

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

Timberlands Pacific Pty Ltd

*Launceston, Tasmania
Mount Gambier, South Australia*

SCS-FM/COC-004554

10 Helen Street
Mount Gambier, South Australia, 5290
Emma-Kate Griffiths
www.tppl.com.au

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
19 December 2018	18 December 2023

DATE OF FIELD EVALUATION
13-17 Sept 2021
DATE OF REPORT FINALIZATION
29 November 2021

SCS Contact:

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

SCSglobal
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

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

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	9
4. RESULTS OF EVALUATION	9
4.1 Definitions of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations.....	9
4.2 History of Findings for Certificate Period.....	9
4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations	10
4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations	18
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS	21
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted	21
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses	21
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION	22
7. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE	22
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL).....	31
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected for Evaluation	31
Appendix 2 – Staff and Stakeholders Consulted.....	31
Appendix 3 – Additional Evaluation Techniques Employed	32
Appendix 4 – Required Tracking	33
Appendix 5 – Forest Management Standard Conformance Table	34
Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs Conformance Table	35
Appendix 7 – Trademark Standard Conformance Table.....	91
Appendix 8 – Group Management Program.....	96

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Evaluation Team

Auditor name:	Kimberly Robertson	Auditor role:	Audit Team Leader
Qualifications:	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 fifteen FM audit teams since 2015.		

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site for evaluation	4.5
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation	1
C. Number of days spent by any technical experts (in addition to amount in line A)	
D. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and follow-up	3.5
E. Total number of person days used in evaluation	8.0

1.3 Applicable Standards

All applicable FSC standards are available on the websites of FSC International (www.fsc.org) or SCS Global Services (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: FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018 EN FINAL
	<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 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. Certification Evaluation Process

2.1 Evaluation Itinerary, Activities, and Site Notes

Date: Monday 13 th September 2021	
FMU/location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
8.30 am Tasmania (8.00 am (South Australia, 10.30 am NZ. All times below are Tasmania time)	IT test, debrief and planning for day.
8.45 - 9.15 am Tasmania: Timberlands Pacific Launceston and Mt Gambier Office – auditors remotely.	Opening Meeting: Introductions, client update, review scope of evaluation, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards, confidentiality and public summary, conformance evaluation methods and tools, review of open CARs/OBS, emergency and security procedures for evaluation team, final site selection.
9.15 am -10.15 am Tasmania:	Client Update, Organization overview
10.15 -10.45	Break for NZ auditor lunch.
10.45 -11.30 am Tasmania:	Closing of 2020 CARs
11.30 -12.30 pm Tasmania:	Documentation, record review and staff interviews for Forest Management principles assigned per the Forest Management Audit Plan.

	Principle 1 – Compliance with Laws
12.30 – 1.00 pm	Break for lunch for Timberlands staff
1.00 pm -3.30 pm	Criteria 2.3 Health and Safety
Date: Tuesday 14th September 2021	
FMU / location / sites visited	Activities / notes
8.00 am – 3.30 pm	<p>Auditor undertaking remote inspection of active sites and, interviews with TPPL staff and contractors or contracting staff.</p> <p>Longhill Coupe 814120015T1, Mechanised Production Thinning, mobile phone interview with the TPPL Production Manager and Contractor machine operator, re Induction, Sign in procedures, FOS Plan, Special values, Endangered Species photo guide, control of public access during operations, training, first aid, fire extinguishers, fuel storage, spill kits, powerlines, communication; remote walk through of site to review machinery exclusion zones around streams, wilding removal in adjacent STT indigenous forest.</p> <p>Castra Coupe 806124C: recently clearfelled site and interview with the TPPL harvest manager re Induction and review of canister at sign in Process for activity in a new coupe Eagle Exclusion zone FPP special values Monthly harvest safety check Raoding Extreme weather event</p> <p>Mobile phone coverage was only available at the above two sites. TPPL provide pre-recorded videos of the following sites:</p> <p>Buealah Coupe 805131A: Clearfell, mechanised logging, video by TPPL harvest manger showing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coupe documentation, pre start, FOS Plan, Forest practices plan, coupe map • Call up • Landing construction • Harvesting • Forwarder Operation • Landing, extraction tracks, cutover • Adjacent native vegetation • Spill kit

