

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

Hancock Victorian Plantations Pty Ltd

SCS-FM/COC-007709

World Trade Centre,
Tower 4, Level 12, 18-38 Siddeley Street
Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, 3005

Tim McBride
www.hvp.com.au

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
1 February 2004	31 January 2024

DATE OF FIELD EVALUATION
1-5 February 2021
DATE OF REPORT FINALIZATION
10 May 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 nd annual evaluation	<input 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:				
Hancock Victorian Plantations (HVP)				

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 Standards Used.....	4
2. CERTIFICATION EVALUATION PROCESS	5
2.1 Evaluation Itinerary, Activities, and Site Notes	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems	8
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.....	8
4. RESULTS OF EVALUATION	8
4.1 Definitions of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations	8
4.2 History of Findings for Certificate Period.....	9
4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations	10
4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations	15
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS	19
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted.....	19
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses	20
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION	20
7. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE	21

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Evaluation Team

Auditor name:	Tuesday Phelan	Auditor role:	Lead Auditor
Qualifications:	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.		

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site for evaluation:	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):	0
D. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and follow-up:	2
E. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	7

1.3 Standards Used

All standards used 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.

Standards applicable <i>NOTE: Please include the full standard name and Version number and check all that apply.</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 type="checkbox"/> SCS COC indicators for FMEs, V7-0
	<input type="checkbox"/> FSC standard for group entities in forest management groups (FSC-STD-30-005), V1-1
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

2. Certification Evaluation Process

2.1 Evaluation Itinerary, Activities, and Site Notes

Date: 1 February 2021	
FMU / location / sites visited	Activities / notes
HVP Western Region Office, 243 Ring Road, Mitchell Park 0900 - 1100	Opening Meeting: Introductions, client update, review scope of evaluation, audit plan, intro/update to FSC standards and SCS audit process, confidentiality and public summary, conformance evaluation methods and review of open CARs/OBS, emergency and security procedures for evaluation team, final site selection.
1100 - 1700	Review of FSC FM P&C and staff interviews.
Date: 2 February 2021	
FMU / location / sites visited	Activities / notes
0645 0 0700	Inspection of gravel removal and weed control works done at Tuisk Road, Spargo on plantation edge and neighbouring road easement.
0800 - 1200	Review of FSC FM P&C and staff interviews.
Carngham Plantation, Ballarat District – Plantation establishment	Inspected 2020 planted area on 2 nd rotation site on former farmland. Establishment regime was pre-plant knockdown spray, ripping and mounding, planting and post plant spray to control abundant grasses. The site has not been fertilized. Discussed management of aerial spray operations with supervisor, including nozzle configurations, planning, notifications, supervision and operational and water monitoring. Current mechanical disturbance operation could not be accessed due to recent very high rainfall event.
Scarsdale Plantation, Compartment 9, Ballarat District – First thinning	Inspected recently commenced active production thinning operation, waterway buffer application, signage and harvesting equipment. Discussed haulage and road management arrangements, curfews for neighbouring houses, control measures for identified threatened species, waterways and erosion prone soils and supervision and monitoring regime with District Forester. Reviewed Timber Harvest Plan and Canvas forms for operational supervision of harvesting. Interviewed contractor about harvesting equipment, induction and supervision, fire and safety management, operations around special values at site, servicing practices and waste management.
Scarsdale Plantation, Compartment 22, Ballarat District – Ripping and mounding	Inspected completed contour ripping and mounding operation including buffers from waterway. Reviewed Site Preparation Site Operations Plan (SOP), map and Canvas site diary record. Discussed with District Forester previous knockdown herbicide application notifications, operational planning considerations including management of mine shafts and eroded area within the coupe, waterway setbacks, erosion control and native forest inliers. Also discussed wilding management on adjacent firebreak and intended planting areas around machinery exclusion zones.
Date: 3 February 2021	

