

FOREST MANAGEMENT CERTIFICATION REPORT**SECTION A: PUBLIC SUMMARY**

Project Nr:	6847-GB		
Client:	Smiths Gore		
Web Page:	www.smithsgore.co.uk		
Address:	Smiths Gore, Haddington House, 28 Sidegate, Haddington, near Edinburgh, EH41 4BU		
Country:	UK – Scotland and England		
Certificate Nr.	SGS-FM/COC-003104	Certificate Type:	Group Forest Management
Date of Issue	4 March 2007	Date of expiry:	3 March 2012
Forest Zone:	Boreal/Temperate		
Total Certified Area	7,931 ha		
Scope:	Forest Management of the Smiths Gore group of forests & plantations in the UK for the production of softwood & hardwood timber.		
Company Contact Person:	Andrew Greathead, Head of Woodland & Arboriculture Department		
Address:	Smiths Gore, Haddington House, 28 Sidegate, Haddington, near Edinburgh, EH41 4BU		
Tel:	0044-(0)-1620-828979		
Fax	n/a		
Email:	andy.greathead@smithsgore.co.uk		
Evaluation dates:			
Main Evaluation	23,24 November 2006		
Surveillance 1	24,25 February 2009		
Surveillance 2	09 February, 31 March 2010		
Surveillance 3	22 Jul & 09 Sep 2010		
Surveillance 4			

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	SCOPE OF CERTIFICATE	5
2.	COMPANY BACKGROUND	10
2.1	Ownership	10
2.2	Company Key Objectives	10
2.3	Company History	10
2.4	Organisational Structure	11
2.5	Ownership and Use Rights	11
2.6	Other Land Uses	11
2.7	Non-certified Forests	11
3.	Group Management.....	12
3.1	Group Management System.....	12
3.2	Membership of the Group.....	12
3.3	Monitoring of Group Members	12
4.	FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	12
4.1	Bio-physical setting	12
4.2	History of use.....	13
4.3	Planning process	14
4.4	Harvest and regeneration	14
4.5	Monitoring processes	15
5.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT	15
5.1	Social aspects.....	15
5.2	Environmental aspects.....	16
5.3	Administration, Legislation and Guidelines	17
6.	CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT, HARVESTING, SILVICULTURE AND MONITORING	19
7.	PREPARATION FOR THE EVALUATION.....	19
7.1	Schedule.....	19
7.2	Team	19
7.3	Checklist Preparation	20
7.4	Stakeholder notification	20
8.	THE EVALUATION.....	20
8.1	Opening meeting.....	20
8.2	Document review	21
8.3	Sampling and Evaluation Approach.....	21
8.4	Field assessments	21
8.5	Stakeholder interviews	21
8.6	Summing up and closing meeting	22
9.	EVALUATION RESULTS	22


9.1	Findings related to the general QUALIFOR Programme.....	22
	PRINCIPLE 1: Compliance with law and FSC Principles.....	22
	PRINCIPLE 2: Tenure and use rights and responsibilities.....	24
	PRINCIPLE 3: Indigenous peoples' rights.....	25
	PRINCIPLE 4: Community relations and workers rights.....	25
	PRINCIPLE 5: Benefits from the forest.....	27
	PRINCIPLE 6: Environmental impact	28
	PRINCIPLE 7: Management plan	30
	PRINCIPLE 8: Monitoring and evaluation	31
	PRINCIPLE 9: High Conservation Value Forests	32
	PRINCIPLE 10: Plantations.....	32
10.	CERTIFICATION DECISION	34
11.	MAINTENANCE OF CERTIFICATION.....	34
12.	RECORD OF CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS (CARs)	36
13.	RECORD OF OBSERVATIONS	53
14.	RECORD OF STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS AND INTERVIEWS	65
15.	RECORD OF COMPLAINTS	67

ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS (not part of the Public Summary)

AD 20:	Evaluation Itinerary
AD 21:	Attendance Record
AD 26:	Corrective Action Requests
AD 36-B:	Evaluation – Observations and Information on Logistics
AD 36-C:	Evaluation – Information on Group Members
AD 38:	Peer Review Report
AD 40:	Stakeholder Reports
	Evaluation team CV's
	List of stakeholders contacted

Complaints and Disputes

Procedures for submitting complaints, appeals and disputes, and the SGS processing of such are published on www.sgs.com/forestry. This information is also available on request – refer SGS contact details on the first page.



INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the evaluation was to evaluate the operations of Smiths Gore against the requirements of the QUALIFOR Programme, the SGS Group's forest certification programme accredited by the Forest Stewardship Council.

1. SCOPE OF CERTIFICATE

The scope of the certificate falls within the Boreal/Temperate/ Forest Zones and includes 22 Group Members as described below.

Description of FMUs:				
Description	Ownership	Area (ha)	Longitude E/W	Latitude N/S
<p>Edinburgh Head Office, Central Scotland</p> <p>All the following FMUs are mixed estate woodlands or conifer plantations.</p> <p>Resource = Resource Managed and certified by Smiths Gore's Scheme</p> <p>Group = Group Member with own management but certified by Smiths Gore's Scheme</p>	Smiths Gore		3° 18' West	55° 59' North
				Location given is for the Smiths Gore head office. Other locations available on request.
Lochnabo, near Elgin, Morayshire (Resource)	Sir Iain Tennant	385		
Innes Estate, near Elgin, Morayshire (Resource)	Mark Tennant	138		
Pitgaveny, near Elgin, Morayshire (Resource)	A.A. Dunbar	611		
Fyvie, near Keith, Aberdeenshire (Resource)	Sir G Forbes-Leith	473		
Ballogie Estate, Aboyne, Aberdeenshire (Group)	Ballogie Trust	1,635		
Pluscarden, near Elgin, Morayshire (Group)	Gordon Woodlands	546		
Duthil, Strathspey, Inverness-shire (Group)	Gordon Woodlands	197		
Ben Newe, Strathdon, Aberdeenshire (Group)	Gordon Woodlands	525		
Brerachan & Kinnaird, near Pitlochry, Perthshire (Group)	Gordon Woodlands	406		
Arniston, Gorebridge, Midlothian (Resource)	Mrs A. Dundas-Bekker	356		
Glenormiston, near Peebles, Scottish Borders (Resource)	Executors for Glenormiston	73		

Description of FMUs:				
Description	Ownership	Area (ha)	Longitude E/W	Latitude N/S
	Estate			
Penicuik Estate, Penicuik, Midlothian (Resource)	Sir Robert Clerk	332		
Ravenswood, near Melrose, Scottish Borders (Resource)	William Younger	30		
Arkleton, near Dumfries, Dumfries & Galloway (Resource)	John Higgs Farms	146		
Blackwood, Auldgirth, Dumfries & Galloway (Resource)	D.C. Matthews	369		
Capenoch, near Thornhill, Dumfries & Galloway (Resource)	R.H. Gladstone	430		
Kirtleside, Laurieston, Dumfries & Galloway (Resource)	Sir I. Johnson-Ferguson	163		
Knocknalling, near St.John's Town of Dalry, Dumfries & Galloway (Resource)	Knocknalling Farms	72		
Lincluden, Shawhead, Dumfries & Galloway (Resource)	H. Keswick	353		
Crochmore & Grove, near Dumfries, Dumfries & Galloway (Resource)	B.J.K. Weatherall	95		
Chillington, Brewood, Staffordshire (Resource)	J.W. Giffard	310		
Pickering Estate, Pickering, Yorkshire (Resource)	Duchy of Lancaster	286		

Size of FMUs:		
	Nr of FMUs	Area (ha)
Less than 100ha	4	270
100 to 1000 ha in area	17	6,026
1001 to 10000 ha in area	1	1,635
More than 10000 ha in area		
Total	31	7,931

Total Area in the Scope of the Certificate that is:	
	Area (ha)
Privately managed	7,931
State Managed	
Community Managed	

Composition of the Certified Forest(s)	
	Area (ha)

Composition of the Certified Forest(s)	
	Area (ha)
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives (In the vast majority of cases, a minority proportion of each FMU is managed primarily for conservation objectives)	1,025
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for production of NTFPs or services	0
Area of forest classified as "high conservation value forest"	0*
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	6,906
Area of production forest classified as "plantation"	6,906
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting (Normally 100% of conifer and 50% of broadleaved areas)	
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration (Normally 50% of broadleaved areas)	

List of High Conservation Values	
Description	Notes
There are European (e.g. Special Area of Conservation – SAC) or UK (e.g. Site of Special Scientific Interest – SSSI) conservation designations in some of the forests under application for certification. There are also areas of Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland. 'Ancient' = established woodland in continuous existence since before 1600 in England and 1750 in Scotland. There are also areas of PAWS which will be restored to ASNW. PAWS = Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites.	Included* within the area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives. 1,025 ha

Annual Timber Production				
Species (botanical name)	Species (common name)	Area (ha)	Maximum Annual Sustainable Yield (m ³)	
			Projected	Actual
<i>Picea sitchensis</i>	Sitka spruce (40%)			
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	Scots Pine (40%)			
<i>Picea abies</i> , <i>Pinus contorta</i> , <i>Pinus nigra</i> , <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> , <i>Larix spp.</i> , <i>Quercus spp.</i> , <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> , <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> , <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> , <i>Prunus avium</i> , <i>Betula spp.</i>	Mixed conifers- mainly Norway spruce, Lodgepole pine, Corsican Pine, Douglas Fir, Larches. (19%) Mixed Broadleaves (1%) inc. Oaks, Beech, Ash, Sycamore, Wild Cherry, Birches			
Totals		6,906	Average Yield Class 10 m3 p.ha per year Re. annual allowable cut - Individual forests are thinned and felled to UK yield model guidelines which aim to fell at age of maximum mean annual increment.	13,122 m3 (2005) 24,213 m3 (2006)

List of Timber Product Categories				
Product Class	Product Type	Trade Name	Category	Species (inc. potential)
Wood in the rough	Logs of coniferous wood	Sawlogs	Conifer	<i>Larix europaea</i> , <i>Larix leptolepis</i> , <i>Larix x eurolepis</i> , <i>Picea abies</i> , <i>Picea sitchensis</i> , <i>Pinus contorta</i> , <i>Pinus sylvestris</i> , <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> , <i>Taxus baccata</i> , <i>Thuja plicata</i> , <i>Tsuga heterophylla</i> .
Wood in the rough	Logs of coniferous wood	Fencing	Conifer	<i>Larix europaea</i> , <i>Larix leptolepis</i> , <i>Larix x eurolepis</i> , <i>Picea abies</i> , <i>Picea sitchensis</i> , <i>Pinus contorta</i> , <i>Pinus sylvestris</i> , <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> , <i>Thuja plicata</i> , <i>Tsuga heterophylla</i> .
Wood in the rough	Logs of coniferous wood	OSB / MDF Chip	Conifer	<i>Larix europaea</i> , <i>Larix leptolepis</i> , <i>Larix x eurolepis</i> , <i>Picea abies</i> , <i>Picea sitchensis</i> , <i>Pinus contorta</i> , <i>Pinus sylvestris</i> , <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> , <i>Thuja plicata</i> , <i>Tsuga heterophylla</i> .
Wood in the rough	Logs of coniferous wood	Pulp	Conifer	<i>Picea abies</i> , <i>Picea sitchensis</i> .
Wood in the rough	Logs of coniferous wood	Fuel / Firewood	Conifer	<i>Larix europaea</i> , <i>Larix leptolepis</i> , <i>Larix x eurolepis</i> , <i>Picea abies</i> , <i>Picea sitchensis</i> , <i>Pinus contorta</i> , <i>Pinus sylvestris</i> , <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> , <i>Thuja plicata</i> , <i>Tsuga heterophylla</i> .
Other products of wood	Residue of coniferous wood	Baled brash	Conifer	<i>Picea abies</i> , <i>Picea sitchensis</i> , <i>Pinus contorta</i> , <i>Pinus sylvestris</i> , <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> , <i>Thuja plicata</i> , <i>Tsuga heterophylla</i> .
Other products of wood	Residue of coniferous wood	Stumps	Conifer	<i>Larix europaea</i> , <i>Larix leptolepis</i> , <i>Larix x</i>

List of Timber Product Categories				
Product Class	Product Type	Trade Name	Category	Species (inc. potential)
				<i>eurolepis, Picea abies, Picea sitchensis, Pinus contorta, Pinus sylvestris, Pseudotsuga menziesii, Thuja plicata, Tsuga heterophylla.</i>
Wood in the rough	Logs of deciduous broadleaves	Sawlogs	Deciduous (Hardwood)	<i>Acer platanoides, Acer pseudoplatanus, Alnus glutinosa, Betula pendula, Betula pubescens, Carpinus betulus, Fagus sylvatica, Fraxinus excelsior, Juglans regia, Prunus avium, Quercus robur, Quercus petraea, Ulmus glabra.</i>
Wood in the rough	Logs of deciduous broadleaves	Fuel / Firewood	Deciduous (Hardwood)	<i>Acer platanoides, Acer pseudoplatanus, Alnus glutinosa, Betula pendula, Betula pubescens, Carpinus betulus, Fagus sylvatica, Fraxinus excelsior, Juglans regia, Prunus avium, Quercus robur, Quercus petraea, Ulmus glabra.</i>
Wood in the rough	Logs of deciduous broadleaves	Coppice	Deciduous (Hardwood)	<i>Corylus avellana</i>

Approximate Annual Commercial Production of Non-Timber-Forest-Products				
Product	Species		Unit of measure	Total units
	Botanical Name	Common Name)		
Not applicable				

[illegible]

2. COMPANY BACKGROUND

2.1 Ownership

Smiths Gore is privately owned by its partners. It aims to progressively manage more woodland via acquisition by its existing clients and business appointments by new clients.

2.2 Company Key Objectives

Objective	Notes
Commercial	
Primarily, profitable timber sales, cost effective restocking and increase in capital value of forest properties managed by the company. Other commercial income will be taken where opportunities arise, e.g. Arboricultural consultancy & management inc. tree safety surveys.	Smiths Gore manages commercial woodland on behalf of its traditional estate and investment clients in order to maximise the commercial return from the woodlands consistent with sustainable forestry principles.
Social	
Employee and contractor skill base to facilitate the primary commercial objective.	Smiths Gore is a medium sized company employer. Both employees and contractors are engaged in forest management operations. Forest Managers, Land Agents and Administrative staff closely involved with forestry total approx.10. Many more contractors are employed with a variety of different skills.
Environmental	
Legal and FSC compliance to facilitate the primary commercial objective plus reinforce the company's reputation and credentials.	Environmental management provides a firm foundation for continuous improvements of environmental performance, as well as to an open dialogue with stakeholders. Environmental management procedures implemented throughout all operations follow a holistic approach, enable synergy effects and improve both environmental performance and the credibility of Smiths Gore.

2.3 Company History

Smiths Gore is a modern, multi-disciplined firm of property consultants with offices in key locations throughout the UK and associates in the USA, the Caribbean and the Far East. Building on over 150 years experience of property management, looking after some of the country's most important landed estates, they now have a range of professional specialists offering a complete service for property of all types.

Since 1847 rural property has traditionally formed the core of their business. Estate management, forestry, sporting and farm management are key skills. Complementary services in commercial property investment, planning and development, architecture and building surveying, sales, lettings and acquisitions, minerals and telecommunications have developed rapidly over recent years, and cover the full spectrum of rural and urban property. The Firm has a network of some 20 offices throughout the United Kingdom.

Woodland and Arboriculture Department - Within Smiths Gore, the Woodland and Arboriculture Department has evolved from the Firm's traditional association with rural estate management and now manages and advises on more than 40,000 hectares of multi-purpose, multi-benefit woodlands.

Their advice operates on a number of levels – from identifying initial purchase opportunities to the more practical day-to-day management of operations. At a strategic level, they undertake reviews of existing woodlands, prepare management policies for their development and source appropriate supporting advice and partnerships. On a practical basis they take an active role in the management of woodlands, advising on planting, harvesting and timber marketing in the short, medium and long term. Their knowledge of the commercial forestry market enables them to advise clients on the most suitable timings and methods of buying and selling woodland investments. In conjunction with a client's other professional advisers they develop tax-efficient and flexible programmes to maximise the potential of woodland assets.

As the forestry marketplace develops so have the services of the Woodland and Arboriculture Department which also provides tree surveys, forest certification, biomass and renewables as some of the new areas of expertise being developed along with the more traditional woodland management roles.

2.4 Organisational Structure

Smiths Gore is a Partnership of Chartered Surveyors whose **Woodland and Arboriculture Department** provides services to traditional estate owners and investment forestry owners. It has a Head of Department and several senior forestry managers plus Land Agent Partners with responsibility for forestry. Forest operations are carried out by contractors and estate staff on instruction by the Department's forestry managers.

The Woodland and Arboriculture Department consists of five full time forestry managers and one part time assistant based at the Firm's offices in Fochabers, Edinburgh and Lichfield. Generally a land agent has been appointed at each of the Firm's offices, where there is not a forestry specialist, to be the forestry contact. Back up to the land agent is provided as required by the Woodland and Arboriculture Department.

2.5 Ownership and Use Rights

Woodland owners/ investors can be either individuals or partnerships or companies. All the woodlands are privately owned with associated UK legal property rights.

The general public have public access rights consistent with owners' discretion but underpinned by statute law and access codes, e.g. Countryside Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW) / Countryside Code 2004 in England & Wales and the Land Reform (Scotland) Act in 2003 / The "Scottish Outdoor Access Code 2004.

2.6 Other Land Uses

Only forest related activities, including deer stalking for control of deer grazing, take place on most, if not all, of the managed properties at present.

2.7 Non-certified Forests

Non certified forests were fully disclosed and discussed with the managers (a list of 27 properties throughout Scotland and England totalling 3,507 ha is on SGS Qualifor files and is available if required). They are in the main mixed woodlands within traditional estates which are not yet timber producing on a significant scale. All are managed by the same Smiths Gore forestry managers and are subject to Forestry Commission guidelines and monitoring. The Head of Department has managerial responsibility for these properties plus the managers involved are also managing the certified properties. They liaise closely and are clear that any timber production from non-certified forests has to be managed separately from certified timber.

3. GROUP MANAGEMENT

3.1 Group Management System

The degree of management control held by Smiths Gore over client's woodlands varies. For some clients Smiths Gore retains full day-to-day management control over the forest activities on the owner's behalf, in which cases Smiths Gore acts as the "resource manager".

In other cases, part or all of the forest management control is retained by the owner/owner's forest manager or agent, whilst Smiths Gore may be responsible for only certain elements of the forest activity. In these situations, in the context of the Smiths Gore Certification Scheme, the forest owner acts a Group Member whilst Smiths Gore acts as a Group Manager providing a co-ordinating and monitoring role.

Within the context of the Group Scheme, Smiths Gore is therefore both a Resource Manager (for clients and forest areas where it retains full management control) and a Group Manager (where part of the management control remains with the woodland owner).

3.2 Membership of the Group

The Smiths Gore Group Scheme is open to all woodland owners including non-Smiths Gore managed properties who wish to benefit from membership of the group.

Whilst it is not mandatory for all Smiths Gore clients to join the Scheme, Smiths Gore has a policy of encouraging all other non-member clients (for whom the firm has a forest management remit) that their woodlands should be managed in a spirit of compliance with the UK Forestry Standard, the UK Woodland Assurance Standard (UKWAS) and thus in accordance with FSC principles.

Smiths Gore itself does not own woodland, but manages woodlands and forests on behalf of a wide range of clients or their agents. The Firm has therefore set up a group certification scheme to allow its clients to gain certified status should they wish to, and to satisfy steadily increasing demand for raw material from certified forests.

There are at present 22 separate forest properties with a total forest area of 7,931 hectares within the scope of the scheme. 17 of these units are managed by Smiths Gore acting as Resource Manager, the other five as Group Manager.

