

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

Client Address	<u>10 Helen Street, Mount Gambier, South Australia, 5290</u>
Client Contact	<u>Emma-Kate Griffiths</u>
Client Website	<u>www.tppl.com.au</u>

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
19 December 2018	18 December 2023

DATE OF FIELD EVALUATION
23 – 27 May 2022
DATE OF REPORT FINALIZATION
22 August 2022

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



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 type="checkbox"/> 3 rd annual evaluation	<input checked="" 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	5
1.4 Conversion Table English Units to Metric Units	5
2. CERTIFICATION EVALUATION PROCESS	6
2.1 Evaluation Itinerary, Activities, and Site Notes	6
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems	10
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	11
4. RESULTS OF EVALUATION	11
4.1 Definitions of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations	11
4.2 History of Findings for Certificate Period.....	11
4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations	12
4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations	15
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS	23
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted.....	24
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses	24
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION	25
7. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE	26
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL).....	34
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected for Evaluation.....	34
Appendix 2 – Staff and Stakeholders Consulted	34
Appendix 3 – Additional Evaluation Techniques Employed.....	35
Appendix 4 – Required Tracking.....	35
Appendix 5 – Forest Management Standard Conformance Table	36
Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs Conformance Table	86
Appendix 7 – Trademark Standard Conformance Table.....	93
Appendix 8 – Group Management Program.....	98

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Evaluation Team

Auditor name:	Tuesday Phelan	Auditor role:	Audit Team Leader
Qualifications:	<p>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.</p>		
Auditor name:	Graeme Lea	Auditor role:	Team Auditor
Qualifications:	<p>Auditor Graeme is a Lead Auditor for FSC FM and a Senior Lead Auditor for CoC/CW and has 30 years' experience in forestry in New Zealand and Australia, is qualified as a Forest Service Woodsman and has been involved in many aspects of forestry, including establishment, silviculture, harvesting, sawmilling, processing, exporting and biosecurity. Graeme gained a NZQA National certificate in Forest Product Inspection while working in New Zealand and has been a qualified Quality Management auditor for approximately ten years. In addition Graeme has also undertaken ISO 14001 training. Graeme moved to Adelaide South Australia five years ago and since that time has taken part in Forest Management, Controlled Wood and Chain of Custody audits and assessments, but has also undertaken Controlled Wood auditing in Papua New Guinea, Thailand and Vietnam. Graeme has been part of multiple teams for Forest Management audits in both exotic and indigenous forests and has also carried out in excess of 200 Chain of Custody audits.</p>		
Auditor name:	Karen Ziegler	Auditor role:	Trainee Auditor
Qualifications:	<p>Karen Ziegler is a trainee FSC® CoC Lead Auditor. She is a Technical Forester and holds a Bachelor of Science and over 30 years' experience in forestry, conservation planning and fire management in temperate Australia. Karen has worked in softwood and hardwood plantations and native forest. Karen's work has focused on native forest silviculture and conservation planning. In recent years the focus has been on contract work in developing forest practices plans with consideration of conservation values. Karen continues to work in fire management as a contract fire fighter.</p> <p>Karen completed training as a lead auditor for ISO 9001 in 2022.</p>		

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site for evaluation	5.0
--	-----

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	6
E. Total number of person days used in evaluation	16