FMU / location / sites visited	Activities / notes
Beech Forest Depot	Inspected chemical shed and observed storage of chemicals and safe handling equipment. Reviewed the chemical register and SDSs and interviewed staff about pesticide management.
Aire Valley Plantation, Compartments 012 – site preparation	Inspected large slash heaping operation and reviewed the SOP, map and operational procedures held on site. HVP staff explained that the operation is conducted in two phases; lighter slash is heaped in small windrows which are left in situ and heavier slash is pushed into heaps for burning. Heavy slash used for cording landings and extraction tracks is removed for reuse on nearby harvesting sites. The site has a number of drainage features running through it that were originally planted in pines. Native forest had regenerated in these drainage lines and was left at harvest, however some had blown over subsequent to the operation. HVP are voluntarily not re-establishing pine within 20m of the drainage lines at this site to provide for more robust native vegetation to establish in future. Interviewed the contractor about application of the SOP, safety management and cultural heritage training.
Aire Valley Plantation - Beauchamp Falls Road and DELWP campsite	Discussed visitor management arrangements for Beauchamp Falls. The Aire Valley has a very high rate of public visitation (hundreds of visitors per day) to Beauchamp Falls and a patch of forest called the Redwoods on the Aire River. Beauchamp Falls is adjacent current HVP harvesting and re-establishment operations. HVP has secured approval to close the road and visitor site for the period of operations. There is a road agreement and also an agreement for HVP to remove <i>Pinus nigra</i> from around the campsite at DELWPs request. Inspected the harvested area of <i>P. nigra</i> , the road and firebreak barriers, security gate and signage, confirming these should provide adequate safety for operations.
Aire Valley Plantation, Compartment 25 – clearfell harvesting	Inspected recently completed clearfell harvesting operation confirming that major extraction tracks had good cross drainage and soil disturbance had been minimized by use of shovelling techniques.
Aire Valley Plantation, Compartment 32 – clearfell harvesting	Inspected active clearfell harvesting operation using tethered harvesting system. Discussed methods used to minimize soil disturbance which include shovelling logs to processing sites and limiting use of forwarders to moderate terrain and previously established snig tracks. The site is planned to avoid watercrossings and new earthworks. Interviewed operator about tethering system, management controls for threatened species potentially present around the site and management of landings and extraction tracks in heavy rain events. Also discussed safety policies and procedures with the contractor representative and HVPs monitoring of the operation. Inspected area planned to be excluded from operations due to soil instability. Discussed contractor management regimes with HVP staff.
Date: 4 February 2021	
FMU / location / sites visited	Activities / notes

<p>Kentbruck Plantation, Compartments 47 and 55 – Fire Recovery</p>	<p>Inspected fire affected site and received presentations from district staff on the Kentbruck fire, salvage harvesting and re-establishment operations. The fire was ignited by a campfire on neighbouring land on a catastrophic fire weather day. It burnt 500ha of HVP plantation and took two days to contain. HVP and other plantation industry fire crews were able to contain the fire before it spread into the adjacent Lower Glenelg National Park. The area burnt was entirely plantation and road reserve with no significant infrastructure, environmental or cultural values. The site is very flat. HVP rapidly planned and recovered all standing timber from the site using three harvesting crews. This was possible as all material was of merchantable size and customers were willing to take the fire affected wood. Most of the site has now had site preparation, which involved chopper rolling of slash and application of a holding spray to control grasses and fleabane which is particularly problematic this season. Planting will occur in 2021. Reviewed the THP and Aerial herbicide application SOP. Discussed management and monitoring of aerial herbicide operations.</p>
<p>Kentbruck Plantation, Compartment 45, post second thinning fertilizer</p>	<p>Inspected fertilized area and reviewed Fertilising SOP and application records for the operation. Discussed with district staff how foliar sampling, economic analysis and ground truthing is used to plan the later age remedial fertilizing program. Windthrow exposure is a major consideration in the South West. All fertilizer application in the district is ground-based and uses precision agriculture technology to track rates and locations of application. Also discussed SOP development, supervision and record keeping.</p>
<p>Saffins Plantation, Compartment 189, 190, 191 - Third Thinning</p>	<p>Discussed thinning scheduling, silviculture, marking and supervision with district staff. Reviewed THP and site diary records. Inspected thinning operation including marking and application of modified harvesting around wetlands, management of landings and harvesting and fire suppression equipment. Interviewed the contractor about management practices around wetlands, native vegetation and for several significant fauna species with potential to occur on the site. Also discussed fatigue management, fire weather restrictions, servicing and waste management practices and HVP monitoring.</p>
<p>Rennick Plantation, Palpara Campsite and adjacent remnant native vegetation HCV – restoration and maintenance</p>	<p>Inspected Coastal Wattle control works around HCV boundary and restoration works at Palpara Campsite. Discussed HCV monitoring framework as applied in South West District, and input of local ecology experts into assessment and planning for maintenance of HCVs in the district. Received information about the reason for closing and rehabilitating the Palpara Campsite and the development of a management plan for the site. Observed completed fencing, weed control and replanting of native vegetation.</p>
<p>Rennick Plantation, Honeysuckle Airstrip - Ecological Restoration</p>	<p>Received background information from district staff about the site and the restoration project. The site has previously been used as an airstrip and there is no plantation grown on this site due to the prevalence of shallow limestone rock. Reviewed the ten year restoration plan prepared for the site by local ecologists. This involves removal of woody weeds, ecological burning and replanting of native shrubs. Inspected works completed in the first year to remove pine wildings and coastal wattle.</p>

