

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

**Stora Enso Wood Supply Finland Group Entity**

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

**CERTIFICATION REGISTRATION NUMBER  
SCS-FM/COC-00086G**

**Submitted to:**

**Stora Enso Wood Supply Finland**

**Lead Author: Jan Attebring**

**Date of Field Audit: May 10-13, 2005**

**Date of Report: 8/30/05**

Updated: November 2006 (See Section 6.1)

Updated: November 2007 (See Section 6.2)

**Updated: September 2008 (See Section 6.3)**

**Updated October 2009 (See Section 6.4)**

**Certified: Sept 6, 2005**

**By:**

**SCIENTIFIC CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS  
2000 Powell St. Suite Number 1350  
Emeryville, CA 94608, USA  
[www.scscertified.com](http://www.scscertified.com)**

**SCS Contact:** Dave Wager, [dwager@scscertified.com](mailto:dwager@scscertified.com)

**Stora Enso Wood Supply Finland Contact:**  
Pekka Kallio-Mannila, [pekka.kallio-mannila@storaenso.com](mailto:pekka.kallio-mannila@storaenso.com)

## **FOREWORD**

Scientific Certification Systems, a certification body accredited by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), was retained by Stora Enso Wood Supply Finland to conduct a certification evaluation of its Group Entity. 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, 2005, 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 four days 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 Stora Enso Wood Supply Finland , for the management of its Group Entity . 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](http://www.scscertified.com)).

## **ORGANISATION 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.scscertified.com](http://www.scscertified.com)) no less than 30 days after issue of the certificate. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use of the Stora Enso Wood Supply Finland Group Entity.

Section A .....	4
Public Summary and Background Information .....	4
1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION.....	4
1.1 FSC Data Request.....	4
1.2 Management Context.....	5
1.2.1 Environmental Context.....	6
1.2.2 Socioeconomic Context.....	7
1.3 Forest Management Enterprise .....	7
1.3.1 Land Use.....	7
1.3.2 Land Outside Scope of Certification .....	7
1.4 Management Plan .....	7
1.4.1 Management Objectives .....	7
– Timber production (Ferraria and Fromond) without compromising other forest products, notably berries, mushroom and game, and landscape values in sensitive areas .....	7
1.4.2 Forest Composition.....	8
1.4.3 Silvicultural Systems .....	8
1.4.4 Management Systems .....	9
1.4.5 Monitoring System .....	9
1.4.6 Estimate of Maximum Sustainable Yield.....	9
1.4.7 Estimated, Current and Projected Production.....	10
2.0 Guidelines/Standards Employed.....	10
3.0 THE CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS .....	10
3.1 Assessment Dates .....	10
3.2 Assessment Team .....	10
3.2.1 Peer Reviewers .....	11
3.3 Assessment Process .....	11
3.3.1 Itinerary .....	11
3.3.2 Evaluation of Management System.....	12
3.3.3 Selection of FMU’s to Evaluate .....	12
3.3.4 Sites Visited.....	13
3.3.5 Stakeholder Consultation.....	14
3.4 Total Time Spent on audit .....	16
3.5 Process of Determining Conformance.....	16
4.2 Preconditions .....	20
5.0 Certification Decision.....	20
5.1 Certification Recommendation.....	20
5.2 Initial Corrective Action Requests .....	20
5.3 Improvement Recommendations .....	23
6.0 Surveillance evaluations .....	25

## SECTION A PUBLIC SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### 1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

#### 1.1 FSC Data Request

Applicant entity	Stora Enso Wood Supply Finland
Contact person	Mr Pekka Kallio-Mannila
Address	Talvikkitie 40 C, 01300 Vantaa
Telephone	+358-20-4624967
Fax	+358-20-4624960
E-mail	pekka.kallio-mannila@storaenso.com
Certificate Type	Group
SLIMF <i>if applicable</i>	Not Applicable
Group Members <i>if applicable</i>	3 Group Members
Number of FMU's <i>if applicable</i>	3 FMUs in scope of certificate
Number of FMUs in scope that are	
less than 100 ha in area	-
100 - 1000 ha in area	-
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	3
more than 10 000 ha in area	-
Location of certified forest area	
Latitude	Lahti 25°30' E - 25°45' E Tammisaari area 23°15' E - 23°30' E
Longitude	Lahti 60°50' N - 61°05' N Tammisaari area 59°50' N - 60°10' N
Forest zone	boreal
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	-
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:	
privately managed <sup>1</sup>	5,209 ha
state managed	-
community managed <sup>2</sup>	4,275 ha (municipal)
Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate	#
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives	977 ha
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	-

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

<sup>2</sup> 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.

Area of forest classified as 'high conservation value forest'	187 ha
List of high conservation values present <sup>3</sup>	HCV 3 (rare, threatened, or endangered ecosystems)
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	9,397 ha (includes 4,387 ha with restrictions)
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation' for the purpose of calculating the Annual Accreditation Fee (AAF)	-
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting <sup>4</sup>	ca. 4,150 ha
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration	ca. 2,350 ha
List of main commercial timber and non-timber species included in scope of certificate (botanical name and common trade name)	Main Norway spruce ( <i>Picea abies</i> ), Scots pine ( <i>Pinus sylvestris</i> ), and silver birch ( <i>Betula pendula</i> ); occasionally small quantities of aspen ( <i>Populus tremula</i> ), black alder ( <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> ), pubescent birch ( <i>Betula pubescens</i> ) and other boreal broadleaved spp.
Approximate annual allowable cut (AAC) of commercial timber	35,700 m <sup>3</sup> a <sup>-1</sup> > 90% of Norway spruce and Scots pine
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	-
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.)	Round wood

## 1.2 Management Context

Management of the Group's forests is subject to a host of local, national and European Union regulations that regulate private and municipal forestry in Finland. The principal regulations of greatest relevance to forest managers in Southern Finland are associated with the following statutes:

### ***Pertinent Regulations at the EU Level:***

Directives on protection of endangered species  
Natura 2000 Programme

### ***Pertinent Regulations at the National Level:***

Forest Law

<sup>3</sup> 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](http://www.ProForest.net)

<sup>4</sup> 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.

Urban Planning Law (Kaavoituslaki)  
Environmental Protection Law  
Treaties ratified by Finland, including CITES

***Pertinent Regulations at Local Level:***

Town plat  
City Council decisions  
Forestry Centres

***Regulatory Context for Local Regulations:***

City Council accepts budget and revenue objectives of municipal forest management. City Council decision bind the municipal forest management in the City of Lahti. Town plat is binding after acceptance by the Ministry for the Environment. Most forests of Lahti are regulated by town plat and associated legislation and not forest law. Forest law is main legislation for private forest owners. Forestry Centres monitor private forestry.

**1.2.1 Environmental Context**

The forests of Ferraria and Fromond are located in the transitional zone between Hemi Boreal and South Boreal forests. The forest of Lahti is located in the South Boreal forest zone. Wildlife habitats are typical to the region. Most notable special habitats are the landscape of small lakes, swamps and cliffs in Kuovila in Fromond's forest, which is legally protected and belongs to the Natura 2000 Programme of EU, and abundance of herb-rich, fertile forests in Lahti (ca. 8% of town's forest area). The ridge Salpausselkä that extends to the City of Lahti is a groundwater forming area of national importance. No chemicals are used in forests of Lahti, and all contractor machines are inspected for oil leakages and other potential risks before they are accepted for use in logging operations in the area.

All forests of Lahti are managed for multiple-use objectives, i.e. recreation, nature protection, timber production, and professional sports. Ski Centre of Lahti is of international importance, and skiing trails are mostly located in municipal forests. Timber production is the main management objective in Ferraria's and Fromond's forests. All forest owners respect everyman's rights to free hiking, and picking of wild berries and mushroom in their forests. Local hunters' associations have been granted hunting permits in Ferraria's and Fromond's forests.

Fromond has applied voluntarily legal protection to a 187.4 ha area in Kuovila, Ferraria for 221 ha of swamps and waterfowl areas, and Lahti ca. 300 ha in 10 different areas. Areas in Lahti are established for protection of endangered or threatened species and valuable habitats.

Three main game species are found on the Ferraria and Fromond forests: moose, white-tailed deer and roe deer. Populations of all three species are in slight increase in the region. No hunting is allowed in the forests of Lahti because of vicinity of residential areas. Game populations are low in Lahti.

## **1.2.2 Socioeconomic Context**

Forestry and forest industry sector play a very important role in Finland's economic and social spheres. The sector generates 7 % of Finland's GDP and 25% of net exports. The forest sector is the only branch which is viable and self-supporting in all rural areas of Finland.

