

**Forest Management and Stump-to-Forest Gate Chain-of-Custody
Certification Evaluation Report for the:**

Forest land of Nacka County, Sweden

**Conducted under auspices of the SCS Forest Conservation Program
SCS is an FSC Accredited Certification Body**

**CERTIFICATION REGISTRATION NUMBER
SCS-FM/COC-00022N**

Submitted to:

Nacka County, Sweden

Lead Author: Dr Jan Attebring

Date of Field Audit: May 26, 2010

Date of Report: June 10,2010

Date of Certificate : May, 2000

Re-certified: June 2010

By:

**SCIENTIFIC CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS
2200 Powell St. Suite Number 725
Emeryville, CA 94608, USA
www.scs-certified.com**

SCS Contact: Dave Wager dwager@scs-certified.com

Client Contact: Roger Grönvall, Nacka Kommun

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 general 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 SCS website (www.scs-certified.com) no less than 30 days after issue of the certificate. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use of the Nacka County.

FOREWORD

Scientific Certification Systems, a certification body accredited by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), was retained by Nacka County to conduct a certification evaluation of its forest estate. Under the FSC/SCS certification system, forest management operations meeting international standards of forest stewardship can be certified as “well managed”, thereby enabling use of the FSC endorsement and logo in the marketplace.

In May 2010, an interdisciplinary team of natural resource specialists was empanelled by SCS to conduct the evaluation. The team collected and analyzed written materials, conducted interviews and completed a one day field and office audit of the subject property as part of the certification evaluation. Upon completion of the fact-finding phase of the evaluation, the team determined conformance to the 56 FSC Criteria in order to determine whether award of certification was warranted.

This report is issued in support of a recommendation to award FSC-endorsed certification To Nacka County, for the management of its forest estate. As detailed below, certain pre-conditions (also known as Major Corrective Action Requests) that were stipulated by the audit team upon completion of the field audit were addressed by and cleared by SCS prior to finalization of this report. In the event that a certificate is awarded, Scientific Certification Systems will post this public summary of the report on its web site (www.scscertified.com).

Foreword.....	3
Section A- Public Summary and Background Information	6
1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION.....	6
1.1 FSC Data Request.....	6
1.2 Management Context (not required for single slimf's)..	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.2.1 Environmental Context.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.2.2 Socioeconomic Context	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.3 Forest Management Enterprise	9
1.3.1 Land Use	9
1.3.2 Partial Certification Land Outside Scope of Certification	10
1.4 Management Plan.....	10
1.4.1 Management Objectives.....	10
1.4.2 Forest Composition.....	10
1.4.3 Silvicultural Systems	10
1.4.4 Management Systems	11
1.4.5 Monitoring System.....	11
1.4.6 Estimate of Maximum Sustainable Yield	11
1.4.7 Estimated, Current and Projected Production.....	11
1.4.8 Chemical Pesticide Use.....	11
1.5 SLIMF Qualifications (SLIMF's only).....	11
2.0 Guidelines/Standards Employed.....	12
3.0 THE CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....	12
3.1 Assessment Dates.....	12
3.2 Assessment Team.....	12
3.3 Assessment Process	12
3.3.1 Itinerary.....	12
3.3.2 Evaluation of Management System (not needed for single SLIMF)	13
3.3.3 Selection of FMU's to Evaluate (not needed for single SLIMF).....	13
3.3.4 Sites Visited (not needed for single SLIMF)	13
3.3.5 Stakeholder Consultation	13
3.3.6 Other Assessment Techniques (only include if necessary and not needed for single SLIMF).....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.4 Total Time Spent on audit.....	15
3.5 Process of Determining Conformance	15
4.0 Results of the Evaluation	16
Table 4.1 Notable strengths and weaknesses of the forest management enterprise relative to the P&C.....	16
4.2 Preconditions.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.0 Certification Decision	19
5.1 Certification Recommendation	19
5.2 Initial Corrective Action Requests.....	19
6.0 Surveillance Evaluations.....	19
7.0 Summary of SCS Complaint and Appeal Investigation Procedures.....	19
Section B Detailed Results of the Full Evaluation.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.0 Detailed Evaluation of Conformance.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

1.1	Controversial Issues	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.0	TRACKING, TRACING AND IDENTIFICATION OF FOREST PRODUCTS	
	Error! Bookmark not defined.	
2.1	Evaluation of Risks of Mixing Certified and Un-Certified Product	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2	Description of the Log Control System	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.3	End Point of Chain of Custody	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.4	Visual Identification at End Point of Chain of Custody	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.0	Group Management (Omit this section if not applicable)	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.1	Division of Responsibilities	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.2	Conformance with Group Management Criteria	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.3	Group Sampling and surveillance.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.4	Group Size and Scope	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.5	Group Members	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.6	Group Management Evaluation	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix 1	Preliminary Evaluation Report	Error! Bookmark not defined.