Heritage site	Visited site and discussed archaeological assessments, community liaison and planned management controls for the site. Reviewed THP for planned thinning operations at the site.
Date: 5 February 2021	
FMU / location / sites visited	Activities / notes
HVP SW District Office, 26 Pick Avenue, Mount Gambier 0800 - 1400	Review of FSC FM P&C and staff interviews.
1300 - 1400	Remote review of Northern Region Bushfire Rehabilitation
1400 - 1600	Closing Meeting Preparation: Auditor(s) consolidate notes, deliberate, and confirm evaluation findings.
1600 - 1700	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 (2019)	1 st Annual Evaluation (2019)	2 nd Annual Evaluation (2020)	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					
P2	4.2.4 Rainforest Alliance (RA) Rainforest Alliance (RA) interim standard (Major) 7.3.2 RA standard (Minor)				
P3					
P4		4.5.3 (Minor) 4.5.4 (Minor)	4.8.1 (Obs)		
P5					
P6	10.2.1 RA interim standard (Minor)				
P7	7.1.1 RA interim standard (Minor)	7.6.1 (Minor)			
P8					
P9		9.4.1 (Minor) 9.4.2 (Minor) 9.4.3 (Minor) 9.4.4 (Minor)	9.1.1 (Minor) 9.1.2 (Minor) 9.4.2 (Minor)		
P10					
COC for FM					
Trademark			1.3 (Minor)		

Group					
Other					

4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 1:2019	
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 4.5.3 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.
<p>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): HVP’s Forest Management Plan & Sustainability Report 2019/20 states (page 21), in the context of HVP Plantations as neighbours: “HVP strive to be good neighbours with adjoining landowners. This includes complying with all laws, dealing fairly with all neighbours on issues, and being prepared to listen & negotiate mutually acceptable outcomes. HVP have a neighbour notification system to keep affected neighbours informed of our activities and to work with neighbours on a range of issues to minimise any adverse impact our activities may have on neighbours. HVP have a long history of working with neighbours on issues such as noise, dust, pine wildlings, road use, chemical application, pest plants and animals, fencing etc. In addition HVP have a formalised system for allowing neighbours to passively use the plantation area and this system is accessed via the HVP website.” In addition, within the section ‘Community’ (page 19), the FME includes the following in relation to stakeholder engagement: “HVP have a Stakeholder Engagement Plan to ensure that stakeholders have sufficient opportunities to have input into HVP Plantations management of the estate. These opportunities include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Email info@hvp.com.au ▪ HVP Website – Contact Page www.hvp.com.au ▪ This Forest Management Plan – emailed to all available stakeholders. ▪ Telephone 03 92891400. ▪ Notifications regarding operations which include HVP contact name and phone number. ▪ HVP Plantations facebook page. ▪ Newspaper advertisements. ▪ Forums and meetings. ▪ Direct contact at regional offices.” <p>The Audit Team concluded, based on the above mechanisms being made available to stakeholders – as well as interviews with relevant staff and stakeholders during the evaluation – that systems and documentation exist to facilitate the FME’s meeting this requirement. In general, the Audit Team found the FME’s social engagement including stakeholder consultation activities to be of high quality and in</p>	

accordance with the scale and intensity of management actions.