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: The FSC National Forest Stewardship Standard of Australia, FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018 EN
	<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: 23 May 2022	
FMU / location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Timberlands Pacific offices – Launceston and Mount Gambier (South Australia)	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.
	Documentation, record review and staff interviews for Forest Management principles assigned per the Forest Management Audit Plan.
Date: 24 May 2022	
FMU / location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Lisle Forest Clearfall harvesting coupe 815135D completion phase (cable operation)	Received overview of forest practices plan and environmental values on site from TPPL site representative. Reviewed documentation approving harvest of very small area of extremely steep plantation. Made general observations of post-harvest coupe condition, the condition of a rehabilitated stream crossing, waterway protections and extraction track rehabilitation. Harvesting had concluded several days prior to the visit, however the swing yarder had yet to be moved to the next site and log cartage was still occurring. Interview with the contractor and TPPL representative confirmed rehabilitation of one major extraction track and firebreaking of heaps adjacent the landing were planned to occur once the cartage concluded.
Lisle Forest Clearfall harvesting coupe 81532006 active shovel operation	Reviewed and discussed the forest practices plan, forest operations safety plan and TPPL safety and RTE species guides with the TPPL representative. Inspected road upgrades which involved widening and resurfacing the road and enlargement of a culvert to cater for post-harvest drainage conditions. Observed recently commenced active harvesting operation. The harvesting contractor is a steep site specialist with capacity for cable operations and shovel logging. Observed completed harvesting on a steep face around old mine workings and processing activities at a nearby landing. Interviewed two contractor representatives about TPPL site induction and monitoring, practices around various classes of watercourses, working conditions and safety. Inspected safety features on excavator used in swing yarding operation.
Springfield Forest Clearfall harvesting coupe 828173001CG active conventional operation	Reviewed and discussed the forest practices plan and forest operations safety plan with the TPPL representative. Interviewed truck driver regarding electronic log docket creation and delivery processes. Inspected safety features on truck cab. Interviewed harvesting contractor representative about management of the

	high volume of logs on the site, implementation of soil and RTE species protections and working conditions. Observed processing and forwarding operations around active landing.
Springfield Forest Clearfall harvesting coupe 828173001CG active conventional operation	Inspected recently replaced bridge and surrounds at coupe entry. Interviewed TPPL representative about stakeholder notification processes, site values and management of streams and RTE species protections, monitoring practices and upcoming weed control operations. Inspected active land preparation operation which involved heaping slash into windrows. Interviewed contractor about waterway protections, working alone procedures, safety practices, dealings with public around the coupe, working conditions and waste management. Inspected safety and spills response equipment. Received an overview of consultation processes with commercial mountain bike shuttle operators potentially impacted by recent cartage operations.
Derby	Reviewed consultation planning and records of communications to date with Derby Mountain bike stakeholders. Discussed upcoming operations and engagement activities with TPPL representative. Inspected Atlas trail head adjacent an area proposed to be harvested in 2023 and discussed the possible management measures being considered to ensure trail users and contractors remain safe. Inspected recently replaced bridge on road used to access the Atlas trail head.
Penola Plantations, SA, Beachport (second thinning) (THP 551_T2_Bv4)	Carried out remote site inspection of the Beachport Harvest area (268 hectares of Pinus radiata T2 thinning), due to very poor mobile reception reviewed videos taken by TPPL staff immediately prior to the audit. The auditor viewed videos of access into the harvest area, log stockpiles, harvest equipment, inspection of the HCV area and exclusion zones put in place by TPPL and contractors to protect the site as well as extraction tracks and boundaries. The HCV site is alongside a boundary road and was clearly marked by signage and tape placed on trees defining the cultural site boundaries. Also reviewed the Timber Harvest Plan (THP 551_T2_Bv4). THP and haulage route maps and distances to clients, a special values map showing HCV locations, a Cultural Heritage Report by the Traditional landowners the Burrandies Corporation that includes agreed protections.
Penola Plantations, SA, Kaladbro (post-harvest land preparation)	Kaladbro consists of approximately 318 hectares of harvest land with harvest debris on site. Remote inspection of harvest residue heap burning site. Reviewed Establishment Burn Plan and map of hectares of harvested plantation and locations where residue has been placed into rows or heaps ready for burning, weather and rainfall forecast, a SMEAC+ questions briefing titled Residue Heap Burning – Kaladbro, a Notice of Intent for Residue Heap Burning prepared and distributed to neighbours and affected stakeholders, an operational map, a burn permit issued by Fire Permits Victoria.

