

FSC Forest Management Audit

Public Summary Report

Audit Conducted By	SGS 1, place des Alpes 1211 Genova Switzerland www.sgs.com
Contact Person	Knowledge Solutions / Forest Management Accreditation
Report last updated on	02 September 2024
Certificate Holder	Rayonier NZ Ltd – trading as Matariki Forests Trading Limited PO Box 9238, Newmarket, Auckland Auckland 1023 New Zealand www.matarikiforests.co.nz
Contact Person	Andy Fleming
Certified Forest Areas	154283,88
FSC certificate registration code	SGSCH-FM/COC-000097
Certificate issue date	25 September 2021
Certificate expiry date	24 September 2026
Audit Sequence	3

This forest has been certified by SGS as meeting the requirements of FSC national forest standard FSC-STD-NZL-02-2023 Plantations EN.

Certificate Holder and Certification Body Details

Question	Inputs
Certificate Holder	
1.01 Certificate holder name *	Rayonier NZ Ltd – trading as Matariki Forests Trading Limited
1.01.1 Local company name	Matariki Forests
1.01.2 Trading name	Matariki Forests Trading Limited
1.02.1 Street Address *	PO Box 9238, Newmarket, Auckland
1.02.2 Address Line 2	
1.02.3 City *	Auckland
1.02.4 State or Province	
1.02.5 Postal Code	1023
1.03 Country *	New Zealand
1.04 Contact person full name *	Andy Fleming
1.05 Email *	Andy Fleming <andy.fleming@rayonier.com>
1.06 Telephone *	64 (0) 93022988
1.07 Website *	www.matarikiforests.co.nz
Certificate Parameters	
1.08 FSC licence code *	FSC-C021569
1.09 Certificate code *	SGSCH-FM/COC-000097
1.10 Former certificate code (if any)	SGS-FM/COC-000097
1.11 Certificate type *	FM/COC
1.12 Group certificate *	No
1.13.1 Initial certification date *	2006-09-25
1.13.2 Most recent certification date *	2021-09-25
1.13.3 Certificate expiry date *	2026-09-24
1.14 Total number of MUs in the scope of certificate *	5
1.15 Total area certified *	154283,877.8 ha
1.16 Certificate scope	
1.16.2 Current certificate scope *	Forest Management of plantations in the Bay of Plenty, South Canterbury, Otago and Southland regions of New Zealand for the production and sale of softwood and hardwood timber and Biomass in accordance with the FSC Accredited National Standard for New Zealand, version 02 of 17 Jan 2023.
1.16.3 Change of scope since previous audit *	Yes
1.16.1 Nature of scope change	Eastern Bay of Plenty forests have been sold. Two forests, Pukehuia and Maungatapere have been added to the Northland FMU.
1.17 Ecosystem services (ES) in the scope *	No
1.26 Continuous Improvement Procedure being followed *	No
1.25 Name and/or location of the certified forest area(s)	Northland, Bay of Plenty, Hawkes Bay and Southland
Certification Body	
1.18 Certification body name *	SGS
1.19.1 Street Address *	1, place des Alpes
1.19.2 Address Line 2	
1.19.3 City *	1211 Geneva
1.19.4 State	
1.19.5 Postal Code	
1.20 Country *	Switzerland

Question	Inputs
1.21 Contact person full name *	Knowledge Solutions / Forest Management Accreditation
1.22 Email *	forestry@sgs.com
1.23 Telephone *	+ 598.95.020086
1.24 Website *	www.sgs.com

The evaluation process

Question	Inputs
Audit Parameters	
2.01 Audit type *	Surveillance
2.01.1 Audit sequence *	3
2.01.2 Audit location *	On-site
2.01.3 Justification for remote audit	N/A
2.01.4 Methods used for remote audit	N/A
2.02 Audit start date *	2024-08-20
2.16 First stakeholder consultation date for this audit *	2024-07-04
2.03 Audit finish date *	2024-08-29
2.04 Total person days on-site *	16,5
2.04.1 Justification for audit time *	The number of days allocated to this audit was calculated based on the forest area, a review of the forest impact (medium), stakeholder consultation and review of previous reports.
2.05 Date of report *	2024-09-02
Normative Documents	
2.07 Evaluated international normative document(s) *	
2.07.1 Trademark standard FSC-STD-50-001 *	Yes
2.07.2 Group standard FSC-STD-30-005 *	No
2.07.3 CoC standard FSC-STD-40-004 *	Yes
2.07.4 ES procedure FSC-PRO-30-006 *	No
2.07.5 Excision Policy FSC-POL-20-003 *	No
2.07.6 Pesticides Policy FSC-POL-30-001 *	Yes
2.07.7 Applicable NTFP Standard *	No
2.07.8 CIP FSC PRO 30-011 *	No
2.08 Code(s) of NFSS or IFSS used *	FSC-STD-NZL-02-2023 Plantations EN
2.09 Web link to the standard used *	https://connect.fsc.org/document-centre/documents/resource/1407
2.10 If applicable, the adaptation process of CB interim standard	N/A

The evaluation process

Question	Inputs
Certification Decision	
2.20 Conditions associated with the certification decision *	
2.20.1 No specific condition *	No
2.20.2 Correction of minor NCRs issued within required timelines *	Yes
2.20.3 Correction of major NCRs issued within required timelines *	No
2.20.4 Correction of the pre-conditions to certification identified *	No
2.20.5 Other	none
2.32 Conditions assessed and subsequent actions taken prior to the certification decision to correct major or minor non-conformities that were identified *	Refer to TAB 12 of this report
2.22 Auditor's recommendation *	
2.22.1 The organization is in conformity with the certification requirements *	Yes
2.22.2 The organization needs to take corrective actions *	Yes
2.28 Resolution of alleged non-conformities	N/A
2.29 Potential infringements of the FSC Policy for Association *	N/A
2.24 Other details relevant to the decision	N/A
2.23 Certification decision *	Maintain
2.25 Decision date *	2024-11-28
2.26 Decision making entity *	SGSCH

Audit itinerary

4.01 Audit Itinerary Item Start Date *	4.02 Hours *	4.03 MUs or members *	4.04 Activities *	4.05 Site detail *
	8,00	Northland	Opening meeting for the Northland office, document review at the office. Brett and Graeme started the overview of documents provided, sought additional documents, and started on P1 and P2.	document review
2024-08-21	8,00	Northland	Graeme reviewed documentation against FSC Principles 5 and 6 and criteria as applicable to each forest and this audit while Brett did a field visit.	document review
2024-08-21	8,00	Northland	Brett attended field visit. Factors assessed included plantation forests, reserves and HCVs/ Assessment of active operation sites and interview of contractors / Assessment of soil and water and riparian zones/ Assessment of wood tracking system (COC). Stakeholder interviews during the field visit including local shop keeper and forest users.	Field visit
2024-08-22	8,00	Northland	Graeme and Brett continued the review of documentation against FSC Principles and criteria as applicable to each forest and this audit. Brett P.2, and Graeme P.1, 5, 6.	document review
2024-08-27	8,00	Hawkes Bay	Opening meeting for the Canterbury staff, document review at the office. Brett P. 4, 8, and 10, and Graeme P6 and 7.	document review
2024-08-28	8,00	Hawkes Bay	Graeme continued the review of documentation against FSC Principles 7, 9, and Part 10 and criteria as applicable to each forest and this audit.	document review
2024-08-28	16,00	Hawkes Bay, Canterbury and Southland	Brett attended field visit in Hawkes Bay. Factors assessed included plantation forests, reserves and HCVs/ Assessment of active operation sites and interview of contractors / Assessment of soil and water and riparian zones/ Assessment of wood tracking system (COC). Gabriel had a field visit to Southland focussing on stakeholder engagement and particularly interaction with immediate neighbours. He attended a community meeting and	Field visit
2024-08-29	8,00	Hawkes Bay	Brett and Graeme completed the review of documentation against FSC Principles P1 -10 and criteria focussing on the corrective action areas. Brett and Graeme had a team meeting to review audit findings. Closing meeting at 1pm attended by Rayonier staff and the auditors.	document review

Forest management enterprise information

Question	Inputs
Forest Area	
5.02 Brief description of any area of forest over which the certificate holder has some responsibility, whether as owner (including shared or partial ownership), manager, consultant or other responsibility) which the certificate holder has chosen to exclude from the scope of the certificate, together with an explanation of the reason. *	Rayonier managed another areas out of the Scope - those are not included due to the client's decision.
5.03 Area of forest owned/managed but excluded from MUs in the scope of certification *	
5.03.1 According to FSC-POL-20-003 *	30,0.00 ha
5.03.2 Other reasons	235,0.00 ha
5.36 Identified conflicts between laws and/or regulations with certification requirements. *	Conservation areas networking- Asking more than the legislation - Financial impact/Need more area for production - Plantations must be economically viable, otherwise environmental and social expectations can not be achieved. Chemical usage Restrictions going beyond the legislation.

Forest management enterprise information

Question	Inputs
----------	--------

Group members

6.01 Group member name	6.05 Sub-code (if applicable)	6.10 Date Joined *	6.11 Date Left	6.12 Contractor *	6.06 Certified area *
------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Management Units											Area Units: ha	
7.01 MU name *	7.23 Cadastral identifier *	7.02 Forest zone *	7.03 SLIMF type *	7.04 Tenure-ownership *	7.05 Tenure-management *	7.24 Recognised as Community Forest	7.25 SLIMF or Community	7.06 Centroid Latitude *	7.07 Centroid Longitude *	7.08 Total production forest area *	7.09 Total non-production forest area *	7.10 Total area of MU *
Number of Valid Entries:		5						Area Totals		120 636,39	33 647,48	154 283,88
												0,00
Northland		Temperate	Non-SLIMF	Private	Private	No	No	174,45300000	36,21300000	23 814,34	5 187,48	29 001,82
Bay of Plenty		Temperate	Non-SLIMF	Private	Private	No	No	176,87500000	38,00800000	25 006,51	7 206,93	32 213,44
Hawkes Bay		Temperate	Non-SLIMF	Private	Private	No	No	176,86500000	39,18800000	16 232,38	3 994,79	20 227,17
Canterbury		Temperate	Non-SLIMF	Private	Private	No	No	172,57900000	43,21500000	22 493,81	7 408,55	29 902,37
Southland		Temperate	Non-SLIMF	Private	Private	No	No	168,62100000	46,22100000	33 089,35	9 849,73	42 939,08

Commercial timber species

8.01 Species *	8.02 Product code *	8.03 Trade name *	8.04 Harvested quantity in previous calendar year *	8.06 Sold with FSC Claim in previous calendar year *
Pseudotsuga menziesii	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	Douglas fir	161206,0.0 m3	
Pinus radiata	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	Pine	1901303,0.0 m3	
Eucalyptus fastigata	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	Eucalyptus	,0.0 m3	
Eucalyptus delegatensis R.Baker	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	Eucalyptus	,0.0 m3	
Cupressus lusitanica Mill.	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	Benthamii	32,0.0 m3	
Cupressus macrocarpa Hartw. ex Gord.	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	Cypres	424,0.0 m3	
Larix decidua	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	European larch	5092,0.0 m3	
Eucalyptus nitens	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	Eucalyptus	,0.0 m3	
Eucalyptus saligna	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	Eucalyptus	,0.0 m3	
Pinus nigra	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	Corsican Pine	,0.0 m3	

NTFP - non-timber forest products

9.01 Species *	9.02 Product code of NTFP *	9.03 Trade name *	9.04 Harvested quantity in previous calendar year *
----------------	-----------------------------	-------------------	---