More than 60 % of the forest land is owned by farmers and other private people. The size of private forest holdings varies from a few hectares up to some thousands hectares. About 20 % of the Finns are forest owners. The forests often play a significant role for the owner's economy. Today, many forest owners have agreements with the forest industry on the management and harvesting on their land, as well as timber sales that are out for bidding. Prices have been fairly stable and there is a good demand for forest products.

Direct employment in forestry and forest industry has decreased during the past 10-20 years. There has also been a shift in the forest companies from having their own forest workers to hiring contractors to do the logging and silviculture work. Independent of if the workers are directly employed by the forest owner or indirectly by a contractor, salaries, health program and training are applied in the same manner and according to rules and regulations.

## **1.3 Forest Management Enterprise**

### **1.3.1 Land Use**

All group members own their forests. There are no reported ownership disputes. Everyman's rights to freely hike, camp for a limited time, and pick wild berries and mushrooms prevail in Finland, and all forest owners respect them.

Hunting is practiced in Ferrara's and Fromond's properties by land owners and local hunters' association, which has received permit from landowners. In Lahti, recreational use of forests is important, as well as landscape values. Forests of Lahti are subject to town plat, and some areas may be converted to other land uses according to the plat.

All group members have voluntarily set aside valuable habitats for nature conservation.

### **1.3.2 Land Outside Scope of Certification**

No such forest areas exist.

## **1.4 Management Plan**

### **1.4.1 Management Objectives**

The objectives of forest management are:

- Timber production (Ferraria and Fromond) without compromising other forest products, notably berries, mushroom and game, and landscape values in sensitive areas
- Multiple use (Lahti) including timber production, recreation, landscaping, and nature conservation

### 1.4.2 Forest Composition

Forest composition in all three properties is typical to the South Boreal region with pine and spruce dominating on Vaccinium- and Myrtillus-type forests, respectively. Proportion of broadleaved trees is naturally low in Vaccinium-type forests, and it has been further decreased by earlier (before current Forest Law) thinnings. Silver birch is the most common deciduous tree species producing timber. In Lahti, the proportion of herb-rich, fertile forests (Oxalis-type) is higher than average. In these forests, broadleaved species are more common, and pine is almost missing. Although abundant in Lahti, these forests are set out of timber production or only limited logging is allowed because of the national importance of these sites. Some least fertile, dry sites in Fromond's and Ferraria's forest are of Calluna-type with almost exclusive natural pine dominance.

### 1.4.3 Silvicultural Systems

As has been a norm for the South Boreal zone of Finland, the forestry follows even-aged silvicultural management. Old forests at the end or past the rotation time, 80 – 120 years depending on site type, are regenerated either by seed tree cutting followed by natural seeding or clear cutting followed by direct seeding or planting using the same or another native species suitable for the site. Scots pine is preferred in Vaccinium-type and Norway spruce and silver birch in Myrtillus-type forests. Earlier, pines were often planted also in Myrtillus-type sites but none of the group members has recently planted pine on these sites because these sites are considered too fertile for Scots pine. When root rot is a consideration for spruce, birch is used to replace for old spruce forests. All group members have small areas planted for birch with spruce understorey. This two-storied system mimics the natural succession in fertile sites that are invaded by birch after a disturbance, and shade-tolerant spruce saplings grow below the birch canopy. Uneven-aged management with continuous forest cover is practiced in forests of high scenery value in Lahti.

In natural regeneration, seed trees are removed from the site after establishment of the seedling stand. Grass control may be needed in fertile sites. First thinning yields energy wood and small amounts of pulp wood. Later thinnings, typically two or three during a rotation, yield pulp wood and some sawn wood, especially in the last thinning. Rotation time is defined by culmination of mean annual increment. Growth and yield tables with rotation time and thinning recommendation are based on *ca.* 100 years of research.

Retention trees and dead wood are left on clear-cut stands. Forest law lists seven types of habitats that are especially important for biodiversity, and these are left out of forestry operations. These habitats are:

- Small waters like springs, creeks, ponds and small lakes.
- Fertile spruce-dominated peatlands.
- Fertile, herb-rich forest patches.
- Small forest in islands of mineral soil in undrained peatlands.
- Gorges.
- Cliffs and adjacent forests.

- Forests on infertile sands, cliffs etc.

#### **1.4.4 Management Systems**

Management follows the stand-based principle, i.e. the basic management unit is a forest stand. Management decisions are made based on site type, tree species composition, tree age, growth and other ecological and economic factors.

Lahti and Ferraria have professional foresters who are responsible on management planning and monitoring of forest resources. Fromond's management plan was done by the local Forestry Centre. All three forest owners have a forest service contract with Group Manager, Stora Enso Wood Supply Finland. Group members' forest management plans are included in Group manager's information system. The management plan is updated constantly according to the logging and silvicultural operations done in the forest. The contract includes marketing, contracting, logging, and monitoring. However, Finnish law prohibits exclusive marketing contracts and group members have the right to sell timber to other buyers as well. Timber amounts sold to companies other than Stora Enso are small.

The forest management plan guides operational planning that is done annually. The group members decide the annual revenue targets according to the management plan. The forest owner and timber buyer select the stands to be logged according to the management plan and field visits. Logging is planned according to this information, and silvicultural operations needed after logging are identified. After contracting the logger, the operational plan is transferred to the contractor's information system. Valuable habitats specified by Forest Law are marked both in the operational map and in the field.

#### **1.4.5 Monitoring System**

Group manager is responsible on monitoring its contractors and on all post-logging monitoring. When timber is sold to other company than Stora Enso, the group member is responsible for assuring that the logging contractor follows FSC standards. When timber is sold to Stora Enso, it contracts a logging contractor who is committed to Stora Enso's quality standards (e.g. OHSAS 18001:1999 for worker health and work safety) and FSC standard. Stora Enso is responsible on all training within the group, including workers and logging contractors. Stora Enso organises feedback meetings twice-a-year for informing group members on monitoring results. A synopsis on the feedback meetings will be made public. Forestry Centre monitors by sampling all logging and silvicultural operations in Finland. Summary of these results is public.

#### **1.4.6 Estimate of Maximum Sustainable Yield**

Maximum sustainable yield is estimated from growth and yield tables produced by the Finnish Forest Research Institute for different regions and site types of Finland based on *ca.* 100 years of research. The field data necessary for applying these tables is measured at the beginning of each forest management planning cycle, i.e. every 10 years. New technologies based on constant updating of the management plan will improve the accuracy of estimates in each individual planning unit.

In addition to the growth and yield tables of the Forest Research Institute, Ferraria has inventoried its own forests since 1920s, and has made local adjustments to the regional tables.

#### **1.4.7 Estimated, Current and Projected Production**

- a. Total allowable cut of the group is 35,700 m<sup>3</sup> a<sup>-1</sup>. Current logging is 26,000 m<sup>3</sup> a<sup>-1</sup>.
- b. Total allowable cut is based on best silvicultural practice. Real cutting volumes are smaller because of reductions made to allow more opportunities for other forest uses, and a security margin that the group members want to keep.
- c. Estimates on allowable cut are based on field inventory of forest properties, and growth and yield tables. Realised logging is based on bookkeeping of forest owners.

## **2.0 GUIDELINES/STANDARDS EMPLOYED**

The SCS Draft Interim Standard for Finland was developed by modifying the SCS' Generic Interim Standard to reflect management of Finnish forests and then incorporating relevant components of the Finnish Draft National Standard. More than one month prior to the start of the field evaluation, the Draft Interim Standard was sent out for comment to more than 30 stakeholder organizations and individuals. The resulting standard is available upon request from SCS ([www.scscertified.com](http://www.scscertified.com)).

## **3.0 THE CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS**

### **3.1 Assessment Dates**

**Pre-Certification Audit:** Stora Enso has performed internal audits of the three group members during autumn 2004.

**Certification Audit:** The SCS team performed the audit during May 10-13, 2005.

### **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.

**Team Member: Dr. Pekka Nygren.** Nygren is a forester with a background in silviculture and forest ecology. He has 17 years of research experience in forest ecology in boreal, temperate and tropical zone. He has been involved in community forest management in Finnish and EU development projects. Nygren teaches forest ecology courses at the Department of Forest Ecology of the University of Helsinki.