	This was a mix of mounded and brache cultivation areas. Reviewed video by TPPL. Some heaps not burnt due to wind direction and a small amount of harvest material still onsite.
Penola Plantations, SA, Knights (Clearfell operation) (THP_531_CF_A and B)	Knights plantation consists of approximately 168 hectares of clear fell Pinus radiata harvest area carried out in 2021, no HCV areas, cultural heritage, streams or wetlands within or adjacent to the operational area. Reviewed the Forest Operations Plan, operational and haulage maps (Knights) and the contractor Risk Assessment, also reviewed the timber Harvest Plan, the Special Values Search map, Notices of intent to stakeholders. also reviewed videos of entry to the site, roading, harvest machinery in operation, log stockpile areas and boundaries
Penola Plantations, SA Nangwarry Central (Clearfell operation) (THP_521_CF_D)	Reviewed documentation associated with this 187 hectares clear fell site, reviewed THP operational and haulage maps, Special values Flora and Fauna search results map, Timber Harvest Plan. Notice of Intent sent to neighbours and stakeholders. Reviewed videos supplied by TPPL of chemical storage locations, fire extinguisher locations, spill kits, residue chipping locations, condition of remnant vegetation alongside operational areas, buffer zones and mechanical exclusion zones, harvesting and extraction, operational safety signage, and road closed methods cutover areas post clear fall.
Date: 25 May 2022	
FMU / location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Smiths Plains Forest active production thinning coupe 830110M	Reviewed and discussed the forest practices plan, forest operations safety plan and thinning specifications and quality control with the TPPL representative. Inspected thinning, active and rehabilitated extraction tracks and landings. Interviewed contractor about TPPL specifications and monitoring, management of environmental values and public incursions into the coupe. Discussed working conditions, safety communications, working alone, training and accreditation requirements. Inspected safety equipment in the harvesting machine and support vehicle.
Beulah Forest active clearfell coupe 805134C	Reviewed and discussed the forest practices plan, forest operations safety plan, machinery hygiene and product optimization with the TPPL representative. Interviewed contractor representative about worker engagement, training and safety, protection of potential devil / quoll habitat, TPPL monitoring regimes, product optimization, landing and infrastructure design and management to maintain good working conditions. Inspected active log landing and infrastructure, shovel logged steep area and operations.
Beulah Forest HCV 705	Reviewed 2021 HCV monitoring report for site, which is a threatened Eucalyptus ovata community. Inspected condition of site noting some windthrow had impacted it since the last monitoring. Discussed planned management activities to control weeds and wildings with TPPL representative.

<p>Virginstow Forest active infill planting operation at coupe 834040003</p>	<p>Observed refill planting operations. Interviewed planting contractor representative regarding planting methods, training in of new recruits to crew, pay rates and conditions, interactions with TPPL regarding site conditions and safety and incident statistics. Inspected planting equipment and discussed use with crew.</p>
<p>Virginstow Forest active early clearfell coupe 834041003EA</p>	<p>Reviewed and discussed the forest practices plan, assessments for Masked Owl and the forest operations safety plan with TPPL representative. Inspected area felled during the day, adjacent native forest boundary and daily machinery maintenance activities occurring at the landing.</p>
<p>Penola Plantations, SA Nangwarry Central (Land preparation)</p>	<p>Reviewed Forest Operations Plan (Spot Heaping maps, Chopper Rolling and Mounding) and operational maps. Reviewed recorded videos of entry (including the FOP and sign in sheets located at the entry point, boundaries, chopper rolling, fuel tanks on contractor vehicle, fire extinguishers, spill kit, areas of remnant vegetation with tape flagging for the operators, retained organic matter spread out prior to chopper rolling and cultivation. In areas where the harvest debris to too dense this matter is heaped for burning</p>
<p>Penola Plantations, SA Nangwarry North (first thinning) (THP_514_T1_A&B)</p>	<p>Nangwarry North is a T1 thinning infield chipping operation covering approximately 180 hectares where logs are felled, dragged by a skidder to a static infield chipper. Reviewed documentation applicable to infield chipping sites, reviewed the THP including operations and haulage maps, Special values Flora and Fauna search results map, Timber Harvest Plan, Contractor Harvest planning checklist and Notice of Intent sent to neighbours and stakeholders.</p> <p>Reviewed videos supplied by TPPL of chemical storage locations, contractor onsite documentation, fire extinguisher locations, spill kits, residue chipping locations, condition of remnant vegetation alongside operational areas, buffer zones and mechanical exclusion zones, harvesting and extraction, operational safety signage, and road closed methods cutover areas post thinning.</p>
<p>Nangwarry Fire Base</p>	<p>Remote visit to Nangwarry Fire Base used by TPPL used for staff to wait in during the fire season, it houses the fire trucks. The store is closed during the off season. Interviewed TPPL staff. Contractors are maintained (ALMEG Forestry who 47 trained firefighters) who combined with TPPL supervisory staff provide a 24 hour a day service.</p> <p>TPPL lease space in large warehouse which house two plantation specific firefighting appliances with 3,000 litre water tanks. There are also small amount od firefighting foam and sundry equipment. No other chemicals are stored on this site. 15 incidents were attended in the last fire season including plantation fire incidents in TPPL and adjacent plantation. companies. TPPL contribute on wider industry responses outside of their original response areas. TPPL are part of FOA Conference who decided on automatic dispatch zones that all parties agreed to which allow TPPL to attend neighbouring property incidents. TPPL also assist the</p>