Pesticide use since previous audit/year

10.01.1 Trade name *	10.01 Active ingredient *	10.03 Applied area *	10.04 Reason for use *	10.04.1 Location used *	10.04.2 Period of use *	10.04.3 Number of applications *	10.04.4 Frequency of application *	10.05 Quantity of ingredient *	10.06 Summary of ESRA
glyphosate		3914,0.0 ha	herbicide	Forest	2023	23	Annually	11,577.0 metric tonnes	•Soil: Low mobility, low persistence, low bioaccumulation, low toxicity, minimal erosion risk. •Water: Low to moderate migration risk, low toxicity to aquatic life, moderate persistence. •Non-target Species: Low toxicity to aquatic organisms, low to moderate effects on plants, low risk to birds and bees. •Human Health: Low toxicity, potential skin and eye irritation, unlikely to cause cancer or reproductive issues.
clopyralid		584,0.0 ha	herbicide	Forest	2023	10	Annually	,357.0 metric tonnes	Clopyralid is a selective herbicide that can harm or kill certain plant species, impacting biodiversity. It can persist in soil and water, affecting ecosystems over time. Exposure to clopyralid may pose health risks to humans and wildlife if not used in accordance with SDS and RMF Spraying Prescriptions.
metsulfuron		4150,690.0 ha	herbicide	Forest	2023	18	Annually	,431.0 metric tonnes	•Soil: Medium to high mobility, low to moderate persistence, low bioaccumulation, low to moderate toxicity, increased erosion risk. •Water: Moderate to high migration risk, very toxic to aquatic life, moderate persistence. •Non-target Species: Very toxic to aquatic organisms, severe effects on sensitive vegetation, low risk to birds and bees.
picloram		340,260.0 ha	herbicide	Forest	2023	9	Annually	,078.0 metric tonnes	•Soil: Moderate mobility, moderate persistence, low bioaccumulation, low toxicity, minimal erosion risk. •Water: Moderate migration risk, low to moderate toxicity to aquatic life, moderate persistence. •Non-target Species: Moderate toxicity to aquatic organisms, low to moderate effects on plants, low risk to birds and bees. •Human Health: Low to moderate toxicity, potential skin and eye irritation, possible carcinogenicity, and reproductive risks with prolonged exposure.
terbuthylazine		1053,010.0 ha	herbicide	Forest	2023	15	Annually	7,423.0 metric tonnes	Soil: Persistent, affects soil microorganisms Water: Toxic to aquatic life, moderate persistence Non-target Species: Toxic to aquatic organisms, low risk to birds and bees Human Health: Moderate oral toxicity, slight skin and moderate eye irritation, unlikely to cause cancer or reproductive issues
trichlopyr		83,340.0 ha	herbicide	Forest	2023	8	Annually	,018.4 metric tonnes	•Soil: Moderate mobility, moderate persistence, low bioaccumulation, low toxicity, minimal erosion risk. •Water: Moderate migration risk, low to moderate toxicity to aquatic life, moderate persistence. •Non-target Species: Moderate toxicity to aquatic organisms, low to moderate effects on plants, low risk to birds and bees. •Human Health: Low to moderate toxicity, potential skin and eye irritation, possible carcinogenicity, and reproductive risks with prolonged exposure.
sodium fluoroacetate		640,0.0 ha	pesticide	Forest	2023	1	Annually	,192.0 metric tonnes	Acute toxicity (fatal if inhaled or swallowed and toxic with contact on skin), eye irritation, organ damage, reproductive toxicity (damage fertility or the unborn child), and aquatic toxicity.
hexazinone		2801,620.0 ha	herbicide	Forest	2023	19	Annually	5,460.0 metric tonnes	•Soil: High mobility, moderate persistence, low bioaccumulation, low to moderate toxicity, and erosion risk. •Water: High risk of entering water sources, very toxic to aquatic life, and moderate persistence. •Non-target Species: Very toxic to aquatic organisms, severe effects on sensitive vegetation, low toxicity to birds and bees, risks to nearby aquaculture. •Human Health: Low to moderate toxicity, potential skin and eye irritation, unlikely to cause cancer or developmental effects, minimal reproductive impact.
ammonium sulfamate		30,650.0 ha	herbicide	Forest	2023	1	Annually	,122.6 metric tonnes	Toxicity: Harmful if ingested, inhaled, or if it contacts skin and eyes. Environmental Impact: Can harm non-target plants and aquatic life. Soil Health: May alter soil chemistry and affect microorganisms. Human Health: Prolonged exposure can lead to respiratory problems and skin sensitization.

Pesticide use since previous audit/year

10.01.1 Trade name *	10.01 Active ingredient *	10.03 Applied area *	10.04 Reason for use *	10.04.1 Location used *	10.04.2 Period of use *	10.04.3 Number of applications *	10.04.4 Frequency of application *	10.05 Quantity of ingredient *	10.06 Summary of ESRA
copper		4614,680.0 ha	fungicide	Forest	2023	2	Annually	3,945.6 metric tonnes	Cuprous oxide is a fungicide that can negatively impact biodiversity by harming non-target plant species. It can persist in soil and water, disrupting ecosystems and harming soil microorganisms and aquatic life. Human and wildlife health risks include skin irritation, respiratory issues, and gastrointestinal distress from direct exposure, as well as potential long-term effects from food chain contamination. To mitigate these risks, it is crucial to follow Safety Data Sheets (SDS) and Risk Management Framework (RMF) Spraying Prescriptions for safe handling and application.
phosphorus		234,140.0 ha	fertiliser	Forest	2023	2	Annually	25,961.4 metric tonnes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Soil: Moderate mobility, moderate persistence, low bioaccumulation, low toxicity, minimal erosion risk.•Water: Moderate migration risk, low to moderate toxicity to aquatic life, moderate persistence.•Non-target Species: Moderate toxicity to aquatic organisms, low to moderate effects on plants, low risk to birds and bees.•Human Health: Low to moderate toxicity, potential skin and eye irritation, low carcinogenicity, and no significant reproductive risks..
haloxyfop		56,0.0 ha	herbicide	Forest	2023	1	Annually	,002.0 metric tonnes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Soil: Moderate mobility, moderate persistence, low bioaccumulation, low toxicity, minimal erosion risk.•Water: Moderate to high migration risk, very toxic to aquatic life with long-lasting effects, low to moderate persistence.•Non-target Species: Very toxic to aquatic organisms, moderate toxicity to plants, low acute toxicity to birds and bees.•Human Health: Low to high toxicity depending on exposure, potential skin and eye irritation, suspected carcinogenicity, and possible reproductive risks with prolonged exposure.

Forest context and management plan

Question	Inputs
11.28 Description of the forest	<p>Bio-physical setting</p> <p>The Northland Region consists of blocks of exotic forests with a geographical spread of approximately 200km from the northern to southern-most parts of the estate. The estate comprises of just over 23,000 hectares in this region. The forests within the Northland region have their own characteristics. Forest sites range from flat rolling countryside to steep hill country all at low - mid altitude range. The forests grow within sub-tropical climatic conditions with a relatively high rainfall per annum of 1600-1700 mm.</p> <p>The Bay of Plenty region has forests extending from the Coromandel to the Eastern Bay of Plenty. Sites range from coastal hills to rolling country. The area is known for extreme weather events.</p> <p>Hawkes Bay forests are typically among the most productive in NZ with site indexes ranging up to 36m and average projected MAI of 29.6m³/ha per annum at age 28. The region has warm summers, often dry and exposed to drought, and mild winters. The estate consists of several forests accessed off SH5 and SH2 North of Napier.</p> <p>Southern North Island Region now falls under this Region. Site productivity in Manawatu and Wanganui regions vary widely by location.</p> <p>Some forests in the Southern North Island were originally established on sand dunes to protect the farmlands and the railway land from sand encroachment. As a result, the forests are long and narrow. Sites close to the sea still have their original protection plantings. These stands offer protection to the rest of the crop from salt laden winds. Production over most of the forest is low although growth improves markedly approximately 1 km inland from the coast.</p> <p>In the Canterbury Region approx 50% of the forested area is flat, being on the plains. The remainder is in the foothills. The foothills estate is more productive. The plains estate comprises Eyrewell and Balmoral forests, both of which are under land use and tenure review by the landowner, the Ngai Tahu Iwi.</p> <p>The Southern region forests are a diverse mixture. This diversity is a result of location, altitude, exposure, soil types and original vegetative cover. The plantation crop consists of predominantly Radiata pine (70%), Douglas fir (20%) and range of minor exotic species stands. Radiata pine is best suited to high productivity, lower altitude sites where snow and wind have a lower probability of damaging the crop. Douglas fir can tolerate harsher site and climate conditions and can be managed more effectively where there is risk of heavy woody weed or disease infection.</p> <p>Geography:</p> <p>The forests within the Northland Region reside mainly on steep to very steep broken topography that are highly erosive, however Topuni and Tinopai are both relatively flat to rolling terrain. In the Glenbervie Main Block there are six watershed catchments where five of these are the headwaters of the rivers. Three feed into the Northern Wairoa River via the Wairau River on the west coast. Another three feed into catchments that discharge on the east coast including the Hatea River that flows out through the Whangarei Harbour and the largest catchment that includes the Naunguru River. Mokau and Tutukaka blocks are situated within close proximity (250-400m).</p>
11.29 Description of the management system	<p>Planning process</p> <p>The owner/manager's strategic (long term: rotation or harvest cycle length), tactical (medium term: 3-5 years) and operational (annual or biannual) management and financial planning system.</p> <p>Rayonier Matariki Forests (RMF) planning process is underpinned by its forest information management system, a schematic is outlined below.</p> <p>Planning is undertaken annually. The integrated aims for this project are generally:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.generate an internal strategic plan; 2.aid in the preparation of regional business and 3-year plans; 3.provide data for the 12 Year Plan Project to better understand the impact of changing wood flow and production cost profiles beyond the 3-year horizon; and 4.prepare and audit data for an external valuation that is required by Matariki shareholders and under International Financial Reporting Standards (NZ IAS 41) as adopted by the Matariki Board. <p>The process commences with estate model runs, using WOODSTOCK (www.remsoft.com) model. Areas and yields are updated annually, to reflect the state of the resource. This process models woodflows over an entire nominal rotation (30 years radiata, 45 years Douglas fir) and establishes high level view of available yields.</p> <p>12 year and 3-year plan</p> <p>These tactical level plans introduce constraints – operational, environmental, and market constraints. Regional input and expertise is applied in applying constraints to arrive at woodflows that are feasible. Woodflows are typically smoothed to take these constraints into account. The first year of the 3-year plan becomes the operational plan of the following year budget. A further process of internal review occurs before the budget is finalised.</p> <p>Financial planning is integrated with the woodflow planning described above. RMF uses SAP as its transactional and financial forecasting system</p> <p>An outline of the process, (noting that each step has a number of sub-processes) is outlined below. All process documentation is contained within PROMAPP, and online tool for process documentation</p> <p>The system the owner/manager uses to develop and revise policies and operational procedures, and how these are communicated to operational staff.</p> <p>The development of policies and operational procedures is driven by risk – which may be identified either at the strategic level, or operational level. Strategic level risks and their controls are reviewed depending upon the level of residual risk (post controls) and ranges from monthly to annually.</p> <p>The need for operational procedures is driven by operational staff. The forum for the raising of these is via Functional group meetings</p>
11.01 Legislative, administrative and land use context in which the Organization operates	<p>Legislative, Administrative and Land Use Context</p> <p>The forest management enterprise operates within the framework of the New Zealand legal and commercial system. The legislation is described in Section 6</p> <p>Central government agencies involved are the Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment (MBIE), which administers the Health and Safety in Employment legislation, and also monitors compliance with the HASNO Act regulations. The Department of Conservation, a neighbour in many parts of the country and which administers the Wild Animal Control Act and the Conservation Act; Heritage NZ administers the Historic Places Act. The Biosecurity Act is administered by the Animal Health Board and Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI) Biosecurity.</p> <p>Territorial government administration is through the various Regional and District Councils in regions where the company operates. These councils administer the Resource Management Act and issue resource consents for specific activities regarding soil and water. Some local District Councils administer aspects of local infrastructure especially rural roads.</p>
11.02 Roles of responsible government agencies involved in aspects of forest management	Local government (Regional and District Councils) are responsible for the regulations related to forest activities outlined in the RMA (NES-PF), this means they regularly undertake compliance checks to ensure all regulations are being complied with by the certificate
11.03 Ownership and use-rights (both legal and customary) of lands and forest of external parties other than the certificate holder	The company has a mix of leasehold, forestry rights and partnership with iwi
11.04 Non-forestry activities being undertaken within the area evaluated, whether they are undertaken by the certificate holder or by some other party (e.g. mining, industrial operations, agriculture, hunting, commercial tourism, etc.)	
11.04.1 mining	No
11.04.2 industrial operation	No
11.04.3 agriculture	No
11.04.4 hunting	Yes
11.04.6 other, please specify	N/A

Forest context and management plan

Question	Inputs
11.05 Forest management objectives	RNZ's vision is to grow a successful and sustainable future. RNZ is committed to health and safety excellence. Its policy states that first and foremost, it cares about people and does not want anybody harmed in its business. RNZ believes that good health and safety performance and good business performance go hand in hand. RNZ is also committed to meeting its obligations under Health and Safety Legislation, Codes of Practice, and any relevant Standards or Guidelines. RNZ is committed to sound environmental management, as a fundamental business objective.
11.06 Land use and ownership status of the forest resource	The company has a mix of freehold, leasehold, forestry rights and partnership with iwi
11.07 Socio-economic conditions of the forest management	Rayonier have staff and workers mainly from New Zealand, main language speak is English. The company has 5 FMU in the north and south Islands. The predominant Iwi (main tribal group) for most of the South Island is the Ngai Tahu. It is generally recognised that this tribe represents the interests of Maori of local ancestry. The North Island has a large number of Iwi and the company continues to build strong relationships with the local Maori. Areas having special spiritual, cultural or historical tribal significance to Maori are known as Waahi Tapu. Special care is taken to ensure such areas are not disturbed and consultations carried out to determine where these exist in forest areas. These areas have been highlighted in planning documents and Historic Places Trust authorities are sought when forestry operations occur in the vicinity of these sites.
11.08 Brief description of forest composition	The company owned and/or managed 154,283.88 hectares of forestland in the North and South Islands of New Zealand.
11.09 Profile of adjacent lands	
11.09.1 urban	No
11.09.2 agriculture	Yes
11.09.3 wetland	Yes
11.09.4 mining	No
11.09.5 desert	No
11.09.6 pasture	Yes
11.09.7 orchards	Yes
11.09.8 other, please specify	none
11.23.1 Description of segregation controls implemented *	The company has a LDD system for tracing products coming out from the forests. Log dockets are completed when trucks are loaded, and invoices are generated with the information of all dockets associated to them. All dockets' information is entered into a log management system. The sale invoices are issued from the company's software and all log dockets for the sale are listed on the invoice.
11.27.1 log yard *	No
11.27.2 road side *	No
11.27.3 other, please specify	customer yard
11.31 Major changes to management plan *	None.