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fuel storage • First aid kit <p>Lisle Coupe 815135D, Clearfell, cable logging video by TPPL production manager showing Entry to site, use of UHF channel Signing in, FPP, FOS plan, Risk assessment Cable set up – not in operation Extraction tracks Forwarder operation Interview with Crew boss and feller buncher operator Fuel Storage</p> <p>Payanna coupe 821137021, clearfell, mechanised, video by TPPL harvest manger showing Site entrance and signage, FPP, FOS Plan, risk assessment, Job safety assessment Rooding Class 4 stream crossing, Machine exclusion zone Adjacent native reserve Windrows retained for Tasmanian devil and quoll Extraction routes Landing Fuel/oil storage Truck load strapping Powerlines Forwarder</p>
Date: Wednesday 15th September 2021	
FMU/location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
<p>8.00 am – 3.30 pm Field day, sites TBC</p>	<p>Auditor undertaking remote inspection of active sites and HCV, interviews with contractors or contracting staff.</p> <p>Castra Coupe 806124C: recently clearfelled site, now undergoing stie preparation, mob phone interview with the TPPL harvest manager and machine operator and a walk around site re Sign in, mobile cannister with site FOS plan , FPP, Contractor site Risk Assessment Eagle exclusion zone Temporary stream crossings Landing rehabilitation Weed control Communication with TPPL Working alone procedures, spot tracker, first aid kit, radio and mob ph coverage Fuel Storage, spill kit</p>

	<p>Process for moving to a new site</p> <p>Mobile phone coverage was only available at the above site. TPPL provided pre-recorded videos of the following sites:</p> <p>Beulah HCV Virginstown HCV</p>
1.00 pm – 3.30 pm	<p>Criteria 6.4 RTE Species</p> <p>Criteria 6.6 maintain the continued existence of naturally occurring native species and genotypes, and prevent losses of biological diversity,</p> <p>Criteria 9.4 HCV monitoring</p>
Date: Thursday 16th September 2021	
FMU/location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
8.00 am -10.00 am Timberlands Pacific Launceston and Mt Gambier Office – auditors remotely	<p>Documentation, record review and staff interviews for Forest Management principles assigned per the Forest Management Audit Plan.</p> <p>Principle 4 – Community relations, and Criteria 7.6</p>
10.00am – 10.30 am	Auditor break for lunch
10.30 am – 12.30 pm	Principle 4 – Community relations, and Criteria 7.6
12.30 – 2.30 pm	Implementation of Management Activities: 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6, 10.7, 10.12.
2.30 – 3.30 pm	Trademarks (FSC-STD-50-001)
Date: Friday 17th September 2021	
FMU/location/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
8.00 am to 9.00 am	Auditor to follow up any outstanding evidence
9.00 – 11.30 am	Closing Meeting Preparation: Auditor(s) take time to consolidate notes and confirm evaluation findings
11.30 am – 12.00 pm (Tasmania, 11.00 am SA, 1.30 pm NZ)	Closing Meeting: Brief summary of audit activities, present preliminary findings, confidentiality, SCS/FSC dispute policy, timeline for report, 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 st Annual Evaluation (year)	2 nd Annual Evaluation (year)	3 rd Annual Evaluation (year)	4 th Annual Evaluation (year)
No findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P1				Minor 1.3.4	
P2		Observation 2.3.1 Minor 2.5.1 Minor Annex B 2 & 3	Minor 2.5.1	Minor 2.3.1	

P3	Minor 3.1.3 Minor 3.3.1	Minor 3.1.2 Minor 3.5.1	Minor 3.1.1, Minor 3.5.2		
P4	Minor 4.2.1 Observation 4.2.8				
P5					
P6	Minor 6.5.2	Observation 6.7.2			
P7	Minor 7.4.2		Minor 7.6.2		
P8					
P9	Minor 9.1.2	Minor 9.1.1 Minor 9.4.1 Observation 9.4.2	Obs 9.1.1		
P10			Minor 10.7.5	Observation 10.3.3	
COC for FM	Minor 2.2		Minor 5.1 and 5.2		
Trademark	Major 1.15				
Group					
Other					