3.3 Monitoring of Group Members

The Head of the Department acts as overall Group Scheme Manager with responsibility for administration and control of the scheme. Each member's woodland area is in turn the responsibility of one of the Smiths Gore forest managers acting either in the capacity of Resource Manager or Group Manager. This forest manager is also responsible for assessing the readiness of prospective members to join the scheme.

The Group Scheme Manager, assisted by his supporting Group Managers where appropriate, conducts membership entry assessments with systematic identification of any gaps against UKWAS compliance and internal surveillance follow up and monitoring thereafter. The system includes a range of controlled documents to record and manage this process.

4. FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

4.1 Bio-physical setting

Britain has a relatively poor native tree flora of 32 species, including only 3 conifers. In addition, many exotic species have been introduced since Roman times, with large numbers of exotic conifer species introduced for commercial forestry purposes during the twentieth century.

Approximately 10% of Britain's land area carries tree cover (15% of Scotland, compared to 7% in England). This is an increase since the beginning of the 20th century, when forest cover stood at approximately 5%. However, this increase is composed predominantly of recent plantation forests, largely with exotic species. The UK has no remaining natural forests, but ancient semi-natural woodlands (ASNW) make up approximately 1% of land area. Since 1945 almost 50% of ancient semi-natural woodland has disappeared.

Large areas of degraded upland areas have been established during the last 50 years as even aged plantations of exotic species such as Sitka Spruce (*Picea sitchensis*), Lodgepole Pine (*Pinus contorta*) and Larch (*Larix* spp). Other exotics managed are Norway Spruce (*Picea abies*), Douglas Fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), true firs (*Abies* spp.), Western Hemlock (*Tsuga heterophylla*).

Geography:

The Group Scheme woodlands are distributed widely throughout the UK, ranging from the far north of Scotland to the English Midlands. Topography and geological origin are therefore wide and varied.

Ecology:

Similarly, climatic and biome/natural vegetation classification are also wide and varied. Given the UK's location on the western seaboard of Europe, quite frequently the climate is can be exposed. Vegetation types range from heather moorland to low altitude rough grassland.

Soils:

Smiths Gore's group scheme woodlands are located throughout the UK, often on upper ground of lower value to agriculture but also within an agricultural matrix for mixed estates. Soils tend to be either thin or poorly drained. Predominant soil types are podsols, gleys and peaty gleys with occasional brown forest soils.

4.2 History of use

Britain's forests have been steadily denuded since the Bronze Age through both clearance and use of timber. As a result, by the beginning of the twentieth century very little forest remained. In response to this, the Forestry Commission was established in 1919 with the aims of establishing and maintaining adequate reserves of trees and production of timber, and of promoting the interests of British forestry.

The Forestry Commission had an active policy of reforestation, particularly from 1945 onwards, acquiring land and planting it mainly with exotic plantation species. In addition, it was also responsible for providing incentives for private forestry, aided in the 1970s and 1980s by tax advantages. This resulted in the planting of predominantly exotic plantations in both the public and private sector.

By the 1980s there was increasing concern about wider forest goods and services, in particular landscape, recreation and biodiversity. As a result, incentives have been increasingly slanted towards encouraging multiple use forestry and increasing use of native species.

The Forestry Commission is represented by a Policy and Practice unit (previously the Forestry Authority) covering Great Britain with three national organisations in Scotland, Wales and England that are responsible for regulating forestry and providing grant aid to private owners. In Northern Ireland similar responsibilities are held by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture & Rural Development for Northern Ireland (DARDNI).

Approximately two-thirds of the UK's woodland resource is privately owned, often as part of mixed estates or farms. Few private ownerships exceed 1000 ha. Most commercial private forestry is based on plantations. In recent decades, plantation crops of broadleaves or conifers have been established on many ancient woodland sites.

Management for timber production is not always the main objective of privately owned woodlands: management for game is common on mixed estates, and an increasing number of woods are managed specifically for recreation and conservation. Timber production is considered important in larger estates and company owned forests. Biodiversity and landscape conservation and recreational use are now almost always included as multiple objectives in management planning.

Smiths Gore manages woodlands for a variety of objectives, according to the owner's priorities and the type of property. Timber production and financial profit are usually important objectives, but the conservation of rare species and habitats is also a requirement of management, especially where there are nature conservation designations.

Adjacent land uses consist mainly of farming, including hill farming through lower ground pasture to arable on the most fertile soils. Within this mix of farming and forestry, game management for the stalking of deer and shooting of game birds often takes place. The vast majority of woodland is located squarely in a rural environment and close proximity to the main urban areas is rare. Adjacent

communities are therefore almost always small rural towns and villages with a scattering of individual houses throughout the wider countryside.

4.3 Planning process

Permission from the Forestry Commission is required for the felling of all trees in Great Britain (with certain limited exceptions). The FC regulates felling in private woodlands by granting a licence, approving a plan associated with a grant scheme (generally a type of Woodland Grant Scheme, WGS or new devolved country variants) or approving a long-term forest design plan for larger forests. Most planting (and re-establishment through natural regeneration) on private land takes place with the assistance of grants made by the Forestry Commission.

Woodland Grant Scheme contracts identify overall management objectives and include a basic schedule of operations, describing the management activities planned over a 5-year period. Prescriptions are described in general terms for compartments. These documents often form the basis for the management plan.

Environmental Impact Assessments are used to assess large scale (+100 hectares) afforestation proposals where required by the Forestry Commission. Thinning is regulated by either a Felling Licence (subject to Forestry Act 1967) or a WGS type contract.

All properties within the Smiths Gore certification scheme will have management plans that are reviewed every five years. In addition, many woodlands (or part of woodlands) are the subject of Forestry Commission WGS contracts, which may give an outline of planned management operations for a 5 year period (including felling, thinning, new planting and restocking by replanting or by natural regeneration). Increasing use is made of 'Long Term Forest Plans' which are FC contracts to give longer approval for felling and restocking operations, giving 10 years in detail and a further 10 years in outline approval, i.e. a 20 year projection which is consistent with the requirements of the UKWAS.

All Smiths Gore managed woodlands have property files which monitor both forest operations and financial performance.

4.4 Harvest and regeneration

Clear felling followed by restocking by planting is the method generally employed for upland plantation management in Great Britain. Felling coupe size and shape are expected to comply with Forest Landscape Design Guidelines. Irregular systems and natural regeneration are increasingly used in ASNWs.

Motor-manual and mechanical whole tree, tree length and short wood harvesting systems with a variety of extraction methods including skidding, forwarding and cable crane may be utilised depending on site conditions and topography. Mechanical harvester felling followed by mechanical forwarder extraction is now the norm for most UK conditions.

In general, the aim, for commercial areas, is to grow crops to age of Maximum Mean Annual Increment (Max MAI) and then to fell. However, restructuring and the establishment of retentions as part of an agreed forest design plan or WGS type contract may involve felling at ages other than Max MAI. Smiths Gore managers use local experience or mensuration techniques to assess yield forecast of thinning or felling before harvesting.

Smiths Gore employs a range of silvicultural practices, including clearfelling and thinning plus retention of trees beyond economic rotation age where required for conservation objectives under the UKWAS. Continuous cover forestry systems are being used in semi-natural woodlands and are also being tried experimentally in windfirm conifer plantations.

Restocking and afforestation in the UK is generally by planting. Natural regeneration is employed where realistic and is used more frequently for semi-natural woodland. Ground preparation is often carried out using mounding or scarification. Insect attack and weed competition are mitigated by such ground preparation techniques and choice of plant size. Use of chemical insecticides and herbicides are used when required if there is no realistic alternative not entailing excessive cost. Smiths Gore has a general policy aim to reduce chemical use in this context. Burning of lop and top following felling is much less common but may be justified on some sites, e.g. for rabbit control.

In the UK the building of new forest roads and quarrying for such roads is governed by Environmental Impact Assessment regulations. This process is administered by the Forestry Commission and it is a process with which the forestry managers are familiar.

Fencing is sometimes necessary to protect against stock, deer and rabbits, coupled with control of game and pest species by shooting.

Afforestation of new native woodlands on semi-natural degraded sites usually involves direct notch planting with minimum ground preparation and maintenance.

Most operations are undertaken by contractors with supervision by the forestry managers. Some of the traditional estates still maintain small forestry labour forces with similar involvement by the forestry managers or owners with experience of forest management.

The age-class distribution of each FMU will be available from data contained within the Management Plan.

4.5 Monitoring processes

Where a woodland is subject to a WGS type contract, implementation of the prescribed management is checked by the Forestry Commission at a sample of sites. Other monitoring may be carried out on an ad hoc basis by statutory bodies or conservation NGOs where there are particular features of interest.

Regular visits are made to all properties and to vulnerable, sensitive and working sites by Smiths Gore forestry managers. Risk assessment procedures will be followed as required for safe working practice and adherence to recognised environmental guidelines as published by the FC. Records are maintained of site visits, operations undertaken and production. Monitoring results will be fed into Management Plan revisions, which normally take place every 5 years.

5. SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT

5.1 Social aspects

Number of own workers inc. managers	10	
Number of contract workers	Variable	
Minimum daily wage for agricultural/forestry workers	> UK min. wage	
Infant mortality rates (under 5 years)	Very low	
Proportion of workers employed from the local population (%)	Variable & low. Local people are being employed, but there are not that many that need to be employed from the local population for the scale of work concerned. It involves contractors & machinery as required. Local employment is appropriate for scale and intensity of operations.	

The social conditions in the main commercially productive conifer forest areas of the UK are similar, involving mainly Scotland, Wales, parts of Northern England and Northern Ireland. The rural economy is fragile within them all. Tourism is particularly important and landscape values are correspondingly high in many but not all parts of these areas. Whilst tourism can be important, woodlands in the other areas of the UK are equally important for economic regeneration policies and their amenity and recreational value to nearby urban populations (e.g. Scottish central belt, Southern England).

The UK now has a minimum wage structure and health and education standards are relatively high and comparable with the rest of Western Europe. Infant mortality is very low and literacy rates are very high.

The UK timber production and processing industry is under economic pressure from the relatively high currency value of UK sterling and the impact of timber imports. The increase in UK landfill tax has meant that recycling of paper and card waste products has greatly increased, resulting in less demand for raw timber for these products. The overall effect has been serious reduction in timber prices to the disadvantage of timber growers in particular. This is another aspect of the pressures on the UK rural economy where farming is also under serious economic pressure.

Issues relating to amenity, specifically access and recreation are of major importance in the overall context of rural land management in the UK.

Where Long Term Forest Plans are prepared, a “scoping” meeting may be held with statutory consultees and local representatives to discuss proposals and exchange information prior to the preparation of the plan.

The legal access situation has recently changed in all three countries. The general thrust is to legally increase the public’s opportunities for access subject to following a formalised code of responsible behaviour.

It has been generally accepted in the past in Scotland that the general public is at liberty to walk over any land provided he or she does so without causing damage to crops, fences and wildlife. This applied to the whole country with the exception of private gardens or grounds that form the curtilage of a dwelling house or other private residence.

The newly devolved Scottish Executive passed part 1 of The Land Reform (Scotland) Act in 2003. This law came into force in 2004 and gives everyone statutory rights of non-motorised access to land and inland water, subject to responsible use and respect for land management practice & employment. The “Scottish Outdoor Access Code” is the official advice that supports the Act.

In England and Wales the situation in the past has been more complex with many restrictions on public access to private land.

In England and Wales the areas being opened up under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (‘CROW’) are usually mountain, moor, heath, down and registered common land. The new rights cover most recreation activities carried out on foot, including walking, sightseeing, bird watching, climbing and running. Walking dogs must be on a lead in certain situations. The new right of open access does not include cycling, horse riding, driving a vehicle or camping unless already permitted. Gardens, parks and arable land are excluded together with closures and restrictions by farmers and landowners for up to 28 days for any reason or long term if necessary for land management, safety or fire prevention reasons. The “Countryside Code” launched in July 2004 is the official advice that supports the CROW Act.

The new legislation started to come into effect from September 19th 2004, applying to designated regions of England with completion at the end of 2005. New access legislation began being effective throughout Wales from May 2005. Some landowners are dedicating areas for permanent open access, e.g. the Forestry Commission.

In general, Smiths Gore and its clients accept or encourage public access on the land that it manages, subject to no conflict of interest with land management practice and personal privacy. The owner has the final decision on access rights (subject to legal requirements, as per preceding background information). Formalised Public Rights of Way exist in some woodlands and are respected.

5.2 Environmental aspects

The UK has approximately 2 million hectares of forest of which 575,000 hectares are estimated to be on Ancient woodland sites. Approximately 300,000 hectares of this can be described as Ancient and Semi Natural (ASNW) woodland, the balance having been converted into plantation, i.e. Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS).

Ancient woodlands are those that have had continuous woodland cover since at least 1600 AD in England and Wales, and since 1750 AD in Scotland. The term ASNW covers all stands of ancient

origins that do not obviously originate from planting. This may include stands with naturalised alien species such as sycamore or beech.

ASNW represent the least modified semi-natural woodlands in Britain; they represent an unbroken link with the natural forests that developed after the end of the last glaciation, some 8,000 years ago. For example, native pine (*Pinus sylvestris*), or Caledonian pine forests as they are often called have been shown to contain several sub-populations of Scots pine that collectively form a genetically and biologically distinct western outlier of the natural distribution of this species. The pine-dominated Caledonian forest may once have covered more than 1.5 million hectares of the Highlands but the present area of native pinewood is now thought to be only 16,000 hectares of which more than half is scattered pine.

Areas within woodlands of particular significance for biological or geological reasons are given statutory designations as areas of special scientific interest (SSSIs) and have statutory protection.

The UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UKBAP) includes specific guidance and costed targets for a wide range of species and habitats that are the subject of Species Action Plans (SAPs) and Habitat Action Plans (HAPs). Individual local authorities have developed their own Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs).

The GB Forestry Commission and the Forest Service of Northern Ireland have developed the UK Forestry Standard and have published 'Guidelines' for Nature Conservation, Archaeology, Recreation, Landscape, Soil and Water.

Forest management is expected to meet the requirements of these guidelines and standards. There are also complex laws relating to the conservation of many species and habitats in the UK (e.g. The Wildlife & Countryside Act, 1981).

5.3 Administration, Legislation and Guidelines

The following table lists the key national legislation, regulations, guidelines and codes of best practice that are relevant to forestry in the commercial, environmental and social sectors. This list does not purport to be comprehensive, but indicates information that is key to the forestry sector.

Legislation and regulation	Notes
UK Forestry Act 1967	Inc. Felling licence regulations
Forestry Commission / Forest Service grant scheme contracts	
European Environmental Impact Assessment regulations	As an EU member state, UK is affected
Management of Health and Safety at work Regulations 1992	
Wildlife and Countryside Act* 1981	Inc. Sites of Special Scientific Interest
Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004	Largely updates W and C Act* 1981
European Natura legislation	As an EU member state, UK is affected
UK Environmental Protection law inc. Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) regulations	Several layers and / or country variants
UK Employment law inc. minimum wage	Several layers and / or country variants
UK Property law	Several layers and / or country variants
UK Planning law	Several layers and / or country variants
Road Traffic law	Several layers and / or country variants
Guidelines and Codes of Best Practice	Notes
Health & Safety Executive 'Managing health and safety in forestry'	
Arboriculture & Forestry Advisory Group leaflets (AFAG)	Recent successor body to Forestry & Arboriculture Safety & Training Council (FASTCo) with similar leaflets
Forestry Commission / Forest Service Environmental guidelines and other technical / advisory / guidance publications	

FC and HSE chemicals use advisory guidelines & code of practice	Inc. herbicides and insecticides
Road Haulage of Round Timber Code of Practice	
UK Forestry Standard	Not the same as the UK Woodland Assurance Standard (UKWAS) which incorporates the UKFS

The Forestry Commission separately in Scotland, Wales and England implements forestry regulation in Great Britain. (Regulation in Northern Ireland is controlled separately through the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development for Northern Ireland (DARDNI)).

The primary piece of legislation relating to forest management is the Forestry Act 1967. With certain exceptions, mainly relating to non-commercial situations, it is illegal to fell trees in Great Britain without the prior approval of the Forestry Commission. Permission is granted through a felling licence, normally conditional on regeneration or replanting, or through approval of a plan of operations for the site. The latter is an integral component of grant aid provided under the Forestry Commission's Woodland Grant Scheme (WGS) type contracts and its recently devolved country variants in Scotland, England, Wales and Northern Ireland.

Following recent political devolution in the UK the Forestry Commission has similarly devolved its structure and operations. Its role as a regulatory authority remains very similar in each of Scotland, England and Wales.

Approval of grant aid under the WGS is also conditional upon compliance with a range of Forestry Commission environmental guidelines, which aim to ensure that forestry operations are conducted in a manner consistent with the maintenance, protection and/or enhancement of soil, water, landscape, biodiversity and heritage values.

Where felling licences or plans of operations affect areas designated for nature conservation or landscape value, there is an obligation to consult the relevant statutory bodies prior to approval.

The other major aspect of legal control is health and safety. The Health and Safety at Work Act, 1974, and the Management of Health and Safety at work Regulations, 1992, enforced in Great Britain by the Health and Safety Executive, regulate this. The required safety standards for forestry operations are contained in a number of Safety Guides, produced by the Forestry and Arboricultural Safety and Training Council and its successor, the Arboriculture & Forestry Advisory Group.

The local standard used for this assessment was the FSC endorsed UK Woodland Assurance Standard (UKWAS) which was approved in 1999. The UKWAS reflects the FSC GB standard and is now accepted as *the* forest management 'standard' in the UK. The UKWAS was used in conjunction with the SGS QUALIFOR Programme. In addition, the requirements of the UK Forestry Standard were also taken into account.

The UK Forestry Standard, developed by the GB Forestry Commission and the Forest Service of Northern Ireland, is underpinned by a series of 'Guidelines' covering Archaeology, Landscape, Nature Conservation, Recreation, Soils and Water. Forest Practice Guides Nos. 1-8 also covers guidance for the management of semi-natural woodlands in the UK. It is a requirement of UKWAS that this guidance is adhered to.

Following the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, the UK government became a signatory to the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Framework Statement on Climatic Change, and adopted the declaration on Sustainable Development and the Statement of Forest Principles. This led to the publication of Sustainable Forestry: the UK Programme and Biodiversity: the UK Action Plan, which committed the UK to the pursuit of sustainable forestry and the conservation of biological diversity.

The UK programme on forestry evolved as European countries signed the resolutions proposed by the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe at Helsinki in 1993 (the Helsinki Resolutions). These resolutions provided guidance for countries on sustainable forestry management, conserving biodiversity, co-operating with countries with transitional economies and managing forests in relation to climatic change. The UKWAS adopts the principles and requirements laid down in these international agreements.

The Habitats and Birds Directives provide for a network of protected areas (Natura 2000) in the European Union and require member states to establish such sites and to develop systems to prevent damage to certain endangered species. This legislation is translated into GB law in the 'Conservation (Natural Habitats) Regulations 1994'. The process of selection and approval of Natura 2000 sites in the UK is almost complete. Preceding Natura 2000, the UK Government's policies on nature conservation have been largely implemented through the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, which established a system of designated sites known as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and provided for the protection and conservation of many UK species and habitats. This has been largely updated in Scotland via the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004. The UKWAS requires participants to meet all of these requirements.

There are many other laws relating to the protection and welfare of animals. Those of most importance to forest certification concern anti-poaching legislation and close seasons for hunting game species, including the Deer Act Scotland 1996 and the Deer Act England and Wales 1963. Environmental Impact Assessment legislation covers all deforestation, afforestation and road building proposals that might have a significant environmental impact.

6. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT, HARVESTING, SILVICULTURE AND MONITORING

The following table shows significant changes that took place in the management, monitoring, harvesting and regeneration practices of the certificate holder over the certificate period.

Description of Change	Notes
SURVEILLANCE 1	
The new head office for Smiths Gore forest management operations has moved from Edinburgh to Haddington, East Lothian.	Haddington is approx. 25 miles east of Edinburgh. The Group Scheme Manager is now based at the Haddington office.
SURVEILLANCE 2	
No significant changes.	
SURVEILLANCE 3	
No changes.	
SURVEILLANCE 4	

7. PREPARATION FOR THE EVALUATION

7.1 Schedule

A pre-evaluation was not necessary. Smiths Gore properties put forward for certification under this re-assessment for their second certificate have already been through the certification process under their first certificate provided by another Certification Body (CU/SKAL). Smiths Gore have therefore had certification experience since preparing from 2000 onwards. Nevertheless pre-assessment communication took place to confirm relevant information. Key stakeholders were identified.

7.2 Team

The table below shows the team that conducted the main evaluation and the independent specialist(s) that were selected to review the main evaluation report before certification is considered.

Evaluation Team	Notes
Team Leader	Has a BSc degree in forestry and other land management qualifications with 30 years experience in forestry mainly in the UK. UK & Eire programme manager for SGS Qualifor forest management certification. Over 400 days FSC auditing inc. overseas.
Local Specialist	Has a Forester's certificate, a 1 st class honours degree in ecology and a PhD in wildlife management, with over 45 years experience of temperate forest ecology in the UK and overseas. Over 200 days FSC auditing inc. overseas.
Local Specialist	
Peer Reviewers	Notes
	Re-Assessment - not applicable

7.3 Checklist Preparation

A checklist was prepared that consisted of the documents listed below. This checklist was prepared using the FSC-endorsed national or regional standard.

This re-assessment in 2006 was audited against the first version (pub.1999) of the UKWAS, as per FSC-UK guidance, the second revised version (pub.2006) will be used for future Surveillances from 2007 onwards.

Standard Used in Evaluation	Effective Date	Version Nr	Changes to Standard
SGS Qualifor: Group and Resource Manager Checklist (AD34-01)	1 February 2005	1	
FSC Accredited National Standard for the United Kingdom = the UK Woodland Assurance Standard (UKWAS).	1 November 2006	2	1 st edition published 1999. This revised 2 nd edition published 1 Nov 2006. From this date, existing FSC certificate holders in the UK will have one year to comply with the revised requirements of the standard whilst all new certificates will be issued for certifications assessed against the requirements of the revised standard. See the FSC UK website (www.fsc-uk.org) for further information.

7.4 Stakeholder notification

A wide range of stakeholders were contacted 4 weeks before the planned evaluation to inform them of the evaluation and ask for their views on relevant forest management issues. These included environmental interest groups, local government agencies & forestry authorities and forest user groups plus workers' unions where relevant. The full list of stakeholders that were contacted is available from SGS. Responses received and comments from interviews are recorded under paragraph 14 of this Public Summary.

8. THE EVALUATION

The Main Evaluation was conducted in the steps outlined below.

8.1 Opening meeting

An opening meeting was held at the Edinburgh office. The scope of the evaluation was explained and schedules were determined. Record was kept of all persons that attended this meeting.

8.2 Document review

A review of the main forest management documentation was conducted to evaluate the adequacy of coverage of the QUALIFOR Programme requirements. This involved examination of policies, management plans, systems, procedures, instructions and controls.

8.3 Sampling and Evaluation Approach

A detailed record of the following is available in section B of the evaluation report. This section does not form part of the public summary, but includes information on:

- ☐ Sampling methodology and rationale;
- ☐ FMUs included in the sample;
- ☐ Sites visited during the field evaluation; and
- ☐ Man-day allocation.

Approx. 60% of the total forest area is located within the North East of Scotland and managed by the Fochabers Office (and Tomintoul sub-office), approx. 20% within South West Scotland managed by the Dumfries Office, approx. 10% in Midlothian and Scottish Borders managed by the Edinburgh Office and the balance of approx. 10% is managed by the Lichfield office in the English Midlands.

SG head office in Edinburgh was visited. The Head of the Woodland & Arboriculture Department and plus forestry managers from Fochabers, Inverness (Group members) and Edinburgh were interviewed. This covered a high proportion of the SG staff who are actively involved in forest management and timber sales.

SG Scheme properties are widely distributed throughout Scotland but with significant areas being in north Scotland including a high number of the group members not managed by SG. Other properties are located in the south of Scotland and as far as the English Midlands. Sites were selected taking operational activity and practical logistics into consideration. Three offices and most of the managers within those offices were sampled. This allowed the coverage of a wide range of forest management operations and issues. Other areas will be visited at future surveillances and all offices will be visited during the course of the certificate. Excluding planning, preparation and report writing, 8 auditor man days were involved for the evaluation including field assessment and office based evaluation inc. stakeholder consultations

8.4 Field assessments

Field assessments aimed to determine how closely activities in the field complied with documented management systems and QUALIFOR Programme requirements. Interviews with staff, operators and contractors were conducted to determine their familiarity with and their application of policies, procedures and practices that are relevant to their activities. A carefully selected sample of sites was visited to evaluate whether practices met the required performance levels.

8.5 Stakeholder interviews

Meetings or telephone interviews were held with stakeholders as determined by the responses to notification letters and SGS discretion as to key stakeholders that should be interviewed. These aimed to:

- ☐ clarify any issues raised and the company's responses to them;
- ☐ obtain additional information where necessary; and
- ☐ obtain the views of key stakeholders that did not respond to the written invitation sent out before the evaluation.

Nr of Stakeholders contacted	Nr of Interviews with		
	NGOs	Government	Other

Nr of Stakeholders contacted	Nr of Interviews with		
	NGOs	Government	Other
MAIN EVALUATION			
35	1	4	3
SURVEILLANCE 1			
4	1	2	1
SURVEILLANCE 2			
4	1		3
SURVEILLANCE 3			
3		2	1
SURVEILLANCE 4			

Responses received and comments from interviews are recorded under paragraph 14 of this Public Summary.

8.6 Summing up and closing meeting

At the conclusion of the field evaluation, findings were presented to company management at a closing meeting. Any areas of non-conformance with the QUALIFOR Programme were raised as one of two types of Corrective Action Request (CAR):

- ☐ Major CARs - which must be addressed and re-assessed before certification can proceed
- ☐ Minor CARs - which do not preclude certification, but must be addressed within an agreed time frame, and will be checked at the first surveillance visit

A record was kept of persons that attended this meeting.

9. EVALUATION RESULTS

Detailed evaluation findings are included in Section B of the evaluation report. This does not form part of the public summary. For each QUALIFOR requirement, these show the related findings, and any observations or corrective actions raised. The main issues are discussed below.

9.1 Findings related to the general QUALIFOR Programme

PRINCIPLE 1: Compliance with law and FSC Principles	
Criterion 1.1	Respect for national and local laws and administrative requirements
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	<p>Compliance with the law was found to be good. Changes in legislation are conveyed to managers, foresters and staff through line managers and advisors together with staff access to the company system of information dissemination.</p> <p>Managers were found to be aware of, and complying with the spirit of relevant codes of practice. In general, the company was found to be making good efforts to integrate up to date guidance and best practice into tactical management.</p> <p>Managers are also kept up to date on FSC and UKWAS and other new developments through training and the</p>

	company information system.
Criterion 1.2 Payment of legally prescribed fees, royalties, taxes and other charges	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	No evidence of non-payment.
Criterion 1.3 Respect for provisions of international agreements	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	No evidence to the contrary. Managers are aware of relevant international agreements and their impact on forest management in the UK.
Criterion 1.4 Conflicts between laws and regulations, and the FSC P&C	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	No identified conflicts. There is no evidence of substantiated outstanding claims of non-compliance related to woodland management. No legal disputes are current.
Criterion 1.5 Protection of forests from illegal activities	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	Owners and managers are highly aware of potential problems and are prepared to deal with them, including the involvement of the Police if appropriate. These appear to be minimal, mainly concerning illegal fly tipping but with occasional poaching. Managers are aware of the risk to any rare birds nesting from egg thieves and would liaise with the Police and RSPB if required.
Criterion 1.6 Demonstration of a long-term commitment to the FSC P&C	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	<p>SG have made the following statement on their website (www.smithsgore.co.uk). It has been prepared by the Head of the Forestry Department and endorsed by a SG senior partner.</p> <p>“Smith Gore Woodland and Arboriculture Department declares its commitment to the UK Woodland Assurance Standard which is endorsed by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC). This commitment includes the protection and maintenance of the long term ecological integrity of the certified woodlands within its Group Scheme. Smiths Gore clients who own woodlands are encouraged to join the scheme for its timber marketing benefits.”</p> <p>As a membership requirement of the scheme owners are required to sign their commitment to the same UKWAS standard.</p>

PRINCIPLE 2: Tenure and use rights and responsibilities

Criterion

☐ Strengths

Strengths

Weaknesses	
Compliance	Properties are owned by individual and corporate clients with the company as managers. There is long term unchallenged use. Legal title documents are held by clients' solicitors and copied to the company as required. Solicitors' documentation demonstrating legal ownership can be made available to prove ownership under the UK's long established property laws.
Criterion 2.2 Local communities' legal or customary tenure or use rights	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	No permissive or traditional uses, other than the provision of recreation, were encountered.
Criterion 2.3 Disputes over tenure claims and use rights	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	No legal disputes are current.
PRINCIPLE 3: Indigenous peoples' rights	
Criterion 3.1 Indigenous peoples' control of forest management	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	Within international context, "Indigenous Peoples", as defined under FSC, are not considered to be present in the UK.
Criterion 3.2 Maintenance of indigenous peoples' resources or tenure rights	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	Within international context, "Indigenous Peoples", as defined under FSC, are not considered to be present in the UK.
Criterion 3.3 Protection of sites of special cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance to indigenous peoples	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	Within international context, "Indigenous Peoples", as defined under FSC, are not considered to be present in the UK. Please refer to Criterion 4.4 for information on the management of special sites.
Criterion 3.4 Compensation of indigenous peoples for the application of their traditional knowledge	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	Within international context, "Indigenous Peoples", as defined under FSC, are not considered to be present in the UK.
PRINCIPLE 4: Community relations and workers rights	
Criterion 4.1 Employment, training, and other services for local communities	
Strengths	Recreational provision in the form of a circular walking path with high quality surface, for the public seen at Alderbank, Penicuik is exemplary.

	<p>Ben Newe provides commendable opportunity for the Scottish Endurance Riding Club to use the property. Access arrangements are extremely well managed for the forest owner.</p> <p>At Pitgaveny, effective collaboration with SNH and RSPB has led to the provision of a high quality bird-watching hide. This represents a valuable public facility.</p>
Weaknesses	
Compliance	<p>There was good use of local area harvesting and / or establishment & maintenance contractors / deer controllers being engaged at Pluscarden and Ben Newe. Contractors came from the Glenlivet and Elgin area, both of which are within a 30 kilometre radius of the respective properties. Penicuik Estate maintains an estate workforce of direct employees.</p> <p>SG promotes training of contractors via ongoing improvements in operational practice through site supervision by experienced managers and internal monitoring surveillances. SG provides its managers with training (e.g. tree safety surveys) and recruits new management staff when required for replacement or due to expansion.</p> <p>Managers interviewed are aware of the need for notifying local communities in advance when high impact operations are planned and seeking to mitigate impact, e.g. timber lorry traffic avoiding rural schools' delivery and collection times.</p>
Criterion 4.2 Compliance with health and safety regulations	
Strengths	Documented Work Instructions and Risk Assessments seen at SG offices are also excellent.
Weaknesses	<p>Forest workers are not always adequately equipped for first aid contingency.</p> <p>At Penicuik, a machine operator did not have a first aid kit. There was no site inspection regime in operation to record regular inspections of such equipment.</p> <p>SGS Minor CAR 10 was raised</p>
Compliance	At the Inverness office of the Group Member there were comprehensive examples of documented work instructions, site risk assessments and reference to AFAG codes of practice. Suitable documentation was seen for Ben Newe and Pluscarden. The SG Forestry Department has developed particular expertise in tree safety surveys and this has become a significant part of its business.
Criterion 4.3 Workers' rights to organise and negotiate with employers	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	Discussions with employees and other workers do not suggest that they have been discouraged. Discussions with employees and other workers reveal that no evidence that they have been prevented from negotiating collectively.
Criterion 4.4 Social impact evaluations and consultation	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	<p>Comprehensive and up to date stakeholder lists were seen for Pluscarden, Duthil and Ben Newe. The Pluscarden list still requires the addition of the forest neighbour on the western boundary. Stakeholder lists are not yet comprehensive for all members and omit some important stakeholders (e.g. Moray Flood Alleviation Group at Pitgaveny and LBAP officers at Pitgaveny and Penicuik). Evidence of some good stakeholder lists but also lack of full compliance.</p> <p>Progress noted but CU CAR 06 remains open, becoming SGS Minor CAR 03</p>
Compliance	<p>The vast majority of privately owned woodland management planning involves some form of FC approved scheme, e.g. FC Long Term Plans, SFGS/EFGS 'WGS' style schemes which not only require FC approval but, as part of the FC process, include public consultation with relevant organisations and local people. Prior to final approval scheme documentation goes onto an FC administered website in the public domain for a requisite period. Consequently, managers often make management planning documentation publicly available through this initial process.</p> <p>SG will be giving consideration as to how this management planning information continues to be made available thereafter.</p> <p>Similarly, they are well aware of the need for the appropriate warning signs at the threshold of operational sites.</p> <p>SG have made it publicly known via their website that SG Group Scheme members are certified. Management Plans also declare certification status within their text.</p>
Criterion 4.5 Resolution of grievances and settlement of compensation claims	
Strengths	

Weaknesses	
Compliance	<p>Managers respond constructively to complaints and the assessment generates confidence that they would follow established legal process should this become necessary.</p> <p>At Pitgaveny, the Moray Flood Alleviation Group (MFAG) (a recently established local ENGO) recently reported SG to SNH for damaging a badger sett. SG had effectively protected the main sett, but had been unaware of the small annex that was damaged. MFAG had not informed SG of the existence of the annex. A dialogue was established with SNH to reconcile the situation. SG are considered to have acted responsibly in their management of the situation.</p>
PRINCIPLE 5: Benefits from the forest	
Criterion 5.1	Economic viability taking full environmental, social, and operational costs into account
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	<p>Evidence of production being optimised whilst investing in social and ecological value of the resource.</p> <p>The planning of woodland operations can occur at a number of different levels. At all sites visited this included the obtaining of relevant permission (normally FC) and provision of notification during the early stages of planning. Of the sites visited these maintained detailed contracts which specified special conditions of operation or restrictions to ensure special features were protected and best practice followed.</p>
Criterion 5.2	Optimal use and local processing of forest products
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	Local processing opportunities are always considered and taken where appropriate. Limited scope for minor species and NTFPs.
Criterion 5.3	Waste minimisation and avoidance of damage to forest resources
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	Timber at all sites visited which were active (Penicuik) or had been previously harvested, had been undertaken efficiently with acceptable loss or damage to residual crops. Most site evidence and documentation observed for the sites visited showed compliance with all relevant guidelines. But see CAR 09.
Criterion 5.4	Forest management and the local economy
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	Local contractors and sawmills are supported.
Criterion 5.5	Maintenance of the value of forest services and resources
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	Managers are well aware of the range of services and resources and undertake measures for their maintenance.
Criterion 5.6	Harvest levels
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	<p>Pluscarden, Ben Newe, Pitgaveny and Penicuik were assessed for this criterion together with random site inspection of harvesting / restocking sites at Pluscarden, Pitgaveny and Penicuik. All had suitably compliant harvesting with site evidence of restocking where appropriate being carried out or in preparation stage.</p> <p>Managers record basic mensurational data in order to provide estimates of future production and control of yield</p>

	<p>is usually carried out on an appropriate area basis with reconciliation of actual production versus forecast.</p> <p>Records of yield were checked for Ben Newe and were satisfactory.</p> <p>Other than venison produced via deer management, no non-timber products are produced. Therefore, no instances were encountered where harvesting of NTFPs was at a level which could exceed the long term productive potential of the resource.</p>
PRINCIPLE 6: Environmental impact	
Criterion 6.1 Environmental impacts evaluation	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	<p>Forest management plans invariably involve an FC approved scheme and are consequently consulted on with external bodies such as EN, SNH, Local Authorities, EA and SEPA by the FC through the LTFP/SFGS/EFGS process. For new planting the same type of consultation mechanism including EIA and environmental regulatory requirements where appropriate will allow other stakeholders to propose amendments to proposals for consideration by the FC and the applicant.</p> <p>At site level, constraints maps and risk assessments are used to ensure that potentially impacted elements are identified prior to commencement of works.</p>
Criterion 6.2 Protection of rare, threatened and endangered species	
Strengths	<p>ASNW Oak woodland adjacent to Loch Spynie, is managed on a non-intervention regime with effective communication with SNH. Loch Spynie (SSSI) is a large loch supporting an abundance of wildlife. The owner has very effectively collaborated with SNH and RSPB in its management.</p>
Weaknesses	<p>The SG GIS system needs to be able to provide complete mapping support for forest management. Currently the GIS layer for Biodiversity is not able to print maps and were this to continue it would be a management constraint.</p>
Compliance	<p>There were examples of endangered BAP species being identified with managers thereafter aware of the need to plan management accordingly for their maintenance and enhancement where feasible, e.g. Black Grouse at Pluscarden and Capercaillie at Duthil.</p>
Criterion 6.3 Maintenance of ecological functions and values	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	<p>Deadwood practice does not always meet current UKWAS requirements.</p> <p>E.g. Pitgaveny had site evidence of a significant lack of deadwood and it was understood that the member did not favour its retention. The SG Deadwood Strategy and Operators Instructions should be modified to cover requirements requiring machine operators to seek opportunities to leave deadwood.</p> <p>SGS Minor CAR 06 was raised.</p>
Compliance	<p>At some of the sites visited, clearfelling on a significant scale was mostly appropriate given their upland plantation situation with clear commercial objectives, e.g. Pluscarden (visited), Ben Newe (desk exercise). However, also at Pluscarden, Pitgaveny and Penicuik a combination of thinning, selective felling and clearfelling at appropriate smaller scale were in evidence on lower altitude, more sheltered sites, consistent with less harsh conditions and wider objectives.</p> <p>Managers interviewed were aware of the need to pursue lower impact silvicultural systems in windfirm conifer plantations in order to demonstrate that they are increasingly favoured where they are suited to the site and species.</p>
Criterion 6.4 Protection of representative samples of existing ecosystems	
Strengths	<p>There were some examples of very good provision of Natural Reserves in forests, e.g. Penicuik and Pitgaveny (but see Minor CAR 07 re. designation and mapping).</p>
Weaknesses	<p>There is an inconsistent approach to designating and mapping Natural Reserves and Long Term Retentions in some Management Plans.</p> <p>E.g. Pitgaveny, Penicuik, Arniston. Some managers were unclear on the definitions of Natural Reserve and Long Term Retention. Definitions were understood by the Duthil and Ben Newe manager but designations and mapping were incomplete.</p> <p>SGS Minor CAR 07 was raised.</p>
Compliance	<p>At least 15% of the forest area of each of the sites visited are being managed primarily for the conservation of</p>