Stakeholder feedback

12.01 Stakeholder group *	12.02 Stakeholder description *	12.03 Stakeholder's comment	12.06 CB's follow up
NGO, Northland	Whangarei mountainbike club	They are very approachable, and trusting. 10 out of 10.	N/A
Roading contractor, Hawkes Bay	David White Earthmoving Ltd	Communication is excellent at all levels. Approachability and willingness to collaborate on plans. Local knowledge is always taken seriously and into consideration when planning. Contracts are fair and kept current. 10/10	N/A
Neighbour, Northland	Glenbervie B&B, Lorraine	Good view on the company, and mentioned the general community same. She called the company about an abandoned car at a forest gate and it was removed within hours	N/A
Neighbour, Northland	Glenbervie neighbour on Puketotara Rd	The company is good. Lived on the road for 50 years. Will the manager is good and helped get rid of a noxious weed, moth plant opposite the home in a forest block that can't get replanted at the moment	N/A
Truck driver, Northland	Cartage	Good company. Road are in pretty good conditions. No issues. I get audited by Rayonier which went over H&S including loading, chaining, and tying down.	N/A
Logging contractor, Northland	Foreman yarder crew	Requests to Rayonier get done. Supervisor makes regular visits at least weekly. Opportunity to discuss concerns with supervisor	N/A
Logging contractor, Northland	Worker yarder crew	No issues with Rayonier.	N/A
Logging contractor, Northland	Worker yarder crew	The supervisor visits probably a couple of times a week. Easy to talk, if needed.	N/A
Logging contractor	Worker yarder crew	Can discuss the harvest plan with Rayonier. Supervisor visits regularly	N/A
Binwood operator, Northland	Excavator operator	Cool, helpful, and good Rayonier crew	N/A

Stakeholder feedback

12.01 Stakeholder group *	12.02 Stakeholder description *	12.03 Stakeholder's comment	12.06 CB's follow up
Neighbour Mangatapere, Northland	Horse rider	The roads and tracks are much improved since Rayonier took over management. I can use my horse in the forest for recreation.	N/A
NGO	Forest Industry Contractor Association	this organisation representative deals very close with Rayonier's H&S Manager. Rayonier participates in all industry projects they have, and they are very generous with the resources. The company is very supportive. There was a fatality but no in the last 12 months, it was some years ago for which the company did a large investigation and puts a lot of resources on this issue.	N/A
Govt	Hawke's bay Regional Council	no comments, there is an internal policy for the council staff to not do any comment.	N/A
Govt	Hastings District Council	Multiple calls. busy at the moment and will be away the week of the 20th August. He asked me to email him and I did it. No answer received	N/A
FSC	FSC representative	knows the company. No complaints/comments received about Rayonier. The company hasn't been in touch with the representative.	N/A
Logging contractor, Hawkes Bay	Foreman yarder crew	Good to work for. Get on well with the supervisor.	N/A
Logging contractor, Hawkes Bay	Worker yarder crew	Supervisor is easy to work with.	N/A
Silviculture contractor, Hawkes Bay	Foreman	Company supports the business. Helps with documentation and training	N/A
Silviculture contractor, Hawkes Bay	Worker	The supervisor is good.	N/A
Silviculture contractor, Hawkes Bay	Worker	No interaction with the company.	N/A

Stakeholder feedback

12.01 Stakeholder group *	12.02 Stakeholder description *	12.03 Stakeholder's comment	12.06 CB's follow up
Truck driver, Hawkes Bay	Business owner	Excellent company. The best I work for. Proactive with my business, e.g. assist with permits.	N/A
Sawmill, Hawkes Bay	Owner	They are a good corporate citizen. No problems.	N/A
Castle Dent forest Neighbour	neighbour	<p>The main concerns from them and some other neighbours is the lack of communication from the company, pest control, fence maintenance and people coming into neighbours' property from the company's forests. There will be a meeting next week (Tuesday 27th august) between neighbours, forestry companies (including Rayonier) and police to discuss all these issues. In the past Rayonier has been a great company but in the last year the situation changed a lot. They have been trying to get in touch with someone from Rayonier sending emails and doing phone calls but nobody came back to them. Evidence provided by the company: The company has a spreadsheet with the identification of stakeholders and the type of engagement with them. CAR 03 to 4.2 was raised about identifying social impacts in Southland region. In Glendhu forest there is a local hunting club with access allowed to hunt in the weekends. This was confirmed through the interview with the local community and also through the evidence of the Group Access License dated on 01.04.2023. For Castle Dent forest Rayonier was waiting to finish with the planting season that was finished the week before the audit for allowing hunting in the forest. There is a "Hunter Roster Version 2" where it can be checked that the WYN hunting group has been allocated for hunting in this forest on the weekends of the 27-28 July, 3-4 August, 10-11 Aug, 24-25 Aug and 31 Aug- 1 Set. It was confirmed with some Lawrence hunting club members that this group was granted with access for hunting in the past weekends. However, Observation 01 was raised for pig control in some areas in Southland region. Per the visits to the forest, it was evidenced all forest are fenced, with locked gates that keys are provided to people whose access was granted. At the entrance of the forests there are signs of private property, and that access is granted through permit. Rayonier identified the current security</p>	Observation 07 was raised about illegal activities control.

Stakeholder feedback

12.01 Stakeholder group *	12.02 Stakeholder description *	12.03 Stakeholder's comment	12.06 CB's follow up
Farm Owner	neighbour	They are boundary neighbours of Rayonier. Around 2-3 years ago they contacted the company, and they had a meeting with the company's representative about gorse damaging the fences, the company said they will supply the chemicals for the neighbour to do the control, but they never supplied it. They don't know if representative they met is still working for the company. Rayonier contacts them when doing aerial spraying and gives them the opportunity to do any comment, but the neighbour didn't contact them since 3 years ago. The neighbour says the forests are not open to general public anymore for hunting and this is a problem because the number of deer and pigs increased. She knows the Pig Hunting Association is accessing the forest but there is no info about what is happening with deer. About the comment done of water quality she has no evidence that there is any affectation of the water quality but she thinks this because of the colour of the water. She is also concerned about the trees distance to neighbouring fences and if there is any legislation how the company ensures it is in compliance with this regulation. CAR 03 was raised for social impact assessment and stakeholder engagement in Southland region. Observation 01 was raised about pig control.	CAR 26 was raised for social impact assessment and stakeholder engagement in Southland region. Observation 06 was raised about pig control.
Glendhu forest neighbour	Neighbour	Didn't know that Rayonier is the owner of Glendhu forest. However they don't have any complaint about the company. No dealing with them at all. No positive nor negative comments.	CAR 26 was raised for stakeholder engagement.
Lawrence Neighbour	Neighbour	The stakeholder doesn't know the name of the forest next to their property. However doesn't know anything (bad or good) about Rayonier.	CAR 26 was raised for stakeholder engagement.
Glendhu forest neighbour	Neighbour	No problem with Rayonier. In the past there were some issues but everything sorted out. No issues with animal pests. There were some issues with poachers but the stakeholder didn't reported them to the police. Not been told about any operations but there were not operations in the last years around their property.	N/A

Stakeholder feedback

12.01 Stakeholder group *	12.02 Stakeholder description *	12.03 Stakeholder's comment	12.06 CB's follow up
Manukaawa forest neighbour	Neighbour	It is a boundary neighbour. Rayonier has been a good neighbour and they have a good neighbour relationship. They had an issue with gorse in the boundary fence some year ago and Rayonier came up and clean all the gorse and re built the fence. This year the problem is the pigs. The stakeholder contacted the company and Rayonier sent pig hunters. The stakeholder contacting someone from the hunting crew asking for the number of pigs hunted but didn't receive any answer. After this the stakeholder didn't contact Rayonier asking for info. From their side what the stakeholder is doing is hiring a hunter to hunt pigs in their property.	N/A
Glendhu forest neighbour	Neighbour	The person from the organisation started in February this year and didn't have contact with Rayonier. Rayonier is a good neighbour, nothing to complain about. No boundary issues. They don't have pig problems nor any other pest problem from Rayonier's forest. The Stakeholder knows there are hunters in Rayonier's forest controlling deer and pigs. It is aware of the meeting to be held in Lawrence on the 27th but the stakeholder won't be participating because they are not affected at all by Rayonier's operations.	N/A
Castle Dent forest neighbour	Neighbour	Knows Rayonier's representative. He is not sure if Rayonier is aware of the impacts caused by their operations (negatives or positives). The stakeholder thinks there is lack of proactivity from Rayonier to approach the community.	CAR 26 is raised due to assessment of impacts and engagement with stakeholders in Southland region.

Stakeholder feedback

12.01 Stakeholder group *	12.02 Stakeholder description *	12.03 Stakeholder's comment	12.06 CB's follow up
Manukaawa forest Neighbour	Neighbour	<p>They are boundary neighbours with Rayonier. One of Rayonier's representatives was in touch with them in the past and they had a good relationship. In the last time there are issues with pigs and poachers. Negative issues the stakeholder identify about Rayonier are:-Lack of commitment to deal with issues coming from the forests (pigs and poachers),-Poor communication until the new community representative started few months ago. Now the communication has improved. However, the company doesn't say what they are doing to help neighbours,-Noise from machines. They contacted Rayonier, the company talked to the operator but this situation went on happening. The stakeholder thinks the internal communication in the company is not working properly. Positive issues:-Rayonier has done some good thing about signage on no trespass area,-Rayonier has being doing some pest control but in a reactive way (when neighbour ask for that) not proactively,-They do act when neighbours push they do respond.</p>	<p>CAR 26 is raised about impacts assessment and stakeholder's engagement. Observation 06 is raised about pig's control. Observation 07 is raised about security control</p>
Lawrence Police Station	Neighbour	<p>The representative has been working in the area for 4 years. In the last year there were lot of concerns from farmers about issues happening in the forests and for this reason the representative decided to the organise a meeting between the farmers and the forestry companies. The idea of the meeting was to let farmers and forestry companies to catch up and create a network. The media picked the information of the meeting and did the article, some issues in the article are true but some others are not. What was originally planned to be a small meeting for the local community finished in something massive. The pigs problems was the issue that was treated passionately, this issue involves all the forestry companies. The forestry companies explained about recreational hunting done on weekends and pest control. The next stage could be a group of representatives working together to address the pig issues. Trespassing, stock in forestry land, poaching, were some other issues that discussed in the meeting. The people participating in the meeting was happy with the idea of the meeting, no negative feedback was received about the idea of the meeting. With Rayonier the stakeholder has excellent communication. Rayonier's representative is reporting everything that happens in the forests. It is really good to work with Rayonier.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Stakeholder feedback

12.01 Stakeholder group *	12.02 Stakeholder description *	12.03 Stakeholder's comment	12.06 CB's follow up
Ararimu forest neighbour	Neighbour	Knows the company. Rayonier left a letter about harvesting operations at the end of last year. Stakeholder is happy with the company as a forest neighbour, because with all the controls the forestry company is doing there are no more possum as there were in the past.	N/A
Riverhead forest neighbour	Neighbour	Knows Rayonier's representative and says they receive an email from the representative once a week. They have a key for the gate at Riverhead Forest. The company communicated all the operations.	N/A
Hamptons and Matais forest Neighbour	Neighbour	The "Hamptons" and "Matais" Rayonier forests at Willowflat, northern Hawke's Bay. We all got totally smashed by Cyclone Gabrielle and have been putting things back together ever since. We occasionally communicate over boundary issues and aerial 1080 work, poachers (a mutual concern) etc. The Napier staff have been good to deal with. Perhaps the only issue would be the need to get more keys for our various contractors that need to travel through Rayonier owned forest to access our conservation work. Generally though this has not been a big issue.	N/A
Recreational group – Northland	Recreation group	They are very approachable and trusting.	N/A
Department of conservation	Government Org	Nothing for the East Coast District in this list.	N/A

Stakeholder feedback

12.01 Stakeholder group *	12.02 Stakeholder description *	12.03 Stakeholder's comment	12.06 CB's follow up
Maramarua forest-Recreational group	Recreation group	I have been using Maramarua for over 15 years. I host motorcycle events mainly in the Central block. Rayonier have been incredibly supportive throughout the time I have been running these events. In every working relationship, it always comes down to the individuals one deals with. Someone from the Bay of Plenty region is my point of contact at Rayonier. This person provides practical solutions to my queries. Rayonier is stringent on environmental issues and is happy to work with us to achieve the desired results. In all other aspects, Rayonier has been excellent to deal with. There has been the odd staffer with unrealistic expectations, but these have been resolved.	N/A
Contractor company	Contractor	Most of the supervisors we work with are good to deal with. Rayonier office staff often helpful and pleasant. Rayonier recently ran a very informative training day on compaction which was well received these are done semi regularly. Good must of these are paid for. Rayonier hold regular H&S meetings although these could improve, they are the only forest management company holding them regularly. We are regularly consulted on training needs in our field of expertise. I feel that Rayonier put a lot of resource into this area. We are local indigenous people and employ local so Rayonier's work in our area is very important to us. 80% of our staff are indigenous.	N/A
Western Bay of Plenty District Council	Government Org	We will not be making any comments.	N/A