4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2020.1	
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):	
Deadline	
<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):	
Primary standard reference:	FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018 EN FINAL Indicator 2.5.1 <i>Workers*</i> have adequate job specific training consistent with Annex B and supervision to safely and effectively undertake their roles and duties as part of the implementation of the <i>management plan*</i> . Annex B) 6) Identify where <i>Indigenous Peoples*</i> have <i>legal*</i> and <i>cultural responsibilities*</i> related to management activities (<i>Criterion*</i> 3.2); 7) Identify and implement applicable elements of UNDRIP and ILO Convention 169 (<i>Criterion*</i> 3.4) 8) Identify sites of special cultural, ecological, economic, religious or spiritual significance to <i>Indigenous Peoples*</i> and implement the necessary measures to protect them before the start of forest management activities to avoid negative impacts (<i>Criterion*</i> 3.5 and <i>Criterion*</i> 4.7); 9) Identify where <i>local communities*</i> have <i>legal*rights*</i> related to

	management activities (Criterion* 4.2);
Other applicable standard reference(s):	
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): TPPL have several relatively new staff to the company who require cultural awareness training.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): TPPL shall ensure that all applicable staff are trained, or receive fresher training if required, in accordance with Annex B) 6, 7, 8 and 9.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	<p>All staff participated in Cultural Heritage Training for both Taswood and Penola sites. Cultural awareness training has been added to Induction Process for all new staff. Information and events forwarded to staff to help increase overall awareness as it is received from the Reconciliation Action Plan Working Group (RAPWG)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance lists for Cultural Heritage Training - via Training register, row 38 • Come Walk with Us Participation Workbook (Taswood Content) • Aboriginal Cultural heritage training (Penola) • Cultural Awareness Presentation (Induction) • NAIDOC Weekly Updated • MannaLargenna Invites • NAIDOC week events Invites • Walk on Country with Aunty Patsey Invites • First Nations RAP Engagement – Timeline of actions • Tas regional RAP WG TOR/minutes Aug 21
SCS review	13 Sept 2021. Auditor reviewed the training materials listed above and the training register. The training register notes that most staff (33 people) have received Aboriginal and cultural heritage training (from the above list) in the past year. Two staff haven't received training, but they haven't yet started work. CAR closed
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: 2020.2	
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):	
Deadline	
<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):	
Primary standard	FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018 EN FINAL Indicator 3.1.1 Indigenous Peoples connected to the

reference:	Management Unit, or that may be affected by management activities, are identified through a systematic process using Best Available Information.
Other applicable standard reference(s):	
Non-Conformity (or Background/Justification in the case of Observations): The auditor recognizes the work undertaken with Reconciliation Tasmania, however there is a lack of evidence of who Reconciliation Tasmania actually represents and while TPPL have also engaged an outreach person through a related consultancy organisation known as “The Collective” there is no documented evidence of people who this contact will reach out to.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): TPPL shall identify and document the Indigenous stakeholders connected to, or included in the consultation processes in all regions included in the DFA	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	Both the Taswood and Penola Cultural Heritage Plans updated to reflect which first nations groups are connected to each estate. The Stakeholder register has also been updated to reflect the first nations groups and other first nations stakeholders who have been identified as having connections. The stakeholder register also records where contact has been made or attempted to be made. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder register and specific identified contacts • Cultural heritage plans specify groups • RAP Project presentation • RAP (including email formally approving RAP by Rec Aus) • First Nations RAP Engagement – Timeline of actions
SCS review	13 Sept 2021. Review of the Taswood and Penola Cultural Heritage Plans list Aboriginal groups connected to each area. Stakeholder register reviewed and lists particular contacts for each of these groups. CAR closed
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: 2020.3	
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):	
Deadline	
<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):	
Primary standard reference:	FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018 EN FINAL Indicator 3.5.2 Measures to protect such <i>cultural landscapes*</i> and <i>cultural sites*</i> are agreed through <i>culturally appropriate*engagement*</i> with <i>Indigenous Peoples*connected to*the Management Unit*</i> . Measures are documented, implemented, and monitored. When <i>Indigenous Peoples*</i> determine that physical identification of sites in