The Audit Team, however, was contacted during and following the onsite work by numerous (21) Gippsland Region landowners, who expressed their concerns regarding a proposed non-forest resource development project.

Issues raised by landowners include the following:

Sub-optimal stakeholder engagement and communication;

- unacceptable project scale, emitting noise equivalent to a continuously running diesel truck; and their placement as close as legally possible to plantation neighbours;
- as a result of the proposed placement and design of the non-forest resource development project, the following implications for neighbours: ;
- adverse visual impact, and
 - property devaluation;
 - loss of amenity and subsequent loss of landowner rights, including through the incursion onto neighbours' properties of the 1km mandatory set-back; with neighbours no longer able to build on this land (as they currently can) should the proposal proceed;
 - potential losses and increased threat to life and property caused by fire emanating from HVP's plantation due to reduced ability to control fires (from both physical [access and egress] and legal perspectives, particularly from the air);
 - negative impacts on native vegetation and native populations of fauna (e.g. Strzelecki Koala) and flora, and potential disruption to the Koala Biolink;

In relation to the non-forest resource development project, HVP staff provided the Audit Team with the following documents:

- a copy of the FME's (internal) Communication Plan dated 20 January 2019;
- samples of the communications that had occurred between Delburn community members, including responses to stakeholder letters and emails from the General Manager: Gippsland Region; and
- an extract of the stakeholder communications stored in the FME's Stakeholder Management System and relating to the initiative (a total of 46 records). This included, as a record of HVP's response to a stakeholder's feedback, that HVP's policy is that no information would be released prior to the company's Board granting approval of the contractual arrangements with project developer. Also recorded were references to extra initiatives requested by HVP of project developer to mitigate any increase in fire risk due to the project.

The Audit Team was also provided with a copy of an email from the CEO of HVP, written in response to a stakeholder email about the project and sent to him in August 2019. While addressing a couple of the queries in some detail, a key message was that the stakeholder should contact project developer rather than HVP.

The General Manager Gippsland Region did meet on site with several stakeholders, at their request, for discussions about the proposed project. Details of such meetings are logged in the Stakeholder Management System records provided to the Audit Team.

FSC requirements are such that – as the owner and manager of the Delburn Plantation, and the entity granting the license and option to lease the land – HVP is ultimately responsible for management activities taking place within the FMU. As such, the requirements of Principle 4 remain applicable and HVP as the FSC certificate holder is required to work with potentially affected parties to mitigate adverse impacts.

The Audit Team, through interviews and document review, confirmed that HVP does provide regular opportunities for engagement and consultation with stakeholders, with such activities and outputs generally considered to be delivered to a high standard.

However, based on direct stakeholder feedback and interviews with concerned neighbours, the Audit

Team interprets its effort relating to this one project development proposal as an exception to HVP’s otherwise adequate record on stakeholder engagement, including the potential to avoid or reduce social impacts caused by its operations.

Regarding requirements described in Indicator 4.5.4 – that the FME shall demonstrate that the information derived from social impact evaluations and/or consultation processes with stakeholders has been considered and, where appropriate, addressed in the planning and implementation of forest management activities – the Audit Team Leader (following an interview with the Manager: Safety & Community, Northern Region, on 5 December 2019) was provided with several documents illustrating the FME’s processes of consultation with stakeholders, and derivation of information from social impact evaluations, including information being considered and addressed in the planning and implementation of forest management activities. The documentation provided (including the relevant communications plan) was reviewed and evaluated as leading to an appropriately detailed and robust stakeholder consultation process.

Another example of the FME’s considering and responding to stakeholder consultation and feedback, provided during an interview with the Environment and Certification Managers, concerned a landowner suffering from asthma who was accommodated in a hotel for two days while HVP conducted a burn-off near his home.

Given the evidence provided, including the above examples, the Audit Team concluded that – in general – HVP considers information derived from social impact evaluations and consultation processes with stakeholders, and addresses such information in the planning and implementation of forest management activities.

However, the outcomes to date of the non-forest resource project development-related community engagement process are considered as a lapse in relation to Indicator 4.5.4; with HVP deflecting stakeholder feedback to the proponent. The Audit Team concludes that the FME has not in this instance considered information derived from stakeholder consultation processes and, as appropriate, addressed that information in the context of forest management activities.