Degrees:

Master of Science in Forestry, University of Helsinki, Finland

Master of Science in Agroforestry, Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza (CATIE), Costa Rica

Doctor of Agriculture and Forestry, University of Helsinki, Finland

### **3.2.1 Peer Reviewers**

Dr. Sauli Valkonen, Senior Researcher with the Finnish Forest Research Institute.

## **3.3 Assessment Process**

### **3.3.1 Itinerary**

May 10, 2005

- Meeting with Stora Enso group manager in Tikkurila. Interviews.
- Travel to Tammisaari and meeting with Stora Enso Team officers and Ferraria Forest Manager. Presentation of Ferraria forest management and Stora Enso Team activities. Interviews.
- Field visit at Ferraria. Discussions and interviews.
- Stay over night in Tammisaari.

May 11, 2005

- Meeting with Elsa Fromond and Stora Enso Team officer. Presentation of Fromond estate and management ideas and objectives. Interviews.
- Field visit at Elsa Fromond's estate. Discussions and interviews.
- Travel to Lahti.
- Evening stakeholder meeting, trade union representatives, Finnish association for nature conservation representatives.
- Stay over night in Lahti.

May 12, 2005

- Meeting with Stora Enso Team in Lahti. Presentation of Stora Enso activities in Lahti area. Interviews.
- Meeting with Lahti municipality and Stora Enso Team. Presentation of Lahti municipality landscape planning. Interviews.
- Field visit in Lahti surroundings. Discussions and interviews.
- Travel to Tikkurila.
- Stay over night in Tikkurila.

May 13, 2005

- Meeting with Stora Enso group manager and Finnish FSC representative.
- Audit team synthesis and evaluation.
- Evening audit team departure.

### **3.3.2 Evaluation of Management System**

The management system was evaluated for the Group Entity and the three Group Members through:

- Meeting with the group manager and the supervisors at the team offices who were responsible for each group member.
- Review of the management system in terms of staffing, guidelines, instructions etc.
- Review of the group member planning system and current management plans
- On site inspections of operational planning and logging instructions

### **3.3.3 Selection of FMU's to Evaluate**

The audit team spent three days in the field, where a typical day included 1-2 hours of presentation and interviews at the office and 6-8 hours in the field. A couple of months before the field audit, the audit team requested forestry maps showing management units (figures), forest types, development classes and protected areas within the forest holdings. Based on the pre-information received, the audit team decided to focus the field audit on protected and set-aside areas, and sites, where operations had taken place during the past couple of years. Sites of recent operations were emphasised because silvicultural recommendations have recently been modified in Finland, and the audit team wanted to be sure that **current** forest management in the holdings follows the most recent recommendations. A list of sites where the following operations had taken place 3 years or less before the audit was requested a week before the field audit:

- Sites planned for regeneration felling
- Recent regeneration fellings
- Commercial and pre-commercial thinnings
- Regenerations, and silviculture of seedling and sapling stands

When entering to the forest holding, the audit team informed Stora Enso which sites it wanted to inspect. Further, a request to see all sites where any operation was under work during the audit days was made at that occasion. A thinning (Ferraria) and planting work (Lahti) was identified at this point.

### 3.3.4 Sites Visited

Owner and site	Description	Observations
Ferraria, Mannerheimssten	Thinning in middle-aged Vaccinium-type pine stand. The stand was pruned at an earlier stage.	Well performed thinning with good stocking after logging. Ferrara forest manager reported that they use seed trees in about 50 % of the regenerations in pine forest. He also reported that fertilisation or pesticides are not used. Interview with two machine-operators who reported on the health routines and level of training as well as the operational tools in the machines. All logging instructions can be viewed on a display in the cabin. No snags were left in the stand.
Ferraria, Skogbybruk	Areas around an old mill with "noble" broadleaves and pastures. Sheep was used for keeping the cultural landscape open. Some under-storey cleaning in the mature broadleaved stands.	Ferraria forest manager informed on the cultural history of the area with water mills and the old residential area. Management aims at keeping the area intact through a set of activities.
Ferraria, Leksvall	Cutting of seed trees. The pine stand was cut for regeneration at an earlier stage.	Retention trees were left but no snags.
Ferraria, Bomossa 267	Regeneration felling in a mixed pine-spruce stand.	Some big birch trees were left as retention and seed trees. Patches of spruce regeneration were left. Other areas will be regenerated with spruce and pine seedlings. Some swampy areas were marked on the map during planning and left after logging. No snags were left.
Fromond, Sällvik Skogsvägsbommen	Thinning in a middle-aged spruce stand.	Thinning well performed. No deciduous to leave, 100 % conifers. No snags in the stand. Across the road was a young stand which was cleaned some years before. Birch was left as main species in the lower parts of the stand due to frost risk. Some spruce regenerated under the birch storey.
Fromond, Sällvik Skalloberget	Regeneration felling in a mixed conifers-deciduous stand. Seed trees of pine and birch.	Small area opened by a storm was now under regeneration from the seed trees. Some large trees for retention but no snags.
Fromond, Sällvik "löväng"	Thinning in a middle-aged pine stand	Well performed thinning. More than 10 % deciduous in the stand. No snags left.
Fromond, Skogböle Kisakeskus	Pre-commercial thinning in a mixed birch-spruce stand	A rift with frost risk. More than 50 % deciduous after thinning. Some snow break.
Lahti, Kilpiäisten tikkametsä (woodpecker forest)	Set-aside area with mixed broadleaved multi-aged stand. Habitat for rare bird and butterfly species.	The area has been habitat for white-backed woodpecker (endangered species) and many other rare species occur. Some nearby residents views the point that there are big dead trees that might fall down and be a risk for children and others. The management only allows minor cleanings at the moment.
Lahti, Kuntokatu	Thinning in middle-aged pine stand.	Close to residential area with skiing and running tracks. School classes have visited the site to see forestry in operation. Residents have been allowed to collect fire-wood. No snags left in the stand.

<b>Owner and site</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Observations</b>
Lahti, recreational area	Area with special function around the ski stadium.	All the area around the ski stadium is managed to provide good opportunity for the competitions and exercise.
Lahti, regeneration, stand # 60009	Regeneration of birch on a slope close to road and industrial areas. Seedlings of <i>B. pendula</i> were planted.	Retention trees left but no snags. Two contract workers were doing the planting.

### 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 key stakeholders as to the applicability of the SCS interim draft standard, as modified to reflect forest management in Finland;
- to solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the Group Entity and the Group Member’s management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the company and the surrounding communities; and
- 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 contacts with the National FSC Initiative and the team’s own knowledge, lists of stakeholders from Stora Enso, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources. The following types of groups and individuals were determined to be principal stakeholders:

- Stora Enso Company employees, including head office, team office and field
- Contractors
- Members of the Finnish FSC Working Group/National Initiative
- Finnish Association for Nature Conservation
- WWF
- Lahti Residents’ Association
- Forest Centre (Government authority)

The evaluation team contacted individuals and organizations within each of these stakeholder groups. In total nine groups and individuals commented on the evaluation, either via letters, phone calls, or in-person interviews (see section 3.3.5.1 for a summary of their comments). A total of 30 number of groups and individuals were sent, via email or regular mail, a public notice describing the upcoming evaluation and were offered opportunities to solicit comments (Appendix 2). Additionally, three stakeholders were contacted via phone during the assessment, but did not return phone calls. Names of groups and individuals that commented and were willing to allow names be listed in the report, as well as those who were contacted but did not respond, are listed in Appendix 2.

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

#### Environmental groups

Comment/Concern	Response
Lahti should have a multi-function objective for the forest and plan on a landscape level	Lahti demonstrated a wide set of functions for their forest
Timber yield is dominating the management too much	The audit team did not find recent indicators on dominant role of timber production.
Nature conservation parameters are missing in the public stand records	The issue is taken up in the report
Some set-aside areas should have legal protection	Outside the scope of FSC
No participatory process in the landscape planning	Lahti has prepared an Internet function for communication on the Plan

The concern about the dominating role of timber production at expense of other forest uses in the City of Lahti seems to concern some past incidents. When the audit team requested recent, specific examples on this, the newest case mentioned (clear-cutting of a forest important for local landscape) had occurred five years ago. Lahti has a long tradition of informing and hearing people who live close to planned operations but general public has not been consulted. Hearing of all residents of the town on all operations does not seem to be a reasonable request. The new Internet site on forestry and landscape planning offers several functions for public feedback. The web site, opened in spring 2005, seems to be an excellent tool for participatory planning. Its functionality and public reception should be evaluated in forthcoming annual audits.

