



Client Name / Business name	Private Forestry Service Queensland Inc.
Dates of review:	Tuesday 29 th , Wednesday 30 th November and Thursday 1 st December 2022 = on-site; Thursday 8 th December 2022 = stakeholder contact; Sunday 11 th December 2022 = review corrective actions.
Type of review:	<input type="checkbox"/> Stage 1 pre-certification; <input type="checkbox"/> Stage 2 certification; <input type="checkbox"/> Surveillance post certification; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Re-certification; <input type="checkbox"/> Follow up or special audit
Office & non-forest site address visited	Office & depot: 8 Fraser Road Gympie, QLD 4570. Field sites: in the Defined Forest Area.
Forest sites visited	Inactive sites: one in plantation FMU - Fife. Active sites: three [3], determined as Gundiah, Miva, Blue Sky Estate.
Certification standard	AS 4708:2013
Scope of activities within the scope of certification (short description)	Processes involved in the management and protection of private native forest, plantations, and revegetation land use activities.
Scope of the audit / review	Criteria 0-9 of the Standard. Sustainable Forest Management System [FMS] as assessed at office and in field by document review, systems demonstration, and evidence gathered in the field.
Names of review team members:	Wayne Tibbits. Andrew Young as an observer only.
Name of Global-Mark Client Manager, and signatory to this report:	Wayne Tibbits
Brief description of the FMUs [Forest Management Units]	Forests are in two main FMUs. Native forest and hardwood plantation.
Brief description of the Defined Forest Area [DFA] including its area as advised to the Scheme Owner (including updates)	Of the total of 6,163 hectares forest area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5,835 hectares are owned by Energy Queensland. • 171.8 hectares at Brooweena are owned by PFSQ. • Four other owners averaging 16 hectares each.
Guidance as to how to obtain further details of the DFA may be accessed	At https://www.pfsq.org.au/about-us/
Exclusions to the standard/management system	None. Damage agent salvage operations. The organisation does currently control any non-wood products.
Name of Management Representative	David Menzies, Executive Officer

Review team declaration:

We confirm that for the purpose of this review:

- We did not have any conflict of interest with and is fully independent from the company listed above
- We had the review team has sufficient resources, and competences to complete its review and reach its conclusions,
- We had the appropriate credentials to perform this review in accordance with Global-Mark and applicable accreditation requirements.

Comment and disclaimer on this report:

- This report does not and should not be seen as advice. Please consult a qualified advisor or consultant for advice.
- Due to the sampling nature of third party business reviews, the time available and samples size, some issues, non-compliances or improvements might not have been identified in the present report. This does not imply that these issues do not exist, or are in compliance. Employees, management and other stakeholders of the organization need to and are responsible for, continuously identifying and taking necessary controls to ensure continued compliance with the standard(s), and improvement.
- Readers of this report should make judgement taking the above into account.
- The report is confidential, and is owned by the organization listed above, Global-Mark Pty Ltd and the review team members who participated in its preparation. The summary of it is publicly available through Global-Mark.
- Global-Mark reserves the right to make this report available to regulators, and/or funding providers if requested.



Attendance to opening and exit meeting (please refer to attendance sheet, scanned)

This will be provided after CSC review. Both attended by Andrew, Dave, Mark, Natasha, Wayne.

1 Review team conclusions

This one-person re-certification surveillance review on-site over three days focused on the full set of AS 4708 criteria, namely the full suite of requirements related to management system, stakeholders, biodiversity, productive capacity, ecosystem health, soil & water, carbon, culture/heritage, and social & economic values. Each requirement was assessed, where possible, within the overall Forest Management System [FMS] and field operations across the defined forest area. The included site visits assessing forest operations and conditions one full day in the field. Its focus was on sites near Gympie. It also included half a day off-site contact with stakeholders and review of additional evidence by way of corrective action for audit findings.

Since the previous audit in November 2021, there has been several changes in key members of staff supporting the forest management system. Mark Delaney joined PFSQ about half a year ago as a Forestry Undergraduate. Natasha Scott has commenced as Finance manager. Arna Love, who had been Executive Officer, left the organisation.

Stakeholder feedback: This audit included consultation a sample of the organisation’s stakeholders. The audit team leader contacted by telephone one affected stakeholder in the week after the audit. This was one with an economic interest in the management of the defined forest area. This stakeholder expressed opinion that, “PFSQ are honest operators. PFSQ do work at a quality level. It is possible to have a good working relationship with PFSQ. They are aware of the sustainability issues of relevance to this stakeholder.” They had no reason to have any complaint or dispute with the forest manager.

During this audit we closed the two of the three previous findings that were all observations. The third was escalated to a minor nonconformance, as additional field evidence showed insufficient improvement that forest operations had minimal damage to forest growing stock. This 2022 audit raised 16 new findings, 12 as observations, and four as nonconformance, with one as a major nonconformance. The client was required to formulate a corrective action plan for these matters of nonconformance. The major nonconformance related to no current or future estimate of carbon stored in the defined forest area, and could be readily rectified by the client.

A corrective action plan was received 6th December. It was assessed 11th December. The corrective action evidence for the major nonconformance was assessed by the audit team leader and downgraded re-classifying it as a minor nonconformance. **Global-Mark’s rules allow that it “may still award a certificate, provided that the forest manager identifies the root cause of the non-conformance and provides a plan acceptable to the certification body to meet the outstanding requirements within an agreed time frame”. The audit team leader confirms all matters as sufficiently addressed to recommend re-certification.** The next scheduled audit is around September 2023 as a surveillance with transition to AS/NZS 4708:2021.

We believe that the organization listed above at the sites listed above, **provided it addresses the matters of nonconformance**, has the capability to systematically meet the requirements of the Australian Forestry Standard and for the activities/products and sites listed on the Global-Mark scope of certification.