In part because the non-forest resource project development is at this stage only a proposal, the NCR identified against this requirement is graded minor.

Corrective Action Request (or Observation):
 Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above.
 Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.

FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	Since previous audit, OSMI (the windfarm developer) has commenced engagement and assessments for the project. This has included conducting specific engagement activities in nearby Mirboo North. HVP is interacting with neighbours on a face to face basis continuously and ongoing.
--	--

SCS review	Reviewed the OSMI Australia and Strzelecki Community Alliance websites and discussed the engagement processes with a HVP representative. The public information about the Delburn Windfarm clearly articulates HVPs involvement as the plantation manager and specifies its ongoing involvement in the project. The OSMI website describes the establishment of a Community Consultative Committee, which HVP will be part of once established. It also includes a complaints and dispute resolution procedure. HVPs representatives are engaging one on one with its neighbours on ongoing basis regarding the proposed project. Joint processes have been established with OSMI to ensure information from consultations and complaints is considered in the project planning.
-------------------	--

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: 2:2019	
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 7.6.1 Culturally appropriate engagement is used to ensure that affected stakeholders are proactively and transparently engaged in the following processes: 1) Dispute resolution processes (Criterion 1.6, Criterion 2.6, Criterion 4.6); 2) Definition of Living wages (Criterion 2.4); 3) Identification of rights (Criterion 3.1, Criterion 4.1), sites (Criterion 3.5, Criterion 4.7) and impacts (Criterion 4.5); 4) Local communities’ socio-economic development activities (Criterion 4.4); and 5) High Conservation Value assessment, management and monitoring (Criterion 9.1, Criterion 9.2, Criterion 9.4).
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):	
<p>While the Audit Team recognises that HVP is, in general terms, meeting the requirements of Criterion 7.6, Audit Team members – in discussion with the Environment and Certification Managers – identified gaps in relation to specific stakeholder consultation-related requirements of the new Standard. The Audit Team concluded that these gaps are less to do with the implementation of consultation (with both affected and interested stakeholders), and more to do with the specific requirements – especially new requirements – of the Australian Standard. For example, the Audit Team identified gaps in relation to living wages (i.e. the context provided by Criterion 2.4).</p> <p>As the FME is undertaking stakeholder engagement, and relatively few gaps are identified in relation to this Indicator, it is graded minor.</p>	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation):	
<p>Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above.</p> <p>Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.</p>	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	Living Wage for Environmental Certification 2020 provided as an explanation of how living wage consultation occurs.
SCS review	<p>It is unclear why this issue was raised as a CAR by the former Certification Body who conducted a gap assessment rather than an evaluation against FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018.</p> <p>Despite the above, the document presented was reviewed and it was confirmed in interview that staff are predominantly managers and engaged under salaries at individually negotiated professional rates. Field and nursery employees are</p>

	engaged under the HVP –Enterprise Agreement 2020-2023, which sets minimum weekly rates of \$977.10 for a Grade 1 base entry worker. This rate is several hundred dollars per week higher than minimum wages. Consultation for this process is via prescribed industrial relations laws involving representation by either the workers or their nominated representatives. In this case the agreement shows that workers were represented by a plantation worker and the AWU in consultations.
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: 3:2019	
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 9.4.1 A program of periodic monitoring assesses the following, consistent with Annex G: 1) Implementation of strategies; 2) The status of High Conservation Values, including High Conservation Value Areas on which they depend; and 3) The effectiveness of the management strategies and actions for the protection of High Conservation Values, to maintain and/or enhance the High Conservation Values.
Other applicable standard reference(s):	FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018 EN 9.4.2, 9.4.3, 9.4.4
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): The Australian Standard FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018 includes new requirements, including those described in Annex G. Through its HCV re-assessment work led by [an expert consultant], the FME is addressing the new requirements including those described in Criterion 9.4. Due to the fact that the assessment required under Criterion 9.1 is the foundation for conformance with the remaining criteria under Principle 9, this non-conformity is raised as a minor as HVP has a system in place for monitoring of HCVs, that will need to be updated upon completion of the HCV reassessment currently underway.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	The HCV assessment has been prepared and processes are in place to commence consultation. Business interruptions from COVID19 and bushfires caused delay in the redevelopment of the HCV management and monitoring plans.