#### Community Groups & Local Residents

Comment/Concern	Response
Forest close to residential area should be cleaned of dead trees to avoid risks	Lahti reports that some set-aside areas need dead wood to maintain the biodiversity
Large shading trees close to houses should be removed	Lahti reports that the residents views are often conflicting

Both issues raised by community groups are controversial: there are almost as many opinions as residents. In general, the forest management of Lahti insists leaving dead trees in legally protected areas and other areas that are to be maintained as natural as possible. In other areas, dead trees are removed if the residents so request. The question of shading trees is equally controversial because some home owners want to have shade while others prefer sunny yards. Forest management of Lahti tries to follow the individual home owners' preferences adjacent to yards, but the conflicting views are not considered beyond the buffer zone around the residences.

### Employees and Contractors:

Comment/Concern	Response
No direct training in nature conservation	Stora Enso is planning for more training
The feedback from the quality control could be more organized	The issue is taken up in the report
Some concern that the set-aside rule will lead to less jobs in the forest	No comments
Some concern that the wood import from Russia will lead the less jobs in the forest	Outside the scope of FSC
Quality of regenerations and young stands is too low	The results from the quality control will be closely monitored by the audit team
The competitiveness in the industry should increase	No comments
The mechanization has led to less jobs in the forest	No comments

The most important criticism by employees and contractors concerns training and feedback on quality control. These concern are taken into account in CARs and RECs. In general, employees and contractors were quite satisfied with work conditions in Stora Enso Wood Supply Finland.

### 3.4 Total Time Spent on audit

The SCS audit team was made up of two persons, and the total time for the audit was distributed as follows:

- Field inspection, 5 man-days
- Interview with Group members 1 man-day
- Interview with stakeholders 0.8 man-days
- Interview with Group manager 2 man-days
- Preparatory work incl. Auditing documents 3 man-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

<b>Table 4.1 Notable strengths and weaknesses of the forest management enterprise relative to the principles and criteria</b>			
<b>Principle/Subject Area</b>	<b>Strengths Relative to the Standard</b>	<b>Weaknesses Relative to the Standard</b>	<b>CAR/REC #s</b>
<b>P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No known violations</li> <li>▪ Group members show good knowledge on forest and environmental law</li> <li>▪ Group manager has provided information on international treaties ratified by Finland to Group members</li> <li>▪ Strong commitment to FSC standard</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Although sufficient areas have been set aside for nature conservation, these areas must be better documented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CAR 2005.1</li> </ul>
<b>P2: Tenure &amp; Use Rights &amp; Responsibilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All group members have undisputable ownership on their forests</li> <li>▪ No known disputes on property limits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None</li> </ul>
<b>P3: Indigenous Peoples’ Rights</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Not applicable in Southern Finland</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪</li> </ul>	
<b>P4: Community Relations &amp; Workers’ Rights</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Local contractors are used for logging</li> <li>▪ Workers’ rights are respected</li> <li>▪ High standard of occupational health and work safety</li> <li>▪ Everyman’s rights respected</li> <li>▪ Apparently good community relations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ REC 2005.1</li> </ul>
<b>P5: Benefits from the Forest</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Forest management planning takes into account multiple forest functions (timber, game, scenery, recreation, etc.)</li> <li>▪ Sustainable timber harvesting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ REC 2005.2</li> </ul>

<b>Principle/Subject Area</b>	<b>Strengths Relative to the Standard</b>	<b>Weaknesses Relative to the Standard</b>	<b>CAR/REC #s</b>
<b>P6: Environmental Impact</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No use of fertilisers, herbicides, and pesticides in forest</li> <li>▪ No recent peatland drainage</li> <li>▪ Sufficient areas set aside for conservation</li> <li>▪ Selection of set aside areas is ecologically justified</li> <li>▪ Chemicals, containers, and other waste is treated according to legislation and good environmental practice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Areas with logging limitations are not yet adequately identified in forest management plan</li> <li>▪ Instructions for logging contractors on biodiversity aspects like retention trees, small valuable habitats, etc. are not specific enough</li> <li>▪ Training of machine operators and workers on these aspects is not sufficient</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ REC 2005.3 – 2005.9</li> <li>▪ CAR 2005.2 – 2005.8</li> </ul>
<b>P7: Management Plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Forest management plan in compliance with FSC standards</li> <li>▪ Good updating system of the management plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Worker training on forest management plan is not yet adequate</li> <li>▪ Internal audit routine is not yet developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ REC 2005.10 – 2005.11</li> <li>▪ CAR 2005.9 – 2005.11</li> </ul>
<b>P8: Monitoring &amp; Assessment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existing quality control system</li> <li>▪ Annual monitoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ FSC standard must be fully included in the quality control system</li> <li>▪ Feedback on monitoring results needs to be strengthened</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ REC 2005.12 – 2005.13</li> <li>▪ CAR 2005.12 – 2005.14</li> </ul>
<b>P9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forest</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Most important areas under legal protection</li> <li>▪ Areas are identified in the field</li> <li>▪ Management plans developed with Environment Centre</li> <li>▪ Monitoring of HCVF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Other than legally protected areas are not yet identified in forest management plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ REC 2005.14</li> </ul>
<b>Group Management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Contract between Group manager and Group members</li> <li>▪ Informed consent of Group members</li> <li>▪ Good record keeping</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Terms of FSC monitoring in case that a Group member sells timber to other company than Group manager (Stora Enso) is not fully defined in the contract</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CAR 2005.15 – 2005.17</li> </ul>

## 4.2 Preconditions

Preconditions are major corrective action requests that are placed on a forest management operation after the initial evaluation and before the operation is certified. Certification cannot be awarded if open preconditions exist.

No preconditions were placed on Stora Enso Group during the initial evaluation.

## 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 Stora Enso Wood Supply Finland Group Entity be awarded FSC certification as a “Well-Managed Forest” subject to the corrective action requests stated in Section 5.2. Stora Enso Wood Supply Finland Group Entity has demonstrated that their system of management is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the SCS Finnish Interim Standard are met over the forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation. Stora Enso Wood Supply Finland Group Entity 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

<b>Background/Justification:</b> While sufficient areas have been set aside for nature conservation, continuity of areas without legal protection has not been clearly defined	
<b>CAR 2005.1</b>	The contract between Stora Enso and Group members must include a statement that changes in set aside areas that result in a non-conformance with 1.6.5. will jeopardize enrollment in the FSC group.
<b>Deadline</b>	First annual audit; the contract language must be reviewed
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 1.6.5

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Prescribed burning shall be conducted in sites of low fertility. Prescribed burning is not possible in Lahti because of vicinity of residential areas and Fromond’s forests are mostly in fertile sites.	
<b>CAR 2005.2</b>	Ferraria must make preparations for fulfilling this indicator, including a plan of areas that will be burned during the next five years.
<b>Deadline</b>	The plan must be presented in the first annual audit; implementation will be evaluated in subsequent audits.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 6.2.2; Annex 6

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Leaving dead trees in harvesting operations is a new requirement in Finland, and it is followed variably.	
<b>CAR 2005.3</b>	Develop instructions and field guides regarding dead tree retention, and provide suitable training to supervisors, machine operators and workers.
<b>Deadline</b>	First annual audit; the instructions and field guides must be evaluated at that point, and evidence on training must be provided by both group management and employees and contractors
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 6.3.1

<b>Background/Justification:</b> While all Group members have placed at least 10% of their forest area outside final felling operations, these areas have not yet been clearly defined in forest management plan.	
<b>CAR 2005.4</b>	Areas designated to meet requirement 6.3.3 (10% retained from final felling) must be explicitly identified in forest management plan.
<b>Deadline</b>	First annual audit; presentation of updated forest management plans
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 6.3.3

<b>Background/Justification:</b> While all Group members have set aside more than 5% of their forest area for conservation, they have not identified, which of these are used for fulfilling the FSC indicator 6.4.1.	
<b>CAR 2005.5</b>	Areas designated to meet 6.4.1 (5% conservation area) must be identified in the forest management plan and marked on maps.
<b>Deadline</b>	First annual audit; presentation of updated forest management plans
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 6.4.1

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Unproductive forest land and wastelands are not adequately identified in forest management planning.	
<b>CAR 2005.6</b>	Unproductive forest land and wasteland must be identified in forest management plan, as well as its “naturalness”.
<b>Deadline</b>	First annual audit; presentation of updated forest management plans
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 6.4.2