	documentation or on maps would threaten the value or <i>protection</i> *of the sites, then other means will be used.
Other applicable standard reference(s):	
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): At the time of the audit an identified cultural site within the Penola Pines was seen to be protected by TPPL however there is no documented evidence of measures to protect the site (Buffer zone and remediation actions have been reviewed with a representative from the Burrandies Aboriginal Corporation but still to be formally determined with agreement of the Indigenous representative).	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): TPPL shall ensure the agreed protections put in place for the cultural site visited by representatives from the Burrandies Corporation as agreed and formalized and included on harvest planning documentation	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	Report from Burrandies inspection for Beachport site received and actions implemented. The Beachport Timber Harvest Plan updated accordingly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management Prescriptions and Buffer Guidelines GT, THP template reviewed for consistency across prescriptions. • Cultural Heritage Management Plan Penola Plantations, section Cultural Heritage Assessments – procedures, checked for consistency. • First Nations RAP Engagement – Timeline of actions
SCS review	13 Sept 2021. Report from South East Aboriginal Focus Group (dated 2 Oct 2020) includes the following recommendations for the Beachport site: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep machinery within the stumpline of the current plantation, falling trees away from the site. 2. A rubber wheeled harvester to remove pines to minimise soil disturbance. 3. Removing the coastal wattles and replanting the area with natives to restore the site. 4. Should any new Aboriginal sites or ancestral remains be discovered during harvesting operations adhere to the Aboriginal heritage site discovery protocols <p>Timberlands Beachport site Timber Harvest THP 551 T2B Plan reviewed and includes ‘Harvest operations to leave at least one row unthinned as a buffer surrounding the Aboriginal Heritage site. No machinery to enter the cultural heritage area and all tress to be felled and processed within the stumpline of standing plantation.’ This covers the first recommendation. Second thinning operations only use rubber wheeled harvesters, meeting the 2nd recommendation. The cultural heritage management plans in the harvest plan include the protocols if a new Aboriginal site is discovered during harvesting covering 4th recommendation.</p> <p>Remedial work to remove wattles and replanting of natives to be undertaken after harvest completed as noted by TPPL staff.</p> <p>CAR closed</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: 2020.4	
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):	
Deadline	
<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):	
Primary standard reference:	FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018 EN FINAL Indicator 7.6.2 (2) <i>Culturally appropriate* engagement* and best efforts* are used to: (2) Identify interested*and affected stakeholders*</i>
Other applicable standard reference(s):	
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): The auditor reviewed stakeholder databases that do not identify stakeholders as either affected or interested as required by 7.6.2 (2).	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): TPPL shall ensure that all stakeholders are identified as either affected stakeholders or interested stakeholders.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	FME corrected the database during the audit.
SCS review	Prior to the end of the onsite audit process the auditor reviewed stakeholder databases confirming that all stakeholders have now been identified as either affected or interested stakeholders.
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: 2020.5	
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/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):	
Primary standard reference:	FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018 EN FINAL Indicator 9.1.1 An assessment is completed consistent with Annex G that records the location and status of <i>High Conservation</i>

	<i>Value*</i> Categories 1-6, as defined in <i>Criterion*</i> 9.1; the <i>High Conservation Value*</i> <i>Areas*</i> they rely upon, and their condition.
Other applicable standard reference(s):	
Non-Conformity (or <i>Background/ Justification in the case of Observations</i>): The Spehr HCV area (which was the HCV site initially visited by the auditor) was inaccurately mapped (wrong location was mapped) but did have the PP monitoring site established at the actual location. Upon review by TPPL this site location was discovered to be an error and the correct HCV area was in a different location. (The correct HCV location was then visited.)	
Corrective Action Request (or <i>Observation</i>): TPPL shall carry out a review of HCV areas and Special values in the GIS system to ensure that all are mapped accurately. The auditor is aware that an ICAM investigation has been commenced and is due for reporting on Monday 2 nd November 2020 and that this information will be forwarded to the auditor.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	ICAM Incident Investigation Report dated 27-29 October 2020
SCS review	<p>The auditor reviewed the ICAM Incident Investigation Report dated 27-29 October 2020 which is a comprehensive report into how the above incident occurred. It appears that this is a combination of several factors</p> <p>“During a planned FSC audit field visit, the auditor requested a map of the Spehr HCV site. The Tree Crop Manager produced the map from GIS and identified that the photo monitoring points had been erected in the wrong location and the field trip had not been to the recorded HCV site (refer Appendix 1).</p> <p>In early 2019 the Forester responsible for managing and monitoring HCV who hosted the field trip, had visited the location with a senior manager. From this point, she had ‘assumed’ the location shown was the HCV site and had not checked the source data in GIS.</p> <p>The GPS location of the posts, erected by ALMEG silviculture contractors, as photo monitoring points, had been provided verbally and the data points had not been confirmed in GIS”.</p> <p>During the audit the auditor also visited the correct HCV area, confirming its location on GIS maps and also confirming that the photo monitoring points had been shifted and were now in the correct location</p>
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 2020.6
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):