Stakeholder feedback

12.01 Stakeholder group *	12.02 Stakeholder description *	12.03 Stakeholder's comment	12.06 CB's follow up
Contractor company	Contractor	<p>Communication is excellent at all levels. Approachability and willingness to collaborate on plans. Local knowledge is always taken seriously and into consideration when planning. Contracts are fair and kept current.Plans and updates sent through promptly. Meetings with forestry management frequent. Weekly schedule of operations for all forest users sent out to all parties by forest manager.As local roading contractors with 40 yrs experience planning is encouraged. There is no problem reviewing plans and suggesting alterative options. These are given full consideration and engineering details are supplied to fully understand any changes. Rayonier, logging contractors and us as roading/earthmoving are involved with final design.The maintenance of roads is on ongoing and problem areas are seen to early before they become an environment issue due to adverse weather. Rayonier's encouragement to act early and respond quickly to identified areas allows for less environmental impact. Native areas avoided. Archaeological finds reported with onsite forms available.All work is done to the highest standard. This is encouraged by Rayonier. Council inspections are passed.Rayonier are very proactive in encouraging a high standard of H & S. Information is readily shared and education is encouraged.</p>	N/A
Riverhead forest neighbour	Neighbour	<p>I have thought about my interactions with Rayonier matariki and in the main I have been very impressed with the contact. Mail drops giving us early notice of removal of trees and spraying of weeds was given with plenty of notice. We were given contact names and phone numbers so that we could contact them with any queries we had in respect of anything that was not specified in the correspondence. So proactive. I was told monitoring of the stream would be done when the spraying took place and this was evidenced by a patrol of observers on the ground. My only concern is that there still seems to be largish piles of Slash left on the hillside. We have been lucky that we have not had too many instances of torrential rain to take the wood down the hill into the stream. I am aware that the piles also deteriorate and act as a soil erosion barrier. The only other concern is the logging trucks and impact of that weight on the road surface. But in the main I am OK with Rayonier Martariki. The tree removal has let in a lot more light.</p>	N/A

Stakeholder feedback

12.01 Stakeholder group *	12.02 Stakeholder description *	12.03 Stakeholder's comment	12.06 CB's follow up
Riverhead forest neighbour	Neighbour	We have several issues with people shooting in the forest and entering with motorbikes and quadbikes, people dumping rubbish in the entrance, a lot of illegal activities are happening, my concern is about the danger of fire with cigarettes and petrol being used, I think access to the forest needs to be review, I the past I contact Rayonier due some issue with water running into my property and a barrier was use to stop the water issues, however since I have been away looking after my ill father in Tauranga I was not paying much attention to this issue now that I am back I want to have the correct contact to have the opportunity to review this issues with the company.	Observation 07 was raised about issues with poachers.
Local user of Bottle Lake forest	Forest user	Very happy with the open user for the forest and how this is planned with the council.	N/A
Local user of Bottle Lake forest	Forest user	Signage about block with operation very good, also the council website has more details, good fencing around the operations, very lucky to use this area every day.	N/A
Local user of Bottle Lake forest	Forest user	Good warning about operation, will like to have more specification about when the harvest tracks will be re-established. No negative comments.	N/A
Regional Parks Christchurch City Council	Forest user	Very good planning with Rayonier for the recreational plans in Bottle Lake Forest – the company send their harvest plan to be review by us and then we check the social impact for the users and decide which areas could be harvest this year, the rest is moving for the following year, very respectful and professional team.	N/A
Glenbervie forest neighbour	Forest user	Good view on the company, and mentioned the general community same. She called the company about an abandoned car at a forest gate and it was removed within hours	N/A
Glenbervie forest neighbour	Forest user	The company is good. Lived on the road for 50 years. The manager is good and helped get rid of a noxious weed, moth plant opposite the home in a forest block that can't get replanted at the moment	N/A
Logging contractor Northland	Forest user	Requests to Rayonier get done. Supervisor makes regular visits at least weekly. Opportunity to discuss concerns with supervisor.	N/A

Stakeholder feedback

12.01 Stakeholder group *	12.02 Stakeholder description *	12.03 Stakeholder's comment	12.06 CB's follow up
Mangatapere forest neighbour	Forest user	The roads and tracks are much improved since Rayonier took over management. I can use my horse in the forest for recreation.	N/A
Hawke's bay neighbour	Forest user	They are a good corporate citizen. No problems.	N/A
Outdoor Access Commission	Government Org	<p>There has been worthwhile contact regarding some Southland forests. In Canterbury there has been collaboration on enabling access on an unformed legal road and signage for another situation. Northland Region has been responsive to recent requests. There appears to have been little contact in the Bay of Plenty and Hawkes Bay Regions. While stakeholder consultation is not mentioned on the RMF website, we have heard from some clubs that they are positive about access arrangements and relationships with RMF. A previous audit also provided positive comment from some clubs and organisations regarding recreational access. We believe closer contact between RMF and Herenga ā Nuku should bring benefits to both organisations in terms of understanding both forestry and public access issues, and the practical resolution of any issues. It has not been possible to fully assess RMF's compliance with laws regarding legal public access. Current maps clearly identifying legal forest boundaries, and areas with public access rights, are not available on the RMF website and have not been subsequently supplied. Some issues around obstruction of legal access exist, and RMF has acknowledged that some roads have locked gates on them. The locations identified and commented on by RMF were presented in the report. Herenga ā Nuku doubts that the legal requirements have been met. There are a several PAEs on RMF forests and RMF has confirmed that access on PAEs is being managed in accordance with the terms of the PAE. RMF operates a very robust Forest Induction System [https://rmf.tickbox.nz/login] as an initial requirement before any understanding of permits or requests for access is possible. It is easily accessible from the website under the heading Forest Access. However, the process to address requests for recreational access is not immediately transparent as the user must first work through the comprehensive</p>	<p>The company has presented all details of all roads mentioned in the OAC report showing that the gates are under the internal road and not on the unformed legal road. Most of the other roads mentioned in the OAC report are PAEs that are being managed according to the conditions in the CFL, examples of these are: Jubilee Forest- Access to Bald Hill and Pourakino Picnic Area; Tairua forest; West dome forest. However, this info was presented after the audit and could not be analysed in detail during with the company staff and there is also no evidence it was communicated the OAC to know their thoughts about these info presented by the company. CAR 02 was raised. About the maps on the website, the company has the location of all forest under the following link https://www.matarikiforests.co.nz/forest-access/forest-locations/ .</p>

Nonconformities/Observations raised

14.01 Unique finding number *	14.02 CB Non-conformity Ref *	14.06 Grading *	14.07 Open / Closed *	14.08 Standard *	14.09 Clause *	14.03 Issue date *	14.04 Due date *	14.05 Close date *	14.10 Requirement *	14.11 Description of audit finding *	14.15 Corrective action requested *	14.14 MU Applicability	14.12 Corrective action taken by the auditee *	14.13 CB's review of corrective actions
2022-C021569-08	CAR 08	Minor	Closed	NFSS	6.1.7	2022-08-17	2023-08-16	2023-08-16	A record shall be kept to identify corrective actions where non compliance with prescriptions occurs.	Non compliances for FSC were not recorded under ENSAIF. Review of ENSAIF CAR entries.	It is evidence of the CARs for FSC and PEFC been added to the ENSAIF system – due day of completing the actions take to close the CAR for FSC CARs were CARs were notified by the Env Manager to SGS as per procedure on the 16 Aug 2023.	N/A	The company has updated their procedure under PROMAP V01.0 and now CARs follow up are allocate to more than one role to avoid the due day to be pass. CARs are now assigned to the Director Forests Investment, Environmental Manager and Regional Manager	It is evidence of the CARs for FSC and PEFC been added to the ENSAIF system – due day of completing the actions take to close the CAR for FSC CARs were CARs were notified by the Env Manager to SGS as per procedure on the 16 Aug 2023.
2022-C021569-09	CAR 09	Minor	Closed	NFSS	6.2.3	2022-08-17	2023-08-16	2023-08-16	Indigenous habitat supporting rare, threatened or endangered species and identified as being significant to their life cycle shall be not always correctly identified in management planning. Although all native areas are identified in the operational maps, interviews in the field confirmed that Protected areas SEA status levels are not able to be identified on maps in the Geomaster system.	Indigenous habitat supporting rare, threatened or endangered species and identified as being significant to their life cycle shall be not always correctly identified in management planning. Although all native areas are identified in the operational maps, interviews in the field confirmed that Protected areas SEA status levels are not able to be identified on maps in the Geomaster system.	It is evidence of prescriptions been update (Plan updates and changes 801-010-01 dated 30 Aug 2022, 612-015-09, 612-015-09, 910-012-31)- showing SNA category 2	N/A	Rayonier GIS Analysts has created a Geomaster Mobile Instructions V2023.1 to be able to see the Status of each SEA under the mapping system.	It is evidence of prescriptions been update (Plan updates and changes 801-010-01 dated 30 Aug 2022, 612-015-09, 910-012-31)- showing SNA category 3
2022-C021569-11	CAR 11	Minor	Closed	NFSS	6.5.1	2022-08-17	2023-08-16	2023-08-16	Forest managers shall comply with any applicable regional pest management strategy including where this identifies a wilding species as a pest.	Forest managers were not always comply with any applicable regional pest management strategy including where this identifies a wilding species as a pest. However wilding control in other areas (e.g. Canterbury) appear to be reliant on local authority requirements rather than company specific processes and or procedures. If controls do not come from the NES-PF, which affects afforestation only, there is no common process for wilding control. There is no company wide Wilding Control system (Integrated Pest Management System) describing how the organisation will meet the requirements of an RPMS where wildings are identified as a pest and implement those requirements in operations.	The company has updated their process under promap now is steps to follow for wilding control	N/A	The company has updated their process under promap now is steps to follow for wilding control	The company has updated their process under promap now is steps to follow for wilding control
2022-C021569-12	CAR 12	Minor	Closed	NFSS	7.2.5	2022-08-17	2023-08-16	2023-08-16	There shall be a timetable for the periodic revision of the management plan and there is evidence of plan revision consistent with the timetable.	There is a timetable for the periodic revision of the management plan and there is evidence of plan revision consistent with the timetable, however version and dates of the documents are not well maintained. There is a timetable for the periodic revision of the management plan however there is not clear evidence of plan revision consistent with the timetable. However, there is no evidence that all management plan documents are regularly kept up to date. For example, there appears to be more than one version of the harvest prescription available and those sighted do not have any version control system in place. There is no evidence that documents used to implement portions of the Management Plan are current, updated or revised according to any set criteria such as a timetable.	CAR 12 is close and now raise as Major CAR 13	N/A	CAR 12 is close and now raise as Major CAR 13	CAR 12 is close and now raise as Major CAR 13
2022-C021569-13	CAR M13	Major	Closed	NFSS	7.2.5	2023-08-17	2023-11-16	2023-11-10	There shall be a timetable for the periodic revision of the management plan and there is evidence of plan revision consistent with the timetable.	There is a timetable for the periodic revision of the management plan and there is evidence of plan revision consistent with the timetable, however version and dates of the documents are not well maintained. There is a timetable for the periodic revision of the management plan however there is not clear evidence of plan revision consistent with the timetable. However, there is no evidence that all management plan documents are regularly kept up to date. For example, there appears to be more than one version of the harvest prescription available and those sighted do not have any version control system in place. There is no evidence that documents used to implement portions of the Management Plan are current, updated or revised according to any set criteria such as a timetable.	Action plan as follow: Review of the documents to identify which templates are missing the latest version details. Confirm all the latest version and send those to the contractors and staff. Set a review within the Promapp system to control if everyone is using the same version. Evidence and Actions taken, 25 Oct 2023 – audit system review – this includes the CARs review of the SGS audit 2023. Review of the latest procedures/prescription have been reviewed and share with all the regions, the latest procedures are under the company SharePoint (Promapp) After the audit was completed – review of the procedures and templates was done, for example for the harvesting team latest harvesting prescription is called HB23.1 dated 17 Oct 2023 this has been used in the operation since the changes after the audit.	N/A	Action plan as follow: Review of the documents to identify which templates are missing the latest version details. Confirm all the latest version and send those to the contractors and staff. Set a review within the Promapp system to control if everyone is using the same version. Evidence and Actions taken, 25 Oct 2023 – audit system review – this includes the CARs review of the SGS audit 2023. Review of the latest procedures/prescription have been reviewed and share with all the regions, the latest procedures are under the company SharePoint (Promapp) After the audit was completed – review of the procedures and templates was done, for example for the harvesting team latest harvesting prescription is called HB23.1 dated 17 Oct 2023 this has been used in the operation since the changes after the audit.	Evidence of this document use for another regions example: Harvest Plan for sale area 812-030-02 used the latest harvesting template – Region Bay of plenty – Omatana Forest – dated of the plan 27 Oct 2023 Harvest Plan for sale area 609-086-3 used the latest harvesting template – Region Bay of plenty – Tairua Forest – dated of the plan 26 Oct 2023 Harvest Plan for sale area 807-046-015 used the latest harvesting template – Region Canterbury – Ashley Forest – dated of the plan 2 Nov 2023 Another example if the latest template for Planting those are done per region - latest version called 802P2.1 dated 17 Oct 2023 for Hawkes bay HB23.1 dated 17 Oct 2023 this document has not changes done after the audit – the only things that have been done is adding the document details) As part of the measure to avoid this issue to happen again the company implemented a monitoring as of procedure and templates for operations. Bookings under Promapp Internal environmental audit performance procedure is book for 20 Dec 2023 The new PEFC internal audit review is book for 25 April 2024 book under Promapp
2022-C021569-14	CAR 14	Minor	Open	NFSS	2.1.4	2023-09-14	2024-09-13	2024-08-29	The Organisation respects the full freedom of workers' organisations to draw up their constitutions and rules.	There was no documentation stating the company's position around union matters although in practice management say workers are free to join.	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance	N/A	The company has contacted each service provider and stated the company's position on unions. See the following quote that is within each of the letters. Rayonier Matahiki Forests supports workers' rights to join a union if they wish. "We will facilitate union representatives' access to workplaces if requested, as per section 20 in the Employment Relations Act 2000." "They will not face discrimination or penalties for being a union member or for participating in union activities and meetings Each service provider was required to sign a form saying they 'Staff are aware that they can join a union if they wish'. Evidence was seen for 59 service providers. Evidence: -BML - Union Wage Acknowledgement -Cox Logging -Crest Clean July 2024 -Harmer Solutions - Union and Wage Memo - August 2024 -Interpine RMF Union and Wage Memo - Signed 06-08-2024 -OVL - Union Wage Acknowledgement -Rangiora Nursery - Living Wage - July 2024 -STH - Wage and Union Memo -Shonan Union Wage Memo	Based on the above changes, and consideration of the root cause, the Auditor concluded that the Organisation has addressed the non-conformity and the CAR can therefore be considered closed out.
2022-C021569-15	CAR 15	Minor	Open	NFSS	2.3.1	2023-09-14	2024-09-13	2024-08-29	The Organisation complies with the Health and Safety at Work Act and has systems in place to ensure compliance with the Approved Code of Practice for Safety and Health in Forest Operations.	The company is not checking hazards and risks for yarder access and guarding. The field visit highlighted that all the yarders visited had access and guarding hazards and risks. For example, access onto the Marshall's harvest line required high stepping about a metre onto the machine without use of steps or a guard rail. Original manufacturer's guarding was removed from hydraulic area requiring 'delicate' footing. There was evidence of paint removed by boots over an extended period of time. There were several yarders that exposed sprockets and chains close to where hands and boots regularly go. Many yarders had slip, trip and fall risks due to empty containers, cables, hoses, or oil/fuel spills on access ways.	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance	N/A	The company's H&S National Advisor described the work being done of guarding across the company's machinery since raising the CAR. An annual machinery survey was initiated across the regions and identified areas needing improvements. All contractors were contacted requiring guarding to meet the PCA Yarder Guarding and Safe Access Best Practice Guide (soon to be released). All new machinery or hire machinery has to meet the standards of AS5327. -Rayonier Mail - Fwd - WorkSafe media releases - Standards for guard railing on forestry mobile plant -Rayonier Mail - Fwd - Mobile Plant Hazard Inspection -Machine hazard inspection - Crew 89 Maadi 124 - swinger	Based on the above changes, and consideration of the root cause, the Auditor concluded that the Organisation has addressed the non-conformity and the CAR can therefore be considered closed out.
2022-C021569-16	CAR 16	Minor	Closed	NFSS	6.1.3	2023-09-14	2024-09-13	2024-08-29	Fine level evaluation* of conservation zones and protection areas is progressively undertaken appropriate to scale to determine viability and establish specific management requirements of poorly represented areas.	The company does not progressively conduct fine level evaluations of conservation zones and protection areas. The field visit highlighted that all the yarders visited had access and guarding hazards and risks. For example, access onto the Marshall's harvest line required high stepping about a metre onto the machine without use of steps or a guard rail. Original manufacturer's guarding was removed from hydraulic area requiring 'delicate' footing. There was evidence of paint removed by boots over an extended period of time. There were several yarders that exposed sprockets and chains close to where hands and boots regularly go. Many yarders had slip, trip and fall risks due to empty containers, cables, hoses, or oil/fuel spills on access ways.	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance	N/A	At the commencement of the audit the company presented a folder containing documentation to establish their updated processes to meet the requirements of this CAR. The documents include: "An updated SEA Management Strategy which now states: 8.4. Fine Level Monitoring: Fine level monitoring is required to be completed on all SEA category 1 sites annually. This is to measure any changes to the level of foliage cover and canopy condition from the photographs taken from the same locations. More information on this process can be found here: Fine Point Monitoring Assessment.docx (sharepoint.com). A new document, SEA Fine Point Monitoring Assessment, which outlines the objectives of the SEA Management Strategy. This is entirely based on an intensive photo point system throughout the applicable HCV and SEA sites.	Based on the above changes, and consideration of the root cause, the Auditor concluded that the Organisation has addressed the non-conformity and the CAR can therefore be considered closed out.
2022-C021569-17	CAR 17	Minor	Closed	NFSS	6.4.5	2023-09-14	2024-09-13	2024-08-29	Rare and threatened species and their habitats within the management unit are protected, including through the provision of habitat maintenance, conservation zones, protection areas, connectivity, and other direct means for their survival and viability, such as species recovery programs.	The company does not always manage RTEs to protect their survival and biodiversity. The company does not always protect RTEs because they do not follow up on sightings that could lead to the identification of new populations of RTEs. Two specific examples were identified in the audit. Kiwi sign was identified by the water monitoring person at Tairua Forest in January 2023. Unusual lizard identified by a DOC worker in 2022.	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance	N/A	As part of the internal closure of CAR 17 the company identified that the 'unusual lizard' was in fact a child's toy so no further action was required. For the kiwi sign incident a full survey of Tairua and Atherstone forests was implemented to assess the presence of both Kiwi and bat presence. There were no kiwi identified. Additionally, the SEA management plan now includes monitoring protocols for these types of incidents. Evidence: Harvest Plan for Sale Area: 205-018-01, Forest: Tairua Harvest Plan for Sale Area: 905-001-02S, Forest: Okuku Engineering Management Plan Regimnet Road Extension, Forest: 916 – Glen Ailie SEA Management Strategy: 16/08/2024	Based on the above changes, and consideration of the root cause, the Auditor concluded that the Organisation has addressed the non-conformity and the CAR can therefore be considered closed out.