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Training of contractors and machine operators on buffer zones adjacent to waters and small waters is not adequate.	
<b>CAR 2005.7</b>	Stora Enso must incorporate Indicator 6.5.2 to its instructions for operational planning, and all contractors and machine operators must be trained.
<b>Deadline</b>	First annual audit; evidence on training must be provided by both group management and contractors
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 6.5.2

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Individual Group members have limited capacity for following the rules and recommendations on chemical use in the forest.	
<b>CAR 2005.8</b>	Group manager must prepare a list of the chemicals prohibited under 6.6. and 6.6.2, including trade marks under which they are sold in Finland.
<b>Deadline</b>	First annual audit; the list must be presented in the audit
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Criterion 6.6; FSC Indicator 6.6.2

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Workers are not adequately trained on some specific items related to FSC compliant forest management planning.	
<b>CAR 2005.9</b>	Group manager must provide the necessary training to the workers as soon as possible- to be assessed at first annual audit.
<b>Deadline</b>	First annual audit; evidence on training must be provided by both group management and contractors
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 7.3.1

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Internal group audits have not yet been conducted.	
<b>CAR 2005.10</b>	Group manager must develop and implement the practice of annual internal audits.
<b>Deadline</b>	First annual audit; the routine must be reviewed by the audit team
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 7.3.2

<b>Background/Justification:</b> FSC standard requires private forest owners to make a make a summary of their management plan public; this is not customary in Finland.	
<b>CAR 2005.11</b>	Group manager must develop a report template for the use of the group members for providing the information listed under Criterion 7.1.. The group members must keep the report up to date.
<b>Deadline</b>	First annual audit; the template must be reviewed by the audit team
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 7.4.2

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Group manager's quality control system is not yet revised for FSC compliance.	
<b>CAR 2005.12</b>	Stora Enso must revise its quality control system to comply with FSC, and send the revised form to SCS.
<b>Deadline</b>	First annual audit; the template will be reviewed by the audit team
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 8.1.1

<b>Background/Justification:</b> FSC certified timber from Group members' forests will initially form only a small fraction of Stora Enso's wood supply, and it must be clearly identified as FSC timber.	
<b>CAR 2005.13</b>	Group manager must produce clear labels for wood from certified forest.
<b>Deadline</b>	First annual audit; the labels must be reviewed by the audit team
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 8.3.1

<b>Background/Justification:</b> While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring the group members' forestry operations, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.	
<b>CAR 2005.14</b>	Group manager must prepare a public summary of the monitoring results to be available upon request.
<b>Deadline</b>	First annual audit; the first public summary must be reviewed by the audit team
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 8.5.1

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Under Finnish law, Group members retain their right to sell timber to any buyer of their choice and these buyers may not have committed to FSC standards.	
<b>CAR 2005.15</b>	If a group member sells timber to others than Stora Enso, the contract must include statements that FSC standard must be followed in all operations; the statements shall be included also in bidding documents. The group members also need to be made aware that they can only sell their wood as FSC certified through Stora Enso.
<b>Deadline</b>	First annual audit; new contracts and bidding documents must be presented for evaluation by the audit team
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Group management requirement C1.c

<b>Background/Justification:</b> New members may join to the group but conditions for joining are not sufficiently specific.	
<b>CAR 2005.16</b>	A statement covering the initial internal FSC audit as a condition for joining the group must be added to the contract.
<b>Deadline</b>	First annual audit; the contract language must be reviewed
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Group management requirement C2.c

<b>Background/Justification:</b> If a member joins or leaves either the group, the Group entity shall inform the certification body within a month.	
<b>CAR 2005.17</b>	An explicit statement must be added to the contract between SEM and group members
<b>Deadline</b>	First annual audit; the contract language must be reviewed
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Group management requirement C6.a

### 5.3 Improvement Recommendations

<b>Background/Justification:</b> While hiring of seasonal or project workers is often justified, chaining of temporary contracts for <i>de facto</i> permanent work is common in the public sector in Finland.	
<b>REC 2005.1</b>	Use of temporary workers should always be justified by seasonal or project nature of the work; “chaining” of temporary contracts instead of hiring permanent workers for normal tasks should be avoided.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 4.1.3

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Capercaillie and black grouse leks are not known in the Group members’ forests. These areas, if found, require special attention in forestry operations.	
<b>REC 2005.2</b>	Leks should be constantly monitored and reported if found.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 5.5.2

<b>Background/Justification:</b> During spring and early summer timber harvesting shall be limited in valuable bird nesting habitats.	
<b>REC 2005.3</b>	Areas with seasonal logging restrictions should be marked in forest management plans.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 6.2.1

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Spruce and pine swamps shall not be harvested. None of the group members has harvested these areas.	
<b>REC 2005.4</b>	Undrained spruce and pine swamps should be indicated as restricted areas in forest management plan.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 6.3.5

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Soil scarification shall not be conducted on spruce and pine swamps and paludified depressions on mineral soil.	
<b>REC 2005.5</b>	Include these areas, esp. paludified depressions that may go unnoticed, in work instructions and forest management plan.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 6.3.8

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Large down logs and dead trees shall be preserved in soil scarification.	
<b>REC 2005.6</b>	Include this aspect in work instructions and training.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 6.3.10

<b>Background/Justification:</b> In collecting harvest slash for wood energy, the recommendations of the Forestry Development Centre Tapio shall be adhered to. In Lahti, local residents often collect slash for energy wood.	
<b>REC 2005.7</b>	Lahti should apply these recommendations even when residents are collecting slash.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 6.5.8

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Biological control methods shall be used for controlling <i>Heterobasidion annosum</i> in summer harvesting in high risk areas.	
<b>REC 2005.8</b>	Group manager should review the BCM available, and give instructions on their application.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 6.6.1.1

<b>Background/Justification:</b> While no chemicals are used in Group members' forests, seedlings for regeneration are usually pretreated in nursery.	
<b>REC 2005.9</b>	When buying seedlings, the group members should require declaration on chemicals applied to seedlings.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 6.6.3.1

<b>Background/Justification:</b> The forest management plan shall include the long-term economic, social, and ecological objectives of management, and the means of achieving them. The objectives have been verified through interviews, but are not explicitly expressed in the management plan.	
<b>REC 2005.10</b>	These objectives should be added to the management plan before the next full certificate audit.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 7.1.2.

<b>Background/Justification:</b> The Finnish FSC standard requires – at least implicitly – planning details that rather belong to operational planning.	
<b>REC 2005.11</b>	Group manager should bring to the attention of the national FCS committee that it is not always relevant to predict specific actions for whole planning period.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 7.1.4

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Forest management shall compile information on the monitoring of flora and fauna from several sources available including Forestry Development Centre, Forest Research Institute etc..	
<b>REC 2005.12</b>	Group manager should provide group members relevant information compiled from these sources.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 8.2.3

<b>Background/Justification:</b> Data shall be collected on the amount of preserved trees in harvesting and dead wood in connection to operational planning at forest holding level.	
<b>REC 2005.13</b>	Group manager should provide feedback to forest owners on the monitoring results.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 8.2.6

<b>Background/Justification:</b> The ecological values of (a) traditional and (b) cultural landscapes and (c) nationally important scenic landscapes shall be preserved in accordance with the guidelines delivered by the regional Environment Centres and/or the National Board of Antiquities.	
<b>REC 2005.14</b>	Group manager should make these guidelines available to group members.
<b>Reference</b>	FSC Indicator 9.1.2

## 6.0 SURVEILLANCE EVALUATIONS

### 6.1 2006 Annual Audit

#### 6.1.1 Assessment Dates

The 2006 annual audit took place on November 24 in Ferraria and Stora Enso Karis office.

1 man-day was spent in the field including field checks and interviews in the office. 1.5 man-days was spent on document review and report writing.

#### 6.1.2 Assessment Personnel

The audit was conducted by Dr. Jan Attebring, SCS.

#### 6.1.3 Assessment Process

The scope of the 2006 annual audit, as with all annual audits, included: document review, auditors spending time in the field and office, interviewing management personnel and, as appropriate, interacting with outside stakeholders

The site visits of the 2006 surveillance audit were conducted during November, 2006. Personnel who participated for the full-day were:

Kåre Philström, Forest Manager, Ferraria

Bengt Fagerlund, Forest Manager, Stora Enso Karis Office

Pekka Kallio-Mannila, Environmental Manager, Stora Enso Forest

For the 2006 annual audit, the Ferraria holdings was selected from the list of group members.

The sites selected and visited during the audit are described in the Table below. Mainly sites with final felling were selected as this was the first season where the practice of high stumps, retention trees, burning, etc. was in use.