	Victorian Country Fire Authority and the South Australian Country Fire Service. TPPL also assist other government departments with prescribed controlled burn. Inspected standby crew room, evacuation plans, first aid kits, fire extinguishers, radio communications. This is maintained to ensure stand by crews are available and rested.
Penola Plantations, SA, Werrikoo. (Aerial pre plant spraying)	Documentation and videos applicable to a pre plant spray operation carried out over approximately 210 hectares at Werrikoo plantation. Reviewed the Werrikoo flight map, the Forest Operations Plan, the Werrikoo weather records, the Pre operational meeting checklist the Werrikoo chemical records and the Agrichemical operational audit. Also reviewed videos of exclusion buffer zones against remnant vegetation (20 metres), chemical mixing equipment, daily clean up processes -drums returned to Drum Muster, chemical triple rinse processes, helicopter spraying, helicopter landing and loading site and processes.
Date: 26 May 2022	
FMU / location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Timberlands Pacific offices – Launceston and Mount Gambier (South Australia)	Documentation, record review and staff interviews for Forest Management principles assigned per the Forest Management Audit Plan.
Date: 27 May 2022	
FMU / location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Timberlands Pacific offices – Launceston and Mount Gambier (South Australia)	Documentation, record review and staff interviews for Forest Management principles assigned per the Forest Management Audit Plan.
	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 (2018)	1 st Annual Evaluation (2019)	2 nd Annual Evaluation (2020)	3 rd Annual Evaluation (2021)	4 th Annual Evaluation (2022)
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	Major 2.3.1 Minor 2.3.4
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				Observation 4.5.3
P5					
P6	Minor 6.5.2	Observation 6.7.2			Minor 6.4.3
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		Observation 9.3.1
P10			Minor 10.7.5	Observation 10.3.3	Minor 10.10.1
COC for FM	Minor 2.2		Minor 5.1 and 5.2		
Trademark	Major 1.15				Observation 1.2
Group					
Other					

4.3 Existing 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 (or Background/Justification in the case of Observations):	
The forest industry developed a guide to compliance with the ILO code of practice on safety and health in forestry work in Australia’ 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 (or Observation):	
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>	TPPL reviewed the intent of all legislation listed on the Legal Register and identified potential conflict confirming there was no conflict. Prepared weekly update documenting issue and analysis.
SCS review	Sighted Legal Register 9/12/21 which now includes specific 'Conflict with stewardship requirements field for each item.'
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: 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 Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):	
<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 only required on sites 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,</p>	

<p>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> <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>	
<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. 	
<p>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</p>	<p>TPPL reviewed the contractor's working alone procedures to ensure their adequacy. Added question to confirm check in procedures with contractors in monthly operational safety checklist. Delivered Safety First Working Group Presentation October 2021 – including a section on working alone requirements.</p>
<p>SCS review</p>	<p>27 May 2022 - Reviewed Padgett Group Safe Work procedure NEW-ALO-01, confirming it includes check in protocols using mobile phone, UHF radio or SPOT CONNECT at 7.00am, then at least every 2 hours and whenever location is changed or leaving the worksite. Copies of the procedure signed by two site preparation workers were sighted. Reviewed various completed Site Prep Operational Safety Checklists confirming they include appropriate questions for check ins and the Safety First Working Group Minutes and Presentation dated 11/10/22 , which covered this topic. Interviews with workers at all sites confirmed the application of these processes.</p> <p>First aid kits were not immediately available to operators at one location visited during the audit. Interviews and inspection of first aid kits at harvesting operations at Smiths Plains and Beulah and Cascade land preparation confirmed these are located in vehicles rather than the plant being operated. At the Smiths Plains site, the operators confirmed they operate up to 500m from the landing and can be remote from where other operators are working. This is not consistent with the requirement to be immediately available. CAR remains open.</p> <p>8 August 2022 – Reviewed</p>
<p>Status of CAR:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Closed</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)</p>