Deadline	
<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):	
Primary standard reference:	CoC Indicators for FMEs: Training 5.1 and 5.2
Other applicable standard reference(s):	
Non-Conformity (<i>or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations</i>): The auditor accepts that TPPL have a highly automated CoC system which means that individual responsibilities can be significantly lessened, and also confirmed that TPPL have identified CoC training to be developed and delivered in FY 21, however the standard requires training for all people who have roles relating to CoC.	
Corrective Action Request (<i>or Observation</i>): TPPL shall ensure that FSC CoC awareness training is carried out for all individuals involved in or have responsibilities related to CoC requirements. Training records shall also be maintained.	
FME response (<i>including any evidence submitted</i>)	<p>Training was provided to all staff as part of MESH Meeting on 22 February 2021.</p> <p>The Training Register has been updated to include those who receive the training. Chain of custody has been added as part of our induction process and included on Employee Induction Program checklist.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training Register: row 52 • MESH Presentation 22 February 2021 Slides 66-69 • Employee Induction Program Checklist: Ian Blackmore completed example
SCS review	13 Sept 2021. Training register reviewed by auditor and 33 staff undertook the MESH training 22 February 2021. MESH training presentation reviewed and included a general overview of the COC system. CAR Closed
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (<i>refer to description above</i>)

Finding Number: 2020.7
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):
Deadline
<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):

Primary standard reference:	FSC STD 10.7.5 The use of pesticides complies with national, state and/or international guidelines, as well as those advised by the manufacturer, through provision of training, information and protective equipment to ensure adequate protection of workers or any other persons involved in the; 1) Transport of chemicals; 2) Storage and labelling of chemicals; 3) Handling and application; and 4) Emergency procedures for clean-up following accidental spillages.
Other applicable standard reference(s):	
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Risk of adverse impacts arising from the use of chemicals was not adequately managed for the Killara South wilding control operation. The contractor was found to be storing and decanting chemicals for the job without authorization from the forest manager in a general workshop area at the Casterton depot. There were no chemical safety facilities observed in this workshop, and the forest manager took immediate action to direct these activities cease at the site.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): TPPL shall ensure that all requirements of indicator 10.7.5 are complied with in relation to 1) Transport of chemicals; 2) Storage and labelling of chemicals; 3) Handling and application; and 4) Emergency procedures for clean-up following accidental spillages.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	Contractor was immediately told of the requirements of the site – no chemical storage facility and no unauthorized storing or equipment and materials. Actioned: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorised activity list developed and included in ‘Schedule 5 Special Requirements’ section of General Services contract currently under negotiation (see ALMEG General Services Contract_2021 page 34), no storage at depots and fire bases • Monthly worksite inspection includes two questions addressing presence of substances and non-TPPL owned/approved items (see Worksite_Inspection_Casterton_June_2) • Direction to not store chemical containers at depots or bases, storage and labelling requirements, and handling and application requirements and risks included in spray plan contractor is inducted into and signs (see Forest Operations Plan GT – Spray Plan Template_General Weeds) • Risk assessment and prevention listed in Forest Operations Plan GT – Spray Plan Template. Emergency Response Procedure for Chemical spills contained in TPPL Emergency Response Procedures, pages 15-17 (See Emergency Response Procedures)
SCS review	13 Sept 2021. ALMEG General Services Contract_2021 reviewed and ‘Schedule 5:Use of Depots and Bases’ explicitly excludes their use for storage of pesticides (including