Site	Description	Evaluation
Bomossa	Final felled area with soil scarification and planting of Pine and Spruce seedlings	Soil scarification and planting is well performed. Small patches with natural regeneration of Spruce and Birch are saved during the felling.
Säljmosse	Final felled area with soil scarification and planting of Pine and Spruce seedlings	Soil scarification and planting is well performed. Small patches with natural regeneration of Spruce and Birch are saved during the felling.
Ekstocksudden	Burning of final felled area	Well performed burning of clear-felled area. Several big trees that were saved during the felling died as a result of the burning.
Ingelnäs	Final felling	The operation resulted in some deep tracks in the lower parts of the area. These tracks will be repaired during the soil scarification in the summer next year. High stumps, dead trees and eternal trees were created and saved.
Vidsjön	Final felling	The area is adjacent to a set-aside area where a border zone was left intact. Several small patches of wet areas and rocks were saved during the felling. High stumps, eternal trees and dead trees were created and saved during the operation.

#### 6.1.4 Status of Corrective Action Requests

In the 2005 audit, 17 CARs were issued. These are listed below together with the actions taken by the certificate holder and the evaluation by the certifier.

<b>CAR 2005.1</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 1.6.5
The contract between Stora Enso and Group members must include a statement that changes in set aside areas that result in a non-conformance with 1.6.5. will jeopardize enrollment in the FSC group.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
The between the group manager and the group member has been revised to incorporate this issue.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The CAR is closed	

<b>CAR 2005.2</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 6.2.2; Annex 6
Ferraria must make preparations for fulfilling this indicator, including a plan of areas that will be burned during the next five years	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
One object has been burned and a plan has been established.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The CAR is closed	

<b>CAR 2005.3</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 6.3.1
Develop instructions and field guides regarding dead tree retention, and provide suitable training to supervisors, machine operators and workers.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
Field guides has been developed and a 2-days training was conducted.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The CAR is closed	

<b>CAR 2005.4</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 6.3.3
Areas designated to meet requirement 6.3.3 (10% retained from final felling) must be explicitly identified in forest management plan.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
The areas have been marked in the compartment list and on the map	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The CAR is closed	

<b>CAR 2005.5</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 6.4.1
Areas designated to meet 6.4.1 (5% conservation area) must be identified in the forest management plan and marked on maps.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
The areas have been marked in the compartment list and on the map	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The CAR is closed	

<b>CAR 2005.6</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 6.4.2
Unproductive forest land and wasteland must be identified in forest management plan, as well as its "naturalness".	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
The areas have been marked in the compartment list and on the map	

**Position in the end of this audit:** The CAR is closed

<b>CAR 2005.7</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 6.5.2
Stora Enso must incorporate Indicator 6.5.2 to its instructions for operational planning, and all contractors and machine operators must be trained.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
All contractors and machine operators took part in the 2-days training	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The CAR is closed	

<b>CAR 2005.8</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Criterion 6.6; Indicator 6.6.2
Group manager must prepare a list of the chemicals prohibited under 6.6. and 6.6.2, including trade marks under which they are sold in Finland.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
The group manager has asked the FSC committee to supply a list of prohibited chemicals, but has not got a clear answer. The group manager shall again ask the FSC committee in writing, and if the FSC committee can not answer the question, they (the committee) must take the question to FSC International.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The CAR remains open and will be reviewed again at the next audit.	

<b>CAR 2005.9</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 7.3.1
Group manager must provide the necessary training to the workers as soon as possible- to be assessed at first annual audit.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
A two-days training was held with all workers and contractors	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The CAR is closed	

<b>CAR 2005.10</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 7.3.2
Group manager must develop and implement the practice of annual internal audits.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
Forms and routines have been developed. A sample of each group member is taken every year.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The CAR is closed	

<b>CAR 2005.11</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 7.4.2
Group manager must develop a report template for the use of the group members for providing the information listed under Criterion 7.1.. The group members must keep the report up to date.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
A report template has been developed and provided to all members.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The CAR is closed.	

<b>CAR 2005.12</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 8.1.1
Stora Enso must revise its quality control system to comply with FSC, and send the revised form to SCS.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
A new form for the quality control has been developed which includes the FSC Indicators.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The CAR is closed	

<b>CAR 2005.13</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 8.3.1
Group manager must produce clear labels for wood from certified forest.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
The Change of Custody certificates (FSC and PEFC) requires only “lot” number. The “lot” number follows each truck-load from the forest to the mill gate.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The CAR is closed	

<b>CAR 2005.14</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 8.5.1
Group manager must prepare a public summary of the monitoring results to be available upon request.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
The group manager shall prepare a list of variables to be included and prepare a small paper with the monitoring results.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The results will be reviewed at the next audit.	

<b>CAR 2005.15</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Group management requirement C1.c
If a group member sells timber to others than Stora Enso, the contract, must include statements that FSC standard must be followed in all operations; the statements shall be included also in bidding documents. The group members also need to be made aware that they can only sell their wood as FSC certified through Stora Enso.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
It is included in the contract that FSC wood can only be sold to Stora Enso. It is still uncertain how a group member communicates to other buyers about the FSC rules if the timber is not sold to Stora Enso.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The results will be reviewed at the next audit.	

<b>CAR 2005.16</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Group management requirement C2.c
A statement covering the initial internal FSC audit as a condition for joining the group must be added to the contract.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
This is included in the new contract	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The CAR is closed	

<b>CAR 2005.17</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Group management requirement C6.a
An explicit statement must be added to the contract between SEM and group members	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
This is included in the new contract	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The CAR is closed	

A number of recommendations were also issued at the 2005 audit. These are listed below with the actions taken and the certifiers evaluation. Note here that the response to a recommendation is not mandatory.

<b>REC 2005.1</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 4.1.3
Use of temporary workers should always be justified by seasonal or project nature of the work; “chaining” of temporary contracts instead of hiring permanent workers for normal tasks should be avoided.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
There is no need for temporary workers.	

**Position in the end of this audit:** The recommendation is closed

<b>REC 2005.2</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 5.5.2
Leks should be constantly monitored and reported if found.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
Hunters sometimes report the observations of Capercallier leks places.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation is closed	

<b>REC 2005.3</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 6.2.1
Areas with seasonal logging restrictions should be marked in forest management plans.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
There are plans to co-operate with Bird.life to map out areas for seasonal logging.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation is closed	

<b>REC 2005.4</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 6.3.5
Undrained spruce and pine swamps should be indicated as restricted areas in forest management plan.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
All old ditches are marked on the map.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation is closed	

<b>REC 2005.5</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 6.3.8
Include these areas (spruce and pine swamps), esp. paludified depressions that may go unnoticed, in work instructions and forest management plan.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
This subject was taken up during the 2-days training.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation is closed	

<b>REC 2005.6</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 6.3.10
Large down logs and dead trees shall be preserved in soil scarification. Include this aspect in work instructions and training.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
This subject is now included in the Field Instruction.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation is closed	

<b>REC 2005.7</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 6.5.8
In collecting harvest slash for wood energy, the recommendations of the Forestry Development Centre Tapio shall be adhered to. In Lahti, local residents often collect slash for energy wood. Lahti should apply these recommendations even when residents are collecting slash.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
This recommendation will be reviewed at the annual audit of Lahti.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation remains.	

<b>REC 2005.8</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 6.6.1.1
Group manager should review the BCM available, and give instructions on their application.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
There is now good knowledge on the available BCM.	

<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation is closed
--

<b>REC 2005.9</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 6.6.3.1
When buying seedlings, the group members should require declaration on chemicals applied to seedlings.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
There is declaration on the boxes that contains the seedlings	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation is closed	

<b>REC 2005.10</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 7.1.2.
These objectives (long-term economic, social, and ecological objectives) of management should be added to the management plan before the next full certificate audit.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
The REC will be review at next full audit.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation remains	

<b>REC 2005.11</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 7.1.4
Group manager should bring to the attention of the national FCS committee that it is not always relevant to predict specific actions for whole planning period.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
The development of the Finnish FSC standard is ongoing	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The REC will be reviewed when the standard is out for review.	

<b>REC 2005.12</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 8.2.3
Group manager should provide group members relevant information compiled from these sources (monitoring of flora and fauna).	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
This work has started	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation is closed.	

<b>REC 2005.13</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 8.2.6
Group manager should provide feedback to forest owners on the monitoring results (the amount of preserved trees in harvesting and dead wood).	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
This will be included in the internal audit.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation is closed.	