Details of forest sites visited on Wednesday 30th November 2022

Forest Management Unit, block location, name, type of activity	Site activity classification
Native forest FMU. Gundiah. Owned by Energy Queensland. Selective harvest by CGM Contracting. Not still active on the day due to wet weather and soil conditions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Active still; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Active but suspended; <input type="checkbox"/> Active yet finished; <input type="checkbox"/> Inactive; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Random.
Native forest FMU. Miva. Owned by Energy Queensland. Recent spray of excessive regrowth as silvicultural treatment.	<input type="checkbox"/> Active still; <input type="checkbox"/> Active but suspended; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Active yet finished; <input type="checkbox"/> Inactive; <input type="checkbox"/> Random.
Reafforestation FMU. Blue Sky/ Windsor Park. Employee Ben establishing seedlings in areas of stage 1 & 2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Active still; <input type="checkbox"/> Active but suspended; <input type="checkbox"/> Active yet finished; <input type="checkbox"/> Inactive; <input type="checkbox"/> Random.
Plantation FMU. Fife. Thinning took place several months ago.	<input type="checkbox"/> Active still; <input type="checkbox"/> Active but suspended; <input type="checkbox"/> Active yet finished; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inactive; <input type="checkbox"/> Random.



Mandatory reporting checks	Audit team leader comments
What is their DFA category for PEFC notification fee schedule?	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 to < 5,000 hectares; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5,000 to < 25,000 hectares; <input type="checkbox"/> 25,000 to < 50,000 hectares; <input type="checkbox"/> > 50,000 hectares.
Certificate includes a brief description of the geographic locality(ies) of the FMUs comprising the DFA in the scope of certification.	Yes, as it lists “The DFA covers Northern NSW and the regional council areas of Bundaberg, Fraser Coast, Gympie, Ipswich, Lockyer Valley, Sunshine Coast and Toowoomba, including sites of private forest owners/growers including the organisation itself.”
Certificate includes address for obtaining more information on the DFA (i.e. Summary Reports, DFA maps etc.).	Yes, as it lists “DFA and certification audit details are available at http://pfsq.org.au ”
Client has maintained records of all communications including complaints and corrective action taken in accordance with the requirements of AS 4708 or NZS AS 4708 (as applicable), and these were available Global-Mark on request. This includes correspondence, recommendations and actions documented by the Scheme Owner.	Employees of the Scheme Owner, Responsible Wood, Matt de Jong, Sustainability Manager [21/7/22] and Jonathan Tibbits, Marketing & Communications [16/9/22], have contacted PFSQ. Sighted email communications to PFSQ from: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr Laird about case study of his property 7/9/22.• Dr Holsbeeck, University Sunshine Coast, about support for Integrated Biomass management.
If there was any breach of regulatory requirements within the scope of certification to AS 4708 or NZS AS 4708, did the client notify Global-Mark in writing within five business days?	No.
How does the client maintain a DFA register used that has details of all separately described blocks or forest management units?	Details are recorded in a spreadsheet that lists the site location, owner, necessary agreements, and areas.
How does the client maintain a system that can track additions and/or deletions to the DFA between audits and that can provide areas and maps of any changes?	The Executive Officer updates this as required. When sites are added or removed, an update is provided.
Have there been any significant changes to the DFA and if so when did they advise Global-Mark?	No significant changes. 5,835 hectares are owned by Energy Queensland. The figure on RW website was 6,326 hectares as of 11/1/2022.
How does and when did the client provide the Scheme Owner [Responsible Wood or New Zealand Forest Certification Association] with an annual statement confirming the current DFA?	A new process is being developed for Dave and/or Mark to email RW.
How would Global-Mark summarise the most important observations, positive, negative, regarding the implementation and effectiveness of the client’s forest management system and including considerations of compliance risks arising from activities of relevant stakeholders?	Positive implementation and effectiveness of the client’s forest management system includes: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Forest staff have a thorough knowledge of the forests in the properties that they manage. This appears, at least in part, to come from these people over the years doing much of the silviculture activities themselves.2. Incorporation of the SiteDocs App, for “Safety compliance made easy”. This is used for checking the environment, safety, operations, and administration. Photos are included to demonstrate evidence of evaluation of activities.3. Consideration of the non-tree components of the forest ecosystem in its plans and activities. An example is the placement of epiphytes and bird/bat nesting boxes on trees at Blue Sky.



Mandatory reporting checks	Audit team leader comments
	<p>In terms of areas for potential improvement we note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was a decision to not progress an overarching forest management plan that was under development in 2021. It appears that now this initiative started in 2021 might require more attention, in order to align to the requirement in AS/NZS 4708: 2021 of a “public summary of management may be referred to as the forest management plan” [clause 7.4.4]. Need to refine new processes and systems used to audit, monitor , and review sustainable forest management system. Consideration could be given to additional checks and maybe peer review of property plans as, at least in part, several audit findings [66, 72, 73, 74, 75, and 78] related to this part of planning.
What are any applicable qualifications for scale and intensity, as referred to in AS 4708 or NZS AS 4708 (as applicable)?	The organisation over most of its operations has low scale of activities, as few and small sized operations, whether harvest or silviculture treatment. The intensity is also low, with mostly thinning harvest operations and little use of heavy machinery for silviculture.
What sampling methodology was used to determine the size of sample of active blocks?	Inactive sites: one in plantation FMU - suggest Fife. Active sites: three [3], determined as Gundiah, Miva, BlueSky Estate - on the basis of information in a list of active operations that have been occurring in the DFA in the three months leading up to when the audit is scheduled, as supplied by PFSQ.

Mandatory logo use checks	Audit team leader comments
What are the licence registration numbers provided by the Scheme Owner?	RW/ 1-21-23 PEFC/21-23-23
Where does the client store the licence agreement with the Scheme Owner?	Sighted the signed agreement archived in Quality Manual folder of electronic documents. Signed 30/4/21 by Arna Love and 4/5/21 by Simon Dorries.
Where does the client use the PEFC and/or Responsible Wood logos?	Both are used on their website. RW only on footer of maps.
When the client used the PEFC and/or Responsible Wood logos, what essential elements were fulfilled?	Logo and licence registration numbers provided by the Scheme Owner.
In on-product and off-product use, how were the Logos reproduced according to the measurements, colours and other specifications detailed in the respective Logo Reproduction Tool Kit?	Correct without alteration.
What if any additional voluntary information is included?	PEFC trademark had supporting statement, “Supporting Sustainable Forest Management”.