Finding Number: 2021:03
<p>Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation</p>
<p>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</p>

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):	
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): <p>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 (including any evidence submitted)	TPPL developed procedure TTP22 for control of wildings and have allocated a significant budget for implementation. LiDAR analysis has been completed for Taswood to map the extent of wildling infestations in and around the estate. The Introduced Weed Species Management Policy has been updated to add a new Taswood Wildling Control Plan section which references the TTP22 procedure. 450ha of wildling infestations were identified and will be treated by silvicultural contractors between Dec 22 and April 23. A framework for prioritizing work has been established. Wildings are already systematically monitored through the firebreak inspection process in Penola.
SCS review	Reviewed TTP22 which documents the process and results of the LiDAR analysis and confirmed the FY23 budget allocation for wildings. Interviewed Treecrop staff, confirming the intention to engage contractors over summer 22/23 to complete priority wildling control.
Status of CAR:	<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

Finding Number: 2022:01
Finding and Deadline

<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR: Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major CAR: 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR: 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 and deadline (specify):	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
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.
<p>Non-Conformity (<i>or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations</i>):</p> <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 only required on sites 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> <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>	
<p>Corrective Action Request (<i>or Observation</i>): 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>)	TPPL reviewed the contractor’s working alone procedures to ensure their adequacy. Added question to confirm check in procedures with contractors in monthly operational safety checklist. Delivered Safety First Working Group Presentation October 2021 – including a section on working alone requirements.

	<p>8 July 2022. Summarised in Table 1 the following actions and submitted supporting documentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated wording in WHS Manual for first aid kit requirements - Updated monthly monitoring checklists to include confirming first aid kit requirements are met - Communicated first aid kit requirements to Safety First Always Working Group during June meeting. - Emailed requirements to contractors in Tasmania and Green Triangle - Implemented updated monthly checklist for seven contractors in July.
SCS review	<p>27 May 2022 - Reviewed Padgett Group Safe Work procedure NEW-ALO-01, confirming it includes check in protocols using mobile phone, UHF radio or SPOT CONNECT at 7.00am, then at least every 2 hours and whenever location is changed or leaving the worksite. Copies of the procedure signed by two site preparation workers were sighted. Reviewed various completed Site Prep Operational Safety Checklists confirming they include appropriate questions for check ins and the Safety First Working Group Minutes and Presentation dated 11/10/22 , which covered this topic. Interviews with workers at all sites confirmed the application of these processes.</p> <p>First aid kits were not immediately available to operators at one location visited during the audit. Interviews and inspection of first aid kits at harvesting operations at Smiths Plains and Beulah and Cascade land preparation confirmed these are located in vehicles rather than the plant being operated. At the Smiths Plains site, the operators confirmed they operate up to 500m from the landing and can be remote from where other operators are working. This is not consistent with the requirement to be immediately available. CAR remains open.</p> <p>8 August 2022 – Reviewed corrective actions and supporting documentation confirming implementation of a comprehensive systems response to ensuring first aid kits are immediately available to staff and contractors in a variety of relevant circumstances. CAR is closed.</p>
Status of CAR:	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i></p>

