Southern Pacific Fibre Pty Ltd Verification of FSC Controlled Wood supply 2016-17

Summary

Southern Pacific Fibre Pty Ltd (SPF) has controlled wood supply for their products from local controlled material sources. Local supply is from private plantation owners on a ‘spot basis’, each signed up under a Timber Purchase agreement.

Southern Pacific Fibre has conducted a risk assessment on supply as part of their verification program for controlled wood sources under FSC-STD-40-005(V2-1) EN. Given that FSC Australia have published an FSC accredited national (Annex 2) risk assessment there is already a determination of Low risk for Western Australia at the annex 2 level for controlled wood criteria. Therefore the risk assessment is confined to an Annex 3 verification focused on High Conservation Values (HCV) only.

The risk assessment found an unspecified risk for HCV. Therefore a verification process according to FSC-STD-40-005(V2-1) EN. Annex 3 needs to be carries out. In order for the wood to qualify as controlled wood this verification needs to confirm that suppliers have a strong system of control for HCV at all stages of their operations.

This verification process has been updated to be consistent with FSC ADVICE-40-005-14 and FSC Australia guidance on controlled wood implementation http://www.fscaustralia.org/policies-and-standards/controlled-wood/guidance-on-controlled-wood-implementation

For the determination of a strong system of control for HVC the FSC Australia guidelines have been used. http://au.fsc.org/download.high-conservation-values-evaluation-framework-final-v3-4.231.htm

In addition all applicable and current FSC International advice notes are followed.

SPF concludes that there is a strong system of control for wood that it procures.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier Name</th>
<th>Product type</th>
<th>Material category</th>
<th>FSC, CoC certificate or CW (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. Hulme</td>
<td>‘Quandinnie’ Plantation</td>
<td>Woodchips (infield)</td>
<td>Controlled material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. and N. Sawyer</td>
<td>‘Jucasta’ Plantation</td>
<td>Woodchips (infield)</td>
<td>Controlled material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. &amp; N. Chalmer</td>
<td>‘Wilson 4’ Plantation</td>
<td>Woodchips (infield)</td>
<td>Controlled material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. &amp; W. Duncan</td>
<td>‘Yilgangie’ Plantation</td>
<td>Woodchips (infield)</td>
<td>Controlled material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Davies</td>
<td>‘Perenial Park’ Plantation</td>
<td>Woodchips (infield)</td>
<td>Controlled material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Arnold</td>
<td>‘Arnold’ Plantation</td>
<td>Woodchips (infield)</td>
<td>Controlled material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Scott</td>
<td>‘Tallawarra’ Plantation</td>
<td>Woodchips (infield)</td>
<td>Controlled material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Egescov</td>
<td>‘Rancho X’ Plantation</td>
<td>Woodchips (infield)</td>
<td>Controlled material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Knox</td>
<td>‘Kirwin’</td>
<td>Woodchips (infield)</td>
<td>Controlled material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Lowe</td>
<td>‘Neridup’</td>
<td>Woodchips (infield)</td>
<td>Controlled material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1. Introduction

SPF has controlled wood supply for their products from local controlled material sources. Local supply is from the following suppliers listed in Table 1 - Approved Suppliers to SOUTHERN PACIFIC FIBRE.

SPF has conducted a risk assessment on supply as part of their verification program for controlled wood sources under FSC-STD-40-005(V2-1) EN. Given that FSC Australia have published an FSC accredited national (Annex 2) risk assessment there is already a determination of Low risk for Western Australia at the annex 2 level for 4 controlled wood criteria. Therefore the risk assessment is confined to an Annex 3 verification focused on High Conservations values (HCV) only.

The risk assessment found an unspecified risk for HCV. Therefore a verification process according to FSC-STD-40-005(V2-1) EN. Annex 3 needs to be carries out. In order for the wood to qualify as controlled wood this verification needs to confirm that suppliers have a strong system of control for HCV at all stages of their operations.