2 Review teams findings (major, minor non-conformities or observations)

At the conclusion of this review the following presents the status of new and existing findings:

Number of findings:



Finding Details	# Major non-conformities	# Minor non-conformities	# Observations	Total
Findings from previous audit(s) at start № 59, 61, 62	0	0	3	3
Findings from above closed during this audit № 59, 62	0	0	0	0
New findings opened during this audit № 63-79	1	4	12	17
New findings closed during this audit № 63, 68, 71	0	0	3	0
Findings open at the end of this audit № 61, 64-67, 69, 70, 71-79	0	0	0	0



3 Comments in relations to compliance with the standard

Evidence from field sites
<p>Criterion 0.2 - Chain of custody:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No products were being carted at the sites during the times they were visited. Harvested forest products were sighted on a landing of CGM Contracting. <p>Criterion 1 - Management system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competent employee Ben demonstrated high level of botanical nomenclature. <p>Criterion 2 - Stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gundiah - this property has two neighbours. Nothing specific to report. <p>Criterion 3 - Biodiversity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observations at field sites confirmed biodiversity values were identified within operational plans. Gundiah - sighted habitat trees marked with painted "H". Numerous birds were sighted. Mixture of species kept in treated areas. Miva - this is category "X" forest, meaning stand structure few trees suitable for habitat, and so no formal "H" trees. Blue Sky/ Windsor Park - sighted some of the 20 bird or bat habitat boxes and epiphytes placed on tree stems. This reforestation project provided enhancements to biodiversity this and its mixed species planting. Fife - Gympie Messmate one of two plantation species, so hybrid potential maybe? <p>Criterion 4 - Forest productive capacity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observed appropriately designed, constructed, and used, roads, extraction tracks and log landings. Gundiah - selective harvest left little damage to retained trees. Borrow pit being used by harvest contractor to get gravel for road. Dave painted trees to retain, and focused on trees above 30 cm dbhob or small regrowth to protect from harvest damage that were destined for future uses. Miva - sighted 40 metres X 40 metres silvicultural plot, within a larger treatment area. Measured tree 9 in its plot to have 31 cm dbhob. Its silvicultural history was = salvage harvest, chopper roll, stem injection (Tordon), spray excessive regrowth twice, burn every three years. Northern area inspected was undergoing silviculture treatment of regrowth spray (Grazon). Blue Sky/ Windsor Park - auditor estimated survival at 90% on the basis of several lines of trees visually assessed. Fife - in a small patch of about 100 metres by 50 metres we sighted four retained trees with large amount of bark damage. Suspended harvest of plantation planted along contours applied a third row out with thin in between for 50% removal. <p>Criterion 5 - Forest ecosystem health:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gundiah - visibly health forest with no obvious weed presence. Miva - we inspected the northern part, and all trees were visibly healthy, except for mistletoe. Blue Sky/ Windsor Park - weed species were known and being controlled, such as Umbrella Sedge. Sighted this and Fleabane, the latter of which is Ben found was not quickly killed by herbicide application. Seedlings were planted with tree guards to protect from browsing at the edges near vegetation cover for browsing animals. <p>Criterion 6 - Soils and water:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gundiah - inspected a drainage feature with the buffer & setback identified by blue marks on trees, done by Dave with paint. Minimal damage to soil from machine operation, with rutting mostly >0.1 metre. Drainage feature inspection found marked boundary for machines to keep out of was adhered to. Stream order one with 2 metres buffer was specifically viewed and the marked buffer sighted with no machine encroachment. Miva - Tracks for vehicles were in acceptable condition. Blue Sky/ Windsor Park - auditor measured slope at 40% on the steeper sections of stage 1 & 2. No obvious erosion in area Ben is working, to establish plants. Fife -some rutting was evident at the extraction track adjoining the dam wall. This track appeared to have some wood cording placed in it for lessening rutting impact. One extraction track was measured with only one "whoa-buoy" at near the bottom of this track of 40% slope and a distance of 88 audit paces in its length. <p>Criterion 7 - Carbon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing specific to report <p>Criterion 8 - Culture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing specific to report



Evidence from field sites
<p>Criterion 9: Social and Economic Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gundiah - mechanical selective harvest had low stumps of 15-20 cm measured by the audit team leader. Sighted a range of products, such as poles, and various sawlogs. Miva - sighted 40 metres X 40 metres silvicultural treatment plot. Measured tree 9 in its plot to have 31 cm dbhob. Its silvicultural history was = salvage harvest, chopper roll, spray excessive regrowth twice, burn every three years. Blue Sky/ Windsor Park - a small, damaged shed was sighted on the edge of a track where we observed planting in 2021. This shed appeared to be made of materials containing asbestos. PFSQ advised that they do not go near this site, and it is part of the management responsibility of the site developer. Fife - the audit team leader sighted two harvested pulp logs left in the plantation [near water tank], one tree head in same area cut to 18 cm dbh leaving an additional length of pulp log that could have been harvested, and an estimated 10 tonnes of logs left at the landing that had been pushed up into an apparent waste heap. The harvest of plantation extracted range of products, poles, sawlogs, pulpwood.

Standard heading and number	Review team and client manager comments with evidence sighted (traceability of evidence)	Conformance level [NC = nonconformance]
General Requirements:		
0.1 - Defined Forest Area	<p>Of the total of 6,163 hectares forest area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5,835 hectares are owned by Energy Queensland. 171.8 hectares at Brooweena are owned by PFSQ. The other four owners only average 16 hectares each. <p>Observation № 63 - The organisation's spreadsheet of its active sites with stakeholders is not capable of recording any historic changes. Evidence: Dates that sites were included and/or excluded. During the audit the Finance Manager and Executive Officer decided to include columns for details in the spreadsheet to identify when a forest site is included and/or excluded. Improvement is noted and Global-Mark close the finding.</p> <p>Observation № 64 - The included components in the figures for defined forest area (DFA) are unclear. Evidence: Presented figures in spreadsheet did not match those from GIS layer, indicating a need to clarify if areas are total land under management control or forest. Three business days after the audit the Executive Officer provided a corrective action plan for this.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
0.2 - Chain of Custody	<p>Private Forest Service Queensland has sold some forest products since the previous audit. Customers have not asked for products as certified. Previously, some customers did.</p> <p>Observation № 65: The organisation does not have an overall current process to provide any potential receivers with the information necessary on products that are sold with a certified status. Three business days after the audit the Executive Officer provided a corrective action plan for this.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
Criterion 1: Systematic management		
Forest management shall be undertaken in a systematic manner appropriate to the nature and scale of the enterprise and provide for continual improvement.		
1.1 - Forest Management policy	<p>The forest manager has defined a forest management policy that includes commitments to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> systematic approach - throughout. continual improvement - at end of policy. compliance with relevant legislation - as a dot point. provision of resources - on second page. process of regular review - last dot point. proactive engagement with stakeholders - first page last point. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable



Standard heading and number	Review team and client manager comments with evidence sighted (traceability of evidence)	Conformance level [NC = nonconformance]
	<p>This appears to meet requirements also of AS/NZS 4708:2021, as it incorporates minimise harm and provide benefits.</p> <p>There is a suite of approved policies: sustainable forest management, dated 14/11/22, signed David Menzies. Also, workplace health & safety.</p> <p>These are made available at: “about us” on PFSQ’s website.</p>	
1.2 - Forest Management plan	<p>At the previous audit we sighted evidence of an overarching forest management plan that was under development. There has been a decision to not progress this. It appears that this initiative might require more attention, well align to the requirement in AS/NZS 4708: 2021 of a “public summary of management may be referred to as the forest management plan” [clause 7.4.4].</p> <p>Historically, the organisation has had a separate forest management plan for each property [block] - sighted the file for Fife property as Lot 1 RP 190074 at 33 Murrays Roads, Kin Kin.</p> <p>Identification of applicable legal requirements and other requirements - Fife: identified need to consider regulated vegetation, cultural heritage, Sustainable Planning Act [no change of use], Safety in Harvest Operations [Harvest Code of Practice]. At Gundiah we sighted the legal road reserve that had been demarcated by PFSQ staff for avoidance of harvesting.</p> <p>Identification of significance of aspects and impacts - There is a draft of the FMP for Brooweena that includes tables of “aspects and impacts” for land management history, climate, geology/landforms & drainage, regulated vegetation & regional ecosystems, flora & flora, water, local government planning, site survey, project planning.</p> <p>Consideration of stakeholders - Current plans show impact from operations on stakeholders.</p> <p>Scope and objective of forest management - Gundiah and Miva Hub Properties have a section for “landowner’s specific objectives” and “management plan purpose/scope”. Observation № 66 - The organisation does not for all properties in its defined forest area state the scope and objectives of forest management. Evidence: Properties, other than Energy Queensland properties with a property plan, are smaller that might have a Harvesting Operations Plan instead of a property plan, such as for Fifi that does not have the scope and objectives stated. Three business days after the audit the Executive Officer provided a corrective action plan for this.</p> <p>POL009 is the Management Policy that sets some four management objectives with targets. They include, “support development of sustainable forest resource”, within which are five targets, such as “promote networks of relevant stakeholders”.</p> <p>Description of relevant operating conditions and controls - these are in Harvesting Operations Plan, such as for Fife, with many pages of conditions for product.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
1.3 - Implementation of the forest management plan	<p>Evidence of a legal right - These are arranged with the owners. Sighted Harvest Management Contract 23/11/22 with details in schedule 1, map, and other details.</p> <p>Operational plans are in place - There are property plans for the larger native forest owned by Energy Queensland or PFSQ. Smaller plantation sites where harvest activities occur, have Operational Harvest Plan [OHP].</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable



Standard heading and number	Review team and client manager comments with evidence sighted (traceability of evidence)	Conformance level [NC = nonconformance]
	<p>Defined roles and responsibilities -Sighted the “Structure Chart” up to date for the organisation. Mark Delaney does not have a PD as he is still a part-time employee. Natasha, the Finance Manager, does not yet have a PD.</p> <p>Observation № 67 - Written evidence of defined roles and responsibilities could be improved. Evidence: Natasha, the Finance Manager, and Mark a part-time employee as an undergraduate, do not yet have a PD. Three business days after the audit the Executive Officer provided a corrective action plan for this.</p> <p>Required competencies exist in staff and contractors -Dave sent information on contractor Craig.</p> <p>Forest operations maintain and enhance the health and vitality of forests - please refer to comments from notes taken on field site visits.</p> <p>There are procedures for communication, document management and record keeping - There is REG001 Document Control Register, as a spreadsheet. POL017 Document Control Policy also exists. Observation № 68 - Procedures for document management were inconsistently recorded. Evidence: POL017 had a title of Policy 16 and was not recorded in REG001 Document Control Register. During the audit the Finance Manager made corrections to the document management elements. Improvement is noted and Global-Mark close the finding.</p> <p>Contingency or emergency plans - Sighted Emergency Plan and Diagram for the Gympie office, on display on the wall of the open plan area. Operational Harvest Plan has emergency evacuation procedures, with a safety focus.</p> <p>Upon follow up of new evidence at this audit, Global-Mark noted improvement and closed previous audit observation № 59 from the 2020 audit. PFSQ tried to find a signed agreement with Energy Queensland but could not. However, they were able to produce a schedule of rates, spreadsheet from Energy Queensland with reference to “Contract: 10524 - Schedule 14E - Mount Marsh”. The organisation also during the audit sent an email to Energy Queensland requesting confirmation of a contract, and this was received the same day.</p>	
1.4 - Monitoring and corrective actions	<p>The forest manager does monitor and evaluate activities and their outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sighted records from SiteDocs for “Safety compliance made easy” - AUD003 on 11/11/2022 at Gundiah, with nine sections for environment, 21 for operations, and several for administration. Several photos were included to demonstrate evidence of evaluation of activities. This is a positive matter to report. <p>The forest manager does implement measures to correct identified deficiencies and to prevent repeat occurrences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sighted records from Site Docs for “Assigned to me” with several corrective actions. Example, from pre-start there were mechanical issues for field truck assigned to Executive Officer. This is a positive matter to report. <p>Procedures are in place for routine monitoring and evaluation of the performance outcomes - This is a work in progress for Site Docs.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable



Standard heading and number	Review team and client manager comments with evidence sighted (traceability of evidence)	Conformance level [NC = nonconformance]
	<p>Observation № 69 - Procedures for monitoring using the App Site Docs are not yet developed. Three business days after the audit the Executive Officer provided a corrective action plan for this.</p> <p>The forest manager has these periodic auditing mechanisms - Arna did an internal audit dated 2/1/2022. This was labelled "Management Review 2022", though its context is given as "preparation for management review". It highlighted system parts, including adequate monitoring, and public reports are available. There also is POL017 Internal Audit Procedure.</p>	
1.5 - Review	<p>The forest manager has the following for its Management Review of its FMS. Their policy has a commitment to regularly reviewing and continually improving. The work by Arna was a start. There is POL014 Continuous Improvement Policy.</p> <p>Minor nonconformance № 70 - The current procedure for senior management review of the forest manager's forest management system is unclear and/or not followed. Evidence: The past mechanism of getting Board members to independently review no longer applies, periodicity of review not stated, and the document labelled "Management Review 2022", was not a proper management review. Three business days after the audit the Executive Officer provided a corrective action plan for this.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
1.6 - Research	<p>The forest manager bases its forest management on research as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous existing research in native forest silviculture is used, such as stems per hectare • The organisation is aware of research showing Myrtle Rust is an issue. <p>The forest manager contributes to forest research as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed research project with DAFF on native forest inventory. • Current Meat & Livestock project with DAFF on pasture response to thinning. • The project with Dr Holsbeeck, University Sunshine Coast, about support for Integrated Biomass management. Sighted emails. • It has several field plots to assess and compare various silviculture treatments. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
Criterion 2: Stakeholders Forest management shall demonstrate proactive stakeholder engagement		
2.1 - Identify stakeholders	<p>The forest manager has its established and maintained list of stakeholders as follows: REG005 PFSQ Stakeholder Database. It has separate sheets for interested, affected, neighbours, field days, Board members, current clients, processors, contractors, suppliers. The list was used by the Audit Team Leader to identify and establish contact with a stakeholder.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
2.2 - Stakeholder engagement plan	<p>The forest manager has its established and maintained stakeholder engagement plan as version 5, approved by Executive Officer. It meets the requirements as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Positive contribution is acknowledged in the "aim". Direct effects are described. Evaluates stakeholder feedback by adopting which of the four quadrants the stakeholders are in - low or high influence and low or high interest. Describes how feedback is sought through the same quadrants approach and strategies and tools. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable



Standard heading and number	Review team and client manager comments with evidence sighted (traceability of evidence)	Conformance level [NC = nonconformance]
	<p>e. It has separate sheets for interested, affected, neighbours, field days, Board members, current clients, processors, contractors, suppliers.</p> <p>f. There is a section on information pathways.</p> <p>g. Complaints, disputes and grievance are covered.</p> <p>h. Ensures stakeholder views are considered</p> <p>This plan has been in place since the transition from 2007 to 2013 version of AS 4708. It remains in conformance to the requirements of this standard.</p>	
2.3 - Stakeholder participation	<p>The forest manager provided evidence of means to facilitate and encourage meaningful engagement of stakeholders through their notifications for field days or operations. Sighted letter to neighbours for harvest operation at Gundiah [Mt Urah], with option to provide feedback to Executive Officer. Sighted flyer for native forest management field day at Crow's Next on 8/12/22, where the topics would provide opportunities for stakeholder participation.</p> <p><u>Global-Mark contact with stakeholders:</u> This audit included consultation by the audit team leader with one affected stakeholder in the week after the audit. The contact method was by telephone. The particular stakeholder was one with an economic interest in the management of the defined forest area. This stakeholder expressed their opinion that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PFSQ are honest operators. • PFSQ do work at a quality level. • It is possible to have a good working relationship with PFSQ. • PFSQ are aware of the sustainability issues of relevance to this stakeholder. • PFSQ had coped well enough in its challenges of losing staff. <p>They had no reason to have any complaint or dispute with the forest manager.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
2.4 Stakeholders affected by forest operations	<p>The forest manager provided evidence of considering impacts on affected stakeholders. This included notifications for example, planned burns, 27/9/22 for those near Narine, and 5/10/22 for those near Mt Urah. There are three entries for field days. Sighted letter for Mt Urah notification, signed by David Menzies.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
2.5 - Records	<p>The forest manager keeps records as follows. A new spreadsheet that records notifications, with first entry 17/05/22 for a field day. There are two entries for planned burns, 27/9/22 for those near Narine [nine stakeholders listed, and scanned proof of Australia Post method of contact], and 5/10/22 for those near Mt Urah. There are three entries for field days.</p> <p>Observation № 71 - Some records of communication notifications with stakeholders were incorrectly labelled. Evidence: The spreadsheet had "Regarding" as "Burn Notification" rather than "Harvesting Notification", and the entry for Narine is for activities outside of the DFA. During the audit the Executive Officer made corrections to the spreadsheet elements. Improvement is noted and Global-Mark close the finding.</p> <p>Upon follow up of new evidence at this audit, Global-Mark noted improvement and closed previous audit observation № 61 from the 2020 audit. The organisation has developed a new spreadsheet that records notifications, with first entry 17/05/22. There are five entries, three for field days and two for planned burns.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable



Standard heading and number	Review team and client manager comments with evidence sighted (traceability of evidence)	Conformance level [NC = nonconformance]
2.6 Public disclosures	<p>At https://www.pfsq.org.au/responsible-wood/ - The forest manager has made available access to these:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2021 audit report in full, as no summary was provided by Global-Mark • 2017 to 2020 audit summary reports [2020 is there twice]. • PDF maps of “our defined forest areas” <p>At https://www.pfsq.org.au/about-us/</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is description of the organisation, its approach to forest management, and key policies that largely address the components of forest management plan. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
Criterion 3: Biodiversity Forest management shall maintain or enhance biodiversity.		
3.1 - Identify diversity priorities	<p>Planning by site or property is used to identify biodiversity. The audit team assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Harvesting Operations Plan [OHP] for Fife at Kin Kin. We noted and sighted these maps: Regulated vegetation, Regional ecosystem, Koala habitat, Protected Plants Trigger. • Forest Management Plan 001, for Private Native Forestry Plan Number 06342 of Mt Marsh, signed 29/8/22 by Matt Palmer of Energy Queensland and 26/9/22 by David Menzies as “contractor/third party”. This is as per NSW Government Local Land services. Map 1 has koala habitat preference. There is a table of threatened species and what to do, but there are no known records of listed species. • Native Forest Management Plan, for Eagle Rock Hub at Ravensbourne, dated October 2022 by David Menzies as “contractor/third party”. This shows regional ecosystem mapping. Part is a 228 hectare offset where category X changed to category B. Another part of 250 hectares is an environmental offset for koala habitat, where pole harvesting is permitted. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
3.2 - Maintain or enhance biodiversity	<p>The organisation has managed the Blue Sky Estate to progressively preserve and restore ecological structure and function. This site was visited during the audit. Specific comments related to this are contained above in those related to the field visits.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
3.3 - Identify significant biodiversity values	<p>Planning by site or property is used to identify biodiversity. The audit team assessed the OHP for Fife at Kin Kin. We noted and sighted these maps: Regulated vegetation, Regional ecosystem, Koala habitat, Protected Plants Trigger. See 3.1 above about Mt Marsh and has koala habitat preference.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
3.4 - Maintain or enhance significant biodiversity values	<p>Planning by site or property is used to identify biodiversity. The audit team assessed the OHP for Fife at Kin Kin. We noted and sighted these that even though the site was identified/mapped as not Koala habitat, procedures were set for daily koala monitoring, and what to do in case any koala was sighted.</p> <p>Native Forest Management Plan, for Eagle Rock Hub at Ravensbourne, shows in its section on Wildlife has a subsection on “Threatened Plant species”.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
3.5 - Monitor biodiversity	<p>Native Forest Management Plan, for Eagle Rock Hub at Ravensbourne, shows that wildlife survey had been historically conducted by University of Queensland and Energy Queensland [formerly Ergon Energy. It lists koala, hollow and replacement habitat trees.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC;