Nonconformities/Observations raised

14.01 Unique finding number *	14.02 CB Non-conformity Ref *	14.06 Grading *	14.07 Open / Closed *	14.08 Standard *	14.09 Clause *	14.03 Issue date *	14.04 Due date *	14.05 Close date *	14.10 Requirement *	14.11 Description of audit finding *	14.15 Corrective action requested *	14.14 MU Applicability	14.12 Corrective action taken by the auditee *	14.13 CB's review of corrective actions
2023-C021569-18	CAR 18	Minor	Closed	NFSS	6.6.4	2023-09-14	2024-09-13	2024-08-29	Management maintains, enhances, or restores habitat features" naturally with native ecosystems, to support the diversity of associated occurring species and their genetic diversity.	Management does not always maintain, enhances or restores habitat features, even when impacts are known. The company has a programme of assessing significant environmental areas. The program is widely implemented across many sites annually, e.g. in BOP between 35-50 sites were assessed in 2022 and 2023. However, a work plan to generate actions is not implemented as an outcome of the SEA review as some sites require management activities to maintain or restore the site, e.g. removing windings in Maramanu Forest was identified in 2022 but not done. No company CAR was raised in Ensaite.	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance	N/A	Management actions are now all recorded in the online EMS system which additionally records dates and follow up action requirements, including timelines. These were summarised into a spreadsheet to demonstrate how the process is implemented. The winding removal operation was implemented and completed in June 2024. Evidence of this was sighted in both the EMS system and within the document produced to show how each CAR had been responded to. Evidence: Environmental Events, Stakeholder, RTEs, Security (EMS + ENSAFE) 2023_FSC_MinorCAR_Closeout evidence	Based on the above changes, and consideration of the root cause, the Auditor concluded that the Organisation has addressed the non-conformity and the CAR can therefore be considered closed out
2023-C021569-19	CAR 19	Minor	Closed	NFSS	9.4.3	2023-09-14	2024-09-13	2024-08-29	A public summary of monitoring results is made available, excluding Confidential information.	All HCVs do not have publicly available monitoring results. The HCV mgmt. plans do not describe whether the management strategies have been effective over time and whether the HCV values are being maintained or enhanced. Goals do not always provide specific timeliness for the work.	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance	N/A	The company has a comprehensive overview of each site on the company website, including the purpose of monitoring and what is monitored. All information is part of the Public Summary. Evidence: Public Summary (Updated July 2024) 2024_public-summary.pdf (matarkforests.co.nz)	Based on the above changes, and consideration of the root cause, the Auditor concluded that the Organisation has addressed the non-conformity and the CAR can therefore be considered closed out
2023-C021569-20	CAR 20	Minor	Closed	NFSS	9.4.5	2023-09-14	2024-09-13	2024-08-29	Management strategies and actions are adapted when monitoring or other new information shows that these strategies and actions are ineffective to ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of high conservation values.	The HCV mgmt. plans do not describe whether the management strategies have been effective over time and whether the HCV values are being maintained or enhanced. Goals do not always provide specific timeliness for the work. The company has management strategies and actions for HCVs. These are within the individual HCV mgmt. plans. It is evident that they are updated regularly, and they describe management goals and the timing of them. However, the strategies do not conclude whether the effective/ineffective or whether the work is maintaining or enhancing the HCV values. They also do not always provide a clear goal of when a strategy will occur. For example, goals may not give a specific timeframe.	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance	N/A	As monitoring is undertaken annually, recommended management strategies are adaptive in that they are targeted to the most recently assessed threats to HCV values. Reports now include strategies and actions to be undertaken as well as considering the efficacy of past actions. This has been included in a section of the plan - "Plan evaluation (has the plan been effective in helping to achieve HCV strategy objective?" Evaluations include comments such as: Plan has been effective. Terms of Covenant no. 2 upheld and public access along with engagement with a range of community groups maintained. Plan has been effective thus far. Key threats are being managed (e.g., windings poisoned) and enrichment planting scheduled for 2025.	Based on the above changes, and consideration of the root cause, the Auditor concluded that the Organisation has addressed the non-conformity and the CAR can therefore be considered closed out
2023-C021569-21	CAR 21	Minor	Closed	NFSS	10.7.4	2023-09-14	2024-09-13	2024-08-29	The use of pesticides complies with the ILO document "Safety in the use of chemicals at work" regarding requirements for the transport, storage, handling, application and emergency procedures for cleanup following accidental spillages	Staff that are managing chemical operations need GrowSafe certificates to formally demonstrate their knowledge of chemical management. Many forest growing staff do not have growsafe certificates although they are supervising or managing forestry plant pesticide operations. For example, in Canterbury it appeared that no staff in the forestry team have GrowSafe certificates. Although staff do not touch, transport or mix chemicals, the GrowSafe certificate provides management oversight of important aspects of chemical management.	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance	N/A	The company staff managing chemical operations have GrowSafe certificates to formally demonstrate their knowledge on aspects of chemical management. Evidence of GrowSafe +Rebecca Coles (Canterbury) 042029 +Emma Walters (Canterbury) 042029 +Peter Robinson (Southland) course postponed to now Oct 2024 from August +Sam Mackay (Southland) course postponed to now Oct 2024 from August +Bab Schoonderwerf (BOP) 10/11/2025 +Sam Middlemass (Northland) 14/03/2029 +Max Paku (Northland) 14/03/2029 +Lawrence Weston (Hawkes Bay) 13/01/2027	Based on the above changes, and consideration of the root cause, the Auditor concluded that the Organisation has addressed the non-conformity and the CAR can therefore be considered closed out
2023-C021569-22	OBS 01	Obs	Closed	NFSS	1.6.1	2023-09-14	2024-09-13	2024-08-29	A publicly available dispute resolution process" is in place and modified where necessary in in Culturally appropriate engagement" with affected stakeholders.	The company refers directly to the NZ ombudsman and the USA as a main contact and not the NZ process in the first instance. The company does not have its NZ dispute process (complaints mgmt, SOP) online.	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance	N/A	The company has the Dispute Resolution Procedure which details its main Principles as: 1. Timeliness 2. Cultural Consideration 3. Transparency 4. Operational Integrity The procedure is fully replicated on the company website in the Corporate Governance section. Evidence: Masrani Forests Dispute Resolution Process, dispute-resolution-process.pdf (matarkforests.co.nz)	N/A
2023-C021569-23	OBS 02	Obs	Closed	NFSS	6.4.2	2023-09-14	2024-09-13	2024-08-29	Generic policy and plans for the maintenance of populations of rare or threatened species within the management unit are prepared and progressively updated in consultation with competent experts.	When the company closes out CAR18 (indicator 6.6.4), the company needs to address the requirements within its indicator around how management will maintain the different RTE species	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance	N/A	The company has many generic processes that have become increasingly specialised over time. The procedures cover broad areas like Environmental Information for contractors, High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) assessment procedure, Significant Ecological Area Monitoring and Wilding Conifer Control These are supplemented by various guides to RTE species across all 5 FMU's. In response to Obs 4 the company have updated their SEA management plan and introduced a new line level assessment programme, both of which are now operational.	N/A
2023-C021569-24	OBS 03	Obs	Closed	NFSS	10.3.4	2023-09-14	2024-09-13	2024-08-29	The Organisation complies with any applicable Regional Council pest management strategy including where this identifies a wilding species as a pest".	The Canterbury office does not have a document that clearly lays out the requirements of the ECAN RPMP, so although the indicator is met, there is no formal process to ensure that it remains so. The Southland Plan could serve as a template.	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance	N/A	The Canterbury RMF Wilding Control Plan has been developed in response to the observation raised in the last audit and supplement procedures as identified in last years audit. The Plan aligns with the requirements of the Canterbury Regional Pest Management Plan 2016-2038 ECANs Regional Pest Management Plan outlines a Progressive Containment Program for Wilding Conifers in the Canterbury region. Many of the RMF Canterbury Forests are located within the defined Canterbury Wilding Conifer Containment Area. Management of windings in these forests will be managed in accordance with the ECANs RPMP.	N/A
2024-C021569-25	CAR 22	Minor	Open	NFSS	6.7.17	2024-08-20	2025-08-19		In areas identified as very high risk in 6.7.16 a pre-harvest" evaluation is undertaken to establish the most appropriate method to transition to forestry" practices that support soil stability on this land. This evaluation is documented and include consideration of: 1) Post-harvest retirement to suitable permanent vegetation; 2) transition to a continuous cover forest; 3) alternative species, silvicultural practices and regimes; and 4) retirement without harvest and encouragement of suitable long-term soil stability vegetation	As shown in 6.7.16 above areas with very high risk are identified pre harvest. This then leads to controls and methods being put in place to manage the harvest operation. All harvested areas are then assessed using a post-harvest checklist. This includes the question: "Are there any areas that were hard to harvest that may warrant replanting?" This may give an indicator for future discussion and planning between staff but does not fully address the points listed in the indicator above. This may give an indicator for future discussion and planning between staff but does not fully address the points listed in the indicator above.	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance	N/A		
2024-C021569-26	CAR 23	Minor	Open	NFSS	6.7.18	2024-08-20	2025-08-19		If areas identified in 6.7.16 are clear-felled then: 1) For replanting of plantation species that require clear fell harvesting a programme of erosion monitoring is undertaken covering the full rotation of the crop to determine effects, including identifying where sediment has reached water bodies; and 2) areas left to revert to an indigenous vegetation cover are monitored to ensure natural regeneration is occurring.	All clear-felled areas in very high-risk zones are required to have obtained resource consent for any subsequent operation including replanting. Programmes implemented include monitoring specifically around rain events and for up to the first 6 years post-harvest. The company have recently harvested a small red zone area in Hampton Forest. A resource consent for replanting some of this area has been submitted and approved, as under the NES-CF this is required where greater than 2 ha is to be planted. The consent includes a section titled: "Measures used to avoid, remedy and mitigate erosion and land instability", but does not specifically address the monitoring requirements as specified above.	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance	N/A		
2024-C021569-27	Obs 05	Obs	Open	NFSS	6.7.21	2024-08-20	2025-08-19		No storage or mixing of fuels, oils, chemicals, or similar substances is undertaken in areas where a deliberate or inadvertent discharge could enter any water body.	"Silviculture and Spraying prescriptions contain clear instructions that: Fuel must be stored in approved containers where accidental spillage will not result in contamination of any water body. Chemicals should be in their original containers and with legible labels. Chemicals should not be stored or mixed where a spill could contaminate a waterway. For earthworks and harvesting the requirements are stated via the Contractor agreement whereby they are required to comply with the NZFOA New Zealand Environmental Code of Practice for Plantation Forestry guidelines (14.1 Guidance notes – Fuel & oil – B&P). Additionally, checks are made at regular intervals on all operations using the EMS audit checklist – AUD-1005. It was observed that the wording used in the Silviculture prescriptions could also be included in prescriptions for other operations such as Harvesting and Earthworks."	N/A	N/A		