	<p>biodiversity.</p> <p>The management plans for Penicuik (e.g. of new template) and the existing management plans for Pluscarden, Ben Newe and Duthil showed good analysis of this UKWAS criterion, all of which either exceeded or clearly indicated how 15% would be achieved during the plan period via maps and analysis.</p>
Criterion 6.5 Protection against damage to soils, residual forest and water resources during operations	
Strengths	SG documentation and SG managers' understanding of regulations was exemplary.
Weaknesses	At Silverburn (Penicuik) a perennial water course feeding the River North Esk had been damaged by estate staff skidding timber across it. Insufficient protection of the burn was in place, contravening Forest and Water Guidelines. Minor CAR 09 was raised.
Compliance	Brash matting techniques for timber extraction by forwarder were being applied where appropriate and feasible in all situations.
Criterion 6.6 Chemical pest management	
Strengths	The policy and strategy on the detection and control of <i>Hylobius</i> (i.e. non-prophylactic) is exemplary.
Weaknesses	
Compliance	There is SG internal guidance for managers on chemicals use which builds on recognised best practice and understood UKWAS requirements. Chemical usage records are kept. SG either do not use pesticides on the FSC highly hazardous list or know to check the derogation status of those mentioned within UKWAS guidance.
Criterion 6.7 Use and disposal of chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	<p>Legal requirements and non-legislative guidance with chemicals storage are not always being followed.</p> <p>At Pitgaveny the chemical store houses a collection of agricultural and forestry chemicals, some of which were out of date and some not labelled for forestry use. There was no warning sign on the chemical store door.</p> <p>SGS Minor CAR 08 was raised.</p> <p>UKWAS requires that when plastic treeshelters are redundant they be disposed of to current legal environmental standards. There should be a SG group policy addition on the matter to guide managers.</p>
Compliance	
Criterion 6.8 Use of biological control agents and genetically modified organisms	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	No BCAs or GMOs are used.
Criterion 6.9 The use of exotic species	
Strengths	Long experience of using introduced conifers.
Weaknesses	
Compliance	<p>Species selected for new woodlands, natural regeneration and restocking are suited to the site and matched to the objectives. All sites visited demonstrated this based on management plan rationale, dialogue with managers and site observation. The normal range of conifer and broadleaves used in UK forestry management was encountered. From discussions with managers and the site evidence seen, the use of non-native North American conifers and European conifers and broadleaves was suitably balanced for plantations.</p> <p>For new woodlands, native species are preferred to non-native unless non-native species used can show that they will clearly outperform native species in meeting the objectives. It is a requirement of FC grant schemes that all native species used are locally adapted.</p> <p>No examples of other non-native plant and animal species being introduced were encountered during the assessment.</p>

Criterion 6.10 Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	<p>An area of forest at Pitgaveny has recently been cleared to provide the site for a sewage treatment plant to serve the community of Lossiemouth. This was done with full consultation and considered to be in the best environmental interests of the area.</p> <p>Other than an FC approved increase in open ground at restocking consistent with current plantation design, there was no such activity or any planned at any other sites visited.</p> <p>Other than an FC approved increase in open ground at restocking consistent with current plantation design, there was no such activity or any planned at any other sites visited.</p>
PRINCIPLE 7: Management plan	
Criterion 7.1 Management plan requirements	
Strengths	The Fochabers, Inverness (Group member) and Edinburgh SG offices were those assessed. There were examples of very good overall standards of existing management plans, combined with very clear management rationale, excellent knowledge of sites and regulations, excellent work instructions & site hazard assessments and awareness of up to date forest research results.
Weaknesses	<p>All Resource and Group members have management plans but some have shortfalls against the UKWAS, as identified by CU CAR 01. In response, the GSM has revised the SG management plan template which is now comprehensive and UKWAS compliant as a template. The Penicuik Management Plan has been updated accordingly as a future example of revised management plan standards to demonstrate this SG revision process and was assessed by SGS Qualifor as UKWAS compliant overall. This revised template will apply throughout in future for all Resource managed members. Self managed Group members' management plans will be checked by the GSM for suitable compliance to the same equivalent revised SG standard. All Group members' management plans were checked by SGS and Pluscarden and Duthil were also assessed in detail and found to be of a high standard overall with mostly UKWAS compliance.</p> <p>The GSM has produced a detailed target timetable to bring all management plans up to the revised SG standard consistent with the following situation. Significant FC grant aid is potentially available to give financial support to the preparation of management plans. FC grant aid is currently under government review and there is a temporary hiatus which should be resolved by the summer of 2007. It is proposed that a reasonable response under such circumstances is for all SG forests & woods to have an UKWAS compliant draft management plan using the revised SG management plan standard before next surveillance towards the end of 2007, with all plans finalised by the end of 2008.</p> <p>Evidence of demonstrable progress – leave CU CAR 01 open, reduced to become SGS Minor CAR 01.</p>
Compliance	
Criterion 7.2 Management plan revision	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	All future management planning should contain formal provision for documented five yearly reviews.
Compliance	Long term management plans discussed with a manager had either been reviewed in 2005 or were recently overdue for review, e.g. Duthil, Brerachan & Kinnaid plus Pluscarden and Ben Newe respectively.
Criterion 7.3 Training and supervision of forest workers	
Strengths	SG markets timber using professional and reputable timber harvesting companies, some of whom are ISO 9000, 14000 and 18000 certified.
Weaknesses	
Compliance	SG policy is to engage only suitably qualified staff and contractors with appropriate levels of supervision. Implementation of work at sites visited was in accordance with plans with minor exceptions, e.g. minor CARs 09 & 10. SG policy requires that all staff and contractors have relevant training in safe working practices.
Criterion 7.4 Public availability of the management plan elements	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	

Compliance	The vast majority of privately owned woodland management planning involves some form of FC approved scheme, e.g. FC Long Term Plans, SFGS/EFGS 'WGS' style schemes which not only require FC approval but, as part of the FC process, include public consultation with relevant organisations and local people. Prior to final approval scheme documentation goes onto an FC administered website in the public domain for a requisite period. Consequently, SG managers have made management planning documentation publicly available through this initial process. They have also made it available to requests from existing stakeholder contact to date.
PRINCIPLE 8: Monitoring and evaluation	
Criterion 8.1 Frequency, intensity and consistency of monitoring	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	The new SG Management plan template section 10 'Monitoring and Plan Revision' represents an adequate system when implemented via completion of management plans. Section 10.1 deals with 'Monitoring – What, why, where, how' and 10.2 'Plan Revision – When, what circumstances.' Section 10.1 is being further revised to incorporate 'Who / Responsibility and When / Frequency / Analysis'. From discussion with the GSM it is clear this revision will ensure the monitoring system that forms part of the new management plans will link clearly to the management plan objectives and will therefore be considered useful to future management. Evidence of demonstrable progress – leave CU CAR 02 open, reduced to become SGS Minor CAR 02.
Compliance	An Annual Summary is completed for all Group properties as part of internal Group Scheme monitoring. Quarterly Reports are made for the Group Member properties (Gordon Woodlands Ltd). This provides a valuable summary of monitoring activity, results and management recommendations resulting from them.
Criterion 8.2 Research and data collection for monitoring	
Strengths	There were some very good examples of monitoring, e.g. tree health monitoring of trees adjacent to roadsides and footpaths is exemplary. Also, some excellent monitoring providing valuable management information was being given by a sporting tenant at Duthil.
Weaknesses	Contact where appropriate with SNH and LBAP officers with the aim of surveying and monitoring Rare Threatened & Endangered habitats and species should be included.
Compliance	There were examples of endangered BAP species being identified with managers thereafter aware of the need to plan management accordingly for their maintenance and enhancement where feasible, e.g. Black Grouse at Pluscarden and Capercaillie at Duthil.
Criterion 8.3 Chain of custody	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	SG uses a system of advice notes and invoices that allow the tracing of products to the forest of origin. Weight tickets are obtained for each individual load as a basis for invoicing. Weight tickets or associated advice notes (or both) possess adequate site references as an identification system for timber despatch. This system was working satisfactorily at Pluscarden and Ben Newe. These examples of the system demonstrate adequate site traceability including use of the SKAL Chain of Custody code number on timber sales invoices 'SKAL-FM/COC-018684'. SG have been made aware of the need to show their forthcoming new SGS Chain of Custody code on all invoices and delivery documents once re-certified by SGS. The new CoC code number provided will be in the following format 'SGS-FM/COC-XXXX'.
Criterion 8.4 Incorporation of monitoring results into the management plan	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	Most of the SG Management Plans are relatively recent or are being revised. Correspondingly, monitoring is also relatively recent and when meaningful results are available these will be considered and incorporated into management plans. The GSM is fully aware this will require to be done. A summary of monitoring results will be produced, as a minimum, at the end of each 5 year period and made publicly available if requested. Plans are in hand to provide this via the new SG Management Plan template being refined by the Group Scheme Manager. Management Plans will therefore contain provision for

	monitoring summaries.
Criterion 8.5 Publicly available summary of monitoring	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	See 8.4 above. Management Plans will therefore contain provision for monitoring summaries and once meaningful results become available, these will be made publicly available upon request.
PRINCIPLE 9: High Conservation Value Forests	
Criterion 9.1 Evaluation to determine high conservation value attributes	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	There are European (e.g. Special Area of Conservation – SAC) or UK (e.g. Site of Special Scientific Interest – SSSI) conservation designations in some of the forests under application for certification. E.g. The Pitgaveny Management Plan contains maps showing the location of ASNW, SSSIs and SACs.
Criterion 9.2 Consultation process	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	Managers were able to demonstrate suitable liaison and a good working relationship with e.g. Scottish Natural Heritage on designated sites.
Criterion 9.3 Measures to maintain and enhance high conservation value attributes	
Strengths	Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS) (UKWAS 6.4.2, 1 st Edition) PAWS areas at Alderbank, Penicuik are being progressively restored. Operators are exercising imagination in the conservation of existing remnants of native species and dead wood. Restoration work is exemplary. Exemplary management of ASNW at Loch Spynie (Pitgaveny).
Weaknesses	
Compliance	
Criterion 9.4 Monitoring to assess effectiveness	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	Managers are aware that, for areas and features of particular significance, as identified under UKWAS 6.1.1, annual monitoring shall be undertaken to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance these areas. In many cases this has begun. This will become consistent within new management planning improvements with results considered for effectiveness at management plan 5 year reviews.
PRINCIPLE 10: Plantations	
Criterion 10.1 Statement of objectives in the management plan	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	See 7.1, Objectives are stated in the management plan.
Criterion 10.2 Plantation design and layout	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	

Compliance	<p>Many FMUs possess large blocks of woodland contained within larger mixed habitat estate grounds including park and agricultural land plus water areas. Within these traditional mixed estates an overriding objective is integrated estate management where woodland management is one part of the overall management of the estate.</p> <p>Elsewhere, there are upland plantations where plantation design and layout was found to be consistent with recognised modern UK practice, including guidelines for restructuring and attention to landscape considerations.</p> <p>With a few exceptions, all other planting seen was restocking. This is consistent with current commercial forestry trends in the UK.</p>
Criterion 10.3 Diversity in composition	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	<p>All Management Plans inspected indicated restructuring plans where appropriate. These were confirmed by site visits, e.g. Pluscarden. At least 15% of the forest area of each of the sites visited are being managed primarily for the conservation of biodiversity.</p>
Criterion 10.4 Species selection	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	<p>The normal range of conifer and broadleaves used in UK forestry management was encountered. From discussions with managers and the site evidence seen, the use of non-native North American conifers and European conifers and broadleaves was suitably balanced for plantations. Equally there were several examples of native species being used where appropriate to the objectives.</p> <p>All sites visited complied with the detailed UKWAS criteria from analysis of management plans and maps e.g. Duthil analysis of 'area by species' taken from the 'Duthil Plantation compartment structure'.</p>
Criterion 10.5 Restoration of natural forest	
Strengths	<p>Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS) (UKWAS 6.4.2, 1st Edition)</p> <p>PAWS areas at Alderbank, Penicuik are being progressively restored. Operators are exercising imagination in the conservation of existing remnants of native species and dead wood. Restoration work is exemplary.</p>
Weaknesses	
Compliance	
Criterion 10.6 Impacts on soil and water	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	<p>Environmental impacts of long-term plans have been considered during the consultation and planning process. Evidence of brief appraisals or contact with specialist agencies or personnel concerning particular issues was seen in management files and planning documentation.</p> <p>At all sites road material used for roads construction and maintenance was either quarried on site or sourced from local quarry stone.</p> <p>Managers are aware of and comply with Forest & Water Guidelines. But see CAR 09, as per 6.5 above..</p>
Criterion 10.7 Pests and diseases	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	<p>All Management Plans inspected were compliant. Windthrow hazard assessments are used to anticipate problems and plan accordingly. Increasing diversity of plantations should help to reduce the threat of pest and disease problems. Managers interviewed had a good knowledge of the risks.</p> <p>Site inspections are carried out with suitable frequency based on experience and site knowledge. Aspects, such as tree health and grazing records are made within these site visit records when there is something to report on pests and diseases.</p>

Criterion 10.8 Monitoring of impacts, species testing and tenure rights	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	SG will be summarising results of their individual FMU monitoring within FMU management plan revisions.
Criterion 10.9 Plantations established in areas converted from natural forests after November 1994	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Compliance	No plantations in this category.

10. CERTIFICATION DECISION

SGS considers that Smiths Gore's forest management of its group scheme forests in the UK can be certified as:

- i. There are no outstanding Major Corrective Action Requests
- ii. The outstanding Minor Corrective Action Requests do not preclude certification, but Smiths Gore is required to take the agreed actions before first surveillance in 2007. These will be verified by SGS QUALIFOR at the first surveillance to be carried out about 6 months from the date of the issuance of the certificate. If satisfactory actions have been taken, the CARs will be 'closed out'; otherwise, Minor CARs will be raised to Major CARs.
- iii. The management system, if implemented as described, is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the applicable standard(s) are met over the whole forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation;
- iv. The certificate holder has demonstrated, subject to the specified corrective actions, that the described system of management is being implemented consistently over the whole forest area covered by the scope of the certificate.

11. MAINTENANCE OF CERTIFICATION

During the surveillance evaluation, it is assessed if there is continuing compliance with the requirements of the Qualifor Programme. Any areas of non-conformance with the QUALIFOR Programme are raised as one of two types of Corrective Action Request (CAR):

- .01 **Major CARs** - which must be addressed and closed out urgently with an agreed short time frame since the organisation is already a QUALIFOR certified organisation. Failure to close out within the agreed time frame can lead to suspension of the certificate.
- .02 **Minor CARs** - which must be addressed within an agreed time frame, and will normally be checked at the next surveillance visit

The full record of CARs raised over the certification period is listed under section 12 below.

The table below provides a progressive summary of findings for each surveillance. A complete record of observations demonstrating compliance or non-compliance with each criterion of the Forest Stewardship Standard is contained in a separate document that does not form part of the public summary.

SURVEILLANCE 1	
Issues that were hard to assess	None
Number of CARs closed	10 Outstanding CARs were closed.

Nr of CARs remaining open	No outstanding CARs from previous evaluations were not closed.
New CARs raised	No new Major CARs and 5 new Minor CARs were raised.
Certification Decision	<p>The forest management of the forests of the Smiths Gore Group Certification Scheme remains certified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The management system is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the applicable standard(s) are met over the whole forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation; and ▪ The certificate holder has demonstrated, subject to the specified corrective actions, that the described system of management is being implemented consistently over the whole forest area covered by the scope of the certificate.
SURVEILLANCE 2	
Issues that were hard to assess	None
Number of CARs closed	5 Outstanding CARs were closed.
Nr of CARs remaining open	No outstanding CARs from previous evaluations were not closed.
Nr of New CARs raised	No new Major CARs and 1 new Minor CAR was raised.
Certification Decision	<p>The forest management of the forests of the Smiths Gore Group Certification Scheme remains certified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The management system is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the applicable standard(s) are met over the whole forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation; and ▪ The certificate holder has demonstrated, subject to the specified corrective actions, that the described system of management is being implemented consistently over the whole forest area covered by the scope of the certificate.
SURVEILLANCE 3	
Issues that were hard to assess	<p>It was hard to complete the assessment because approval of part of the report format was the subject of extended dialogue with ASI / FSC International and FSC-UK and the UKWAS organisation during 2010.</p> <p>The complete record of observations demonstrating compliance or non-compliance with each criterion of the Forest Stewardship Council FM Standard (the UKWAS in the UK) is referred to as the AD33 document within the Qualifor reporting system, i.e. adding to the AD36 documentation. For UK FM reports, the AD33, otherwise known to certificate holders as the 'UKWAS checklist', has been presented in an approved UKWAS format since 1999. However, following an ASI observed audit of another SGS certificate holder in 2010, this became the subject of a proposed Major CAR against SGS' accreditation in the UK because the view was held by ASI that, to meet FSC accreditation requirements, AD33 UK FM reports must be in the FSC P&C format and not the UKWAS format.</p> <p>The FSC-UK FM standard (FSCUK-FS-106 : v1-2) is exactly the UKWAS 2nd Edition but re-written in FSC P&C format. Reporting of individual CARs and Observations already had dual UKWAS and FSC references.</p> <p>After extended correspondence and discussion, the following position was reached to the satisfaction of ASI, FSC Int, FSC UK and the UKWAS organisation but not until May 2011.</p> <p>It has been agreed with ASI that future SGS FM reports in the UK, relevant to new audits w.e.f. June 2011, will have a revised AD33, wherein the UKWAS format will be maintained, but inserted into the report document will be a preceding explanatory text and comprehensive dual referencing to FSC criterion level will be inserted beneath UKWAS requirements.</p> <p>Secondly, changes in a group member manager made it difficult to obtain evidence to close the open CAR and caused further delay.</p>

Number of CARs closed	1 Outstanding CAR was closed.
Nr of CARs remaining open	No outstanding CARs from previous evaluations.
Nr of New CARs raised	No new Major CARs and 3 new Minor CARs were raised.
Certification Decision	<p>The forest management of the forests of the Smiths Gore Group Certification Scheme remains certified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The management system is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the applicable standard(s) are met over the whole forest area covered by the scope of the evaluation; and ▪ The certificate holder has demonstrated, subject to the specified corrective actions, that the described system of management is being implemented consistently over the whole forest area covered by the scope of the certificate.
SURVEILLANCE 4	
Issues that were hard to assess	
Number of CARs closed	
Nr of CARs remaining open	
Nr of New CARs raised	
Certification Decision	

12.