SCS review	It is unclear why this issue was raised as a CAR by the former Certification Body who conducted a gap assessment rather than an evaluation against FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018. This CAR should be closed as it was inappropriate to raise the CAR through a gap assessment.
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: 1:2020	
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 Indicator 4.8.1 4.8.1 Traditional knowledge and its associated intellectual property are protected and are only used when the owners of that traditional knowledge have provided their Free, Prior and Informed Consent formalised through a binding agreement .
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): The organization has commenced discussions with an indigenous contracting business towards their potential engagement to conduct cultural burning within the estate in the foreseeable future. However, interviews confirmed that mechanisms for establishing Free, Prior and Informed Consent have not yet been determined in the event that the organization applies this traditional knowledge.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The organization shall ensure that it has systems in place to ensure owners of traditional knowledge and associated intellectual property have provided Free, Prior and Informed Consent formalized through a binding agreement.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	The commenced discussions amounted to an initial contact phone call to gauge the local Registered Aboriginal Party (RAP) appetite to conduct any joint activity. Since the audit, the organisation has advanced this discussion to an onsite reconnaissance with the RAP. Further to this meeting, it was agreed that the project is of mutual benefit and therefore the organisation will ensure the project contract considers or outlines as warranted use of traditional knowledge and intellectual properties as allowed by the RAP.
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)
Finding Number: 2:2020	
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 Indicator 9.1.1 An assessment is completed consistent with Annex G that records the location and status of High Conservation Value Categories 1 6, as defined in Criterion 9.1; the High Conservation Value Areas they rely upon, and their condition.
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): The Assessment of High Conservation Values Across the Hancock Victoria Plantations Estate in Victoria, Version 3, 14/12/20 addresses the potential for forests within the estate to provide critical ecosystem services in preventing soil erosion. The assessment recognises some areas within the estate have high soil erosion risk and states that these are assigned HCV 4.2 status. However the report also concludes that as native vegetation is not harvested, soil erosion is unlikely, and on this basis the assessment concludes that no additional HCVs need be assigned under subcategory 4.2. There are several problems with the assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment concludes that HCV 4.2 is not present in native forest as there is no harvesting in native forest within the estate. The identification of HCV 4.2 should be based on its presence within the estate rather than the potential risk to the value due to the organisations activities. • The assessment is ambiguous about whether HCV 4.2 was ultimately identified in the plantation area of the estate. 	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The HCV assessment shall be completed consistent with Annex G that records the location, status and condition of HCV 4.2 in both custodial lands and plantation lands within the estate based on its presence.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	In response to the audit findings HVP highlights that the assessment report indicates that HCV 4.2 does exist within the FME and provides the following excerpt from the assessment report “Figures 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 show mapping of high risk areas in terms of the RUSLE equation and the LS factor (this is the product of slope length and slope steepness) across the HVP estate while Figures 4.2.3 and 4.2.4 show the LS factor for two relatively high risk areas, the Strzelecki Ranges and North East Victoria. Most of the highest risk areas occur outside the HVP estate, however there are some areas in North East Victoria that are mapped as high soil erosion risk areas and these were assigned HCV 4.2 status.” The assessment report then identifies threats to soil erosion and mitigation measures to avoid those threats such as not harvesting custodial (native) forest. The report specifically indicates that due to this risk / threat mitigation “no additional HCVs were assigned in relation to this subcategory.” With regard to HCV 4.2, the organisation provides for clarity the following: the organisation has incorporated the assessment results (as stated above) into land records and will conduct analyses of the remaining plantation area using GIS layers and replicate the methodology from the assessment report to identify any potential HCV 4.2 within pine plantation.