Nonconformities/Observations raised

14.01 Unique Finding number *	14.02 CB Non-conformity Ref *	14.06 Grading *	14.07 Open / Closed *	14.08 Standard *	14.09 Clause *	14.03 Issue date *	14.04 Due date *	14.05 Close date *	14.10 Requirement *	14.11 Description of audit finding *	14.15 Corrective action requested *	14.14 MU Applicability	14.12 Corrective action taken by the auditee *	14.13 CB's review of corrective actions
2024-CO21569-28	Obs 04	Obs	Open	NFSS	6.4.6	2024-08-20	2025-08-19		Hunting, fishing, trapping and collection of rare or threatened species is prevented.	Information regarding RTE species could be better presented to the general public. No hunting, fishing, trapping or collection of RTE species is undertaken or permitted. This is also a national legal requirement. The Public Use Guidelines and Trespassing on Matariki Forests Land, includes provisions to partially meet this requirement. However, there is no specific guidance or controls for forest users regarding environmental and RTE species protocols. As part of the audit process the auditor observed the forest user induction video and accompanying slide presentation. This process could be a positive avenue to include this type of information.	N/A	N/A		
2024-CO21569-29	CAR 24	Minor	Open	NFSS	2.4.5	2024-08-20	2025-08-19		The Organisation has a method to determine that the workers receive the living wage.	Although there was no evidence of contractors not paying their workers less than the living wage, the company did not have a method to determine that workers have received a living wage. The form sent to the service providers gave an assurance from the business owner that they were paying their workers the minimum but there was no proof that this was happening.	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.	N/A		
2024-CO21569-30	Obs 06	Obs	Open	NFSS	10.3.4	2024-08-20	2025-08-19		The Organisation complies with any applicable Regional Council 'pest' management strategy including where this identifies a wilding species as a pest'.	During the visit to Castle Dent forest, it was evidenced lots of areas damage by pig rooting, this situation could affect the new plantations finished last week apart from causing issues at neighbours properties. Through this observation it will be followed the assessment of the company about the needs to intensify/continue with this pest control in this forest	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.	N/A		
2024-CO21569-31	CAR 25	Minor	Open	NFSS	1.3.2	2024-08-20	2025-08-19		All activities undertaken in the management unit are carried out in compliance with: 1) Applicable laws and regulations and administrative requirements. 2) Legal and customary rights; and 3) Obligatory codes of practice.	It was detected as result of the stakeholder consultation and information requested to the company that there are some road that are closed in some forest for which there is no council approval (Tatua forest (Bay of Plenty)-3 access points, road open and closed manually during the day. Southland - West dome forest, Southland - Jubilee forest). It was also evidenced in Castle dent forest that the new plantations in Cpt 1 and 2 are less than 10 metres from the boundary fences.	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.	N/A		
2024-CO21569-32	CAR 26	Minor	Open	NFSS	4.5.1	2024-08-20	2025-08-19		Through Culturally appropriate engagement* with local communities, measures are implemented to identify, avoid and mitigate negative social, environmental and economic impacts of management activities.	It was identified through a stakeholder consultation done in Lawrence Town and in the area around Castle Dent, Gendhu and Manukawa forests, that Rayvenier is not proactively assessing the potential impacts of its operations and when engaging with the community it is not taking into account the needs and expectations of the community and boundary neighbours. See stakeholder comments in the DAR. It was also identified through the interviews with stakeholders that the communication's mechanisms used by the company are not working properly in the mentioned area. For this stakeholder consultation done in the area of Lawrence (Southland Region) the company provided a spreadsheet 'Boundary neighbours Castledent, Gendhu', from that list there are several contacts whose phone numbers are not correct, when trying to contact them it says number not allocated to phone number, not active number and some numbers belong to a different person.	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.	N/A		
2024-CO21569-33	Obs 07	Obs	Open	NFSS	1.4.1	2024-08-20	2025-08-19		Measures are implemented to provide protection from unauthorized or illegal* harvesting, hunting, fishing, trapping, collecting, settlement, and other unauthorized activities.	The company has identified the need to change the security company in the Lawrence area, there is a proposal with a new security company dated on May 2024 which is still being analysed and discussed. On the 29th the Southland Manager confirms to have a meeting with the company to work in some more details of the proposal. The security company agreement will cover all the Southland region. Observation 07 is raised to follow this up as result of some comment from neighbours about poachers from the forestry	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. NOTE: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.	N/A		

Results of the evaluation for ES impacts

16.01 Date of the evaluation of this document *	16.02 Type of evaluation *	16.03 Ecosystem services claims with ES impact *	16.04 Management unit impacted *	16.04.1 Group member *	16.05 Date of verification or validation of the impact *	16.06 Approved on *	16.07 Valid until *
---	----------------------------	--	----------------------------------	------------------------	--	---------------------	---------------------

17.06 Ecosystem
Service Sponsored *

17.07 Management
Unit sponsored *

17.08 Start of
sponsorship *

17.09 End of
sponsorship *

Principles & Criteria Summary

18.01 Standard Requirement	18.02 Num CARs	18.03 Summary Assessment
The Organization shall comply with all applicable laws, regulations and nationally- ratified international treaties, conventions and agreements.	0	
The Organization shall be a legally defined entity with clear, documented and unchallenged legal registration, with written authorization from the legally competent authority for specific activities.	0	The Organisation is legally registered as Rayonier New Zealand Limited (334608) as a registered NZ Private Limited Company. The incorporation date was 23 Jun 1999.
The Organization shall demonstrate that the legal status of the Management Unit, including tenure and use rights, and its boundaries, are clearly defined.	0	The company has all land titles, leases, easements, JVs, CFLs, iwi leases, covenants and other land tenure documents within the GIS on the cadastral layer, as electronic copies of land tenure documents. The Land Manager is responsible for cadastral information. Evidence included reviewing the GIS coverage with the GIS analyst, which showed attributes including the lot description details.
The Organization shall have legal rights to operate in the Management Unit, which fit the legal status of The Organization and of the Management Unit, and shall comply with the associated legal obligations in applicable national and local laws and regulations and administrative requirements. The legal rights shall provide for harvest of products and/or supply of ecosystem services from within the Management Unit. The Organization shall pay the legally prescribed charges associated with such rights and obligations.	1	It was detected as result of the stakeholder consultation and information requested to the company that there are some road that are closed in some forest for which there is no council approval (Tairua forest (Bay of Plenty)- 3 access points, road open and closed manually during the day; Southland - West dome forest, Southland - Jubilee forest). It was also evidenced in Castle dent forest that the new plantations in Cpt 1 and 2 are less than 10 metres from the boundary fences. CAR 25 is raised.
The Organization shall develop and implement measures, and/or shall engage with regulatory agencies, to systematically protect the Management Unit from unauthorized or illegal resource use, settlement and other illegal activities.	0	The company has several procedures in place to implement measures to control illegal activities. These include: "Public Use Guidelines", a summary of management guidelines to control activities involving all types of public access. Guides relate to instances such as 'Permitted Activities,' Controlled Activities, Commercial Licensed Activities and Prohibited Activities.
The Organization shall comply with the applicable national laws, local laws, ratified international conventions and obligatory codes of practice, relating to the transportation and trade of forest products within and from the Management Unit, and/or up to the point of first sale.	0	
The Organization shall identify, prevent and resolve disputes over issues of statutory or customary law, which can be settled out of court in a timely manner, through engagement with affected stakeholders.	0	The company has a Dispute Resolution Procedure which details its main Principles as: 1. Timeliness: 2. Cultural Consideration: 3. Transparency: 4. Operational Integrity: The procedure is fully replicated on the company website in the Corporate Governance section.
The Organization shall publicize a commitment not to offer or receive bribes in money or any other form of corruption, and shall comply with anti-corruption legislation where this exists. In the absence of anti-corruption legislation, The Organization shall implement other anti-corruption measures proportionate to the scale and intensity of management activities and the risk of corruption.	0	
The Organization shall demonstrate a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria in the Management Unit, and to related FSC Policies and Standards. A statement of this commitment shall be contained in a publicly available document made freely available.	0	
The Organization shall maintain or enhance the social and economic wellbeing of workers.	0	
The Organization shall uphold the principles and rights at work as defined in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (1998) based on the eight ILO Core Labour Conventions.	0	The ILO core labour convention is included in NZ laws. For example, the laws listed in Appendix J. There is no evidence that the company is not complying with major labour laws like the HSAW Act, ACC Act, and the Employment Relations Act. For example, the audit did not identify the company has legal compliance issues with WorkSafe, ACC, or through the employment courts.
The Organization shall promote gender equality in employment practices, training opportunities, awarding of contracts, processes of engagement and management activities.	0	