SECTION A- PUBLIC SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 FSC Data Request

Applicant entity	Nacka County
Contact person	Roger Grönwall
Address	Nacka Stadshus, 131 81 Nacka
Telephone	+46 8 7188000
Fax	+46 8 7189115
E-mail	nacka.kommun@nacka.se
Certificate Number	00022
Certificate/Expiration Date	June 2010
Certificate Type	single FMU
SLIMF	i) a small SLIMF certificate ii) a low intensity SLIMF certificate
Group Members	Nacka is not a Group Members
Number of FMU's	1
Number of FMUs in scope that are less than 100 ha in area	
100 - 1000 ha in area	
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	1
more than 10 000 ha in area	
Location of certified forest area	
Latitude	<i>N 59 degrees 20 minutes</i>
Longitude	<i>E 18 degrees 10 minutes</i>
Forest zone	<i>boreal</i>
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:	
are less than 100 ha in area	
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs	2000 ha
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:	
privately managed ¹	
state managed	
community managed ²	2000 ha
Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate	2
Area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives	2000 ha
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	
Area of forest classified as 'high conservation value forest'	Several small areas

¹ The category of 'private management' includes state owned forests that are leased to private companies for management, e.g. through a concession system.

² A community managed forest management unit is one in which the management and use of the forest and tree resources is controlled by local communities.

List of high conservation values present ³	HCV 1 Protected areas with biodiversity values
Chemical pesticides used	
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	0 ha, only some tinning stands
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation' for the purpose of calculating the Annual Accreditation Fee (AAF)	0 ha
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting ⁴	0 ha
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration	0 ha
List of main commercial timber and non-timber species included in scope of certificate (botanical name and common trade name)	Pinus silvestris (Scots Pine) Picea abies (Norway spruce) Betula spp. (Birch)
Approximate annual allowable cut (AAC) of commercial timber	Not estimated
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	Not estimated
List of product categories included in scope of joint FM/COC certificate and therefore available for sale as FSC-certified products (include basic description of product - e.g. round wood, pulp wood, sawn timber, kiln-dried sawn timber, chips, resin, non-timber forest products, etc.)	No FSC products are sold

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 (sq m)	0.09290304
acre (ac)	hectare (ha)	0.4047

Volume Conversion Factors

Volume

To convert from	to	multiply by
cubic foot (cu ft)	cubic meter (cu m)	0.02831685
gallon (gal)	liter	4.546

1 acre	= 0.404686 hectares
1,000 acres	= 404.686 hectares
1 board foot	= 0.00348 cubic meters
1,000 board feet	= 3.48 cubic meters
1 cubic foot	= 0.028317cubic meters

³ High conservation values should be classified following the numbering system given in the ProForest High Conservation Value Forest Toolkit (2003) available at www.ProForest.net

⁴ The area is the *total* area being regenerated primarily by planting, *not* the area which is replanted annually. NB this area may be different to the area defined as a 'plantation' for the purpose of calculating the Annual Accreditation Fee (AAF) or for other purposes.

1,000 cubic feet = 28.317 cubic meters

Breast height = 1.4 meters, or 4 1/2 feet, above ground level

Although 1,000 board feet is theoretically equivalent to 2.36 cubic meters, this is true only when a board foot is actually a piece of wood with a volume 1/12 of cubic foot. The conversion given here, 3.48 cubic meters, is based on the cubic volume of a log 16 feet long and 15 inches in diameter inside bark at the small end.