This verification process has been updated to be consistent with FSC ADVICE-40-005-14 and FSC Australia guidance on controlled wood implementation http://www.fscaustralia.org/policies-and-standards/controlled-wood/guidance-on-controlled-wood-implementation

For the determination of a strong system of control for HVC the FSC Australia guidelines have been used. http://au.fsc.org/download.high-conservation-values-evaluation-framework-final-v3-4.231.htm

In addition all applicable and current FSC International advice notes are followed. SPF has conducted a risk assessment on supply as part of their verification program for controlled wood sources under FSC-STD-40-005(V2-1) EN. Given that FSC Australia have published an FSC accredited national (Annex 2) risk assessment there is already a determination of Low risk for Western Australia at the annex 2 level for 4 controlled wood criteria. Therefore the risk assessment is confined to an Annex 3 verification focused on High Conservations values (HCV) only.

The risk assessment found an unspecified risk for HCV. Therefore a verification process according to FSC-STD-40-005(V2-1) EN. Annex 3 needs to be carries out. In order for the wood to qualify as controlled wood this verification needs to confirm that suppliers have a strong system of control for HCV at all stages of their operations.

This verification process has been updated to be consistent with FSC ADVICE-40-005-14 and FSC Australia guidance on controlled wood implementation http://www.fscaustralia.org/policies-and-standards/controlled-wood/guidance-on-controlled-wood-implementation

For the determination of a strong system of control for HVC the FSC Australia guidelines have been used. http://au.fsc.org/download.high-conservation-values-evaluation-framework-final-v3-4.231.htm

In addition all applicable and current FSC International advice notes are followed.
2. Assessment of the HCV Control System

2.1. Private Plantation Growers

General

The controlled materials are sourced from *Eucalyptus globulus* Labill. from private plantations or farm forestry plantations grown in Forest management lots up to 1000 Ha.

For the purposes of sampling this forest have been considered Small Low Intensity Managed Forests (SLIMF).

If plantations have been established shire approval is needed for the establishment.

In the case of wood harvest on behalf of private growers there is a grower questionnaire that establishes to the best of the private growers knowledge about the presence of HCVs on their land.

In addition publicly available information is interrogated to determine the presence or absence of HCV e.g. [http://naturemap.dec.wa.gov.au/default.aspx](http://naturemap.dec.wa.gov.au/default.aspx), and [https://www0.landgate.wa.gov.au/property-reports/single-address-report/property-interest-reports](https://www0.landgate.wa.gov.au/property-reports/single-address-report/property-interest-reports)

Any findings of HCV are recorded on maps and form part of the Harvest plans.

HCV 1. Forest areas containing habitat for national or state-listed threatened species or species of high significance.

In general these are small plantations in and around farmed land with little or no native bush or habitat areas so the presence of Rare Threatened or Endangered (RTE) is unlikely. However there following steps are taken:

- The owner is asked if they know of any known sites with RTE species.
- Non planted areas are shown on a site map.
- Publically available maps and overlays are interrogated for the presence of RTE species.
- In the event that there are significant populations of RTE advice is sought on their management.
- The Non planted areas including native bush integral or adjacent to the FMU are not disturbed during harvest (NB the protection of bush is mandatory in WA and any clearing e.g. for safety etc. is heavily regulated).

HCV 2. Forest areas containing 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.

In general these are small plantations in and around farmed land. There are no large landscape level forest considerations for these FMU.

HCV 3 Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.

The same actions as for HCV 1:

---

1 FSC Australia Has determined that in Australia FMUs of up to 1000 ha can qualify as SLIMF
- The owner is asked if they know of any known sites with RTE ecosystems.
- Non planted areas are shown on a site map.
- Publically available maps and overlays are interrogated for the presence of RTE ecosystems.
- In the event that there are significant RTE ecosystems advice is sought on their management.
- The Non planted areas including native bush integral or adjacent to the FMU are not disturbed during harvest (NB the protection of bush is mandatory in WA and any clearing e.g. for safety etc is heavily regulated).

**HCV 4. Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations such as slope, erosion control, water catchment.**

There is an onsite analysis pre harvest to identify issue, this leads to control measures eg:

- Riparian zones are excluded from disturbance during harvest.
- Creek lines are kept free of activity or debris.
- For erosion control roading is maintained and drainage is maintained.
- Stream crossing is only at designated points.
- In wet periods there is no harvesting in heavy or steep land.