Principles & Criteria Summary

18.01 Standard Requirement	18.02 Num CARs	18.03 Summary Assessment
The Organization shall implement health and safety practices to protect workers from occupational safety and health hazards. These practices shall, proportionate to scale, intensity and risk of management activities, meet or exceed the recommendations of the ILO Code of Practice on Safety and Health in Forestry Work.	0	<p>There was no evidence of non-compliance with the HSAW Act. The company has systems in place to comply with the Approved Code of Practice (ACOP). The ACOP offers practical guidance on how everyone in forestry can meet their obligations under the Health and Safety in Employment Act 1992 and its associated Regulations. The ACOP applies to forest operations including planning, establishment, silviculture, harvesting and transportation of log and log products.</p> <p>The company has detailed H&S processes and systems that provide the rules and guidance and provide the company safety and health culture. H&S management is incorporated right through the plan, do, check and act cycle. It starts with the company's health and safety policy. Health and safety is incorporated into contracts, prescriptions, H&S site risk assessments, company supervisor site visits and audits.</p> <p>The field visit did not show any non-compliance of the HSAW and the ACOP. The contractors meet their obligations through having H&S systems of their own. For example, on the field visit there was evidence from all harvesting crews visited of daily tailgate meetings, manual tree felling plans, mechanised felling plans, crew training records so they are trained for task, incident recording and analysis.</p> <p>Refer to the other indicators in this criterion as these also demonstrate requirements within the HSAW Act.</p>
The Organization shall pay wages that meet or exceed minimum forest industry standards or other recognized forest industry wage agreements or living wages, where these are higher than the legal minimum wages. When none of these exist, The Organization shall through engagement with workers develop mechanisms for determining living wages.	1	<p>The company meets the requirements of the Minimum Wage Act 1983. An email from the Director, People and Culture, Rayonier Matariki Forests states 'I can confirm that all RNZ's employees are paid more than the NZ Living Wage.' During the field visit wages were viewed for all crews visited. All workers were paid more than the living wage. For example, Logging crews most junior staff were paid more than this amount and trained staff typically more than \$10 over this.</p> <p>The silviculture crew visited paid more than a living wage and included an additional bonus scheme to help promote. Wage slips were seen for the staff.</p>
The Organization shall demonstrate that workers have job-specific training and supervision to safely and effectively implement the management plan and all management activities.	0	
The Organization through engagement with workers shall have mechanisms for resolving grievances and for providing fair compensation to workers for loss or damage to property, occupational diseases, or occupational injuries sustained while working for The Organization.	0	
The Organization shall identify and uphold Indigenous Peoples' legal and customary rights of ownership, use and management of land, territories and resources affected by management activities.	0	
The Organization shall identify the Indigenous Peoples that exist within the Management Unit or those that are affected by management activities. The Organization shall then, through engagement with these Indigenous Peoples, identify their rights of tenure, their rights of access to and use of forest resources and ecosystem services, their customary rights and legal rights and obligations, that apply within the Management Unit. The Organization shall also identify areas where these rights are contested.	0	<p>The company has identified tangata whenua and has up to date records as discussed with the National Land Manager. Any land that tangata whenua or land that is likely to come across under their ownership, e.g. Crown Forests, there are encumbrances on the title or within lease agreements to provide for within the documentation. For example, access to cultural sites and waahi tapu, Rongoa, hunting,</p>
The Organization shall recognize and uphold the legal and customary rights of Indigenous Peoples to maintain control over management activities within or related to the Management Unit to the extent necessary to protect their rights, resources and lands and territories. Delegation by Indigenous Peoples of control over management activities to third parties requires Free, Prior and Informed Consent.	0	<p>The company has a mix of land ownership structures including freehold, Joint Ventures, Forestry Rights and other structures. It is a complex mix of iwi landowners, iwi crop owners and transitional structures. Also, some of the company's management includes JVs with private companies or government agencies. For example, in Northland Region, the company has a JV with Pouto topu A trust for the Pouto topu forest, and with the business arm of Ngati whatua, Te Rau Maunga Ltd (NN WOK) for Woodhill Forest.</p> <p>The company engages tangata whenua in different ways depending on the ownership structure. They can comment on and request modification to management activities to maintain rights and obligations. For example, The Woodhill JV document covers section 3 Parties to act co-operatively, and section 8 Joint management committee.</p> <p>Also, in the Rangitane JV Pouto Topu A forest Forest Management Plan and Annual Plan, section 1.2 (c) states 'to have respect for the mana whenua of the Owners, and have regard to the owners' role as kaitiaki of the land and related duties, and operating the business in a manner that takes into consideration the principles aof kaitiakitanga' (custodianship).</p>

Principles & Criteria Summary

18.01 Standard Requirement	18.02 Num CARs	18.03 Summary Assessment
In the event of delegation of control over management activities, a binding agreement between The Organization and the Indigenous Peoples shall be concluded through Free, Prior and Informed Consent. The agreement shall define its duration, provisions for renegotiation, renewal, termination, economic conditions and other terms and conditions. The agreement shall make provision for monitoring by Indigenous Peoples of The Organization's compliance with its terms and conditions.	0	There are records of binding agreements. These agreements are stored in the PMAN system. Jane Higgins is the Land Manager, and Peter Spencer is the Director Land and Legal who keep a register and details of these agreements. Monitoring is an important aspect of reviewing the performance of the company as the manager of the iwi lands. For example, in the Woodhill JV, section 11.2 and 11.3 covers the annual land rental review and the 7 year review of annual land rental, and section 12 reviews the net stumpage value.
The Organization shall recognize and uphold the rights, customs and culture of Indigenous Peoples as defined in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) and ILO Convention 169 (1989).	0	NZ are signatories to both UNDRIP and ILO Convention 169. The guidance for these Acts lies with Te Puni Kōkiri. Te Puni Kōkiri is government's principal policy advisor on Māori wellbeing and development. The ILO convention states it was established to 'Recognise the aspirations of these peoples to exercise control over their own institutions, ways of life and economic development and to maintain and develop their identities, languages and religions, within the framework of the States in which they live'. There is no evidence that the company are violating these agreements. For example, The Woodhill JV document covers section 3 Parties to act co-operatively, and section 8 Joint management committee.
The Organization, through engagement with Indigenous Peoples, shall identify sites which are of special cultural, ecological, economic, religious or spiritual significance and for which these Indigenous Peoples hold legal or customary rights. These sites shall be recognized by The Organization and their management, and/or protection shall be agreed through engagement with these Indigenous Peoples.	0	
The Organization shall uphold the right of Indigenous Peoples to protect and utilize their traditional knowledge and shall compensate local communities for the utilization of such knowledge and their intellectual property. A binding agreement as per Criterion 3.3 shall be concluded between The Organization and the Indigenous Peoples for such utilization through Free, Prior and Informed Consent before utilization takes place, and shall be consistent with the protection of intellectual property rights.	0	
The Organization shall contribute to maintaining or enhancing the social and economic wellbeing of local communities.	0	
The Organization shall identify the local communities that exist within the Management Unit and those that are affected by management activities. The Organization shall then, through engagement with these local communities, identify their rights of tenure, their rights of access to and use of forest resources and ecosystem services, their customary rights and legal rights and obligations, that apply within the Management Unit.	0	
The Organization shall recognize and uphold the legal and customary rights of local communities to maintain control over management activities within or related to the Management Unit to the extent necessary to protect their rights, resources, lands and territories. Delegation by local communities of control over management activities to third parties requires Free, Prior and Informed Consent.	0	The company has stakeholder engagement plans that list the stakeholder, who they are and where they are located (in detail), the potential issues, who in the company is the relationship manager, the frequency to contact them, the annual action plan for them, and whether the action is completed. The stakeholder engagement plan is linked to the operational plan for each forest. This means that engagement and company obligations are not ad-hoc but contained in regional spreadsheets. Therefore, at an operational the company involves communities in activities that could impact them and seek feedback from them. The company has stakeholder lists by forest and these are pinned to a geographic location. The planning system includes prescriptions and checklists that cover factors that can impact environment and social outcomes. For example, for aerial spraying near a forest boundary, neighbours are contacted through a letter drop, email or phoned and the operation is discussed with them.
The Organization shall provide reasonable opportunities for employment, training and other services to local communities, contractors and suppliers proportionate to scale and intensity of its management activities.	0	The company provides reasonable opportunities to local contractors and suppliers for 1) through 3). Rayonier employs local staff, local contractors and services. This is the best option since the regions are geographically isolated and using locals helps ensure that forest activities within their region are done. For example, Hawkes Bay staff are at career's days, discover forestry days for school age people, and work with iwi to get local contractors. Contractors are sourced locally and the workforce is local. This was confirmed in interviews in the field. For example, local Northland harvest contractors are Rosewarne and Shaun Leathwick the engineering provider. The planting provider is Silvicultural contractors based out of Kaikohe. Contracts stipulate that the Contractor, in complying with the requirements of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015, will train, supervise and monitor employees, agents or subcontractors to do their job safely.

Principles & Criteria Summary

18.01 Standard Requirement	18.02 Num CARs	18.03 Summary Assessment
The Organization shall implement additional activities, through engagement with local communities, that contribute to their social and economic development, proportionate to the scale, intensity and socio-economic impact of its management activities.	0	The company's regional offices are located in medium sized service centre towns which have all the required services for both the company and it's contractors. Therefore, th company almost exclusively hires local services. This includes all aspects of the business from land prep, forest establishment and tending, earthworks and construction, harvesting, aerial operations, and cartage. Logs go to local mills, where possible, or if not to the port. The company and the iwi organisations have formal agreements to assist tangata whenua get work or scholarships. For example, Clause 10 of the Woodhill forest JV has scholarship details. The scholarship has not been used however the company and NN WOK are using the money instead to have a trip to Mt Gambia, Australia to look at thinning operations which the partnership are heading towards starting as their next forest activity, in 2024.
The Organization, through engagement with local communities, shall take action to identify, avoid and mitigate significant negative social, environmental and economic impacts of its management activities on affected communities. The action taken shall be proportionate to the scale, intensity and risk of those activities and negative impacts.	1	The company generally avoids negative impacts by working through potential operational issues with stakeholders, e.g. the extensive and ongoing consultation with government organisations (Council, NZTA), neighbours and contractors in Hawkes Bay post-cyclone Gabriel. Refer to the storm damage section on page 6 of the report. However, there are current issues with feral pigs affecting neighbours in the Lawrence region in Southland. The company has operational procedures. The company, in its pre-operational processes, include assessments of social impacts. The company's operational documentation including prescriptions and maps show features identified to avoid and mitigate negative social and environmental activities. For example, on chemical spraying jobs, the prescription, on-site spray monitoring, flight path tracking and GIS mapping can readily show situations that could lead to these impacts. The field visit to the harvest area 417 adjoining SH5 in Ohurakura Forest highlighted the complex operational processes at the site. For example, working with neighbours, NZTA, the powerlines company, and aligning traffic management plans with operational timelines.
The Organization, through engagement with local communities, shall have mechanisms for resolving grievances and providing fair compensation to local communities and individuals with regard to the impacts of management activities of The Organization.	0	
The Organization, through engagement with local communities, shall identify sites which are of special cultural, ecological, economic, religious or spiritual significance, and for which these local communities hold legal or customary rights. These sites shall be recognized by The Organization, and their management and/or protection shall be agreed through engagement with these local communities.	0	
The Organization shall uphold the right of local communities to protect and utilize their traditional knowledge and shall compensate local communities for the utilization of such knowledge and their intellectual property. A binding agreement as per Criterion 3.3 shall be concluded between The Organization and the local communities for such utilization through Free, Prior and Informed Consent before utilization takes place, and shall be consistent with the protection of intellectual property rights.	0	
The Organization shall efficiently manage the range of multiple products and services of the Management Unit to maintain or enhance long term economic viability and the range of environmental and social benefits.	0	
The Organization shall identify, produce, or enable the production of, diversified benefits and/or products, based on the range of resources and ecosystem services existing in the Management Unit in order to strengthen and diversify the local economy proportionate to the scale and intensity of management activities.	0	
The Organization shall normally harvest products and services from the Management Unit at or below a level which can be permanently sustained.	0	process to evaluate this is described in the PROMAPP system. The processes behind how information is gathered for this comes from a similar PROMAPP process 'Inventory, Modelling, Forest Information & Valuation' Primarily within this are (at least) 2 process titled 'Inventory Data Collection' and 'Generating Yield Tables' which describes how data is gathered and used. Data is mainly sourced using traditional techniques such as mid-rotation inventory and a pre-harvest inventory.
The Organization shall demonstrate that the positive and negative externalities of operation are included in the management plan.	0	
The Organization shall use local processing, local services, and local value adding to meet the requirements of The Organization where these are available, proportionate to scale, intensity and risk. If these are not locally available, The Organization shall make reasonable attempts to help establish these services.	0	