<b>REC 2005.14</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 9.1.2
The ecological values of (a) traditional and (b) cultural landscapes and (c) nationally important scenic landscapes shall be preserved in accordance with the guidelines delivered by the regional Environment Centres and/or the National Board of Antiquities. Group manager should make these guidelines available to group members.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
This work has started.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation is closed.	

### **6.1.5 General Observations**

Since the last audit, there has been no significant changes in the management or in the harvesting methods.

### **6.1.6 New Corrective Action Requests and Recommendations**

No new CARs or Recommendations were issued.

### **6.1.7 General Conclusions of the Annual Audit**

Based upon information gathered through site visits, interviews, and document reviews, the SCS audit team concludes that Ferrara's management of its forest estate in Nyland County, Finland continues to be in strong overall compliance with the FSC Principles and Criteria. That is, and while there remains aspects of the management program that are deficient relative to the standard of certification, the SCS audit team has concluded from this annual audit that Stora Enso Group forest management program is in general conformance with FSC Principles 1 through 9 (Principle 10 is not applicable as Stora Enso's operations are classified as "natural forest management" under the FSC definitions). As such, continuation of the certification is warranted, subject to ongoing progress in closing out the three open CARs and subject to subsequent annual audits.

## **6.2 2007 Annual Audit**

### **6.2.1 Assessment Dates**

The 2007 annual audit took place on November 27 at Fromond Estate and Stora Enso Karis office.

1 man-day was spent in the field including field checks and interviews in the office. 1.5 man-days was spent on document review and report writing.

### **6.2.2 Assessment Personnel**

The audit was conducted by Dr. Jan Attebring, SCS.

### **6.2.3 Assessment Process**

The scope of the 2007 annual audit, as with all annual audits, included: document review, auditors spending time in the field and office, interviewing management personnel and, as appropriate, interacting with outside stakeholders

The site visits of the 2007 surveillance audit were conducted during November, 2006. Personnel who participated for the full-day were:

Elsa Fromond, Forest owner

Bengt Fagerlund, Forest Manager, Stora Enso Karis Office

Pekka Kallio-Mannila, Environmental Manager, Stora Enso Forest

Kim Österberg, Forest assistant, Fromond Estate

For the 2007 annual audit, the Fromond Estate was selected from the list of group members.

The sites selected and visited during the audit are described in the Table below. Mainly sites with final felling and thinning were selected as this was the first audit for this group member, and the practice of high stumps, retention trees, etc. was in use.

<b>Site</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
Skogböle 28	Final felled area with seed trees. Soil scarification and planting will be conducted during spring.	The site is adjacent to agricultural land, where a zone of trees (mainly hardwood) has been left. All dead and dry trees have been retained and some high stumps have been created. Well performed conservation efforts.
Skogböle 25	Final felled area with seed trees. Soil scarification (intermittent) and planting will be conducted during spring.	Groups of trees have been retained on some hilly parts of the site. In other parts of the site, dead trees have been left and some high stumps have been created. In some lower parts of the site, hardwood trees have been left. Well performed.
Skogböle 17	Thinning in middle-age Pine stand.	Well performed thinning with good stocking after thinning. Tree quality is good and there is no logging damages. Some hardwood and dead trees have been retained.
Skogböle 34	Final felled area with seed trees. Soil scarification (intermittent) and planting will be conducted during spring.	Groups of trees have been retained on some hilly parts of the site. In other parts of the site, dead trees have been left and some high stumps have been created. Well performed.
Skogböle 106	Thinning	Thinning in middle-aged Pine

		stand. Well performed with good stocking and with dead trees and hardwood retained.
Skogböle 90	Final felling	Part of the site is a habitat for the Flying squirrel, which is a protected in Finland. No cutting was done in that part of the area. In other parts of the site, groups of trees and dead trees were saved.

#### 6.2.4 Status of Corrective Action Requests

In the 2005 audit, 17 CARs were issued. After the 2006 audit, three CARs remained open. These are listed below together with the actions taken by the certificate holder and the evaluation by the certifier.

<b>CAR 2005.8</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Criterion 6.6; Indicator 6.6.2
Group manager must prepare a list of the chemicals prohibited under 6.6. and 6.6.2, including trade marks under which they are sold in Finland.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
The group manager has asked the FSC committee to supply a list of prohibited chemicals, but has not got a clear answer. The group manager shall again ask the FSC committee in writing, and if the FSC committee can not answer the question, they (the committee) must take the question to FSC International.	
2007 Audit: The FSC committee has provided a list of all chemicals prohibited according to the FSC standard and the Finnish law and regulations.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The CAR is closed.	

<b>CAR 2005.14</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 8.5.1
Group manager must prepare a public summary of the monitoring results to be available upon request.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
The group manager shall prepare a list of variables to be included and prepare a small paper with the monitoring results.	
2007 Audit: The Group manager has prepared a form for the monitoring result and Fromond has provided the figures required.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The CAR is closed.	

<b>CAR 2005.15</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Group management requirement C1.c
If a group member sells timber to others than Stora Enso, the contract, must include statements that FSC standard must be followed in all operations; the statements shall be included also in bidding documents. The group members also need to be made aware that they can only sell their wood as FSC certified	

through Stora Enso.
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>
It is included in the contract that FSC wood can only be sold to Stora Enso. It is still uncertain how a group member communicates to other buyers about the FSC rules if the timber is not sold to Stora Enso. 2007 Audit: This writing is now part of the general agreement between the Group manager and the forest owner.
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The CAR is closed.

A number of recommendations were also issued at the 2005 audit. After the 2006 audit, three of these recommendations remained. These are listed below with the actions taken and the certifiers evaluation. Note here that the response to a recommendation is not mandatory.

<b>REC 2005.7</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 6.5.8
In collecting harvest slash for wood energy, the recommendations of the Forestry Development Centre Tapio shall be adhered to. In Lahti, local residents often collect slash for energy wood. Lahti should apply these recommendations even when residents are collecting slash.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
This recommendation will be reviewed at the annual audit of Lahti.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation remains until the 2008 audit, when the audit will take place in Lahti.	

<b>REC 2005.10</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 7.1.2.
These objectives (long-term economic, social, and ecological objectives) of management should be added to the management plan before the next full certificate audit.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
The REC will be reviewed at next full audit.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation remains until 2010.	

<b>REC 2005.11</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 7.1.4
Group manager should bring to the attention of the national FSC committee that it is not always relevant to predict specific actions for whole planning period.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
The development of the Finnish FSC standard is ongoing	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The REC will be reviewed when the standard is out for review.	

### 6.2.5 General Observations

Since the last audit, there have been no significant changes in the management or in the harvesting methods.

### 6.2.6 New Corrective Action Requests and Recommendations

No new CARs or Recommendations were issued.

## **6.2.7 General Conclusions of the Annual Audit**

Based upon information gathered through site visits, interviews, and document reviews, the SCS audit team concludes that Fromond's management of its forest estate in Nyland County, Finland continues to be in strong overall compliance with the FSC Principles and Criteria. That is, and while there remains aspects of the management program that are deficient relative to the standard of certification, the SCS audit team has concluded from this annual audit that Stora Enso Group forest management program is in general conformance with FSC Principles 1 through 9 (Principle 10 is not applicable as Stora Enso's operations are classified as "natural forest management" under the FSC definitions). As such, continuation of the certification is warranted, subject to ongoing progress in closing out the open CAR and subject to subsequent annual audits.

## **6.3 2008 Annual Audit**

### **6.3.1 Assessment Dates**

The 2008 annual audit took place on August 26 at City of Lahti office.

1 man-day was spent in the field including field checks and interviews in the office. 1.5 man-days was spent on document review and report writing.

### **6.3.2 Assessment Personnel**

The audit was conducted by Dr. Jan Attebring, SCS.

### **6.3.3 Assessment Process**

The scope of the 2008 annual audit, as with all annual audits, included: document review, auditors spending time in the field and office, interviewing management personnel and, as appropriate, interacting with outside stakeholders.

The site visits of the 2008 surveillance audit were conducted during August, 2007. Personnel who participated for the full-day were:

Kari Varso, Chief Forester, City of Lahti  
Raimo Asikainen, Forester, City of Lahti  
Arto Savolainen, Stora Enso Wood Supply  
Kari Ryhänen, Stora Enso Wood Supply  
Pekka Kallio-Mannila, Environmental Manager, Stora Enso Wood Supply

For the 2008 annual audit, the City of Lahti was selected from the list of group members.