Finding Number: 2022.2	
Finding and Deadline	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR: Pre-condition to certification/recertification</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR: 3 months from Issuance of Final Report</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR: 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit, whichever comes first (<i>surveillance or re-evaluation</i>)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other and deadline (specify):</p>	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Standard and Indicator	FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018 EN FINAL 2.3.4 Records are kept on compliance with the WHS program and on all incidents including near misses, medical treatments and

	lost time. Accident rates and lost time to accidents will also be kept.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Conformity Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Observation Justification and/or Explanation	
<p>Incident recording protocols had not been followed in relation to a damaged radiator access door on the excavator loader at Smiths Plains. The door was badly damaged and secured to the machine with a tie down strap. The TPPL supervisor explained that they had identified the damage several months prior to the audit and lodged a repair request with the principal contractor. The issue had not been reported as an incident in SCRIM or noted on the contractor monitoring form, and the issue had not been followed up by TPPL.</p>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Conformity Corrective Action Request <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; no Corrective Action is required	
<p>The organisation shall keep records of compliance on all incidents, including those which result in heavy machinery not being maintained in a condition consistent with manufacturers specifications.</p>	
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: 2022.3	
Finding and Deadline	
<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR: Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR: 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR: 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 and deadline (specify):	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Standard and Indicator	FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018 EN FINAL 4.5.3 The Organisation provides regular opportunities for engagement with all stakeholders and local communities affected by its operations to identify social impacts and the potential to avoid or reduce such impacts on an ongoing basis.
<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Conformity Evidence <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation Justification and/or Explanation The organisation has recognized that harvesting and haulage operations planned for plantations nearby Derby in 2023 have potential to impact commercial tour operators and members of the public using the extensive and very popular mountain biking trails in this area. The Derby Consultation Plan was developed and in the process of being implemented at the time of the audit. The plan documents progress on a range of consultations with local government and commercial operators. Whilst communication with general trail users has been flagged in the consultation plan, suitable mechanisms were yet to be determined and implemented. This issue is flagged as an observation because harvesting is not due to commence until 2023.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Conformity Corrective Action Request <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation; no Corrective Action is required The organisation should ensure engagement opportunities and information on operations near to the Derby mountainbike trail network are available to general public trail users.	
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: 2022.4	
Finding and Deadline	
<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR: Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR: 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR: 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 and deadline (specify):	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Standard and Indicator	FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018 EN FINAL 6.4.3 Potential impacts of management activities on rare and threatened species and their conservation status and habitats are identified and management activities are modified to avoid negative impacts.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Conformity Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Observation Justification and/or Explanation The Forest Practices Plan (FPP) RCD0013-01 for Cascade Land Preparation does not include prescriptions to protect hardwood windrows present at the site, which the Forest Practices Authority recognize as potential habitat for threatened Spotted-tailed Quolls and Tasmanian Devil. The special values assessment identifies the operation is within the habitat range of these species and the FPP includes protection measures for suspected den sites found during the operation. Although the contractor and supervisor were aware of the presence of the hardwood windrows on the site and were in practice protecting these from damage during the operation, the windrows were not formally identified and protected in the FPP. Hardwood windrow protection prescriptions were included in FPPs at all other sites with this habitat visited during the audit.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Conformity Corrective Action Request <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; no Corrective Action is required The organisation shall identify and document the modifications to management activities to protect RTE species habitat in accordance with best available information.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
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: 2022.5	
Finding and Deadline	
<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR: Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR: 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR: 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 and deadline (specify):	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Standard and Indicator	FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018 EN FINAL 9.3.1 The High Conservation Values (HCV) are maintained and/or enhanced, including by implementing the strategies developed.
<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Conformity Evidence <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation Justification and/or Explanation Windthrow was observed to have had a minor impact on the Beulah HCV, which is a thin strip of a threatened ecological community growing alongside a stream. Very strong winds were experienced across the estate in 2021, resulting in the salvage of a severely impacted area of plantation adjacent the HCV. Whilst windthrow is identified as a threat to HCV in the Taswood Special Values Management Plan, further consideration of protection measures may be needed in future climate scenarios to protect native vegetation HCV areas from wind damage when harvesting adjacent them. This matter is issued as an observation because both HCV and plantation suffered windthrow during this weather event, and there is no clear link between damage and management actions.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Conformity Corrective Action Request <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation; no Corrective Action is required There is opportunity for the organisation to refine its HCV strategies in response to increasing threat of wind damage, particularly for thin strips of native ecosystems immediately adjacent harvesting operations.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
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: 2022.6	
Finding and Deadline	
<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR: Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR: 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR: 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 and dedline (specify):	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Standard and Indicator	FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018 EN FINAL 10.10.1 Development, maintenance and use of infrastructure, as well as transport activities, are managed to protect environmental values identified in Criterion 6.1 and Cultural Sites identified in Criterion 3.5.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Conformity Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Observation Justification and/or Explanation Fill placed over a newly replaced culvert on the coupe access road off Parsons Road at Lisle had extended into a running class 4 stream. This practice is contrary to requirements of the <i>Forest Practices Code 2020</i> and the fill poses a threat to the water quality of this stream.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Conformity Corrective Action Request <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; no Corrective Action is required The organisation shall ensure its road maintenance activities are managed to protect environmental values including water quality through minimizing transport of soil into waterways.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
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: 2022.7	
Finding and Deadline	
<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR: Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR: 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR: 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 and deadline (specify):	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Standard and Indicator	FSC Trademark Standard (FSC-STD-50-001 V2-1) 1.2
<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Conformity Evidence <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation Justification and/or Explanation Review of the organisation's Trademark Licence Agreement record and interview with certification staff confirmed the organisation has not yet updated this agreement to the latest version 6.04.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Conformity Corrective Action Request <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation; no Corrective Action is required The organisation should update its FSC trademark licence agreement to the current version before the FSC re-evaluation audit in 2023.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	Updated trademark licence agreement with FSC, see attached screenshot
SCS review	Reviewed FSC SalesForce database entry dated 24/6/22 confirming the organisation and FSC have executed the updated agreement.
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>