	<p>herbicides). This has yet to be finalised.</p> <p>Review of the Worksite_Inspection_Casterton_dated 21 June 2021 noted no storage of hazardous substances or items not owed by Timberlands on site.</p> <p>Review of the Forest Operations Plan GT – Spray Plan Template_General Weeds confirmed that it includes that chemical containers will be stored at the nursery, not the depots or bases and All chemical SDS's and Labels must be onsite or on hand whilst transporting and using chemicals at ALL times.</p> <p>Review of Forest Operations Plan GT – Spray Plan Template confirmed that it includes risk assessment and response procedures for chemical use and chemical spills.</p> <p>CAR Closed</p>
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2021:01	
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):	
Deadline	
<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):	
Primary standard reference:	FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018 EN FINAL 1.3.4 Potential conflicts between applicable Australian federal, state and/or local laws, the FSC Principles & Criteria, and international agreements are identified and recorded.
Other applicable standard reference(s):	
Non-Conformity (<i>or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations</i>): The forest industry developed a <i>guide to compliance with the ILO code of practice on safety and health in forestry work in Australia</i> in 2019. TPPL haven't undertaken any further analysis of potential conflicts between applicable Australian federal, state and/or local laws/ international agreements and the FSC Principles & Criteria.	
Corrective Action Request (<i>or Observation</i>): TPPL shall undertake analysis to identify if there are potential conflicts between applicable Australian federal, state and/or local laws/ international agreements and the FSC Principles & Criteria.	
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"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 2021:02	
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):	
Deadline	
<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):	
Primary standard reference:	FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018 EN FINAL 2.3.1 A Workplace Health and Safety (WHS) program is in place, that meets or exceeds the ILO Code of Practice on Safety and Health in Forestry Work, and which complies with relevant workplace health and safety legislation and regulations, facilitates improvement in WHS and adopts working conditions that do not endanger workers.
Other applicable standard reference(s):	
Non-Conformity (or <i>Background/ Justification in the case of Observations</i>):	
<p>During a visit to Castra 806124C where site preparation operations were underway the auditor found the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operator working alone and no call up protocols (interviewed the operator who confirmed this). The contracting principal noted that the operator’s wife has his mobile and would ring him if operator doesn’t arrive home). This doesn’t comply with the TPPL Working in Isolation WHS Manual. • No spot tracker (confirmed by operator, and contracting principle noted that this in only required on site with no cell phone coverage). This doesn’t comply with Contractors or TPPL Working In Isolation Policy. • The machine didn’t have a first aid kit in it and is often far from the vehicle with a first aid kit (the Tasmanian Forest Safety Code 2007 requires that first aid kits are immediately available). <p>At the time of documentation review the TPPL Site Prep Operation safety checklist didn’t include working alone risks.</p> <p>The last contractor audit dated 17 September 2020 noted that the site prep operator working alone interviewed did have a spot tracker. Other contractors interviewed note that if staff are working alone, when operator is in phone service they require a 2 hourly call up. If there is no phone service operators are provided with a spot tracker and need to need to check in every 2 hours.</p>	

Graded as a minor CAR as the last contractor audit didn't identify the issue and no such concerns were identified at other sites	
<p>Corrective Action Request (or Observation): TPPL shall ensure that contractor working alone procedures meet the TPPL Work Health Safety Manual requirements section 7.10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timberlands Pacific and all contractors must have an effective policy in place which ensures there is an adequate and reliable system for regular communication for workers carrying out remote or isolated work • ensure suitable emergency communication is available and contact is made every two hours between the lone worker and supervisor by mobile phone, or an agreed 'check in' process. • First aid kits shall be immediately available. 	
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"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 2021:03	
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/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):	
Primary standard reference:	10.3.3. The spread of invasive species introduced by The Organisation is controlled.
Other applicable standard reference(s):	
<p>Non-Conformity (or Background/Justification in the case of Observations): At the time of the audit there were limited opportunities noted to implement wildling control on a plantation basis. Estate-wide wildling control (focusing on wildings in native vegetation) is under development comprising: a wildling assessment phase using remotely sensed data in FY22H2, design and costing of a FY23 pine wildling control budget, implementation in FY23 and then future wildling monitoring coinciding with the 5 year LiDAR cycle (next scheduled FY24) .</p> <p>This is graded as an observation as maintenance wildling control in being carried out (both within plantation and along neighbouring properties at plantation age 3, and alongside thinning and harvesting operations).</p>	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation):	

TPPL are encouraged to undertake a more systematic plantation wide wildling control approach.	
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"/> <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"/> 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.	
Summary of Outreach Activities Conducted (Check all that apply):	
<input checked="" 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	
Stakeholder Comment (Negative, positive, and neutral)	SCS Response

6. Certification Decision

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.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	