Environmental and Socioeconomic Context

Nacka municipality borders the Baltic Sea and is located in eastern Sweden, and lies east of the city of Stockholm. The area and the landscape is influenced by the pre-historic inland ice and the Baltic Sea which has formed pine clad rocky or barren knobs which are interspersed with fertile narrow valleys. Valleys are forested or consist of arable lands and some lakes.

The geology and bedrock of the area is dominated by granite. So-called green stone bedrock is also common. Soils are moraines and sediments – influenced and formed by ice and water in geological times.

Due to the proximity to the sea the climate is humid with modestly cold winters. Annual precipitation is 700 mm.

Pine forest is the dominating vegetation on the infertile rocky areas with thin soil cover. The rich valleys have mixed stands – spruce and a number of hardwoods.

During the 19th century the inhabitants of Nacka municipality were engaged in fishing, small-scale farming and forestry. The proximity to Stockholm led to the establishment of certain industries. Today Nacka is an integrated part of metropolitan Stockholm and its importance as an industrial area has grown considerably. Nacka is also a municipality with 70,000 inhabitants – in residential and suburban sectors. The forests are today exclusively used for recreation and nature protection - the timber economy of marginal importance.

Today's forests in central Sweden reflect a past of up to 300 years of forest harvesting and many centuries of other human intervention. Commercial logging for non-fuel uses emerged on a large scale in the late 19th century. The ecology of Sweden's forests is now highly altered with very little remaining from old forest stands. Forests are now dominated by relatively young, homogenous stands managed on rotations of between 60 and 120 years, with the average close to 90 years. The boreal forest is dominated by two conifer species, Scots Pine (*Pinus silvestris*) and Norway Spruce (*Picea abies*). Historically, broad-leaved, deciduous, hardwood species comprised a significant component of the forest structure, with the most prevalent species being birch (*Betula* spp) and aspen (*Populus tremula*) and, to a lesser extent, alder (*Alnus* spp.). Due to many decades of active efforts to eliminate the deciduous component, the present distribution of hardwoods in Sweden is very limited.

The boreal forests, and to a greater extent the forests of southern Sweden, are under increasing impact from acid deposition which has lowered the pH of forest soils and of forest streams and lakes to the extent of adversely impacting the productivity of silvicultural and aquatic ecological systems. The zone of significant impact from acid deposition has been steadily moving northward for the past 25 years.

1.3 Forest Management Enterprise

1.3.1 Land Use

Nacka municipality is situated in the eastern outskirts of Stockholm.. The forests of Nacka are described as part of “the green belt of Stockholm”, and is of regional interest both for biological and recreational values.

In Nacka the municipality is one of the larger forest owners. Besides the municipality there is one large private forest property and a part of a larger forest area owned by Stockholm municipality which falls within the boundaries of Nacka.

Nacka municipality council has decided that all major forests owned by the municipality will be classified as natural reserves, with management plans focused on preserving biological, recreational and cultural values. As a part of this process a management plan is developed for each of the reserves. The current plan include 6 new nature reserves, and there are political ambitions to plan for more reserves.

1.3.2 Partial Certification- Land Outside Scope of Certification

All of Nacka’s land area is included in the certificate.

1.4 Management Plan

1.4.1 Management Objectives

The objectives of the subject forest management operation are nature conservation and outdoor recreation. The main reason for choosing these objectives are that the Nacka forests are located close to the City of Stockholm and that Nacka is a highly populated area.

Nacka has many areas of high biodiversity values and also many areas with cultural values. There is also many tracks and footpaths that are frequently used for outdoor recreation. Therefore, the Nacka council has chosen to protect all of its area for nature conservation and for outdoor recreation.

1.4.2 Forest Composition

The forest composition varies between the different areas within the FMU. There are low productive areas with thin soil layer, dominated by Pine (*Pinus silvestris*) and fertile areas dominated by broadleaved species (*Quercus*, *Fraxinus*, *Ulmus*, *Acer* etc.).

Most areas have a mixed species composition with Pine, Spruce Birch and some broadleaves. In these areas, some thinning is done with the yield of these commercial species.

1.4.3 Silvicultural Systems

All of the management plans describe operations in terms of nature conservation and recreational purposes. No silviculture with sole forestry objectives are described.

Most of the forest is self regenerated and not much silviculture have been done in the past, due to that the forest have been protected for a long time. No regeneration cutting take place, why there is almost no young forest.