RECORD OF CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS (CARs)

CONTROL UNION (PREVIOUSLY SKAL) CARs HAVE BEEN ELECTRONICALLY COPIED DIRECTLY FROM THE LAST CU SURVEILLANCE REPORT RECORDS AND ARE THEREFORE QUOTED VERBATIM IN BLUE TEXT

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
		Date Recorded>		Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	
CU Major CAR 01	UKWAS 2.1		2 Nov 2005				25 Feb 2009
		Non-Conformance: Management Planning					
		<p>Ref. CU Non-conformity = "Whilst the SG management plans meet the minimum requirements set out in the SG Management Plan template individual plans lack detail and require more specific detail in the documentation of the management plan itself, for example analysis of the growing stock and strengthening of the rationale for management strategy and prescriptions. Objectives for member Estate are generally set out in a generic table but these should be articulated and prioritised for each individual estate (2.1.1 (d)). Major woodland strategy issues should be justified for sustainable timber production and thinning intensities (e.g. using YC), silvicultural systems and more analysis results of woodland in the plan as justification for the measures planned. A number of plans lack mapped identification of special characteristics of the woodland together with planned treatments (notably location and prescriptions of ancient semi natural woodlands and other biodiversity features).</p> <p>CU 'Instruction' = "The general conclusion drawn from the findings was that the assessed management plans in general do not fully meet the spirit or requirements of the UKWAS. The stated objectives should be specific, measurable, acceptable, realistic, and time related (S.M.A.R.T.), objectives set by the management have to be evaluated in time. Reassess the management plans of the group members and revise were required. Send a plan of action to SI before the end of the deadline. The implementation of the action plan will be reassessed during the next surveillance audit."</p>					
		Objective Evidence:					
		CU evidence is contained within the Non-Conformance text above.					
		Close-out evidence:					

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
SGS Minor r CAR 01		<p>SGS assessment – The GSM has revised the SG management plan template which is comprehensive and UKWAS compliant as a template. The Penicuik Management Plan has been updated accordingly as a future example of revised management plan standards and was assessed as UKWAS compliant overall. This revised template will apply throughout in future for all Resource managed members. Self managed Group members' management plans will be checked by the GSM for suitable compliance to the same equivalent standard. Group members' management plans for Pluscarden and Duthil were also assessed and found to be of a high standard overall with mostly UKWAS compliance.</p> <p>The GSM has produced a detailed target timetable to bring management plans up to the required standard consistent with the following situation. Significant FC grant aid is potentially available to give financial support to the preparation of management plans. FC grant aid is currently under government review and there is a temporary hiatus which should be resolved by the summer of 2007. It is proposed that a reasonable response under such circumstances is for all SG forests & woods to have an UKWAS compliant draft management plan before next surveillance towards the end of 2007, with all plans finalised by the end of 2008.</p> <p>Evidence of demonstrable progress – leave CU CAR 01 open, reduced to become SGS Minor CAR 01</p> <p>Surveillance 01 :</p> <p>Delivery of FC grant aid support (which can be substantial but must be prior approved) has been delayed throughout Scotland and England through no fault of applicants. This has caused some consequent delay in implementation but nevertheless the SG programme to have UKWAS compliant management planning is well underway. Many group members either have an existing FC approved 20 year plan or an existing Smiths Gore style template plan, both of which are UKWAS compliant. The other members have clear plans to be completed by the end of 2009 with either an FC style or Smiths Gore style management plan. The Group Scheme Manager has given a commitment to achieve this regardless of FC grant aid position. Should FC grants cause any further delay then the SG template will be used in 2009 and its content transferred in due course to an FC type plan in 2010. The completion programme is confirmed on a SG spreadsheet which shows the type and status of all members' management plans. FC plans for members in Scotland will be under the Scottish Rural Development Programme (SRDP), in England they will be under the English Woodland Grant Scheme (EWGS) whose template is particularly suitable for UKWAS compliance.</p> <p>Existing management plans seen for Penicuik and Arniston already meet the requirements under UKWAS 2.1.1 for management planning.</p> <p>CAR 01 closed.</p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
CU Major CAR 02	UKWAS 2.3.2	Date Recorded>	2 Nov 2005	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	25 Feb 2009
SGS		Non-Conformance: Monitoring					
		Ref. CU Non-conformity = "There is not a coherent system for monitoring, verifying and analysing the outputs of the management plan (against\ the objectives) for individual Group Member estates and that ensures that these records are of use over the long term."					
		CU 'Instruction' = "Develop a monitoring system, to meet the requirements. Send evidence to SI for verification."					
		Objective Evidence:					
		CU evidence is contained within the Non-Conformance text above.					
		Close-out evidence:					

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
Minor CAR 02		<p>SGS assessment – The new SG Management plan template section 10 'Monitoring and Plan Revision' represents an adequate system when implemented via completion of management plans. Section 10.1 deals with 'Monitoring – What, why, where, how' and 10.2 'Plan Revision – When, what circumstances.' Section 10.1 is being further revised to incorporate 'Who / Responsibility and When / Frequency / Analysis'. From discussion with the GSM it is clear this revision will ensure the monitoring system that forms part of the new management plans will link clearly to the management plan objectives and will therefore be considered useful to future management.</p> <p>Evidence of demonstrable progress – leave CU CAR 02 open, reduced to become SGS Minor CAR 02</p> <p>Surveillance 01 :</p> <p>UKWAS compliant management plans should address suitable monitoring. Allied to the close out of CAR 01 above, the Group Scheme Manager has given a commitment to achieve the same for monitoring programme components within the same context by the end of 2009, regardless of FC grant aid position. Similarly, there are existing examples of suitable UKWAS compliance for monitoring, e.g. the Arniston monitoring programme is based on the EWGS template and contains several appropriate aspects to be monitored. Similarly, the revised monitoring programme for Penicuik and additional monitoring aspects proposed for Arniston will achieve a high standard of compliance useful for management purposes.</p> <p>In addition to monitoring related to measuring performance against management objectives, as per above, there were excellent examples of site supervision monitoring, e.g. the Penicuik harvesting file from Sep 2008 onwards (ref. removal of timber from Cpt 16a, Jan/Feb 2009) and also the range of SG site supervision checklists that the GSM has prepared to assist supervision standards.</p> <p>CAR 02 closed.</p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
CU Major CAR 03	UKWAS 2.3.2	Date Recorded>	2 Nov 2005	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	24 Nov 2006
		Non-Conformance: Monitoring					
		<p>Ref. CU Non-conformity = "Areas or features of particular significance (notably ancient woodlands/ ASNW as identified through the SNH records) have not been identified through field survey or subsequently recorded/ mapped as an integral part of the Management Plan. Particularly within Capenoch, the estate plans do not specifically identify all known areas of Category 1 or other Ancient Woodland. There is insufficient evidence of a pro-active approach within management planning documentation of identifying and subsequent prescriptions for the conservation and enhancement of these features and/or consultation with SNH or other relevant organisations in relation to future management."</p> <p>CU 'Instruction' = "See CU Non-Compliance 01."</p>					
		Objective Evidence:					
		CU evidence is contained within the Non-Conformance text above.					
		Close-out evidence:					

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
		<p>SGS assessment – Rather than CU reference to UKWAS 2.3.2 re. 'Monitoring', this CAR more accurately relates to UKWAS 6.1.1 re. 'Protection of rare species and habitats' – identification and mapping of areas and features of significance for biodiversity'.</p> <p>As a systematic response, the new management plan template addresses this issue via Section 3.9.1 'Nature Conservation Designations' and map no. 4 'Biodiversity Plan'. Specifically for Capenoch, documentation and discussion confirmed a search for ASNW at Capenoch had been carried out via the FC's web based 'Land Information Search' and documented confirmation dated 24 Nov 2006 from the SG Dumfries office that environmental priority work at Capenoch to the ASNW (Cpt 27 Long Bank Wood - a predominantly Oak wood classed as ASNW by SNH) had been undertaken and completed, as per FC contract WGS 034000478/WIG2 (e.g. rhododendron clearance).</p> <p><u>CU CAR 03 closed</u></p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
CU Major CAR 04	UKWAS 6.3.1	Date Recorded>	2 Nov 2005	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	24 Nov 2006
		Non-Conformance: Maintenance of biodiversity and ecological functions					
		<p>Ref. CU Non-conformity = "The Management Plan states that the 15% required minimum area will be achieved but the target area is not mapped. The current level of attainment against the target is 10.6% but there is no justification as to how and when the remaining 4.4% might be implemented in the plan. In other Plans (Kirtleside and Blackwood) the 15% requirement is stated in the Plan, but the areas identified to achieve this target are not identified on maps or by written description nor is methodology to achieve the target on the ground articulated.</p> <p>CU 'Instruction' = "See CU Non-Compliance 01."</p>					
		Objective Evidence:					
		CU evidence is contained within the Non-Conformance text above.					
		Close-out evidence:					
		<p>SGS assessment – The management plans for Penicuik (e.g. of new template) and the existing management plans for Pluscarden, Ben Newe and Duthil showed good analysis of this UKWAS criterion, all of which either exceeded or clearly indicated how 15% would be achieved during the plan period via maps and analysis. In addition, the SG responses to CARs 01 re. management planning and CAR 02 re. monitoring further address this issue. <u>Specific responses for Kirtleside and Blackwood (SG Dumfries office) will be checked at next surveillance opportunity at the Dumfries office.</u></p> <p><u>CU CAR 04 closed</u></p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
CU Minor CAR 05	UKWAS 6.3.1	Date Recorded>	2 Nov 2005	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	24 Nov 2006
		Non-Conformance: Conservation of semi-natural woodlands					
		<p>Ref. CU Non-conformity = "Capenoch - enhancement of existing ANSW (mainly oak)woodlands and retention of "natural reserves" are stated as priority objectives but there is insufficient documented evidence as to how this will be achieved and over what period and how it will be monitored</p> <p>CU 'Instruction' = "See CU Non-Compliance 01."</p>					
		Objective Evidence:					
		CU evidence is contained within the Non-Conformance text above.					
		Close-out evidence:					

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
		SGS assessment – This CAR is superfluous given CARS 01, 03 and 04 re. management planning, protection of rare species & habitats and biodiversity. This CAR has therefore already been adequately dealt with under their responses. <u>CU CAR 05 closed</u>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
CU Minor CAR 06	UKWAS 7.1.1	Date Recorded>	2 Nov 2005	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	25 Feb 2009
		Non-Conformance: Consultation					
		Ref. CU Non-conformity = “All statutory stakeholders are consulted as required by the Forestry Commission in the case of grant scheme applications including Forest Plans. Minor: A standard list of stakeholders is available for the individual estates audited in 2005, but in many cases (for example Kirtleside) the list has not been updated. A procedure for more pro-active communication missing in the plans or "Neighbour Files"". Communication about high impact operations (cf Arkletonshields) should be part of the communication plan. This is the responsibility of the Entity and the individual Resource Managers. CU 'Instruction' = “Developed and implement a procedure for a more pro-active approach of stakeholders. Send evidence to SI for verification. This aspect will be evaluated during the 2006 surveillance audit.”					
		Objective Evidence:					
		CU evidence is contained within the Non-Conformance text above.					
		Close-out evidence:					
		SGS assessment – Comprehensive and up to date stakeholder lists were seen for Pluscarden, Duthil and Ben Newe. The Pluscarden list still requires the addition of the forest neighbour on the western boundary. Stakeholder lists are not yet comprehensive for all members and omit some important stakeholders (e.g. Moray Flood Alleviation Group at Pitgaveny and LBAP officers at Pitgaveny and Penicuik). Evidence of some good stakeholder lists but also lack of full compliance. <u>Progress noted but CU CAR 06 remains open, becoming SGS Minor CAR 03</u> Surveillance 01 : The Group Scheme Manager has reminded all group members of the need for appropriate stakeholder lists with useful contact information details (corresp. dated 6 Feb 2009 was seen). Good stakeholder lists were seen for Penicuik and Arniston and others for the Haddington office members have also been updated. Also confirmed that the Pluscarden and Pitgaveny stakeholder lists have been suitably amended. CAR 03 closed.					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
CU Minor CAR 07	UKWAS 8.1.1	Date Recorded>	2 Nov 2005	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	24 Nov 2006
		Non-Conformance: Forest Workforce					
		Ref. CU Non-conformity = “Smiths Gore Instructions to Work and Site Hazard Plans (as required for issue to contractors prior to commencement of operations) were not present in relevant operations file (cf Kirtleside KSE/FCS9 and Arkleton H & M). Iggesund Forestry's Contract Plan not signed.” CU 'Instruction' = “All member files have to be up to date and complete during the next surveillance audit.”					
		Objective Evidence:					

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
		CU evidence is contained within the Non-Conformance text above.					
		Close-out evidence:					
		<p>SGS assessment – Work & Site Hazard planning was checked in detail for Ben Newe, both for a harvesting operation and for a fencing & tree shelter maintenance operation. This member was picked entirely at random and good documentary evidence was seen of risk assessment, excellent site plans, job contracts and checklists.</p> <p><u>CU CAR 07 closed</u></p> <p>(but see new SGS CAR 09 re. example of contravention of Water Guidelines & Spillage Kit at Penicuik).</p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
CU Major CAR 08	CU ref. SI GSC 1.2, 1.6.1	Date Recorded>	2 Nov 2005	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	24 Nov 2006
		Non-Conformance: Group Management					
		<p>Ref. CU Non-conformity = “During the past year there have been significant staff changes, including the departure of the FSC (Group Entity) Group Manager. It is not clear and not yet documented how the responsibilities have subsequently been divided or re-allocated. This should be rectified by 31 January 2006. The division of responsibilities are prescribed in document GSP3. This requires urgent review and updating to clearly document the new staff arrangements now in place.</p> <p>The organisation for the Group Entity has changed significantly. An interim Group Manager (Andy Greathead) was administering the Group Member Monitoring scheme at the time of this audit.</p> <p>The new arrangements for implementing and monitoring the Group Scheme as set out in GS E1 should be updated and formally communicated within the Group Entity (i.e. Smiths Gore).</p> <p>CU ‘Instruction’ = “Revise the group management documentation and send evidence to SI for verification.”</p>					
		Objective Evidence:					
		CU evidence is contained within the Non-Conformance text above.					
		Close-out evidence:					
		<p>SGS assessment – This CAR on Group Scheme Management administration has been suitably dealt with by the new GSM. Form GSK is an organisational flow chart which shows very clearly the new SG Group Scheme structure. After the ‘Group Entity’ or GSM, who is also the Head of the SG Forestry Department based in the Edinburgh office, there are 3 ‘Group Managers’ or SG internal auditors based in the Fochabers (North Scotland), Edinburgh (South Scotland) and Lichfield (Central England) offices. Discussions with managers during this re-assessment confirms this structure is known and clearly understood by all members.</p> <p><u>CU CAR 08 closed</u></p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
CU Minor CAR 09	CU ref. SI GSC 1.4.	Date Recorded>	2 Nov 2005	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	24 Nov 2006
		Non-Conformance: Monitoring of Group Members					
		<p>Ref. CU Non-conformity = “Documents Form 1 (Con Docs) and GC1 (Control) were last revised and issued in Oct and Nov 2003 respectively. These should be revised immediately.</p> <p>CU ‘Instruction’ = “Revise the group management documentation and send evidence to SI for verification.”</p>					
		Objective Evidence:					

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
		CU evidence is contained within the Non-Conformance text above.					
		Close-out evidence:					
		<p>SGS assessment – Forms 1 (Controlled Documents) and GC1 (Group Control) have been suitably updated on 19 Jan and 13 Feb 2006 respectively. Form 1 lists all the documents used for group scheme administration inc. guidance / check sheets on various operational and UKWAS issues, e.g. Herbicides, Chain of Custody etc. Form GC1 primarily records members dates of application and entry into the scheme.</p> <p>CU CAR 09 closed</p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
CU Minor CAR 10	CU ref. SI GSC 1.6.2	Date Recorded>	2 Nov 2005	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	24 Nov 2006
		Non-Conformance: Implementation of responsibilities as defined in 1.2 –1.5 in the standard					
		<p>Ref. CU Non-conformity = “Evidence of the following was not found during ht3e 2005 surveillance audit. New personnel within Smiths Gore involved in the Group Scheme system require to be instructed / trained as to the correct implementation of the Scheme, particularly in relation to the internal auditing process. Scheme Documentation should be made readily available in a documented form, preferably in the form of a dedicated “Quality Manual. Instructions must be specific and adequate in order to ensure that all requirements of the Group Scheme and UKWAS are met.”</p> <p>CU ‘Instruction’ = “Develop a manual as described above. Send evidence to Si for verification. See deadline below. The implementation will be verified during the next surveillance audit.”</p>					
		Objective Evidence:					
		CU evidence is contained within the Non-Conformance text above.					
		Close-out evidence:					
		<p>SGS assessment – A manual containing Scheme documentation has been produced to ensure that everyone within the Group Scheme system is familiar with procedures – particularly the internal auditing process. This was seen. The GSM confirmed that records shall be kept of internal communication and meetings demonstrating this.</p> <p>CU CAR 10 closed</p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
CU Minor CAR 11	CU ref. SI GSC 1.8	Date Recorded>	2 Nov 2005	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	24 Nov 2006
		Non-Conformance: Training of inspectors to monitor group members					
		<p>Ref. CU Non-conformity = “No formal evidence is available of the training of Smiths Gore personnel involved in the implementation of the Group Scheme. See also findings of 1.6 and 4.2.</p> <p>Smiths Gore personnel involved in any aspect of the SGFCS should be formally introduced to the requirements of the Scheme and the UKWA Standard. All people involved (Group Manager, Resource Managers, senior SG partners and owners) must be informed about the requirements and kept updated with changes on a regular basis.”</p> <p>CU ‘Instruction’ = “Records and evidence of internal communication and meetings shall be documented and submitted to SKAL International.”</p>					
		Objective Evidence:					
		CU evidence is contained within the Non-Conformance text above.					
		Close-out evidence:					

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
		<p>SGS assessment – As per the response to CAR 10, the GSM intends to address any training needs for internal group auditors via the regular 6 monthly SG forestry department meetings. Senior SG partners with overall responsibility for the SG forestry department are kept informed by the GSM who is also the head of the forestry department and an associate partner.</p> <p><u>CU CAR 11 closed</u></p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
CU Minor CAR 12	CU ref. SI GSC 2.3.	Date Recorded>	2 Nov 2005	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	24 Nov 2006
		Non-Conformance: Stakeholder consultation regarding the forest management					
		<p>Ref. CU Non-conformity = “Reference to this requirement is included within the Smiths Gore Group Rules But it is not clear if this refers to the consultation of the stakeholders of the individual members or the Group Entity. The Rules should be revised to indicate that the requirement for stakeholder consultation is also applicable to the individual Group Members. Form GSE1 and GSB group rules should be revised accordingly.</p> <p>CU ‘Instruction’ = “Send evidence to SI for verification.”</p>					
		Objective Evidence:					
		CU evidence is contained within the Non-Conformance text above.					
		Close-out evidence:					
		<p>SGS assessment – Forms GSE1 (New Member Introduction) and GSB (Group rules) have been revised on 18 Jan and 16 Mar 2006 respectively. It is now clearly understood by all concerned that there should be stakeholder consultation by each individual member relative to their scheme application and entry, plus ongoing as required re. management planning and operations. Internal auditing will check this has been suitably done. This is different from the stakeholder consultation undertaken by the external auditors (the certification body certifying the SG group scheme, i.e. SGS).</p> <p><u>CU CAR 12 closed</u></p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
CU Minor CAR 13	CU ref. SI GSC 4.1.a.	Date Recorded>	2 Nov 2005	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	24 Nov 2006
		Non-Conformance: Records of the group shall be regularly maintained					
		<p>Ref. CU Non-conformity = “The list of Group Members, issued during the audit is not up to date. This should be revised and appropriate evidence sent to Skal International by the end of January 2006.”</p> <p>CU ‘Instruction’ = “Send evidence to SI for verification.”</p>					
		Objective Evidence:					
		CU evidence is contained within the Non-Conformance text above.					
		Close-out evidence:					
		<p>SGS assessment –Form GC1 (Group Control) also acts as a list of group members. This was seen and was found to be up to date.</p> <p><u>CU CAR 13 closed</u></p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
CU Minor CAR	CU ref. SI GSC 4.1.	Date Recorded>	2 Nov 2005	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	24 Nov 2006
		Non-Conformance: Records demonstrating the implementation of the results an internal control or monitoring system					