7. Annual Data Update

<input type="checkbox"/> No changes since previous evaluation.	
<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Production Forests <input type="checkbox"/> FSC Product Classification <input type="checkbox"/> Conservation & High Conservation Value Areas <input type="checkbox"/> Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification

Name and Contact Information

Organization name	Timberlands Pacific Pty Ltd		
Contact person	Emma-Kate Griffiths		
Address	10 Helen Street Mount Gambier, South Australia, 5290	Telephone	+61 8 8724 2000
		Fax	
		e-mail	emma- kate.griffiths@tppl.com.au
		Website	www.tppl.com.au

FSC Sales Information

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

Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group	
SLIMF (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate	
# Group Members (if applicable)		
Number of FMUs in scope of certificate		
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	<i>Latitude & Longitude: Taswood Estate 147.2415 – 41.288124 GTFT Estate 141.018481 – 37.522661</i>	
Forest zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical
Area in scope of certificate which is: Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac		
privately managed	101 406	
state managed		
community managed		
Total forest area in scope of certificate <i>(Is also equal to [productive area] + [conservation area])</i>	101 406	
Prior year total forest area in scope of certificate <i>(from prior year report)</i>	101 326	
Has Total forest area changed from prior year?	<input type="checkbox"/> No Change from prior year <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, there was a change from prior year. Explain	

		change: Some land has been added to Taswood Plantations (a firebreak within the Forest (that has always been managed by TPPL, but wasn't previously included in the forest area), some small changes due to improved mapping.	
Number of FMUs in scope that are:			
less than 100 ha in area		100 - 1000 ha in area	
1000 - 10 000 ha in area		more than 10 000 ha in area	1
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:			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		
Division of FMUs into manageable units:			
<p>Timberlands Pacific Pty. Ltd. manages their 2 forest estates as 1 FMU for certification purposes. The Taswood Estate consists of 36 forests located primarily across the northern part of Tasmania. These are not contiguous area, but are covered by one management system and a single Forest Management Plan, which is then divided into specific Forest Practices and Forest Operational Plans.</p> <p>The Penola Plantations (Green Triangle region) consists of 64 forests located on the boarder of South Australia and Victoria in the area known as the Green Triangle. As with the Taswood Estate these forests are not contiguous but are covered by a single management system and a Forest Management Plan which, while modelled on the Taswood FMP, is contained in a separate part of the Timberlands Pacific Pty Ltd Forest Management Plan document.</p>			

Non-SLIMF FMUs (Group or Multiple FMU Certificates)

Name	Contact information	Latitude/ longitude of Non-SLIMF FMUs	

Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):		
male workers: # 365	female workers: # 40	
Number of accidents in forest work since previous evaluation:	Serious: # 4	Fatal: # NIL

Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - FME has not used pesticides since last audit.				
Commercial name of	Active ingredient	Quantity applied since previous evaluation (kg or lbs.)	Total area treated since previous evaluation (ha or ac)	Reason for use

pesticide / herbicide				
Axeman	Triclopyr	1294.1 l	1207.79	Establishment
Bowsaw	Metsulfuron methyl	71.67 kg	1087.25	Establishment
Clomac	Clopyralid	231 kg	77	Maintenance
Clomac Forestry	Clopyralid	1433.5 kg	1302.16	Maintenance
Concussion	Glyphosate	80 l	15.4	Establishment
Crucial 600	Clopyralid	30 l	17	Maintenance
Grunt	Hexazinone	1197 kg	514.68	Establishment
Kamba 500	Dicamba	7.5 l	0.066	Sirex
Mako	Sulfometuron Methyl	2.28 kg	45	Maintenance
Metmac	Metsulfuron methyl	28.336 kg	597.78	Maintenance
Uptake Oil	Parafinic Oil	185.1 l	370.21	Maintenance
Velmac G	Hexazinone	280 kg	142	Maintenance
Verdict 520	Haloxypop	106.6 l	165.19	Maintenance
Victory IVM	Clopyralid	65 kg	129.26	Maintenance
Weedmaster DST	Glyphosate	11855.3 l	1945.46	Establishment
Weedmaster Duo	Glyphosate	55.4 l	21	Maintenance
Wipeout 450	Glyphosate	3 l	5	Maintenance