Thinning is to some degree practiced in the middle-aged forest with some yield of commercial wood.

1.4.4 Management Systems

Nacka community has no forestry organisation. The person responsible for the forest areas is responsible for infrastructure, parks and nature.

Nacka has since a little less than a year, a contractor who carries out the different operations.

The contractor, *Skogssällskapet*, is operating over the whole country with clients such as communities and middle-size private forest owners. The contractor is certified against FSC and PEFC standards for forest contractors and also ISO 14001. This means that all the staff has sufficient training in forestry and nature conservation.

The contractor is well known and has a long experience of management of forest in populated areas and also a long record of nature conservation and landscape management.

One person at the contractor's district office in Stockholm is responsible for Nacka.

The contractor has a frame agreement with Nacka and the decision on an operation is taken by Nacka.

1.4.5 Monitoring System

No monitoring system is used as there are no regular forestry operation.

1.4.6 Estimate of Maximum Sustainable Yield

There has been no estimation of sustainable yield due to that no forestry operations take place.

1.4.7 Estimated, Current and Projected Production

There is no estimation of current and projected yield due to the low level of harvest.

1.4.8 Chemical Pesticide Use

There is no use of any chemicals in the forests of Nacka.

1.5 SLIMF Qualifications (SLIMF's only)

All forest area of Nacka is nature reserves or planned to be nature reserves. The timber harvest is very low, only some thinnings with harvest of bio fuel. Therefore, Nacka meets the requirement of low utilisation of the potential yield.

Due to that the harvest level is less than 30 % of the allowable cut, Nacka qualifies as a SLIMF.

2.0 GUIDELINES/STANDARDS EMPLOYED

The standard used for this evaluation is the new (2010) Swedish FSC standard. This standard has been approved by the Swedish National FSC council and endorsed by FSC international. The standard is presented in section B of this report and is also available at the Swedish FSC council (www.fsc-sverige.org).

3.0 THE CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS

3.1 Assessment Dates

The assessment took place in May, 2010.

3.2 Assessment Team

Team Leader: Dr. Jan Attebring. Attebring is a forester with a background in forest management planning, forest inventory and long term yield assessment. Attebring has 10 years of experience in forest inventory and yield assessment including field work in the Swedish National Forest Survey. Attebring has 16 years of experience as an international consultant and has conducted FSC certifications for large forest companies and small forest owners.

Degrees:

Master of Forest from the Forest Faculty, Swedish university of Agricultural Sciences.

Doctor of Forest from the Forest Faculty, Swedish university of Agricultural Sciences.

3.3 Assessment Process

3.3.1 Itinerary

The assessments was made on May 26, 2010.

AM. Interview with Nacka forest manager

PM. Field inspection of a thinning in a recreational area. A young hardwood stand was thinned and older parts of the area was thinned with mostly spruce removed in favor of oak.

3.3.2 Evaluation of Management System (not needed for single SLIMF)

Nacka qualifies as SLIMF.

3.3.3 Selection of FMU's to Evaluate (not needed for single SLIMF)

Nacka qualifies as SLIMF.

3.3.4 Sites Visited (not needed for single SLIMF)

Nacka qualifies as SLIMF.

3.3.5 Stakeholder Consultation

Pursuant to SCS protocols, consultations with key stakeholders were an integral component of the evaluation process. Consultation took place prior to, concurrent with, and following the field evaluation. The following were distinct purposes to the consultations:

To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of Nacka forest management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the company and the surrounding communities.

To solicit input on whether the forest management operation has consulted with stakeholders regarding identifying any high conservation value forests.

Principal stakeholder groups of relevance to this evaluation were identified based upon results from earlier assessments (2000, 2005), lists of stakeholders from the Nacka staff, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources. The following types of groups and individuals were determined to be principal stakeholders:

- Nature conservation NGO
- contractors
- Local and regionally-based environmental organizations and conservationists
- Local residents

Prior to, during, and following the site evaluation, a wide range of stakeholders from the

regional area were consulted in regard to their relationship with the Sample Company, and their views on the management of the Sample Forest. Stakeholders included FSC contact persons, government and non-government organizations involved in forest management, local citizens and groups, employees, contractors, and others. Stakeholders were contacted with a notification mailing soliciting comment and/or phone contact. Comments were received via meetings and personal interviews “face-to-face”, phone interviews (“Interview”), and through written responses. Individuals or groups not offering feedback are labeled “no response” (“NR”). Additional comments may have been received from individuals not wishing to reveal their identities.