Standard heading and number	Review team and client manager comments with evidence sighted (traceability of evidence)	Conformance level [NC = nonconformance]
		<input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
3.6 - Reviews of biodiversity	The organisation is at a small scale with limited resources and capacity to undertake its own reviews of biodiversity. Therefore, it has to rely on the much larger Government agencies to review identification of biodiversity classifications that might impact priorities.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
3.7 - Regeneration	Ensuring that establishment of native forest revegetation or plantations is timely and effective, was confirmed at Blue Sky Estate. The Rehabilitation Plan has in Appendix 4.1 has for stage 1 the “planting palette the species for different plant areas. All are native and include shrubs & groundcovers, small-medium trees, and large trees. Some parts of Blue Sky have been adversely affected by high amounts of rain and flooding, necessitating replanting.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
3.8 - Introduced genetics	<p>Genetic pollution was not considered as applicable for the plantation site at Fife, as the main species was local to the general area [Gympie Messmate].</p> <p>Minor nonconformance № 72 = The forest manager did not evaluate the potential pollen and hybridisation impact of some eucalypts in plantations, with native forest eucalypts. Evidence: OHP at Fife had nothing on potential impact of plantation species <i>E.dunnii</i> and <i>E.mircocoryes</i>. Three business days after the audit the Executive Officer provided a corrective action plan for this.</p> <p>Not applicable at one level, as there is no use of genetic modified organisms.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
3.9 - Native vegetation conversion	The organisation has a clear commitment to this in its policy. The forest manager has no active plantation establishment programme. Its planting programme at BlueSky is native forest restoration. Its native forest operations are selective harvest.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
Criterion 4: Forest Productive Capacity Forest management shall maintain the productive capacity of forests and land.		
4.1 - Identify productive capacity	The organisation has this approach to identify existing and potential productive capacity. The native forest sites in the defined forest area have all had Property Plans developed as reported previously. In these there is information on the productive capacity of each forest. For instance, the Forest Management Plan 001, for Mt Marsh identifies several classes of forest and stratifies these in terms of productive capacity and intended treatments.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
4.2 - Identify harvest rates	Identification of harvesting rates for forest products commensurate with the long term productive capacity of the forest is done at the operational level, which is small scale selective harvest. An example was sighted at Gundiah.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
4.3 - Plan and monitor use	The forest manager has access to or gathers its own information to monitor forest condition, growth, and harvest rates. This includes putting in some plots to monitor the silvicultural treatments compared with control [no treatment]. An example was sighted at Miva.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC;



Standard heading and number	Review team and client manager comments with evidence sighted (traceability of evidence)	Conformance level [NC = nonconformance]
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
4.4 - Infrastructure	<p>The forest manager does this to plan, establish and maintain adequate infrastructure such as roads and bridges to ensure efficient delivery of forest products while minimizing negative impacts on the environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forest Management Plan 001, for Private Native Forestry Plan Number 06342 of Mt Marsh, outlines in section 5.2 how it will construct and maintain crossings. Map 6 and the table after both relate to 7 crossings over Camira Creek and drainage lines. There were no new crossings. <p>Observation № 73 - Forest manager has no specified guidelines, controls, or instructions to contractor using gravel pit for road maintenance. Evidence: The contractor at Gundiah Hub was using gravel from a borrow pit without any clear instructions on how to ensure efficient delivery of forest products while minimizing negative impacts on the environment. Three business days after the audit the Executive Officer provided a corrective action plan for this.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
4.5 - Silviculture	<p>Demonstration that silvicultural systems are appropriate was demonstrated during the on-site field component.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Native forest - Establishment of Blue Sky Estate site with restoration method of clear steps. Selective harvest at Gundiah. Plantation - Thinning of Gympie Messmate at Fifi. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
4.6 - Establishment	<p>Ensuring that establishment of native forest revegetation or plantations is timely and effective, was confirmed at Blue Sky Estate. There has been no plantation establishment in the defined forest area since the previous audit. Employee, Ben, explained and demonstrated at BlueSky his approach to ensure successful establishment.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
4.7 - Damage to forest growing stock	<p>Actions implemented to minimise damage to forest growing stock during forest operations include:</p> <p>Upon follow up of new evidence at this audit, Global-Mark noted some but insufficient improvement on the basis of field observations at Fife, and escalated previous audit observation № 62 from the 2021 audit, to a minor nonconformance. Three business days after the audit the Executive Officer provided a corrective action plan for this.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
4.8 - Unplanned fire	<p>Measures planned and implemented to manage extend and impact of fires include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are plans for hazard reduction burns. Sighted historic records of 2021 burn at Eagle Rock in lot 3 SP214243 & lot 72 in CA311030. Proposed burn in 2023 is southern section of lot 3 SP214243 and lost 136 of CA311049. Gundiah and Miva Hub properties forest management plan, where on page 22 there is a section on fire management. This is detailed and the first management objective is ‘fuel reduction’. It refers to Appendix 4, PFSQ fire management guide [sighted]. Sighted fire truck and slip-on fire units at Gympie. Staff of the forest manager have demonstrated experience in fore management. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
4.9 - Non-wood products	<p>The organisation does currently control any non-wood products.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Conforms;