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
14		<p>Ref. CU Non-conformity = "Information is presumed to be co-ordinated and then held at the Fochabers office. The interim Group Manager should be in possession of all up to date internal control and monitoring information but this was not the case at the time of the audit.</p> <p>CU 'Instruction' = "Verification during the next audit."</p>					
		Objective Evidence:					
		CU evidence is contained within the Non-Conformance text above.					
		Close-out evidence:					
		<p>SGS assessment – The previous GSM was based in the SG Fochabers office in North Scotland. The sourcing and transfer of Group Scheme records has not been as easy or as comprehensive as the new GSM based in Edinburgh, South Scotland would have wished. The significant changes in SG forestry staff which led to a temporary break down in internal monitoring during 2004/05 have also contributed to a less than comprehensive transfer of records. The new GSM has undertaken to continue to try with his colleagues' assistance to find any mislaid past records from the SG Fochabers office and transfer to the Edinburgh office.</p> <p>From discussion the new GSM is fully aware of the importance of proper maintenance of robust membership records and has a new system in place. This has been operating effectively during 2006 and samples of 2006 records were checked and found in order. The new GSM produced satisfactory documentary evidence that he has up to date current control and monitoring information.</p> <p><u>CU CAR 14 closed</u></p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
CU Major CAR 15	CU ref. SI GSC 1.6, 4.1.	Date Recorded>	2 Nov 2005	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	25 Feb 2009
		Non-Conformance: Implementation of the responsibilities specified in 1.2-1.5 of the group standards					
		<p>Ref. CU Non-conformity = "The management system of the members assessed during the 2005 surveillance audit doe not meet the requirements as reported in the UKWA checklist (annexed to the report). Evidencing the effectiveness of the internal control system of the group entity.</p> <p>In order to meet the requirements of the UKWA Standard, the applicant should make:</p> <p>1. An inventory of all weaknesses and non-compliances. 2. Set a scheme to implement all required aspects and 3. Report Skal International about the progress."</p> <p>CU 'Instruction' = "The plan of action should be made by end January 2006 with the requirements of the planned actions to be implemented by end of October 2006."</p>					
		Objective Evidence:					
		CU evidence is contained within the Non-Conformance text above.					
		Close-out evidence:					

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
<u>SGS Minor CAR 04.</u>		<p>SGS assessment – This CAR relates to the effectiveness of internal group member monitoring. Internal monitoring temporarily broke down as a system during 2004/05 due to recent SG forestry staff departures and consequent changes in GSM responsibility. The new GSM has now reactivated the internal monitoring system in 2006 and is currently undertaking a review. This is sensible as a revised system could be capable of managing compliance more time & cost effectively and with greater attention to risk.</p> <p>Form GC9 'Annual Activity Report' is received from each member and informs the GSM of levels of recent operational activity and plans for the next year. It also shows management plan period status and current area analysis of biodiversity. This information forms the basis of the internal audit which is recorded on form GSJ 'Certification Report' and identifies any internal CARs and Observations.</p> <p>The current system states that each member will receive an annual audit by a 'Group Manager' (not necessarily the GSM but a SG forest manager acting as an appointed group scheme internal auditor). There is scope to reduce the frequency of internal auditing for highly experienced managers with equally high UKWAS awareness and similarly for members with small areas and little operational activity. Attention must be maintained for those members with less UKWAS awareness and greater need of improvements to management planning.</p> <p>Completed forms GC9 for 2006 were seen for Ballogie, Ravenswood, Chillington and Arkleton. Completed GSJs were seen for Ravenswood, Chillington and Arkleton.</p> <p><u>Evidence of demonstrable progress – leave CU CAR 15 open, reduced to become SGS Minor CAR 04.</u></p> <p>Surveillance 01 :</p> <p>The revised Group Scheme Rules dated 22nd March 2007 were seen. Under Section 4.e, page 3, internal monitoring has been revised to allow for the frequency of visits to be determined by an assessment of the risk posed to compliance. Members managed by experienced managers with high levels of UKWAS awareness and members with small areas and little operational activity will be given less frequent monitoring than those members with less UKWAS awareness and greater need for improvements to management planning.</p> <p>This revision has been made clear to all SG managers. All new member applications are approved by the GSM.</p> <p>Recent internal monitoring reports (GSJs) for Chillington and Ballogie also confirmed as adequate.</p> <p>CAR 04 closed.</p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
SGS new Minor CAR 05	UKWAS 8.4.1	Date Recorded>	24 Nov 2006	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	25 Feb 2009
		Non-Conformance: Public Liability Insurance adequacy					
		UKWAS requires that public liability insurance specification for timber harvesting operations is consistent with industry recognised levels regarded as adequate. £2 Million cover is unnecessary risk exposure when £5 Million cover is widely available from main timber merchants.					
		Objective Evidence:					
		A sampled SG timber sales contract stated "The purchaser will keep an insurance cover of at least £2 million....". The industry norm is now recognised as £5 million, e.g. Institute of Chartered Foresters 'Timber Sale Contract' plus other private sector and FC operations.					
		<u>SGS Minor CAR 05 was raised</u>					
		Close-out evidence:					

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
		<p>The revised SG timber sales contract template was seen and it now includes public liability insurance cover at £5 million as the default norm. Also seen in practice, e.g. Muirhead thinning contract for Mansfield estate dated Sep 2008.</p> <p>CAR 05 closed.</p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
SGS new Minor CAR 06	UKWAS 6.3.2	Date Recorded>	24 Nov 2006	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	25 Feb 2009
		Non-Conformance: Deadwood practice below UKWAS standard					
		Deadwood practice does not always meet current UKWAS requirements.					
		Objective Evidence:					
		<p>E.g. Pitgaveny had site evidence of a significant lack of deadwood and it was understood that the member did not favour its retention. The SG Deadwood Strategy and Operators Instructions should be modified to cover requirements requiring machine operators to seek opportunities to leave deadwood.</p> <p><u>SGS Minor CAR 06 was raised</u></p>					
		Close-out evidence:					
		<p>The revised SG group scheme deadwood strategy was seen and it now includes very good reference to the requirements for deadwood under the UKWAS 2nd edition. The revised SG timber sales contract template now includes reference to deadwood practice requirements. From discussion the GSM well understands deadwood requirements and that an appraisal of deadwood opportunities, both standing and surface, needs to be taken for harvesting operations together with an overall assessment for the woodland as a whole. It is understood that it is particularly important to identify areas where deadwood is likely to be of greatest ecological value. It is also understood that, in addition, standing dead trees, snags and veteran trees of suitable dimension and quality need to be retained provided there are no health & safety or significant operational and landscape constraint considerations. Corresp. seen confirms that other SG managers have been reminded by the GSM.</p> <p>At Penicuik estate which is managed by the GSM there was plentiful distribution of deadwood of good ecological quality.</p> <p>CAR 06 closed.</p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
SGS new Minor CAR 07	UKWAS 6.3.1	Date Recorded>	24 Nov 2006	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	25 Feb 2009
		Non-Conformance: Natural Reserves and Long Term Retentions					
		There is an inconsistent approach to designating and mapping Natural Reserves and Long Term Retentions in some Management Plans.					
		Objective Evidence:					
		<p>E.g. Pitgaveny, Penicuik, Arniston. Some managers were unclear on the definitions of Natural Reserve and Long Term Retention. Definitions were understood by the Duthil and Ben Newe manager but designations and mapping were incomplete.</p> <p><u>SGS Minor CAR 07 was raised</u></p>					
		Close-out evidence:					

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
		<p>From discussion the GSM well understands the definitions of Natural Reserves and Long Term Retentions under UKWAS. Corresp. seen confirms that other SG managers have been reminded by the GSM.</p> <p>At Arniston NRs and LTRs have been identified and were shown on a map. They have been drafted for Penicuik, awaiting detailed identification of ASNW and PAWS boundaries.</p> <p>CAR 07 closed.</p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
SGS new Minor CAR 08	UKWAS 5.2.1	Date Recorded>	24 Nov 2006	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	25 Feb 2009
		Non-Conformance: Chemicals storage					
		Legal requirements and non-legislative guidance with chemicals storage are not always being followed.					
		Objective Evidence:					
		<p>At Pitgaveny the chemical store houses a collection of agricultural and forestry chemicals, some of which were out of date and some not labelled for forestry use. There was no warning sign on the chemical store door.</p> <p><u>SGS Minor CAR 08 was raised</u></p>					
		Close-out evidence:					
		<p>From record of corresp. and telecom notes the GSM was able to confirm the Pitgaveny chemical store now has a warning sign plus out of date pesticides have been disposed of by a licensed waste disposal operator. The GSM has a clear awareness of the need for monitoring of pesticide products and is aware of the current FSC 'highly hazardous' list.</p> <p>At Penicuik the farm chemical store is modern with a warning sign and has been checked by the estate's agricultural suppliers for any out of date products. A warning sign has been ordered for the forestry chemical store and its condition was acceptable for the small amounts being used by the forestry staff. Its contents were examined and found to be in order.</p> <p>CAR 08 closed.</p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
SGS new Minor CAR 09	UKWAS 4.2.1 & 5.5.3	Date Recorded>	24 Nov 2006	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	25 Feb 2009
		Non-Conformance: Water Guidelines & Spillage kit					
		Operations do not always comply with Water Guidelines, UKWAS and the SG Pollution Control Strategy.					
		Objective Evidence:					
		<p>At Silverburn, Penicuik, a perennial water course feeding the River North Esk had been damaged by skidding timber across it. Insufficient protection of the burn was in place, contravening Forest and Water guidelines. Neither were spillage kits available for the harvesting machines in operation at Penicuik.</p> <p><u>SGS Minor CAR 09 was raised</u></p>					
		Close-out evidence:					

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
		<p>From discussion the GSM well understands the Water Guidelines and highly relevant appropriate operational decision and control of this being put into practice was seen at an even more sensitive riparian site at Arniston estate. At Penicuik suitable spillage kit was seen at the forestry store (the estate tractor was not being used and was parked adjacent). The GSM has emphasised to the estate forestry staff the need for the spillage kit to be on site with machinery when estate operations are taking place near watercourses.</p> <p>CAR 09 closed.</p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
SGS new Minor CAR 10	UKWAS 8.1.2	Date Recorded>	24 Nov 2006	Due Date>	Next assessment	Date Closed>	25 Feb 2009
		Non-Conformance: First aid kit					
		Forest workers are not always adequately equipped for first aid contingency.					
		Objective Evidence:					
		<p>At Penicuik, a machine operator did not have a first aid kit. There was no site inspection regime in operation to record regular inspections of such equipment.</p> <p><u>SGS Minor CAR 10 was raised</u></p>					
		Close-out evidence:					
		<p>The revised SG harvesting supervision checklist was seen and it now includes reference to the need to discuss first aid requirements inc.a first aid kit with a large wound dressing on site as per Arboricultural & Forestry Advisory Group (AFAG) guidance. Similarly, the revised SG timber sales contract template was seen and it now includes reference to first aid requirements. The GSM is aware of the current review by the Health & Safety Executive, the FC and ConFor of first aid training requirement guidance for forestry and has seen its draft publication.</p> <p>At Penicuik certificates were seen for estate staff including those involved with forestry who have quite recently (19 Oct 2007) undergone refresher first aid training.</p> <p>CAR 10 closed.</p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
11	UKWAS 2.2.4	Date Recorded>	25 Feb 2009	Due Date>	Next surveillance	Date Closed>	09 Feb 2010
		Non-Conformance: Chain of Custody					
		Chain of custody codes are not shown on timber sales invoices.					
		Objective Evidence:					
		<p>Although the requirement is understood and timber sales contracts checked have been correctly sold as certified or non-certified, the sales administration system is not operational.</p> <p>Certified estate timber sales invoices do not show the Smiths Gore certification code number 'SGS-FM/CoC-003104', nor do they state that the material is described as certified by showing the term 'FSC Pure' material.</p> <p>E.g. Scottish Woodlands have acted as a timber purchasing company on a recent standing sale at Penicuik Estate. The SW self-billing invoice P1002806 of 13th Feb 2009 does not show the Smiths Gore code number nor describe the material as certified.</p> <p>CAR 11 raised.</p>					
		Close-out evidence:					

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
		<p>Email dated 24/11/09 sent by the Group Scheme Manager to Group and Resource Managers reminding them of the requirement to state FSC number and correct description.</p> <p>Review of certified timber sales invoices showing the applicable chain of custody code at (SGS-FM/CoC-003104) Ballogie Estate confirmed compliance. Another invoice (for Scone Estate) was checked and also found compliant.</p> <p>Observation SGS await requested guidance from FSC on their required protocol for self-billing invoices (SBIs) SBIs are common practice in the UK but, according to FSC, not in other countries.</p> <p>CAR 11 closed.</p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
12	UKWAS 5.1.6	Date Recorded>	25 Feb 2009	Due Date>	Next surveillance	Date Closed>	09 Feb 2010
		Non-Conformance: Pollution – Burning of tyres					
		Members' staff do not clearly understand safety precautions and environmental protection requirements.					
		Objective Evidence:					
		At Penicuik estate staff had been burning up piles of rhododendron. Tyres had been used to assist burning but this practice is now contrary to health & safety and pollution control regulatory requirements. In addition it is in conflict with the estate's own documented health & safety and pollution control policies.					
		CAR 12 raised.					
		Close-out evidence:					
		Letter stating UKWAS requirements sent by the Group Scheme Manager to Penicuik Estate staff dated 25/02/09. Smiths-Gore Pollution Control plan template updated and communicated to Group and Resource managers.					
		The Pollution Control Plan for Penicuik Estate was reviewed and it is confirmed that it has been updated. This includes details which inform staff and contractors that the practice of using tyres to assist with burning is contrary to Health & Safety and pollution control regulatory requirements, and therefore should not take place under any circumstance.					
		CAR 12 closed.					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
13	UKWAS 6.1.1	Date Recorded>	25 Feb 2009	Due Date>	Next surveillance	Date Closed>	09 Feb 2010
		Non-Conformance: Identification of Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (ASNW) and Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS)					
		ASNW and PAWS are not accurately mapped in areas where significant woodland management operations are taking place.					
		Objective Evidence:					
		At Penicuik the presence of ASNW and PAWS are known but not accurately mapped. Although general management awareness gives a general precautionary approach to protecting such areas, reliance to date upon the FC's Land Information Service search does not provide sufficient accuracy in the case of Penicuik.					
		CAR 13 raised.					
		Close-out evidence:					

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
		<p>The Group Scheme Manager is now aware of the limitations of the FC's Land Information Service search. The initial feedback information layer is often not adequate for full UKWAS compliance.</p> <p>At Penicuik, a survey with a report has now been carried by an ENGO, Scottish Native Woods, to identify the presence of ASNW and PAWS.</p> <p>At Ballogie Estate the ASNW and PAWS are accurately mapped to a high standard. A copy of the relevant pages of the Scottish Natural Heritage Ancient Woodland Register was seen to be maintained within the management planning documentation.</p> <p>CAR 13 closed.</p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
14	UKWAS 6.3.2	Date Recorded>	25 Feb 2009	Due Date>	Next surveillance	Date Closed>	09 Feb 2010
		Non-Conformance: Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS) restoration planning					
		Restoration planning for PAWS is insufficient.					
		Objective Evidence:					
		<p>At Penicuik PAWS restoration plans are incomplete. For UKWAS compliance these need to identify action to progressively improve the biodiversity values of the PAWS sites, including the maintenance and enhancement of remnant features, management prescriptions, prioritised implementation and the monitoring of their condition and response.</p> <p>CAR 14 raised.</p>					
		Close-out evidence:					
		<p>The Group Scheme Manager has reminded SG internal auditors and group members of this requirement.</p> <p>A survey at Penicuik with a report has now been carried out by the ENGO, Scottish Native Woods, to identify the presence of ASNW and PAWS. The report identifies action to progressively improve the biodiversity values of the PAWS sites.</p> <p>There is management planning and restoration work relating to PAWS restoration being implemented at Ballogie Estate as seen during the site visit.</p> <p>CAR 14 closed.</p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
15	UKWAS 6.4.2	Date Recorded>	25 Feb 2009	Due Date>	Next surveillance	Date Closed>	09 Feb 2010
		Non-Conformance: Sporting & Game management					
		Contractual control of shooting responsibilities and standards including the viable shooting of native game cannot be confirmed.					
		Objective Evidence:					
		<p>At the date of audit there was no evidence available to the forest manager for Penicuik estate that the game (and deer) shooting tenants have a shooting lease. (In contrast, a shooting lease exists for Arniston estate.) Neither were any game bag (or deer cull for 2007 & 2008) records available on file. There is no evidence of an assessment of the viability of shooting local game species. Similarly, firearms & shotgun certificates plus suitable public liability insurance cover for one tenant were over a year out of date and no longer valid.</p> <p>CAR 15 raised.</p>					
		Close-out evidence:					

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
		<p>Letter dated 26/02/09 sent by Penicuik Estate management to the vermin controller requesting current firearms certificates, current shot gun certificates and current insurance details. These were provided and were up to date. Game bag records and deer cull records for 2008-09 were also provided. (Ref Rural Surveying File PE26). The Estate Manager has obtained this year's returns. No formal lease is deemed necessary by the Estate as the vermin controller is not a sporting tenant and provides the service in return for being able to run a pheasant shoot on the Estate on an informal basis. An assessment of the viability of deer shooting is based on the numbers culled sustainably over previous years (ref. Penicuik deer management plan).</p> <p>Similar documents reviewed at Ballogie Estate during the audit confirmed that there is a management policy in place to monitor and assess game shooting for sporting purposes. Shooting at Ballogie is in-hand with no lease required. The Forest Plan contains an applicable section on sporting use.</p> <p>Firearms and shotgun certificates plus suitable public liability insurance cover for the shooting tenant at Ben Newe were reviewed and confirmed compliant.</p> <p>CAR 15 closed.</p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
16	UKWAS 7.1.1	Date Recorded>	09 Feb 2010	Due Date>	Next surveillance	Date Closed>	9 Sep 2010
		Non-Conformance:					
		Information for neighbours was not made available prior to implementation of high impact operations.					
		Objective Evidence:					
		<p>At Ben Newe, although the local community as a whole were well informed of felling operations prior to implementation, a small number of neighbouring householders were not made aware of spraying operations which were required to tackle Hylobius infestation and carried out during 2009. These neighbours' water supplies were buried within pipes to reach the associated holding tanks being filled by watercourses mostly from above the restock area. The spraying covered the buried pipe areas but avoided the actual tanks and watercourses above by only spraying adjacent to them. The spraying contractors were advised of the presence of water supplies as shown in their work instruction and risk assessment. However, the neighbours were not informed that spraying with an approved pesticide was taking place within the restock area containing their water supply infrastructure. The forest manager confirmed there was no prior contact to provide information or reassurance to them about environmental and safety precautions. Notification to the householders should have been made for UKWAS compliance.</p> <p>CAR 16 raised.</p>					
		Close-out evidence:					

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
		<p>The Group Scheme Manager has reminded SG internal auditors and group members of this requirement, namely that 'local people and relevant organisations and interest groups shall be made aware that 'high impact' operations are planned. Communication was sent accordingly by the GSM on 20th Aug 2010.</p> <p>At Ben Newe (a Group member not managed by SG) the managing agent has changed since this CAR was raised. The new agents have undertaken a further high impact operation on the estate ; ground preparation (scarification by machine) prior to replanting. A water supply was on site and the agent had a site meeting with the operator and the neighbour concerned. The water supply was pegged out prior to operations commencing.</p> <p>There was also good evidence from this audit that local people and organisations were made aware of high impact operations, e.g. at Whitewell ; a privately owned house is immediately adjacent to an extraction route. Copies of correspondence between the residents and SG were seen that provided evidence of an amicable dialogue and avoidance of problems ; Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Beauty (AONB). Evidence of correspondence and site meetings with the AONB footpaths officer demonstrated a sound relationship between the AONB managers and SG ; A SG tenant living adjacent to a timber access route had experienced some debris on the road adjacent to his house. Correspondence was examined that demonstrated a solution and avoidance of recurring problems ; Documented evidence was examined that demonstrated a close relationship between SG and the two shoots operating at Whitewell. Forestry operations have been carefully arranged to avoid critical times.</p> <p>CAR 16 closed</p>					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
17	UKWAS 6.3.1 / 6.3.2 FSC-UK 6.10.1 / 10.5.1	Date Recorded>	9 Sep 2010	Due Date>	Next surveillance	Date Closed>	open
		Non-Conformance:					
		Examples of both Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (ASNW) and also Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS) not being appropriately managed under UKWAS requirements were encountered.					
		Objective Evidence:					
		<p>At Crewe Estate the S-G forest manager was not aware the estate's game department had erected a pheasant release pen in an ASNW. It was agreed with S-G staff that the estate's management of the pen was having a significant negative impact on the ASNW ground flora by producing bare ground in its area due to the intensity of game bird numbers.</p> <p>At Chillington Estate both the new and old pheasant pens located within Big Hyde Rough wood were similarly having a negative impact on the ASNW ground flora by producing bare ground from the intensity of game bird numbers. Big Hyde Rough wood is both an ASNW and also a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</p> <p>Inappropriate restoration methods were being applied to restore remnant ASNW vegetation on a PAWS. At Whitewell (Compartment 13I) clear felling was being applied to a PAWS when thinning would have been preferable. As a result remnant ASNW vegetation was threatened. In addition, standing deadwood and site-native live alder had been felled. The operation was to be amended as a result of audit.</p> <p>CAR 17 raised.</p>					
		Close-out evidence:					
CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					

CAR #	Indicator	CAR Detail					
		Date Recorded>		Due Date>	Next surveillance	Date Closed>	Open
18	UKWAS 4.2.1 FSC-UK 6.5.1		9 Sep 2010				
		Non-Conformance:					
		Water Guidelines re. normal pollution control practice were not being followed.					
		Objective Evidence:					
		At two separate locations at Whitewell (Compartment 13) several full hydraulic and chain saw oil containers and grease cartons had been left unattended and unsecured. In addition fuel bowsers had been left unlocked, one with its cap open. CAR 18 raised.					
		Close-out evidence:					
19	UKWAS 2.1.1 FSC-UK 7.1.1		9 Sep 2010				
		Non-Conformance:					
		Not all Management Plans are fully compliant.					
		Objective Evidence:					
		The management planning documentation for Crewe Estate does not currently cover a 20 year period as per UKWAS 2.1.1 f) requirements : 'Outline planned felling and regeneration over the next 20 years.' For Crewe Estate, Smiths Gore has available a previous 'design plan' and scoping meeting documentation but currently does not have a fully compliant Management Plan. CAR 19 raised.					
		Close-out evidence:					

13. RECORD OF OBSERVATIONS

OBS #	Indicator	Observation Detail			
		Date Recorded>		Date Closed>	
01	UKWAS 2.1.1		24 Nov 2006		25 Feb 2009
		Observation: Management Planning			
		All plans must include a 20 year outline of felling and restocking with 5 year plans in detail as per UKWAS. Plans should clearly set and prioritise their objectives.			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		This is addressed by SG's response in closing out SGS CAR 01. SG Group members' management plans already have or will have by the end of 2009 – 20 year outline of felling & restocking plans, plus clear and priorities objectives.			
02	UKWAS 2.3.2		24 Nov 2006		25 Feb 2009
		Observation: Monitoring			
		Contact where appropriate with SNH and LBAP officers with the aim of surveying and monitoring Rare Threatened & Endangered habitats and species should be included.			