Name	Affiliation	Consultation
Stefan Gustavsson	Contractor	Interview
	SNF, Swedish Nature Conservation	NR
	Fältbiologerna, Young Field Biologists	NR
	Local residents	Interview

3.3.5.1 Summary of Stakeholder Concerns and Perspectives and Responses from the Team Where Applicable

Economic Concerns

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments on the economy was received 	

Social Concerns

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local resident reported that most operations in the forest benefit the recreational activities. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	

Environmental Concerns

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local residents reported that thinning residues should not be removed, as dead wood is important for the bio-diversity 	Nacka must keep path and tracks available for the different activities as jogging and school picnicks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	

3.4 Total Time Spent on audit

The total time spent on the evaluation is 5 person days, distributed as follows:

- interview key persons and document review; 0.5 days
- field inspections; 0.5 days
- stakeholder communications; 0.5 days
- report writing; 4 days

3.5 Process of Determining Conformance

FSC accredited forest stewardship standards consist of a three-level hierarchy, principle, then the criteria that make up that principle, then the indicators that make up each criteria. Consistent with SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluation protocols, the team collectively determines whether or not the subject forest management operation is in conformance with every applicable indicator of the relevant forest stewardship standard. Each non-conformance must be evaluated to determine whether it constitutes a major or minor non-conformance at the level of the associated criterion or sub-criterion. Not all indicators are equally important, and there is no simple numerical formula to determine whether an operation is in non-conformance. The team must use their collective judgement to assess each criterion and determine if it is in conformance. If the forest management operation is determined to be in non-conformance at the criterion level, then at least one of the indicators must be in major non-conformance.

Corrective action requests (CAR's) are issued for every instance of non-conformance. Major non-conformances trigger major CAR's and minor non-conformances trigger minor CAR's

Interpretations of Major CAR's (Preconditions), Minor CARs and Recommendations

Major CARs/Preconditions: Major non-conformances, either alone or in combination with non-conformances of other 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 prior to award of the certificate. If major CAR's arise after an operation is certified, the timeframe for correcting these non-conformances is typically shorter than for minor CAR's. Certification is contingent on the certified operations response to the CAR within the stipulated time frame.

Minor CARs: These are corrective action requests in response to minor non-conformances, which are typically limited in scale or can be characterized as an unusual lapse in the system. Corrective actions must be closed out within a specified time period of award of the certificate.

Recommendations: These are suggestions that the audit team concludes would help the company move even further towards exemplary status. Action on the recommendations is voluntary and does not affect the maintenance of the certificate. Recommendations can be

changed to CARs if performance with respect to the criterion triggering the recommendation falls into non-conformance.

4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

Table 4.1 below, contains the evaluation team's findings as to the strengths and weaknesses of the subject forest management operation relative to the FSC Principles of forest stewardship. The table also presents the corrective action request (car) numbers related to each principle.

Table 4.1 Notable strengths and weaknesses of the forest management enterprise relative to the P&C

Principle/Subject Area	Strengths Relative to the Standard	Weaknesses Relative to the Standard	CAR/REC #s
P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nacka is fully committed to FSC through the decision in the council and has no legal issues pending regarding the management of the land. Nacka has over the years complied with all issued CARs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No weaknesses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
P2: Tenure & Use Rights & Responsibilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are no tenure or use rights except “everyman’s right” and some fishing rights. No conflicts or criticism has been reported. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No weaknesses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
P3: Indigenous Peoples’ Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are no indigenous people in Nacka 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No weaknesses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
P4: Community Relations & Workers’ Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nacka has good relations with the residents and NGOs in the community and also communicate through their web service. Suggestions from residents on cleaning of tracks etc. are often carried out. <p>1 The employees of the contractor enjoy all the rights according to the laws and collective agreements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The FSC certificate is not mentioned in the written agreements with the contractor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CAR 2010.1
P5: Benefits from the Forest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ When thinning is performed, the timber is sold on the local/regional market. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The forest is not used for timber production. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪

P6: Environmental Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As all operations are done with the objective of nature conservation and/or outdoor recreation, all aspects of environmental impact is considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No weaknesses 	
P7: Management Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For each of the nature reserves, there is a management plan. These plans have been developed in cooperation with a group of nature conservation consultants and have been approved by the county board. All these plans are available on the Nacka web site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No weaknesses 	
P8: Monitoring & Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As no forestry operations take place except for some thinnings, no regular monitoring take place. Each site is inspected after the operation. Informal monitoring is done by nature conservation NGOs in most of the areas and prepare situation reports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No weaknesses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
P9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All areas of high conservation values have been identified and is now protected, in most cases through nature reserves. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No weaknesses 	

5.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION

5.1 Certification Recommendation

As determined by the full and proper execution of the SCS *Forest Conservation Program* evaluation protocols, the evaluation team hereby recommends that the Nacka be awarded FSC certification as a “Well-Managed Forest” subject to the corrective action requests stated in Section 5.2. **Nacka** has demonstrated that their system of management is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the Swedish FSC standard are met over the forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation. Nacka has also demonstrated that the described system of management is being implemented consistently over the forest area covered by the scope of the certificate.

5.2 Initial Corrective Action Requests

Background/Justification: In the first frame agreement with the contractor, there was clear writing on Nacka FSC commitment and that the contractor shall comply with all the criteria in the FSC standard. That frame agreement has now expired and there are only a Work order for each years operations. There is no writing about FSC in these work orders.	
CAR 2010.1	Nacka shall include in the contracts, or similar documents, with the contractor, that Nacka holds a FSC certificate, and that the contractor shall comply with all the FSC Criteria in the Swedish FSC standard for SLIMF managers.
Deadline	2011 annual audit
Reference	<i>FSC Indicator 4.2.6</i>

6.0 SURVEILLANCE EVALUATIONS

If certification is awarded, surveillance evaluations will take place at least annually to monitor the status of any open corrective action requests and review the continued conformance of Nacka to the Swedish FSC Standard. Public summaries of surveillance evaluations will be posted separately on the SCS website (www.scscertified.com).

7.0 SUMMARY OF SCS COMPLAINT AND APPEAL INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES

The following is a summary of the SCS Complaint and Appeal Investigation Procedures, the full versions of the procedures are available from SCS upon request. The SCS Complaint and Appeal Investigation Procedures are designed for and available to any individual or organization that perceives a stake in the affairs of the SCS Forest Conservation Program and that/who has reason to question either the actions of SCS itself or the actions of a SCS certificate holder.

A **complaint** is a written expression of dissatisfaction, other than **appeal**, by any person or organization, to a certification body, relating to the activities of staff of the SCS Forest Conservation Program and/or representatives of a company or entity holding either a forest management (FM) or chain-of-custody (CoC) certificate issued by SCS and duly endorsed by FSC, where a response is expected (ISO/IEC 17011:2004 (E)). The SCS Complaint Investigation Procedure functions as a first-stage mechanism for resolving complaints and avoiding the need to involve FSC.

An “**appeal**” is a request by a certificate holder or a certification applicant for formal reconsideration of any adverse decision made by the certification body related to its desired certification status. A certificate holder or applicant may formally lodge an appeal with SCS against any adverse certification decision taken by SCS, within thirty (30) days after notification of the decision.

The written Complaint or Appeal must:

- Identify and provide contact information for the complainant or appellant
- Clearly identify the basis of the aggrieved action (date, place, nature of action) and which parties or individuals are associated with the action
- Explain how the action is alleged to violate an SCS or FSC requirement, being as specific as possible with respect to the applicable SCS or FSC requirement
- In the case of complaints against the actions of a certificate holder, rather than SCS itself, the complainant must also describe efforts taken to resolve the matter directly with the certificate holder
- Propose what actions would, in the opinion of the complainant or appellant, rectify the matter.

Written complaints and appeals should be submitted to:

Dr. Robert J. Hrubes
Senior Vice-President
Scientific Certification Systems
2200 Powell Street, Suite 725
Emeryville, California, USA94608
Email: rhrubes@scscertified.com

As detailed in the *SCS-FCP Certification Manual*, investigation of the complaint or appeal will be confidentially conducted in a timely manner. As appropriate, corrective and preventive action and resolution of any deficiencies found in products or services shall be taken and documented.