Standard heading and number	Review team and client manager comments with evidence sighted (traceability of evidence)	Conformance level [NC = nonconformance]
		<input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
Criterion 5: Forest Ecosystem Health Forest management shall maintain forest ecosystem health and vitality.		
5.1 - Identify damage agents	Native Forest Management Plan, for Eagle Rock Hub at Ravensbourne, shows in its section on Wildlife that feral animals have been identified, and these are listed in the plan. Two wild horses were known to be on a property in the Miva Hub.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
5.2 - Maintain health	Native Forest Management Plan, for Eagle Rock Hub at Ravensbourne, shows in its section on Wildlife that there is feral animal management. For example, 1080 baiting is listed as a regional Council coordinated program. Trapping and shooting are also mentioned.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
5.3 - Weeds and pests	<p>Forest Management Plan 001, for Private Native Forestry Plan Number 06342 of Mt Marsh, outlines that for pest and weed management “no known pest problems that require a management approach”, and that “weeds will be managed via the regeneration activities”.</p> <p>Native Forest Management Plan, for Eagle Rock Hub at Ravensbourne, in the section “PFSQ perspective” outlines impact and control of damage from pigs. It also lists that Red Deer and wild cattle do damage to important forest regeneration.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
5.4 - Fire and disturbance regimes	The forest manager has been unable to use fire since the previous audit due to exceedingly wet conditions in 2022. Controlled fire at the right low intensity is known to be good to control understory pest species and promote health forest. We sighted historic records of 2021 burn at Eagle Rock in lot 3 SP214243 & lot 72 in CA311030. Proposed burn in 2023 is southern section of lot 3 SP214243 and lot 136 of CA311049. Burn contribution to ecosystem health has not had a recent periodic review. Sighted the burn report from 2016 for Boomerang.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
5.5 - Rehabilitate degraded forest	The forest manager has identified that sites such as Miva were degraded, presumably by past human activities, or neglect. They historically facilitated a plan for rehabilitation by way of spraying of overly thick regrowth. Sighted 2023-2023 plan for works, at Miva with scheduled for spray in October & November, of 30 hectares per month.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
5.6 - Chemical use	<p>The forest manager controls chemical use by these means.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has plans to use its App, Site Docs, to manage recording of chemical use. Sighted “daily spray” FORM 001, that can record equipment, nozzle, operators, area, tank mix, rate, meteorological conditions, and photos. Sighted works report January 2022 with 45 hectares of completed spraying at Miva. Chemical uses are tracked in a spreadsheet. Sheet for container 2 lists 13 chemicals. The sheet identifies whether Dangerous Goods, limit to quantity, whether need to separate/segregate, Hazchem, UN number, SDS date, where used, and quantity. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable



Standard heading and number	Review team and client manager comments with evidence sighted (traceability of evidence)	Conformance level [NC = nonconformance]
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inspected container 2 with agricultural chemicals. Sighted Collide, Liaise, Grazon, and Uptake chemicals, all accounted for in records. Inspected shed and sighted three spray units. 	
5.7 - Damage agent salvage operations	This requirement was not able to be assessed due to no salvage at this period of time. It has been previously reported in our AS 4708 audits. All sites that required salvage harvest were done in previous years, as reported by Global-Mark.	<input type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
Criterion 6: Protection of Soil and Water Resources Forest management shall protect soil and water resources.		
6.1 - Identify soil and water values	<p>The organisation's planning by site or property is used to identify soil and water values. The audit team assessed the OHP for Fife at Kin Kin. We noted and sighted the hydrological map from Queensland Globe that showed the dam on site. The map did not have a legend, and was provided by the customer, Queensland Commodity Exports [QCE]. With respect to soils, there was text in the HOP about the FSC's HCV 4 "protection of water catchments and control of erosion of vulnerable soils and slopes".</p> <p>Native Forest Management Plan, for Eagle rock Hub at Ravensbourne, in its "overview" describes geology and soils. The information is from a 2008 report. Details are given, as well as maps.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
6.2 - Water quality	The forest manager manages operations to minimise adverse changes to water quality by maintaining streamside management zones. An example is the Gundiah and Miva Hub properties forest management plan, where on page 17 the risk of adverse impacts on groundwater and stream water is addressed. During our field visit we sighted a >2 metres buffer on an order 1 stream at Gundiah.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
6.3 - Water quantity	The forest manager manages a small defined forest area, where its impacts are deemed too limited to impact water quantity. We do note that the Native Forest Management Plan, for Eagle Rock Hub at Ravensbourne, in its "overview" describes rainfall and climate. The information is from the nearby [32 km] Esk station.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
6.4 - Soil properties	<p>Planning by site or property is used to identify soil properties. The audit team assessed the OHP for Fife at Kin Kin. We noted and sighted the text in the HOP about the FSC's HCV 4 "minimise soil exposure", use of "walkover techniques", and progressive installation of drainage on roads and snig tracks". In a separate section of "Wet/dry weather operations" is required that skid and haul were "not to occur when soils are wet".</p> <p>Observation № 74 - The organisation has operational plan prescriptions for protection of soil that might not be able to assess. Evidence: It prescribes "skidder and haulage operations are not to occur when soils are wet", whilst the Code uses "wet or saturated", and there the organisation has no definition of "wet". Three business days after the audit the Executive Officer provided a corrective action plan for this.</p> <p>Forest Management Plan 001, for Private Native Forestry Plan Number 06342 of Mt Marsh, outlines in section 5.1.1 how it will aim</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable



Standard heading and number	Review team and client manager comments with evidence sighted (traceability of evidence)	Conformance level [NC = nonconformance]
	<p>to prevent erosion on four roads, and provide drainage, as well as stability of batters and roads.</p> <p>Observation № 75 - One forest management plan had unclear information on protection of soil features. Evidence: The PNFP for Mt Marsh had both “yes” and “no” selected for “is the existing drainage up to standard with the Code?” Three business days after the audit the Executive Officer provided a corrective action plan for this.</p> <p>Minor nonconformance № 76 - The rehabilitation of an extraction track appeared to have insufficient water diversion features. Evidence: At Fifi there was a track with only one “whoa-buoy” at near the bottom of this track of 40% slope and a distance of 88 audit paces in its length. It is also reported that the crossing of the top end of dam had obvious rutting that is yet to be remediated. Three business days after the audit the Executive Officer provided a corrective action plan for this.</p>	
6.5 - Pollution	<p>Planning by site or property is used to identify soil properties. The audit team assessed the OHP for Fife at Kin Kin. We noted and sighted the text in the HOP about the FSC’s HCV 4 where location of “refueling/maintenance” distance from drainage lines or dams, as well as spill kits were to be on site and what to do in case of spills.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
Criterion 7: Carbon Forest management shall maintain or enhance forests' contribution to the carbon cycle.		
7.1 - Carbon cycle	<p>That the carbon stored and sequestered in the forests is considered in planning and management of forest operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In its Greenhouse Gas Emissions Policy, P004, commitments are given for “improve forest management practices to maximise the sequestration of Carbon”. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
7.2 - Minimise fossil fuel use	<p>In its Greenhouse Gas Emissions Policy, P004, a commitment is given to reduce CO₂ emissions through single site preparation replacing mounding, and reduced fossil fuel consumption [per seven dot points in the policy]. Currently, the forest manager does not have any forest sites with mechanical site preparation, where this could be observed.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
7.3 - Measurement of carbon storage	<p>The organisation has methodology for calculating the estimate of carbon stored and sequestered in the forests. Each property has its own plot, and these are used in Full-CAM for carbon storage estimation.</p> <p>The latest estimates are for the year 2021. These are presented as Current total onsite carbon 2021 (tC/ha). However, an estimate over the whole defined forest area is not given.</p> <p>Major nonconformance № 77 - The forest manager does not have a current or future carbon estimate. Evidence: Spreadsheet had nothing for 2022 or beyond. Three business days after the audit the Executive Officer provided a corrective action plan for this. Audit team leader reviewed the updated file with carbon estimates, confirming current figures and accumulation included, though future not presented yet. Downgraded to a minor nonconformance, with</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable



Standard heading and number	Review team and client manager comments with evidence sighted (traceability of evidence)	Conformance level [NC = nonconformance]
	completion of recommended actions to be reviewed by Global-Mark at the 2023 audit.	
Criterion 8: Cultural Values		
AS4708 = Forest management shall protect and maintain, for Indigenous and non Indigenous people, their natural, cultural, social, recreational, religious, and spiritual heritage values.		
8.1 - Indigenous peoples' values	<p>In its Sustainable Forest Management Policy there is no reference to Indigenous people.</p> <p>The forest manager has no land within its defined forest area where known Indigenous rights remain.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
8.2 - Indigenous heritage values	<p>The forest manager does this to protect and maintain values of Indigenous people, as its planning by site or property is used to identify these values. The audit team assessed the OHP for Fife at Kin Kin. We noted and sighted the output from the Department of Seniors, Disability Services and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, which is the custodian of spatial data for cultural heritage. The output from the spatial data search 14/12/21 identified no cultural heritage site points, site polygons or management plans, Registered Cultural Heritage Study Areas, in the search area for the site.</p> <p>Forest Management Plan 001, for Private Native Forestry Plan Number 06342 of Mt Marsh, identifies in Map 1 the point of AHIMS for Aboriginal heritage. This has a specified buffer of 50 metres.</p> <p>Observation № 78 - The PNFP for Mt Marsh appears to be lacking detail on means to avoid damage to significant values during forest operations. Evidence: The only reference to Aboriginal heritage is in Map 1 the point of AHIMS. Three business days after the audit the Executive Officer provided a corrective action plan for this.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
8.3 - Other heritage	<p>The organisation has few new examples of other heritage values. The forest manager did not do any search for heritage values at the Fife property, even though QCE as customer of pulpwood did supply in their contract a URL link to heritage values at Department of Environment.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
8.4 - Legal and traditional uses	<p>The organisation has several legal and traditional uses on the sites that it manages. Historically, there has been an agistment/grazing agreement as applicable. This is actually between Ergon Energy and the "Agistor", with example sighted 1/11/2019 to 31/12/2024 for 1,329 hectares. Hence, the forest manager is itself not directly responsible for these legal and traditional uses.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
Criterion 9: Social and Economic Benefits		
Forest management shall maintain and enhance long-term social and economic benefits.		
9.1 - Regional development	<p>The forest manager supports regional communities, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participating in a high school tour group and video arranged by Timber Queensland. Sighted email and video footage showing Executive officer, David, and itinerary 10/10/2022. Native Forestry: A Forest Wars Story on You Tube. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
9.2 - Optimal use	<p>The forest manager pursues efficient and optimal use, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attempt to get maximum value from trees. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Conforms;



Standard heading and number	Review team and client manager comments with evidence sighted (traceability of evidence)	Conformance level [NC = nonconformance]
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sighted spreadsheet of 2022 harvesting at Gundiah, where log processing showed more than twice the delivered price for veneer logs compared to A grade sawlog. See field notes about Fife site. <p>Minor nonconformance № 79 - Efficient and optimal use was not evident at one harvest site. Evidence: The contractor harvest had resulted in leaving potential utilisable stem material behind, where we sighted two pulpwood logs left, one crown piece cut off at 18cm small end when prescribed limit is 8cm, and an estimated 10 tonnes at landing, of mainly shorter logs. Three business days after the audit the Executive Officer provided a corrective action plan for this.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
9.3 - Illegal activities	<p>The forest manager takes action to curb illegal activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reporting suspected activity, such as 11/04/2022 report to Queensland Police with reference number PLI5967491. Properties have gates, and those with Energy Queensland have ownership signs. At least one case of illegal rubbish dumping at Ravensbourne was reported to Matt Farmer, Energy Queensland. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
9.4 - Skills development	<p>The forest manager support skills development through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chainsaw training on 19th December 2022. Sighted Site Docs group chat where three employees taking up the offer. ACDC Chemical for three participants on 19/10/22, with invoice T125B sighted. MEGT Apprenticeship Network Provider email confirming Jade Labonne had completed Certificate III in Business. Agreement 29/9/22 sighted. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
9.5 - Health and safety	<p>The forest manager fosters safety, through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HR003 terms and conditions of employment - Employees are given key points on workplace health and safety. It now using Site Docs App to conduct inductions when going on site. These inductions address measures to identify hazards, manage risk, and protect health and safety. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable
9.6 - Workers' rights	<p>The forest manager recognises rights of forest workers, through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HR003 terms and conditions of employment - Employees are on the Modern Award 2010 for Silviculture [page 1]. Meeting the minimum age is determined by way of screening and interviews. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conforms; <input type="checkbox"/> Observation; <input type="checkbox"/> Minor NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Major NC; <input type="checkbox"/> Not assessed or not applicable

End of report