SCS review	10 May 2021 - The CAR was reviewed and adjusted in response to the FME's feedback. The CAR remains open in its edited form.
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 3:2020	
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 Indicator 9.1.2 The assessment considers results from culturally appropriate engagement with affected and interested stakeholders with an interest in the conservation of the High Conservation Values.
Other applicable standard reference(s):	See also FSC-STD-AUS-01-2018 EN Indicators 9.2, 9.3 and 9.4
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):	
<p>The organisation has not yet conducted stakeholder engagement as part of its revised HCV assessment for the Management Unit. The previous HCV assessment applied the Pro-Forest Toolkit which did not specify HCV sub-value categories or assessment pathways in the same way as Annex G of this standard. Revision of the assessment using Annex G has commenced with potential HCV identified using Best Available Information in the Assessment of High Conservation Values Across the Hancock Victoria Plantations Estate in Victoria, Version 3, 14/12/20. Interview confirmed that the required stakeholder consultation has not yet occurred to complete the assessment.</p> <p>The HCV assessment has been delayed due to different application of FSC transitional processes to the 2018 Australian National Forest Stewardship Standard by the previous Certification Body and significant business interruptions from bushfire and COVID 19. COVID 19 is still impacting the ability to efficiently conduct engagement activities in Victoria, and for this reason it is proposed that a full 12 months be provided to close this CAR.</p> <p>It is observed that should new HCVs be identified through the revised HCV assessment, then the requirements of criterion 9.2 and 9.3 to develop and implement effective strategies to maintain and/or enhance HCVs must be implemented and monitored per 9.4.</p>	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation):	
In completing its revised HCV assessment under Annex G of this standard, the organisation shall consider the results from culturally appropriate engagement with affected and interested stakeholders, including experts and local communities, with an interest in the conservation of the HCVs.	
FME response (including any	The organisation will conduct appropriate engagement with affected and interested stakeholders, including experts, upon identification of any new HCVs

<i>evidence submitted</i>)	that result from a merger of current HCV datasets managed in-house and results from the recent assessment. Engagement will include identification and recording of any local knowledge of HCVs upon verification.
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 4:2020	
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 Indicator 9.4.2
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Interview and document review confirmed that HCV monitoring methodologies are documented in individual site management plans and monitoring results set out in individual district reports. Several case studies about HCV management (Brolgas, historic sites and the Brataualung Forest Park) are documented within Forest Management Plan & Sustainability Report, 2019/20 which is available on the website and the Environment & Conservation webpage documents the management strategies for several iconic HCVs. There is currently no overarching monitoring methodology or summary of monitoring results publicly available.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The organisation shall make its HCV monitoring methodology and summary of monitoring results publicly available excluding confidential information.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	Corrective Action Plan: A monitoring summary will be made available and included in annual updates to Forest Management Plan and Sustainability Report.
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 5:2020	
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-50-001 section 1.3
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): The website www.hvp.com.au applies the trademarks 'FSC' and 'Forest Stewardship Council', however the FSC trademark license code is not shown on the website.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): The organisation shall ensure the FSC trademark license code assigned by FSC to the organization accompanies use of the FSC trademarks. It is sufficient to show the code once per product or promotional material.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	Corrective Action Plan: Website will be updated.
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

5. 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 major comments received from stakeholders and the assessment team’s response. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS are noted below.

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual evaluation.</i>	
Stakeholder Comment	SCS Response
<p>HVP are participating proactively in the development of a major mountain bike trail network at Creswick. They regularly attend meetings and engage diligently and responsively on issues. They were also willing to allow a neighbour to lease an area for horse agistment.</p>	<p>Reviewed some records and interviewed the relevant HVP representative, confirming their involvement in the mountain bike project’s consultative groups and participation in negotiations and planning activities. Broader review of HVPs interactions around community proposals indicates it is receptive to ideas and is working with a number of proponents to facilitate beneficial projects of various scales (Criterion 4.4)</p>
<p>HVP are managing plantation operations in water catchments in an acceptable manner.</p>	<p>Review of engagement records shows that not all stakeholders are happy with HVPs use of herbicide near houses that are located in water catchments. Operational records show that non-chemical weed control methods are used adjacent properties where stakeholders have strong objections to use of herbicide (Criterion 4.5). HVP have recently changed weed control practices in Melbourne Water catchments to a regime of mechanical removal and spot application of herbicide only. These practices are being tested and considered for broader adoption (Criterion 6.7 and 10.7).</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>	