Production Forests

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)	87,335
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	87,335
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	85,276
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	2,059
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range:)	87,335
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.)	
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)	
<i>Pinus radiata</i> (Radiata Pine), <i>Eucalyptus obliqua</i> , (Tasmanian Oak) <i>Eucalyptus regnans</i> , (Ribbon Gum) <i>Eucalyptus viminalis</i> (White Gum) <i>Eucalyptus amygdalina</i> (Black Peppermint) <i>Eucalyptus ovata</i> , (White gum) <i>Eucalyptus sieberi</i> , (Iron Bark) <i>Eucalyptus globulus</i> (Blue Gum) <i>Acacia delbata</i> (Silver Wattle) <i>Eucalyptus nitens</i> (Shining Gum) <i>Pinus brutia</i> (Turkish Pine), <i>Pinus pinaster</i> <i>Pinus attenuata</i> (knobcone pine) <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> (Douglas Fir) <i>Acacia melanoxylon</i> (Blackwood)	

FSC Product Classification*

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
W1 Rough Wood	W1.1 Roundwood Logs	All Species
W3 Wood in chips or particles	W3.1 Wood Chips	Pinus radiata
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: <input type="checkbox"/> x ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
Total amount of land in certified area protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives (includes both forested and non-forested lands).*	10,771

**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 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).		
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.	FIELDS_3 - Plains Grassy Wetland (EVC 125)	0.93
		HEATHERLIE_18 - Plains Grassy Woodland (EVC 55) + Riparian Woodland (EVC 641)	28.87
		MINGBOOL_10 - Plains Sedgy Wetland (EVC 647)	0.64
		NANGWARRY SOUTH_14 - Plains Sedgy Wetland (EVC 647) mosaicked with Aquatic Herbland (EVC 653)	0.96
		NANGWARRY SOUTH_15 - Plains Sedgy Wetland (EVC 647) mosaicked with Aquatic Herbland (EVC 653)	6.02
			0.78

		SPEHR_4 - Plains Sedgy Wetland (EVC 647) grading into a Plains Grassy Wetland (EVC 125)	25.13
		WERRIKOO_10 - Damp Heathland	15.24
		WERRIKOO_14 - Damp Heathland	21.5
		WERRIKOO_60 - Damp Heathland	0.59
		Beulah_1 - Eucalyptus ovata forest and woodland	6.12
		Beulah_1 - Euclayptus obliqua forest with broadleaf shrubs	1.27
		Beulah_1 - Eucalyptus obliqua dry forest	2.93
		Nicholas_162 - Eucalyptus amygdalina inland forest and woodland on Cainozoic deposits	3.12
		Nicholas_166 - Eucalyptus ovata forest and woodland	1.06
		Nicholas_166 - Eucalyptus amygdalina inland forest and woodland on Cainozoic deposits	18.44
		Nicholas_171 - Eucalyptus amygdalina inland forest and woodland on Cainozoic deposits	1.06
		Paradise_1 - Eucalyptus viminalis wet forest	3.77
		Scamander_173 - Eucalyptus ovata forest and woodland	

		Scamander_176 - Eucalyptus ovata forest and woodland	13.17
			3.25
		Scamander_183 - Eucalyptus ovata forest and woodland	3.29
		Scamander_185 - Eucalyptus ovata forest and woodland	1.66
		Scamander_187 - Eucalyptus ovata forest and woodland	0.25
		Stoodley_206 - Freshwater aquatic sedgeland and rushland	6.14
		Virginstow_1 - Eucalyptus ovata forest and woodland	0.15
		Virginstow_41 - Eucalyptus ovata forest and woodland	
HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	The Taswood Estate is located within the South Esk catchment and features strongly in local water management plans for the Tamar River. The Taswood Estate is also located within the Wrinklers Lagoon catchment on the east coast.	9,611
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).		
Total area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest / Area'			10,771

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

<input type="checkbox"/> N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the certificate holder is included in the scope.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Certificate holder owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certificate holder wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification. <i>Note: Excision cannot be applied to CW/FM certificates.</i>		
Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:	Dohle Rd Nursery is not managed under the same criteria as the forest estate; therefore, it is not subjected to the same management standards. Currently there are no plans to include the nursery in the certification. SCS will be notified should this change.	
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):	N/A Seedling Nursery only	
Description of FMUs excluded from or forested area excised from the scope of certification:		
Name of FMU or Stand	Location (city, state, country)	Size (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac)
Dohle Road Nursery	Mount Gambier, South Australia	16