The sites selected and visited during the audit are described in the Table below. Mainly sites with final felling and thinning were selected as this was the first audit for this group member, and the practice of high stumps, retention trees, etc. was in use.

<b>Site</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
Apilakatu	Thinning in a mature Spruce stand. The stand is located close to a big road and a skiing and running track is going through the stand. The stand is affected by rot and there is a risk of wind-through close to the running track.	The stand is mature enough for regeneration felling, but due to the location close to the road, a thinning was preferred. Well performed with no damaged on the running tracks. Some high stumps left. Well performed
Apilakatu	Regeneration felling in mature Spruce stand. The stand is located close to a residential area and running and skiing tracks go through the stand.	As the stand is close to a residential area, the residents were given opportunity to view the logging plan and after discussions some parts of the stand was left untouched. Some high stumps were left and the logging residues is planned to be removed. Well performed.
Ruolanharju	Thinning and burning in a young Pine stand. The stand is located on a steep slope between a major road and a residential area. A small area was burned under strict control and there were no damaged on standing trees.	The management of the stand is well adapted to the location with light thinning and species selection. Well performed.
Ravirata	Thinning in middle-age Pine stand. Active selection of tree species with promotion of Pine, Birch and some rare hardwood species. The area is much used for recreation, so the machine operations will be guarded to prevent any incident.	Good management of the tree species mixture for biological diversity and for recreation. Good planning.
Jalkaranta	Thinning in middle age pure Pine stand. The stand is located in an area with running tracks and is used for many types of recreation like picking berries and fire wood.	Good stocking after thinning. Dead trees and hardwoods remains after thinning. Some high stumps were created. Logging residues will be removed. Well performed in a high value stand.

### 6.3.4 Status of Corrective Action Requests

In the 2005 audit, 17 CARs were issued. After the 2007 audit, no CARs remained open.

A number of recommendations were also issued at the 2005 audit. After the 2007 audit, three of these recommendations remained. These are listed below with the actions taken and the certifiers evaluation. Note here that the response to a recommendation is not mandatory.

<b>REC 2005.7</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 6.5.8
In collecting harvest slash for wood energy, the recommendations of the Forestry Development Centre Tapio shall be adhered to. In Lahti, local residents often collect slash for energy wood. Lahti should apply these recommendations even when residents are collecting slash.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
Lahti has produced a leaflet, which is distributed to all household, and describes all the rules that apply to this activity. / The recommendations from Tapio is now incorporated into the guidelines from Stora Enso regarding size etc. of the wood that can be collected.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation is closed.	

<b>REC 2005.10</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 7.1.2.
These objectives (long-term economic, social, and ecological objectives) of management should be added to the management plan before the next full certificate audit.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
The REC will be review at next full audit.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation remains till 2010.	

<b>REC 2005.11</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 7.1.4
Group manager should bring to the attention of the national FCS committee that it is not always relevant to predict specific actions for whole planning period.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
The development of the Finnish FSC standard is ongoing	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The REC will be reviewed when the standard is out for review.	

### 6.3.5 General Observations

Since the last audit, there have been no significant changes in the management or in the harvesting methods.

### 6.3.6 New Corrective Action Requests and Recommendations

No new CARs or Recommendations were issued.

### 6.3.7 General Conclusions of the Annual Audit

Based upon information gathered through site visits, interviews, and document reviews, the SCS audit team concludes that Lahti’s management of its forest estate in the City of Lahti, Finland continues to be in strong overall compliance with the FSC Principles and Criteria. That is, and while there remains aspects of the management program that are deficient relative to the standard of certification, the SCS audit team has concluded from this annual audit that Stora Enso Group forest management program is in general conformance with FSC Principles 1 through 9 (Principle 10 is not applicable as Stora Enso’s operations are classified as “natural forest management” under the FSC definitions). As such, continuation of the certification is warranted, subject to subsequent annual audits.

## 6.4 2009 Annual Audit

### 6.4.1 Assessment Dates

The 2009 annual audit took place on September 22 at Ferrara and Stora Enso Kari office.

1 man-day was spent in the field including field checks and interviews in the office. 1.5 man-days was spent on document review and report writing.

### 6.4.2 Assessment Personnel

The audit was conducted by Dr. Jan Attebring, SCS.

### 6.4.3 Assessment Process

The scope of the 2009 annual audit, as with all annual audits, included: document review, auditors spending time in the field and office, interviewing management personnel and, as appropriate, interacting with outside stakeholders.

The site visits of the 2009 surveillance audit were conducted during September, 2009. Personnel who participated for the full-day were:

Kåre Pihlström, Forest Manager, Ferrara

Bengt Fagerlund, Forest Manager, Stora Enso Karis Office

Pekka Kallio-Mannila, Environmental Manager, Stora Enso Wood Supply

For the 2009 annual audit, Ferrara was selected from the list of group members.

The sites selected and visited during the audit are described in the Table below. Mainly sites with final felling and thinning were selected as this was the first audit for this group member, and the practice of high stumps, retention trees, etc. was in use.

Site	Description	Evaluation
Mannerheims sten 414	Final felling. Adjacent to a	This area is used for

	road and a WWII memory stone. According to a site fertility criterion, recovery of slash will be performed on this site for delivery to a energy mill. Scarification has been performed which results in small piles of soil for planting.	recreation, why special concerns are taken, such as management of the war site and the use of non-radical scarification method and removal of slash. No cutting was done in some small habitats and retention trees as well as high stumps were left.
Spjutsböle 394	Regeneration. The area had been scarified and after that planted with spruce seedling. In some wet areas, natural regeneration of spruce was used. 25 trees per hectare were left as retention trees.	Scarification and planting was well performed with little damage on the vegetation cover. Birch and alder was used as retention trees and a strip of alder was left as an edge zone in the lower, wet part of the site.
Dal 192	Thinning. A pre-commercial thinning in a 10-12 years old mixed pine-birch stand. There has been some damages by Mouse on the pine, why the share of birch will be at least 50 percent after the thinning.	There has been some losses of pine trees, but there is plenty of birch to fill the gaps and produce a well-stocked stand after the thinning.
Rödjeträsk 181+182	Final felling. The area is a slope with a small creek at the bottom, which is partly improved through ditching. The part of the stand along the creek was left un-touched with old spruce trees.	Well performed nature conservation with retention trees and a zone along the small creek. Some char-cooling sites were marked with high stumps around as protection.
Ingelnäs 200	Final felling. In the 6.3 ha clear-felled area, 39 hardwoods, 35 conifers, 34 dead and 30 small trees were left, where most of the hardwood were concentrated to some wet areas within the stand. In some areas, shelter is used to promote the natural regeneration of spruce.	Well performed nature conservation with both retention trees and dead trees left, both scattered and in groups in the wet parts of the site.

#### 6.4.4 Status of Corrective Action Requests

In the 2005 audit, 17 CARs were issued. After the 2009 audit, no CARs remained open.

A number of recommendations were also issued at the 2005 audit. After the 2009 audit, two of these recommendations remained. These are listed below with the actions taken and the certifiers' evaluation. Note here that the response to a recommendation is not mandatory.

<b>REC 2005.10</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 7.1.2.
These objectives (long-term economic, social, and ecological objectives) of management should be added to the management plan before the next full certificate audit.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
The REC will be review at next full audit.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation will be reviewed during the 2010 recertification	

<b>REC 2005.11</b>	<b>Reference:</b> Indicator 7.1.4
Group manager should bring to the attention of the national FCS committee that it is not always relevant to predict specific actions for whole planning period.	
<b>Action Taken By Company/Auditor Comments</b>	
The development of the Finnish FSC standard has been finalized. Indicator 7.1.4 will be assessed during the 2010 reassessment when new planning documents are available.	
<b>Position in the end of this audit:</b> The recommendation will be reviewed during the 2010 recertification	

#### 6.4.6 New Corrective Action Requests and Recommendations

No new CARs or Recommendations were issued.

#### 6.4.7 General Conclusions of the Annual Audit

Based upon information gathered through site visits, interviews, and document reviews, the SCS audit team concludes that Lahti's management of its forest estate in the City of Lahti, Finland continues to be in strong overall compliance with the FSC Principles and Criteria. That is, and while there remains aspects of the management program that are deficient relative to the standard of certification, the SCS audit team has concluded from this annual audit that Stora Enso Group forest management program is in general conformance with FSC Principles 1 through 9 (Principle 10 is not applicable as Stora Enso's operations are classified as "natural forest management" under the FSC definitions). As such, continuation of the certification is warranted, subject to subsequent annual audits.