7. Annual Data Update

<input type="checkbox"/> No changes since previous evaluation.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information in the following sections has changed since previous evaluation.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Name and Contact Information <input type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales Information <input type="checkbox"/> Scope of Certificate <input type="checkbox"/> Non-SLIMF FMUs <input type="checkbox"/> Social Information	<input 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	Hancock Victorian Plantations Pty Ltd		
Contact person	Tim McBride		
Address	World Trade Centre, Tower 4, Level 12, 18 – 38 Siddeley St, Melbourne, VIC 3005 Australia	Telephone	+61 3 9289 1427
		Fax	
		e-mail	Tim.McBride@hvp.com.au
		Website	www.hvp.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	One	
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	Latitude & Longitude: -37.013707, 144.848051	
Forest zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical
Total forest area in scope of certificate:	238,487 ha	
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:	Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac	
privately managed	238,487	

	*Note: The increase of several hundred hectares from the 2019 audit is the reinstatement of this area to the plantation licence.		
state managed			
community managed			
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	One
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:			
HVP's estate is managed as one FMU divided into three regional operating areas within the state of Victoria. These are the Western Region comprising ~47000ha, the Northern Region comprising ~66,000ha and the Gippsland Region comprising 125,000ha.			

Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):		
Male workers: ~950		Female workers: 61
Number of accidents in forest work since previous evaluation:	Serious: 10 Note: There was an increase in relatively minor numbers immediately following return to work after COVID-19 lockdowns. HVP has focussed on this to ensure safety focus is maintained. The incident records for Q2 did show improvement.	Fatal: 0

Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

<input type="checkbox"/> FME does not use pesticides.				
Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied since previous evaluation (kg or lbs.)	Total area treated since previous evaluation (ha or ac)	Reason for use
Cut-out, Trounce, Weedmaster duo	Glyphosate	24,488	12,441	Weed control
Coptrel	Copper	109	108	Crop fungicide / fertiliser
Lontrel	Clopyralid	4,932	6,025	Weed control

Taskforce	Flupropanate	0	0	Weed control
Dicamba	Dicamba	20		Crop pest control
Verdict	Haloxfop-R-methyl (CAS 72619-32-0)	530	1,727	Weed control
Velmac	Hexazinone	11,296	5,546	Weed control
Brushhoff	Metsulfuron	590	12,053	Weed control
Access	Picloram (CAS 26952-20-5)	65	1,420	Weed control
Oust	Sulfometuron methyl	8	364	Weed control
Garlon	Triclopyr	1,708	2,236	Weed control

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)	169,648
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	169,648
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	169,648
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	0
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	169,648
Clearcut (clearcut size range)	1 - 200
Shelterwood	0
Other:	0
Uneven-aged management	0
Individual tree selection	0
Group selection	0
Other:	0
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	0
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	0

Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	0
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)	
<i>Pinus radiata</i> - Radiata pine, <i>Eucalyptus globulus</i> - Bluegum, <i>E. regnans</i> - Mountain ash, <i>E. nitens</i> - Shining gum	

FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
W1.1 Roundwood (Logs)		Radiata Pine, Blue Gum, Mountain Ash and Shining Gum
W3.1 Woodchips		Radiata Pine, Blue Gum, Mountain Ash and Shining Gum
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species

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

Conservation and High Conservation Value Areas

Conservation Area	Units: X ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
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).*	48,368

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

High Conservation Value Forest / Areas			Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).		244
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.		0

HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.		300
HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).		0
HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		0
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).		0
Total area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest / Area'			544

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

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the certificate holder is included in the scope.</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Certificate holder owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.</i>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Certificate holder wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.</i>		
Note: <i>Excision cannot be applied to CW/FM certificates.</i>		
Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:	<p>1. HVP owns two small nursery sites in Gippsland, that are non-contiguous with our certified estate and also sell seedlings to a range of customers outside HVP. This area has never been part of our certified area and has been excised since 2004.</p> <p>2. HVP, from time to time, manages the harvesting of plantation wood from private third-party plantations and sells it to HVP customers as non-certified wood.</p>	
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):	Loads of wood from non-HVP certified estates use different 'non-certified' dockets, with no certification claims being made or passed on to customers. This income stream is invoiced separately.	
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)
Cowwar Nursery	Cowwarr, Victoria	~25
Gelliondale Nursery	Gelliondale, Victoria	~191