OBS #	Indicator	Observation Detail			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		SG were able to demonstrate contact with both SNH staff and the LBAP officer for the SG Haddington office. SG (by the GSM) have contributed to the writing of the Midlothian BAP's section on Woodland Habitat Action Plans. These included Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (ASNW), Gorge woodland, Parkland trees, Wood Pasture, Veteran trees and Plantation woodlands. The Midlothian LBAP deals with both surveying and monitoring. The GSM is well aware of this requirement and has briefed the other Group Scheme managers accordingly.			
03	SGS Qualifor Group Scheme Checklist AD34 Sections 2 & 3	Date Recorded>	24 Nov 2006	Date Closed>	25 Feb 2009
		Observation: Group Scheme Management (SGS Checklist sections 2: Management Responsibility and 3: Management System)			
		The writing of a comprehensive manual demonstrates that the new GSM has diligently applied thought to the matter but the manual's future and continued use by all other members of staff will depend upon time being available to absorb it and thereafter apply it consistently including updates. Much responsibility falls upon the internal group auditors who are all forestry managers with the advantage of ongoing practical experience but substantial management workloads. Regular face to face meetings between the GSM and his 3 internal auditors will greatly facilitate proper and consistent scheme implementation and there should not be reliance upon the manual. The SG forestry department has meetings every 6 months. Amongst others, the GSM and the 3 internal auditors always attend and so certification could easily be a regular item on the agenda for this purpose at no extra cost.			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		The GSM wishes to retain use of the SG Group Scheme manual and appreciates it will require to be maintained accurately with updated information. Nevertheless, SG provided evidence to confirm certification is regularly discussed or corresponded about within the SG forestry department.			
04	SGS Qualifor Group Scheme Checklist AD34 Section 3.2 & 5.1	Date Recorded>	24 Nov 2006	Date Closed>	09 Feb 2010
		Observation: Internal audit and review			
		Form GSJ also needs revision to clearly show how internal CARs will be responded to and with a specified timeframe that is checked at next internal audit. There were some inconsistencies between internal auditors in identifying when internal CARS were to be addressed. The GSM has plans to deal with this as part of his overall revision of internal group monitoring.			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		Although the GSM has now introduced a standard timeframe for closing out internal SG CARs, the revision of internal monitoring needs to be extended and checking of implementation fully completed by the GSM.			
		Although it is appropriate to determine risk of non-compliance and, as a consequence, suitable monitoring intensity and sampling of members, group scheme records must be maintained to this effect. Therefore records of CAR status being open or closed and SG / members signatures need to be adequately maintained. E.g. the scheme entry records seen for Mansfield estate did not have CAR status recorded, although documented evidence existed to confirm they had actually been closed out.			
		This observation therefore remains open.			
		The GSM has discussed this issue with the other SG internal auditors at their forestry meetings. Sample records were checked and found in order.			
05	UKWAS 6.1.1	Date Recorded>	24 Nov 2006	Date Closed>	25 Feb 2009
		Observation: GIS Mapping Support			
		The SG GIS system needs to be able to provide complete mapping support for forest management. Currently the GIS layer for Biodiversity is not able to print maps and were this to continue it would be a management constraint.			
		Follow-up evidence:			

OBS #	Indicator	Observation Detail			
		<p>Good GIS produced maps were seen for Arniston but check at next opportunity for Biodiversity layer printing.</p> <p>Although there have been no problems with non-compliance, opportunity has still not arisen. To be checked at next surveillance as a priority.</p> <p>Re.Observation 05 Ballogie Estate maintain a clear and concise biodiversity layer on their electronic mapping system and appropriate maps printed and maintained in the approved Forest Plan documentation.</p> <p>Obs 05 closed.</p>			
06	UKWAS 8.1.2 & 5.5.1	Date Recorded>	24 Nov 2006	Date Closed>	25 Feb 2009
		Observation: High Seats & Harvesting Debris			
		<p>All high seats for deer control should be of suitable standard. Harvesting debris should be cleared from site. At Pluscarden one high seat bordering on the defunct, involved adaptation of an old high lead timber extraction tower which did not appear suitable. The manager confirmed it was scheduled for dismantling in the foreseeable future (but see also commendation on this issue.) An old 45 gallon fuel drum left by previous harvesting contractors is still to be disposed.</p> <p>Plastic Treeshelters Disposal</p> <p>UKWAS requires that when these are redundant they be disposed of to current legal environmental standards. There should be a SG group policy addition on the matter to guide managers.</p>			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		<p>No significant harvesting debris was seen at any of the current or recent harvesting sites at Penicuik or Arniston. SG confirm the individual high seat that was unsuitable for deer control at Pluscarden has been dismantled.</p> <p>SG now have now updated their group policy on this requirement and the issue disseminated amongst SG Group Scheme managers.</p>			
07	UKWAS 2.3.1	Date Recorded>	24 Nov 2006	Date Closed>	25 Feb 2009
		Observation: Felling Plans			
		<p>At Pitgaveny a recent felling plan had not been completed due to annual budgetary constraints, though the additional felling is scheduled to be completed within the agreed 5 year felling Plan.</p>			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		SG were able to confirm the felling plan for Pitgaveny has now been completed.			
08	UKWAS 5.1.4	Date Recorded>	24 Nov 2006	Date Closed>	09 Feb 2010
		Observation: Deer Management			
		<p>Deer management strategies could be modified (and simplified) to relate deer management requirements to the monitoring of impacts.</p>			
		Follow-up evidence:			

OBS #	Indicator	Observation Detail			
		<p>Discussed with GSM at closing meeting but requires checking at next opportunity.</p> <p>Discussed further with the GSM who confirms these comments have been taken on board by the SG internal auditors.</p> <p>At Ballogie there is an exemplary approach to deer management which includes the owner taking an active part in the local deer management group (East Grampian Sub-Area 3 Deer Group). The estate employs a forest ranger who manages the deer control programme and very comprehensive cull records are maintained.</p> <p>The Ballogie Forest Plan includes a very detailed Deer Management Plan which includes monitoring procedures and maintenance of records. See also 2.1.1</p> <p>At Ben Newe the approach to pro-active deer management was also found to be commendable with the forest manager taking steps to actively review the deer control contract. On review, the arrangements in place for deer control were found not to have been implemented to expected levels and, thus, at renewal, the lease was awarded to a more suitable contractor.</p>			
09	UKWAS 5.5.1	Date Recorded>	24 Nov 2006	Date Closed>	25 Feb 2009
		Observation: Plastic Treeshelters Disposal			
		UKWAS requires that when these are redundant they be disposed of to current legal environmental standards. There should be a SG group policy addition on the matter to guide managers.			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		SG now have now updated their group policy on this requirement and the issue disseminated amongst SG Group Scheme managers.			
10	UKWAS 8.1.2	Date Recorded>	24 Nov 2006	Date Closed>	25 Feb 2009
		Observation: - First Aid Training for field operators (General observation)			

OBS #	Indicator	Observation Detail			
		<p>UKWAS 8.1.2 states that “the manager promotes continuous improvement in standards of health & safety and ensures that <u>all workers</u> – have had relevant <u>training</u> in safe working practice and <u>first aid</u>.” This UKWAS wording would seem clear and the new UKWAS wording is virtually the same (all workers/instruction/first aid procedures etc).</p> <p>There are perhaps 5 main issues to this observation.</p> <p>This issue was previously raised as a CAR in 2002/03 for another SGS client under their first certificate. It was then agreed with the client that an appropriate Risk Assessment with a system to check its application was sufficient to close out the original CAR. Upon review this seems short on the UKWAS requirement of relevant first aid training.</p> <p>First aid training is understood to not be a legal requirement but universally agreed as best practice in risk management. The HSE guide to ‘Managing Health & Safety in Forestry’ refers to first aid training under ‘Forestry safety skills’ and ‘measures to deal with emergencies’. AFAG Code of Practice refers to ‘attendance at an approved training course is strongly recommended.’ UKWAS consistently refers to both HSE, AFAG and recognised best practice in determining compliance for criteria.</p> <p>Excellent, forestry relevant first aid training is now more readily available than in 2002.</p> <p>Training costs money and UK contractors are under constant financial pressure. Nevertheless, they are now increasingly undergoing such training, sometimes sponsored by their main employer. E.g. major timber purchasing companies.</p> <p>How to specify any first aid training requirement contractually, consistent with UKWAS compliance.</p> <p>Throughout the UKWAS there is reference to the requirement for relevant training with evidence of appropriate certificates of competence. There is complete agreement in the application of UKWAS that relevant training and certificates of competence are required for e.g. operators of chainsaws, forestry machinery and application of pesticides. It is incongruous that a first aid training requirement is not clearly applied in the same way, particularly given the UKWAS wording and a widely accepted view and practice that it is entirely appropriate for modern forestry management.</p> <p>SGS’ view on pragmatic future application of this UKWAS criterion would be that it need only apply to hazardous situations such as timber harvesting, with a requirement for at least one operator on site to have first aid training. Two is obviously preferable but lone working practice is accepted by all involved in the UK for some situations, e.g. lorry drivers. SGS to discuss further with other clients and discuss again with SG in order to reach a constructive and pragmatic consensus of interpretation of UKWAS requirements.</p> <p>Follow-up evidence:</p> <p>Discussed with the GSM as an update on this issue. The GSM is aware of the new forthcoming amended regulations for first aid training requirements to be published by the Health & Safety Executive. He has seen articles and draft guidance in advance.</p> <p>The GSM will check the final publication for its taking effect as law in October 2009. Meantime SG intend that at least one person suitably trained in emergency life saving skills will be present on sites with hazardous operations, e.g. harvesting, pesticide spraying. The SG operational contract template will be amended accordingly.</p>			
11	UKWAS 8.1.2	Date Recorded>	24 Nov 2006	Date Closed>	25 Feb 2009
		Observation: First Aid Training for field operators (Specific observation)			
		As an example of this issue under Observation 10 in practice, first aid certificates for forest workers at Penicuik have expired (2005). Re-assessment would be required to maintain their valid status.			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		Valid certificates were seen for several Penicuik estate staff. The estate should be commended for their commitment to first aid training for estate staff.			
12	SGS	Date Recorded>	24 Nov 2006	Date Closed>	25 Feb 2009

OBS #	Indicator	Observation Detail			
	Qualifor Group Scheme Checklist AD34 Section 4.1 c)	Observation: Group Scheme Management : Point at which members have certified status			
		<p>SGS Group Scheme Checklist - criterion 4. 'Membership of the Group', ref. 4.1 c) "Has the group management carried out an initial evaluation of the applicant's abilities to meet <u>all</u> the requirements of the standard ?")</p> <p>The SG Group Scheme management documents GS:B5 'Timetable For Conformity' plus GS:H 'Acceptance' show how a SG member can declare their woodland management and their timber sales certified at the point they have 'Probationary' status. They are then conditionally expected to proceed to 'Full' membership status following further compliance activity. As a 'Probationer' a member does not have to be compliant with regard to - 'baseline information, native woodland, cultural & recreational resources assessed, review of monitoring proposals and procedures, chemical reduction strategy, wildlife, biodiversity and (all other aspects of) the management plan' - prior to being accepted as a Probationary member with FSC certification status.</p> <p>SG have been advised by their certification consultant and apparently verified by an FSC accredited Certification Body, i.e. SKAL/CU, that this is acceptable with audit track record verifying it to be acceptable as a system. Although SKAL/CU did express some reservations in its system implementation in practice and raised related CARs, ref. page 89 of their main assessment report no. 018684-2002-1-CP.</p> <p>In contrast, SGS would view this 'probationer / full member' protocol as a deficiency in the SG group scheme system, since UKWAS compliance on FSC important criteria such as management planning inc. resource assessment and biodiversity, monitoring and chemicals is not required prior to certified status. Under the SGS FSC accredited system, this could be achieved if there were no SG internal Major CARs on these UKWAS criteria requiring close out by a client or at least reduction to Minor CAR level. Under the existing system, it is understood that it is possible to have theoretical Major CARs on these criteria (e.g. no management plan) and still be classed with certified status inc. declaration of FSC certified timber sales.</p> <p><i>Referring to SGS Qualifor global programme manager for guidance and further discussion with the SG Group Scheme Manager.</i></p> <p><i>SGS Qualifor global programme management has not encountered similar approach to this issue and is awaiting comment from FSC International. FSC response still awaited as at 10 Feb 2007.</i></p> <p>Follow-up evidence:</p> <p>SGS Qualifor received the following reply from FSC International on 14 March 2007 which stated 'Members must be able to demonstrate full compliance with FSC Principles & Criteria <u>before</u> they can start selling timber as FSC (certified) or make any claims about their status. This must be ensured by the Group Scheme Manager and finally by the Certification Body.'</p> <p>SGS Qualifor takes this to confirm their interpretation of FSC compliance requirements.</p> <p>There is no further issue of debate as SG have elected to switch to the SGS system of awarding certification status only if internal SG minor CARs are raised (and are subsequently closed out with internal SG monitoring). Internal SG major CARs will preclude certification status.</p> <p>Ref. revised SG Group Rules (Doc.GS B), section 8 'Timetable for Conformity' – "Only when members achieve Full Membership are they able to demonstrate full compliance with the UKWAS, entitling them to describe their woodlands as managed sustainably to the UKWAS and to sell their timber produce as FSC certified."</p> <p>This change in group rules was changed after re-assessment and circulated to all group scheme managers. All new member applications can only be approved by the GSM.</p>			
13	UKWAS 5.22	Date Recorded>	25 Feb 2009	Date Closed>	31 Mar 2010
		Observation: Pesticides – Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH)			

OBS #	Indicator	Observation Detail			
		Although inspection and dialogue evidence confirmed they were not being used, the section (page 10) on COSHH assessments within the Penicuik Health & Safety file contains some out of date products.			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		The GSM confirmed that the Penicuik Health & Safety has been reviewed and updated accordingly.			
14	UKWAS 5.5.2	Date Recorded>	25 Feb 2009	Date Closed>	09 Feb 2010
		Observation: Biodegradable lubricants			
		It is understood that Penicuik estate staff are experimenting with biodegradable chainsaw oil. Under UKWAS managers must be able to justify the use of non-biodegradable lubricants.			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		There is low usage of non-biodegradable lubricants and concern by Penicuik estate over its practicability from excessive wear to chain and guide bar when using biodegradable chainsaw oil. External firewood sales are no longer taking place, thus significantly reducing chainsaw usage by directly employed staff on Penicuik Estate.			
15	UKWAS 5.5.3	Date Recorded>	25 Feb 2009	Date Closed>	09 Feb 2010
		Observation: Plans and equipment to prevent accidental spillages			
		Penicuik estate uses an old County forestry tractor for its own operations which was seen parked adjacent the forestry store. The estate has many watercourses throughout its boundary and it is therefore important that it is suitably maintained and any oil or hydraulic leaks fixed. A current leak has been reported. The documented estate environmental policy (page 6 of the Health & Safety file) states that ".....to operate and maintain estate vehicles so far as is reasonably practicable with due regard to environmental issues." The documented estate risk assessment (page 9 of the Health & Safety file) states that "All tractors are (to be) well maintained."			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		At Ballogie during the visit to the live thinning site (Compartment 131, Auchaballa) interview with both the contracted harvester and forwarder operators, and inspection of their spill kits, confirmed they were suitably equipped to deal with accidental spillages and accidents.			
16	UKWAS 6.2.2	Date Recorded>	25 Feb 2009	Date Closed>	09 Feb 2010
		Observation: Deadwood management			
		It is important that good deadwood opportunities are not missed by operators on fuel wood harvesting sites. E.g. at Arniston estate the timber stacks at the Yorkston harvesting site contained some old medium sized Scots Pine and large diameter Spruce deadwood. Hence, the importance of assessing the whole woodland area plus pre-operational site appraisal and operator instructions.			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		The GSM has confirmed that a revised deadwood habitat strategy is now in place and has been communicated to group members. Suitable examples of deadwood provision were seen at both Ballogie and Ben Newe.			
17	SGS Qualifor Group Scheme Checklis t AD34	Date Recorded>	09 Feb 2010	Date Closed>	09 Sep 2010
		Observation: Group Scheme Management			
		During the audit visits to both Ballogie and Ben Newe the forest managers did not have a copy of the most recent external audit report readily available for review and were not completely aware of the issues which were raised in external surveillance audit 01(2009). Although it could be established that both managers had indeed received a copy of the previous report, it is important for Group Scheme and UKWAS compliance that the Group Scheme Manager ensures all managers take full account of the reports based on the audit samples of forest management.			