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>	
Summary of Outreach Activities Conducted (Check all that apply): <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	
Stakeholder Comment (Negative, positive, and neutral)	SCS Response
TPPL invited Tasmanian first nations community representatives to join a reconciliation action planning (RAP) working group. Members have opportunity to voice issues and participate in any manner. To date there have been meetings and visits to country. TPPL has been very receptive to comments and open about past issues. Past conversion of forest around streams if of particular concern, and TPPLs approach to progressive	TPPL are undertaking a Reconciliation Action Plan (RAP) Indigenous landowners associated with the DFA (Tasmania and Green Triangle, South Australia) A RAP is a strategic document that supports an organization’s business plan with indigenous groups. It includes practical actions that will drive an organization’s contribution to reconciliation both internally and in the communities in which it operates. The RAP framework provides organizations with a structured approach to advance reconciliation. There are four types of RAP that an organization can develop: Reflect, Innovate, Stretch and Elevate. Each type of RAP is designed to suit an organization at different stages of their reconciliation journey.

<p>rehabilitation of these reserves is pleasing. A project currently being looked at is the re-establishment of dogwood understorey plants in the streamside reserves. First nations representatives in the northeast are working with TPPL to identify potential areas for this to occur. Employment and business opportunities are also part of the RAP. TPPL has identified opportunities with contractors and a community member has recently started working with a planting contractor.</p> <p>Cultural heritage is also part of the RAP and it is hoped that community members will have involvement in assessing and looking after sites in future, building community connection.</p>	<p>TPPL has received conditional endorsement of their Reflect RAP by Reconciliation Australia.</p> <p>From a land management perspective there are great opportunities for groups to come onto the estate where there is a significant reserve area whereby joint management may be undertaken and be used for cultural practices. Streamside reserve plantings and cultural burning are examples of this. TPPL have with indigenous involvement undertaken cool burning at Ascot Park Swamp. This occurred on the 29/11/21 and was the first time two aboriginal groups came together for a common purpose.</p>
<p>TPPL are working increasingly closely with Sustainable Timbers Tasmania (STT) to manage fire risks to both the plantations, community and other values. In particular TPPL provide forest data to assist in running the Bushfire Risk Assessment Model which is used to develop the annual fuel reduction program. Arson is the biggest risk in northern Tasmania. TPPL engage STT to undertake fire protection and response works on its estate in conjunction with the State forest program. TPPL is implementing complementary track works to improve fire suppression access.</p>	<p>Interview with TPPL staff and review of strategic planning confirmed the increased focus on fire protection and response in Tasmania.</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>Comments:</p>	