**HCV 5. Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (water, food, firewood, shelter, income) with no readily available alternative.**

NOTE: These are not applicable in this situation ie. This is private land, no one relies on these forests for fire wood or shelter.

**HCV 6. Forest areas critical to local communities’ traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities)**


For post Colonial heritage sites. If the land has been recently established then a record of shire approval should also show a cultural heritage check. If sites or artifacts are found during activities the appropriate authority is alerted and their instructions followed.(Note this is mandatory in WA for Aboriginal sites).

### 3. Procedures for verifying the supplier’s procedures at Annex 3 level.

For all suppliers including private growers detailed records are kept of supplying blocks and these are made available to FSC auditors.
SPF has adopted the FSC Australia Annex 2 risk assessment. It identified low risk for all controlled wood categories except HCV (3.1 and 3.2) which was undetermined at all IBRA bioregions in Australia.

Therefore SPF Annex 3 risk assessment on HCV for all its suppliers using the draft guidelines from FSC Australia as the benchmark. “High Conservation Values (HCVs) evaluation framework for use in the context of implementing FSC Controlled Wood standards http://au.fsc.org/download.high-conservation-values-evaluation-framework-final-v3.4.231.htm

Under this approach there is verification that appropriate ‘tools’ have been used to satisfy the 6 classes of HCV. The assessments have been completed of all suppliers using FSC Australia guidelines (the ‘tools not rule approach’). Under this there is verification that appropriate ‘tools’ have been used to satisfy the 6 classes of HCV e.g. publically available ecological maps of RTE species and ecosystems for HCV 1 and HCV 3

In the Annex 2 risk assessment under 3.1 and 3.2 there is an undetermined risk. Therefore the onus is on the supplier to demonstrate a strong system of control that SPF can confirm in their verification audits. The system of control for each of the suppliers is set out in detail in this document (above).

4. Stakeholder Consultation

SPF has developed a stakeholder consultation process including NGOs and local indigenous representatives. On an annual basis these stakeholders are consulted on the verification audits. Where issues are raised these are taken into account if possible/practical.

The publication of this document is part of that stakeholder process.

5. Auditor training

SPF personnel conducting field verification audits have had appropriate training on the concept of High Conservation Values against the requirements of the FSC Australia HCV framework. Training records are kept.

6. Audit timing

Audits will occur at a timing that prevents uncontrolled wood passing through the supply chain. In practical terms this means audits will be on active harvesting blocks just before or just after the wood is harvested.
7. Districts and Sampling Plans

There is 1 district for the sampling plan. This has been determined because of the plantations occurring within the IBRA bioregion – Esperance. Supply from all of these regions is purely Eucalypt plantations.

District 1. Private forest supply purchased under contract to the forest owner.

NB

1. Any full FSC certified supply is outside the scope of the SPF controlled wood certification, they are therefore excluded from the calculation of the sampling plan.
2. Private Wood is purchased on a spot market basis. As part of this verification process 100% of private wood sales from all regions the owner or their agent completes a grower declaration to give a history of the plantation and any impacts on HCV that they are aware of.

The sampling plan is calculated on the basis of the number of:

(For SLIMF Sample frequency = 0.6 x √nFMUs)

The FSC definition of a Forest Management Unit (FMU) is:

A clearly defined forest area with mapped boundaries, managed by a single managerial body to a set of explicit objectives which are expressed in a self-contained multi-year management plan.

FSC Source: FSC-STD-20-011 V1-1 ref FSC Glossary of Terms FSC-STD-01-002 (V1-0)

EN

Most of the work is done on a “spot basis” it is not possible to have a list of harvests planned in any one year upon which to base the sample. Therefore the sample is estimated on the total blocks harvest in the previous complete harvest year as an estimate of the blocks that will be harvested in the current year.

In all cases this sample will always meet or exceed the sample rates required by FSC STD 40 005 Annex 3.

This results in the following audit frequency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>Private owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Harvest blocks</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample based on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harvest blocks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>