or Multiple FMU Certificates)

Name	Contact information	Latitude/ longitude of Non-SLIMF FMUs
------	---------------------	---------------------------------------


**Social Information**

<b>Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):</b>		
Male workers: 1028	Female workers: 155	
<b>Number of accidents in forest work since previous evaluation:</b>	Serious: 4 LTI's 3 MTI's	Fatal: Nil

**Pesticide and Other Chemical Use**

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>N/A - FME has not used pesticides since last audit.</i>				
<b>Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide</b>	<b>Active ingredient</b>	<b>Quantity applied since previous evaluation (kg or lbs.)</b>	<b>Total area treated since previous evaluation (ha or ac)</b>	<b>Reason for use</b>
Cloralid 300	Clopyralid	612 kg	1,837 ha	Post-plant weed control
Cloram	Clopyralid Picloram	86 kg 57 kg	199 ha	Pre-plant weed control
Glyphosate 510	Glyphosate	18,131 kg	5,539 ha	Pre-plant weed control
Haloxyfop	Haloxyfop	10 kg	56 ha	Post-plant weed control
Hexagran 750	Hexazinone	10,374 kg	7,891 ha	Post-plant weed control
Hexol	Hexazinone	532 kg	177 ha	Post-plant weed control
Meturon	Metsulfuron	645 kg	5,431 ha	Pre-plant weed control
Pilcoram 500	Picloram	43 kg	58 ha	Post plant weed control
Terbutylazine 500	Terbutylazine	45,525 kg	7,258 ha	Post-plant weed control

Trichloram Brushkiller	Triclopyr Picloram	177 kg 59 kg	1,068 ha	Pre & post plant weed control
Valzine 500	Terbuthylazine Hexazinone	85 kg 15 kg	73 ha	Post-plant weed control
Cuprous Oxide	Copper	7,881 kg	6,915 ha	Dothistroma control

### Production Forests

<b>Timber Forest Products</b>	<b>Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac</b>
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	176,522
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	176,522
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	176,522
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	0
<b>Silvicultural system(s)</b>	<b>Area under type of management</b>
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range:        )	176,522
Shelterwood	
Other:	
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	
Group selection	
Other:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	
<b>Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)</b>	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	Significant areas of the plantation are used for recreational use (including commercial recreation operations). Some
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	understory crops – most notably Ginseng in Maraeroa C (Central region).
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	Approx. 222 ha pasture (grazing leases), 1007 ha utilities (powerline corridors etc.)
<b>Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)</b>	

<p>Species within the estate include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pinus radiata</li> <li>• Pseudotsuga menziesii</li> <li>• Eucalyptus fastigata</li> <li>• Eucalyptus nitens</li> <li>• Eucalyptus regnans</li> </ul> <p>Numerous small areas of minor species (Cupressus lusitanica, Pinus muricata, Cryptomeria japonica)</p>
---

**FSC Product Classification\***

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
W1	W1.1 Saw logs and pulp logs	All
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species

*\*Note: W1, W2, and W3 product groups usually do not require a separate evaluation to FSC-STD-40-004 (COC) if processing occurs in the field for FM/COC and CW/FM certificate types. N1-N10 (NTFPs) are eligible to be sold with FSC claims under FM/COC certification if reported here. Bamboo and NTFPs derived from trees (e.g. cork, resin, bark) may be eligible for FM/COC and CW/FM certification. NTFPs used for food and medicinal purposes are not eligible for CW/FM certification. Check with SCS if you have any products intended to be sold with an FSC claim outside of any of these categories.*

**Conservation and High Conservation Value Areas**

Conservation Area	Units: X ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
<b>Total amount</b> of land in certified area protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives (includes both forested and non-forested lands).*	32360

*\*Note: Total conservation and HCV areas may differ since these may serve different functions in the FME’s management system. Designation as HCV may allow for active management, including commercial harvest. Conservation areas are typically under passive management, but may undergo invasive species control, prescribed burns, non-commercial harvest, and other management activities intended to maintain or enhance their integrity. In all cases, figures are reported by the FME as it pertains local laws & regulations, management objectives, and FSC requirements.*

High Conservation Value Forest / Areas			Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	Cook Rd Forest, Whatoro Forest, Northland Confirmed by DOC as being part of an area with a nationally significant kiwi population, linking Trounson Park & Kaihu Forest Park.	316ha



		Houpoto Swamp, Houpoto Forest, Eastern Bay of Plenty. Large scale wetland, assessed by Bay of Plenty Regional Council as a site of national significance.	110ha
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.		
HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	<p>Pokapoka Stream wetland, Waiomio Forest, Northland. A large wetland assessed as nationally significant by DOC staff.</p> <p>Lake Rd Lake, Kinleith Forest, Waikato Region. One of few natural lakes in the Ecological District, assessed by Waikato Region as nationally significant.</p> <p>Kokota Dunes wetland Lake Morehurehu &amp; associated wetlands Lake Te Kahika All three of the above are located in Te Kao forest, Northland. All are dune lake and wetland associations, assessed by DOC as nationally significant.</p> <p>Te Ranginui wetland, Orete Forest. Kahikatea forest – nationally rare forest type.</p> <p>Tokerau A1 wetland Tikitere wetland 01</p>	<p>83.6ha</p> <p>25ha</p> <p>442ha 97.1ha</p> <p>76.4ha</p> <p>5ha</p> <p>8.3ha 10.6ha</p>

		Tikitere geothermal reserves: LEPT-02 LEPT-13 LEPT-03 LEPT-12 LEPT-01	3.9ha 1.1ha 1.8ha 1.8ha 2.9ha
		Tikitere geothermal sinter terraces GEOT-01	1.3ha
		Tuhoe wetland 01 Tuhoe wetland 02 Tuhoe wetland 03 Tuhoe wetland 04	8.9ha 7.9ha 0.8ha 3.1ha
HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).		
HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		
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).	Pohaturoa, Kinleith Forest, Waikato Region. Very important cultural site for Ngati Raukawa, Te Arawa and Tuwharetoa.  Omaio waahi tapu (0851-RS02)	36ha   0.8ha
<b>Total area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest / Area'</b>			<b>1,244.3 ha</b>

**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 certificate holder is included in the scope.</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Certificate holder owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Certificate holder wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.</i>		
<b>Note:</b> <i>Excision cannot be applied to CW/FM certificates.</i>		
<b>Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:</b>		
<b>Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):</b>		
<b>Description of FMUs excluded from, or forested area excised from, the scope of certification:</b>		
<b>Name of FMU or Stand</b>	<b>Location (city, state, country)</b>	<b>Size ( <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac )</b>