OBS #	Indicator	Observation Detail			
	Section 3.1 e)	Follow-up evidence:			
		The Group Scheme Manager has reminded SG internal auditors and group members of this requirement. Communication was sent accordingly by the GSM on 20 th Aug 2010. From interview and dialogue during the audit, both managers at the S-G Lichfield office were clearly aware of the content of the last external audit report.			
		Observation 17 closed.			
18	UKWAS	Date Recorded>	09 Feb 2010	Date Closed>	open
	2.1.1	Observation:			
		At Ben Newe the relevant constraints map does not identify the 33 KV wayleave which traverses compartment 25. Given the significant hazard, and the planned clear felling operation within this compartment, clear mapping of the wayleave would be required before operations commence.			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		The Group Scheme Manager has reminded SG internal auditors and group members of this requirement. Communication was sent accordingly by the GSM on 20 th Aug 2010.			
		Ben Newe is a Group member (S-G do not provide the management) and the managing agent involved with the raising of this Observation has left. A new company has been appointed and has not yet had time to address outstanding issues such as this Observation. This needs to be addressed by next assessment and the GSM has undertaken to meet with the new managers and follow up accordingly.*			
		Management Plans for Whitewell, Wyreside, Salwick and Chillington were examined. All were appended with good quality maps showing felling, thinning and restocking plans, constraints and biodiversity interests. In addition, copies of work programmes for each sub-compartment were seen and all included documentation of constraints.			
		Crewe management planning included attention to constraints imposed by protection of rare species (Great Crested Newt) for recent harvesting operations. However the management plan itself did not cover the required 20 year period, ref. CAR 19.			
		Observation 18 remains open*.			
19	UKWAS	Date Recorded>	09 Feb 2010	Date Closed>	09 Sep 2010
	2.2.1	Observation:			
		The thinning records maintained at Ballogie Estate, although in place and adequate for minimum compliance with UKWAS, should however be more comprehensive in the analysis of the detail contained. This will enable direct correlation between forecast and actual yield records. This will allow more efficient and useful production forecasting to take place.			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		The Group Scheme Manager has reminded SG internal auditors and group members of this requirement. Communication was sent accordingly by the GSM on 20 th Aug 2010.			
		The GSM could demonstrate that he had followed this up and that Ballogie Estate confirmed they have attended to the updating of their thinning records to be more comprehensive enabling analysis for production forecasting.			
		Production forecasts and weight tickets were examined for Whitewell. SG make routine comparisons between estimated and actual yields from these data and a spreadsheet is maintained at the Lichfield office.			
		Observation 19 closed			
20	UKWAS	Date Recorded>	24 Nov 2006	Date Closed>	09 Feb 2010
		Observation:			

OBS #	Indicator	Observation Detail			
	2.3.4	<p>It is important that monitoring data shall be analysed and the findings taken into account by management, particularly during revision of the management planning documentation, particularly at the 5 yearly reviews.</p> <p>From discussion the GSM fully understands this requirement. Most of the SG Management Plans are relatively recent or are being developed, and the members sampled fall into this category. Therefore there has not yet been the opportunity for a 5 year review when monitoring data shall be analysed. Nevertheless, dialogue with managers establishes that this requirement is understood.</p> <p>Follow-up evidence:</p> <p>From interview and discussion, the forest managers interviewed at Ballogie and Ben Newe understand the relevance of monitoring for the purpose of analysis, particularly for management plan reviews, e.g. at Ballogie Estate the comprehensive record keeping regarding the deer management, including deer counts and cull targets, and associated analysis are duly fed back through into proactive management planning. This is of particular relevance to the natural regeneration establishment of the large native pinewood and for maintaining collaborative working with neighbouring estates woodland owners.</p>			
21	UKWAS 4.1.1	Date Recorded>	09 Feb 2010	Date Closed>	09 Sep 2010
		Observation:			
		<p>At Ballogie Estate (Compartment 131, Auchaballa), the harvesting contractors employed by the timber buyer were seen to be systematically using urea to treat the cut stumps as a matter of course based on a requirement by Ballogie Estate. UKWAS requires that the manager assesses on and off-site impacts and at Ballogie there could be an improved appraisal and understanding of need by the current manager in determining the decision to apply urea as stump treatment. An estate Urea Policy would assist compliance.</p>			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		<p>The Group Scheme Manager has reminded SG internal auditors and group members of this requirement. Communication was sent accordingly by the GSM on 20th Aug 2010, namely, 'All group and resource managers should refer to the Forestry Commission Decision Support System available from the FC website to determine whether or not to apply urea as stump treatment.'</p> <p>The GSM could demonstrate that he had followed this up and Ballogie Estate were able to confirm they have attended to policy development with an amendment to the forest plan.</p> <p>No urea was used in the area assessed, e.g. at Chillington, timber operations have involved hardwoods where treatment with Urea would not be appropriate. A policy statement is provided in each MP re- pesticide use.</p> <p>Observation 21 closed</p>			
22	UKWAS 5.2.2	Date Recorded>	09 Feb 2010	Date Closed>	open
		Observation:			
		<p>Although the Pesticide Application Record seen for Ben Newe identified the date and the area (hectares) of application, in addition to the species treated, it did not identify the actual compartment where operations have taken place. As such, the adequacy of usage records for UKWAS compliance is marginal and relies upon the manager's personal knowledge of site. (See also Minor CAR 16).</p>			
		Follow-up evidence:			

OBS #	Indicator	Observation Detail			
		<p>The Group Scheme Manager has reminded SG internal auditors and group members of this requirement. Communication was sent accordingly by the GSM on 20th Aug 2010.</p> <p>Ben Newe is a Group member (S-G do not provide the management) and the managing agent involved with the raising of this Observation has left. A new company has been appointed and has not yet had time to address outstanding issues such as this Observation. This needs to be addressed by next assessment and the GSM has undertaken to meet with the new managers and follow up accordingly.*</p> <p>At Whitewell the SG manager provided evidence of locations of Warfarin applications for Grey Squirrel control.</p> <p>Observation 22 remains open.</p>			
23	UKWAS 6.2.1	Date Recorded>	09 Feb 2010	Date Closed>	9 Sep 2010
		Observation:			
		<p>At Ballogie Estate, although the identification and management of long-term retentions (LTR) and natural reserves (NR) is being carried out at operational level and is specified in the management planning documentation. The identification of LTRs and NRs, as determined by the forest manager, regarding the interpretation of the wording of the UKWAS, and the subsequent classification of these areas on the estate, could be more clear. Both the LTR and NR areas also require to be better mapped accordingly.</p>			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		<p>The Group Scheme Manager has reminded SG internal auditors and group members of this requirement. Communication was sent accordingly by the GSM on 20th Aug 2010. This included the UKWAS definitions of LTR and NR.</p> <p>The GSM could demonstrate that he had followed this up and that Ballogie Estate confirmed they were reviewing the way these areas are mapped.</p> <p>There was a very good understanding by managers of NRs and LTRs. NRs and LTRs at Whitewell were of the highest standard, accurately defined and mapped. These areas had also been defined and mapped at Wyreside and Salwick and met UKWAS requirements at all locations.</p> <p>Observation 23 closed</p>			
24	UKWAS 7.4.2	Date Recorded>	09 Feb 2010	Date Closed>	open
		Observation:			
		<p>During the site visit to Ben Newe (compartment 19), a small disused water supply tank was inspected located at ground level and which contained water, probably less than 1.5 m deep. This was observed therefore as a potential hazard in that it had an opening at ground level which was not covered or protected. The forest manager requires to mitigate the risk to the public by closing the currently unguarded opening. Although the site in question was quiet and fairly remote without significant public access nearby, nevertheless, there were a few buildings in the area and the current situation is a potential risk to small children or pets.</p>			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		<p>The Group Scheme Manager has reminded SG internal auditors and group members of this requirement. Communication was sent accordingly by the GSM on 20th Aug 2010.</p> <p>Ben Newe is a Group member (S-G do not provide the management) and the managing agent involved with the raising of this Observation has left. A new company has been appointed and has not yet had time to address outstanding issues such as this Observation. This needs to be addressed by next assessment and the GSM has undertaken to meet with the new managers and follow up accordingly.*</p> <p>During the course of this audit, hazard assessments and constraints mapping was to a high standard.</p> <p>Observation 24 remains open.*</p>			
25	UKWAS	Date Recorded>	09 Feb 2010	Date Closed>	9 Sep 2010

OBS #	Indicator	Observation Detail			
	8.1.1	Observation:			
		At Ballogie Estate, (compartment 131, Auchaballa) where live thinning operations were being carried out the forwarder machine operator interviewed was found to be carrying a fully comprehensive first-aid kit; however, the harvester operator did not maintain a similar kit within his harvesting machine. In this instance, the first-aid kit did not contain a large wound dressing. Given the hazardous operations taking place, it is considered normal practice for there to be a basic emergency first aid kit in both machines, in addition to there being a comprehensive kit at some location			
		Follow-up evidence:			
		The Group Scheme Manager has reminded SG internal auditors and group members of this requirement. Communication was sent accordingly by the GSM on 20 th Aug 2010, namely 'The Smiths Gore Group Forest Certification Scheme standard timber sale agreement refers to on site First Aid (AFAG guide 802) at section 19 which should be adhered to by harvesting contractors.'			
26	UKWAS 2.3.1 FSC-UK 7.2.2	Date Recorded> 9 Sep 2010 Date Closed> Open			
		Observation:			
		At Salwick (Compartments 1, 9b, 14) work described in the MP had not been done. A stated intention to plant and subsequently follow up with weeding and beating-up had not been effected and, although we are still within the duration of the work programme, no amendment to the MP had been made.			
		Follow-up evidence:			
27	UKWAS 2.3.3 FSC-UK 8.1.2	Date Recorded> 9 Sep 2010 Date Closed> Open			
		Observation:			
		SG need to consider whether their recording of planting details is sufficiently adequate and robust.			
		Recording details of recent restocking and new planting at Crewe Estate is currently understood to be of a paper nature that is filed and such files may be archived in future. This information, for both conifers and broadleaves, should be recorded in a form that is use over the long term for future reference on performance and adaptability to climate change.			
28	UKWAS 7.1.1 FSC-UK 4.4.1	Date Recorded> 9 Sep 2010 Date Closed> Open			
		Observation:			
		SG need to consider the full range of methods of making local people aware Smiths Gore Group Scheme members' certification status and review the example methods referred to under UKWAS 7.1.1 guidance.			
		At Chillington the consultation letter produced in connection with their Forest Plan had scope to refer to FSC certification and the UKWAS.			
29	UKWAS 6.3.2	Date Recorded> 9 Sep 2010 Date Closed> Open			
		Observation:			

OBS #	Indicator	Observation Detail			
	FSC-UK 10.5.1	At Chillington, although the manager well understood the difference between PAWS and ASNW, their differentiation had not been mapped differently. Accurate mapping would assist awareness and management planning for both habitats.			
		Follow-up evidence:			
30	UKWAS 2.1.1 FSC-UK 7.1.1	Date Recorded>	9 Sep 2010	Date Closed>	Open
		Observation:			
		Managers are required under UKWAS 2.1.1 to take into account of the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Habitat Action Plans (HAPS) and Species Action Plans (SAPs) within their management planning. S-G managers should check whether a local BAP (LBAP) exists and whether there is an appointed LBAP officer who could confirm those habitats and species to which local forest management could make the most effective contribution.			
		Follow-up evidence:			
31	UKWAS 2.1.2 FSC-UK 7.4.1	Date Recorded>	9 Sep 2010	Date Closed>	Open
		Observation:			
		Managers need to consider what other routes could be available to make the public aware that management planning documentation, or, a summary of its primary elements will be provided upon request. At present, Smiths Gore tend to rely upon the fact that FC regulatory authority approved plans are required to go onto a public register where they can be seen by the public for a limited period. This UKWAS requirement may be made more clear within the UKWAS 3 rd edition.			
		Follow-up evidence:			
00	UKWAS	Date Recorded>		Date Closed>	
		Observation:			
		Follow-up evidence:			

14. RECORD OF STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS AND INTERVIEWS

Nr	Comment	SGS Response
Main Evaluation		
1	ENGO – Example of good knowledge of UKBAP bird species presence.	Noted.
2	Gov't – SG operate in a professional manner, no concerns.	Noted.
3	Gov't – Deer management planning is satisfactory and there are no serious issues in area of jurisdiction (south Scotland)	Noted.
4	Gov't – No concerns, unable to comment further.	Noted.
5	Gov't - No concerns, unable to comment further.	Noted.
6	Other - SG operate in a professional manner and are diligent in pursuit of client needs.	Noted.
7	Other – Good to deal with as a sporting tenant.	Noted.
8	Other – Sympathetic and friendly landowning client re. provision of public access facility.	Noted.
Surveillance 1		
1	ENGO – In discussion with SG over their working on contract to complete identification of Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (ASNW) and Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS) for SG.	Noted.
2	Government – No concerns over forestry regulation and legal requirements, SG are competent forest managers.	Noted.
3	Government (Scottish Water) – Re. timber extraction operations during 2008 in the vicinity of Gladhouse reservoir at Maudslie. Consulted prior to felling operations and no concerns reported during and afterwards. Interested in global context and glad to know generally that independently audited FSC / UKWAS certification compliance takes place.	Observation of commendation – At Arniston estate the risk management of siltation pollution from timber extraction at Maudslie, of a watercourse leading to a reservoir for drinking water consumption, had been very quickly and effectively dealt with by negotiating with the local farm tenant and altering the extraction route.
4	Other – Individual member of the general public. Footpaths and car parking facility much appreciated at Penicuik estate.	Observation of commendation - Penicuik estate is adjacent Penicuik village and close to the urban fringe of Edinburgh. The estate have managed to achieve a high level of public access provision whilst still maintaining some privacy and traditional estate activity such as game shooting. This has come from an astute strategy of managed public access with good facilities for public use. Car parking and dry surfaced footpaths have been provided at locations and a documented recreational plan has been produced.
Surveillance 2		
1	ENGO – RSPB – Satisfactory working relationship with relevant FMUs.	Noted.

Nr	Comment	SGS Response
Main Evaluation		
2	Other – large local Community Trust . Extensive and effective collaborative working particularly regarding deer management and capercaillie/black grouse conservation. The woodland managers and the managers of Ballogie estate are seen in high regard by the Trust.	Noted
3	Other – member of recreational body who gain access to Ballogie estate woodlands on regular basis, and have done for many years. Positive relationship which works well.	Noted
4	Other – neighbouring landowner of Ballogie Estate. Good positive working relationship as always.	Noted
Surveillance 3		
1	Gov't - (Natural England) : Generally, not a high degree of interaction, impression of forest management from NE perspective is ok/neutral. Specifically, with regard to Chillington estate and Big Hyde Rough SSSI, tend to agree with SGS that the impact of the pheasant pens upon the ground flora & invertebrate population is undesirable, would welcome a change in the site's management accordingly. The pens' acceptance to date relates to a period when NE's predecessors' powers were more limited.	Noted. Ref. CAR 17 regarding ASNW and PAWS management non-compliances inc impact of pheasant pens at Chillington, but also observation of commendation for management elsewhere of non-designated ASNW, and an example of a low impact pheasant pen on another S-G managed property.
2	Gov't - (regulatory authority) : Very active and conscientious. Experience of Chillington involves several small fellings and replantings, all with approval and satisfactorily carried out.	Noted
3	Other - Whitewell estate neighbour : Suitable levels of communication over the impact of forestry operations and that any issues were satisfactorily dealt with.	Noted
Surveillance 4		

15. RECORD OF COMPLAINTS

Nr	Detail		
	Complaint:	Date Recorded >	dd MMM yy
	No complaints to date.		
	Objective evidence obtained:		
	Close-out information:	Date Closed >	dd MMM yy

ANNEXURE 1**List of Group Certificate Members**

Name of Group member (name of Forest / Woodlands)	Contact Details : Resource Member – Owner & Resource Manager Group Member – Owner / Manager	Geographical Co-ordinates (Longitude & Latitude) of the forest / woodlands central point
Whitfield Estate	Whitfield Estate Per Smiths Gore Eastfield House Main Street Corbridge Northumberland NE45 5LD	Longitude 2' 20" West Latitude 54' 55" North
Carlisle Estate	Church Commissioners per Smiths Gore 64 Warwick Road Carlisle CA1 1DR	Longitude 2' 55" West Latitude 54' 50" North
Minsteracres Estate	Minsteracres Estate Per Smiths Gore Eastfield House Main Street Corbridge	Longitude 1' 55" West Latitude 54' 55" North

	Northumberland NE45 5LD	
Chillington Estate	Chillington Estate Per Smiths Gore 2-3 Sherbrook House Swan Mews Lichfield Staffs WS13 6TU	Longitude 2' 11" West Latitude 52' 40" North
Duchy of Lancaster	Duchy of Lancaster Per Smiths Gore 2-3 Sherbrook House Swan Mews Lichfield Staffs WS13 6TU	Longitude 0' 46" West Latitude 55' 14" North
Mansfield Estates	Mansfield Estates Per Smiths Gore Haddington House 28 Sidegate Haddington EH41 4BU	Longitude 3' 25" West Latitude 56' 27" North
Kirtleside Estate	Kirtleside Estate Per Smiths Gore 28 Castle Street Dumfries DG1 1DG	Longitude 3' 10" West Latitude 55' 05" North
Ballogie Estate	Malcolm Nicol Ballogie Estate Office Ballogie, Aboyne Aberdeenshire	Longitude 2' 42" West Latitude 57' 03" North
Penicuik Estate	Sir Robert Clerk Per Smiths Gore Haddington House 28 Sidegate Haddington EH41 4BU	Longitude 3' 14" West Latitude 55' 50" North

Callaly Estate	Callaly Estate Per Smiths Gore 8 Castlegate Berwick upon Tweed TD15 1JS	Longitude 1' 55" West Latitude 55' 22" North
Blackwood Estate	Blackwood Estate Per Smiths Gore 28 Castle Street Dumfries DG1 1DG	Longitude 3' 45" West Latitude 55' 10" North
Lincluden Estate	Lincluden Estate Per Smiths Gore 28 Castle Street Dumfries DG1 1DG	Longitude 4' 50" West Latitude 55' 05" North
Crochmore Estate	Crochmore Estate Per Smiths Gore 28 Castle Street Dumfries DG1 1DG	Longitude 3' 35" West Latitude 55' 07" North
Knocknalling Estate	Knocknalling Estate Per Smiths Gore Haddington House 28 Sidegate Haddington EH41 4BU	Longitude 4' 10" West Latitude 55' 07" North
Innes Estate	Innes Estate Per Smiths Gore 7 The Square Fochabers Moray IV32 7DG	Longitude 3' 12" West Latitude 57' 40" North
Lochnabo Estate	Lochnabo Estate Per Smiths Gore 7 The Square Fochabers Moray	Longitude 3' 12" West Latitude 57' 37" North

	IV32 7DG	
Pitgaveny Estate	Pitgaveny Estate Per Smiths Gore 7 The Square Fochabers Moray IV32 7DG	Longitude 3' 25" West Latitude 57' 35" North
Fyvie Estate	Fyvie Estate Per Smiths Gore 7 The Square Fochabers Moray IV32 7DG	Longitude 2' 23" West Latitude 57' 25" North
Capenoch Estate	Robert Gladstone Per Smiths Gore 28 Castle Street Dumfries DG1 1DG	Longitude 3' 50" West Latitude 55' 15" North
Arkleton Estate	Arkleton Estate Per Smiths Gore 28 Castle Street Dumfries DG1 1DG	Longitude 2' 55" West Latitude 55' 12" North
Gordon Woodlands	Neil MacKay Bidwells Alder House Cradlehall Business Park Inverness IV2 5GH	Longitude 3' 00" West Latitude 57' 12" North
Bathurst Estate	Bathurst Estate Per Smiths Gore 2-3 Sherbrook House Swan Mews Lichfield Staffs WS13 6TU	Longitude 2' 03" West Latitude 51' 42" North
Keddleston Estate	Keddleston Estate Per Smiths Gore	Longitude 1' 32" West Latitude 52' 58" North

	2-3 Sherbrook House Swan Mews Lichfield Staffs WS13 6TU	
--	---	--

End of Public Summary