Principles & Criteria Summary

18.01 Standard Requirement	18.02 Num CARs	18.03 Summary Assessment
The Organization shall demonstrate through its planning and expenditures proportionate to scale, intensity and risk, its commitment to long-term economic viability.	0	
The Organization shall maintain, conserve and/or restore ecosystem services and environmental values of the Management Unit, and shall avoid, repair or mitigate negative environmental impacts.	0	
The Organization shall assess environmental values in the Management Unit and those values outside the Management Unit potentially affected by management activities. This assessment shall be undertaken with a level of detail, scale and frequency that is proportionate to the scale, intensity and risk of management activities, and is sufficient for the purpose of deciding the necessary conservation measures, and for detecting and monitoring possible negative impacts of those activities.	0	The company has used best available information through using ecological consultants to assess the forests for environmental values. Wildlands consultants produced the national assessment within two reports. The Canterbury assessment in 2004 and the remaining estate in 2008. Additional specific reports have provided additional information to provide additional information, e.g. restoration plans and HCV management plans.
Prior to the start of site-disturbing activities, The Organization shall identify and assess the scale, intensity and risk of potential impacts of management activities on the identified environmental values.	0	
The Organization shall identify and implement effective actions to prevent negative impacts of management activities on the environmental values, and to mitigate and repair those that occur, proportionate to the scale, intensity and risk of these impacts.	0	
The Organization shall protect rare species and threatened species and their habitats in the Management Unit through conservation zones, protection areas, connectivity and/or (where necessary) other direct measures for their survival and viability. These measures shall be proportionate to the scale, intensity and risk of management activities and to the conservation status and ecological requirements of the rare and threatened species. The Organization shall take into account the geographic range and ecological requirements of rare and threatened species beyond the boundary of the Management Unit, when determining the measures to be taken inside the Management Unit.	0	The company has used best available information through using ecological consultants to assess the forests for RTEs and environmental values. Wildlands consultants produced the national assessment within two reports. The Canterbury assessment in 2004 and the remaining estate in 2008. For example, in the Canterbury assessment, section 8 is Avifauna with 8.1 as threatened species, section 9 is freshwater fish, and 10 is amphibians and reptiles. Additional specific reports have provided additional information to provide additional information, e.g. restoration plans, HCV management plans, bat, kiwi, and other bird surveys.
The Organization shall identify and protect representative sample areas of native ecosystems and/or restore them to more natural conditions. Where representative sample areas do not exist or are insufficient, The Organization shall restore a proportion of the Management Unit to more natural conditions. The size of the areas and the measures taken for their protection or restoration, including within plantations, shall be proportionate to the conservation status and value of the ecosystems at the landscape level, and the scale, intensity and risk of management activities.	0	
The Organization shall effectively maintain the continued existence of naturally occurring native species and genotypes, and prevent losses of biological diversity, especially through habitat management in the Management Unit. The Organization shall demonstrate that effective measures are in place to manage and control hunting, fishing, trapping and collecting.	0	Management activities that are undertaken that will help ensure the maintenance of native plant and animal communities are predominantly pest plant and animal control and mitigation of potential adverse effects of forestry activities (through site-specific prescriptions, post-works checks, and corrective actions). Monitoring of reserve areas (SEA's) is used to plan required maintenance actions, and record works done.
The Organization shall protect or restore natural watercourses, water bodies, riparian zones and their connectivity. The Organization shall avoid negative impacts on water quality and quantity and mitigate and remedy those that occur.	2	The NES-CF requirements are 5-10 metre setbacks for perennial waterways and wetlands depending on their widths (<3m, >3m) and size. RMF meets those requirements when undertaking forestry activities, as shown in works prescriptions. Harvesting prescriptions also specify the NES-CF, the Matariki Environmental Guidance and all relevant sections of the FOA Best Practice guides. Planting prescriptions clearly state: Planting Area Setbacks
The Organization shall manage the landscape in the Management Unit to maintain and/or restore a varying mosaic of species, sizes, ages, spatial scales and regeneration cycles appropriate for the landscape values in that region, and for enhancing environmental and economic resilience.	0	The Rayonier estate is in 2nd or third rotation. Radiata continues to be the most adaptable and successful species across the estate. In the early years of the NZFS of which Rayonier has purchase the ex-Crown estate, there were large trials of up to 50 different species. For example, in the Hamner (Canterbury) and Tairua (Bay of Plenty) forests. These trials and Scion's research show the economic returns are heavily stacked to pinus radiata as is evident across NZ. Douglas fir is becoming difficult to plant due to regulatory constraints of the wilding calculator, so it is being replaced by radiata or radiata attenuata hybrid at higher elevations in its South Island estate. Natives are only planted where active restoration is needed, e.g. Bush gully HCV, or as amenity plantings e.g. at Lake Janet, Ashley forest. Hamner has a heritage forest which incorporates the early NZFS plantings, e.g. a 1.25 ha area in Douglas fir was replaced with redwoods. 12 ha of pines harvested are also being replanted in macrocarpa and redwoods in 2023.

Principles & Criteria Summary

18.01 Standard Requirement	18.02 Num CARs	18.03 Summary Assessment
<p>The Organization shall not convert natural forest to plantations, nor natural forests or plantations on sites directly converted from natural forest to non-forest land use, except when the conversion:</p> <p>a) Affects a very limited portion of the area of the Management Unit, and</p> <p>b) Will produce clear, substantial, additional, secure long-term conservation benefits in the Management Unit, and</p> <p>c) Does not damage or threaten High Conservation Values, nor any sites or resources necessary to maintain or enhance those High Conservation Values.</p>	0	<p>The company's SIGNIFICANT ECOLOGICAL AREAS – MANAGEMENT STRATEGY V23.1 clearly states the company's policy which is to protect indigenous remnants. The company's operational management systems which include planning, operations, and post-op management/monitoring all incorporate protection of SEAs. For example, herbicide spraying and harvesting prescriptions clearly demarcate indigenous areas and specify their protection. Also, it was evident in reviewing large areas of the estate through high resolution photography that chemical trespass on to indigenous remnants or harvesting or damage to SEAs was not evident.</p>
<p>Management Units containing plantations that were established on areas converted from natural forest after November 1994 shall not qualify for certification, except where:</p> <p>a) Clear and sufficient evidence is provided that The Organization was not directly or indirectly responsible for the conversion, or</p> <p>b) The conversion affected a very limited portion of the area of the Management Unit and is producing clear, substantial, additional, secure long-term conservation benefits in the Management Unit.</p>	0	<p>N/A, the plantation area does not occupy land converted since 1994. The company complies with the NZ Forest Accord.</p>
<p>The Organization shall have a management plan consistent with its policies and objectives and proportionate to scale, intensity and risks of its management activities. The management plan shall be implemented and kept up to date based on monitoring information in order to promote adaptive management. The associated planning and procedural documentation shall be sufficient to guide staff, inform affected stakeholders and interested stakeholders and to justify management decisions.</p>	0	
<p>The Organization shall, proportionate to scale, intensity and risk of its management activities, set policies (visions and values) and objectives for management, which are environmentally sound, socially beneficial and economically viable. Summaries of these policies and objectives shall be made available to affected stakeholders and interested stakeholders.</p>	0	<p>The company has an Environmental and Sustainability Policy 2023, a 2023 Strategic Plan, systems and procedures within Process Manager, the electronic system that houses all the company's processes.</p>
<p>The Organization shall have and implement a management plan for the Management Unit which is fully consistent with the policies and management objectives as established according to Criterion 7.1. The management plan shall describe the natural resources that exist in the Management Unit and explain how the plan will meet the FSC certification requirements. The management plan shall cover forest management planning and social management planning proportionate to scale, intensity and risk of the planned activities.</p>	0	<p>These include (but are not limited to): Matariki Environmental Guidance, Version 4, April 2024 2024 RMF Strategic Plan</p>
<p>The management plan shall include verifiable targets by which progress towards each of the prescribed management objectives can be assessed.</p>	0	
<p>The Organization shall update and revise periodically the management planning and procedural documentation to incorporate the results of monitoring and evaluation, stakeholder engagement or new scientific and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances.</p>	0	
<p>The Organization shall make publicly available a summary of the management plan free of charge. Excluding confidential information, other relevant components of the management plan shall be made available to affected stakeholders on request, and at cost of reproduction and handling.</p>	0	<p>The 'Public Summary' which was updated in July 2024 is published as a freely available pdf document on the company website</p>
<p>The Organization shall, proportionate to scale, intensity and risk of management activities, proactively and transparently engage affected stakeholders in its management planning and monitoring processes, and shall engage interested stakeholders on request.</p>	0	<p>The company describes how it addresses points 1 to 4 above via a series of documents all considered part of the management plan. This includes: Matariki Forests Dispute Resolution Process PROMAPP: Lands & Legal Assessment of Environmental Impacts (Afforestation) Communication and Engagement Social Implication Assessment Procedure High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) assessment procedure</p>
<p>The Organization shall demonstrate that, progress towards achieving the management objectives, the impacts of management activities and the condition of the Management Unit, are monitored and evaluated proportionate to the scale, intensity and risk of management activities, in order to implement adaptive management.</p>	0	
<p>The Organization shall monitor the implementation of its Management Plan, including its policies and management objectives, its progress with the activities planned, and the achievement of its verifiable targets.</p>	0	
<p>The Organization shall monitor and evaluate the environmental and social impacts of the activities carried out in the Management Unit, and changes in the environmental condition.</p>	0	
<p>The Organization shall analyze the results of monitoring and evaluation and feed the outcomes of this analysis back into the planning process.</p>	0	
<p>The Organization shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring free of charge, excluding confidential information.</p>	0	

Principles & Criteria Summary

18.01 Standard Requirement	18.02 Num CARs	18.03 Summary Assessment
The Organization shall have and implement a tracking and tracing system proportionate to scale, intensity and risk of its management activities, for demonstrating the source and volume in proportion to projected output for each year, of all products from the Management Unit that are marketed as FSC certified.	0	The company follows the ISO plan, do, check, and act process that are imbedded across company documentation, e.g company operating procedures, prescriptions, and monitoring. A large test to the company's adaptive management procedures was the management of the Post-Cyclone Gabriel damage (see page 6) in Hawkes Bay. The adaptive management was across the strategic, tactical and operational levels. For example, the council bridge to Waikoau was damage to a level that cannot carry a logging truck, and the bridge is still out. Different forests had differing levels of storm damage so these became operational at different times. The company had to re-run the estate modelling software to determine the new harvest profile. At a tactical level, the forward roading ahead to give access to harvest areas was not always there so the earthworks program required substantial changes too. At an operational level harvest crews needed rescheduling to adjust with the new programme. The planning was dynamic because changes were regular as post-harvest maintenance was completed.
The Organization shall maintain and/or enhance the High Conservation Values in the Management Unit through applying the precautionary approach.	0	
The Organization, through engagement with affected stakeholders, interested stakeholders and other means and sources, shall assess and record the presence and status of the following High Conservation Values in the Management Unit, proportionate to the scale, intensity and risk of impacts of management activities, and likelihood of the occurrence of the High Conservation Values.		The company used Wildlands to survey the Canterbury estate in 2004 and the rest of the estate in 2008. There has not been a lot of additional land incorporated into the Rayonier estate. However, they have an SEA assessment and HCV. Of the three new forests, one is currently being assessed for HCV. The GIS system records the location and status of the HCVs.
The Organization shall develop effective strategies that maintain and/or enhance the identified High Conservation Values, through engagement with affected stakeholders, interested stakeholders and experts.	0	HCV areas have been clearly identified and documented. The base document to identify threats is the SEA & HCV's – Management Strategy. Beneath this each HCV area has a management strategy in place. This defines objectives and strategies such as: •Monitoring •Threats •Stakeholder •Management Actions •Plan evaluation (has the plan been effective in helping to achieve HCV strategy objective?) •Operation
The Organization shall implement strategies and actions that maintain and/or enhance the identified High Conservation Values. These strategies and actions shall implement the precautionary approach and be proportionate to the scale, intensity and risk of management activities.	0	
The Organization shall demonstrate that periodic monitoring is carried out to assess changes in the status of High Conservation Values, and shall adapt its management strategies to ensure their effective protection. The monitoring shall be proportionate to the scale, intensity and risk of management activities, and shall include engagement with affected stakeholders, interested stakeholders and experts.	0	The company has active management strategies for each HCV. The HCVs are part of an annual SEA monitoring programme, as well as having additional monitoring and management during the year. For example, depending on the stage and level of management required, these activities may be regular and significant or in a maintenance phase. For example, the Puhikoko initially had regular reports. The Duck Creek HCV is currently requiring significant trapping resource as evident in the monthly updates.
Management activities conducted by or for The Organization for the Management Unit shall be selected and implemented consistent with The Organization's economic, environmental and social policies and objectives and in compliance with the Principles and Criteria collectively.	0	
After harvest or in accordance with the management plan, The Organization shall, by natural or artificial regeneration methods, regenerate vegetation cover in a timely fashion to pre-harvesting or more natural conditions.	0	
The Organization shall use species for regeneration that are ecologically well adapted to the site and to the management objectives. The Organization shall use native species and local genotypes for regeneration, unless there is clear and convincing justification for using others.	0	RMF currently (in general) only plants Radiata pine including the hybrid Pinus attenuata. These and all other minor species previously grown for production within the estate are recognised as production forestry species, having been established in New Zealand plantations since the late 19th century. Some areas of the FMU are currently planted in Douglas fir, Macrocarpa Eucalyptus and other minor species and these are now being removed and will not be replanted due to various factors including the risk of wilding spread. The company is an active member of the NZ Forest Owners Association and via the Forest Growers Commodity Levy contributes to Future Forests Research which investigates species and genotypes chosen for the plantations
The Organization shall only use alien species when knowledge and/or experience have shown that any invasive impacts can be controlled and effective mitigation measures are in place.	0	RMF only plants Radiata pine including the hybrid Pinus attenuata. This is recognised as production forestry species, having been established in New Zealand plantations since the late 19th century. The risk of wilding conifers is managed under section 11 of the NES-PF and the Wilding Conifer Control section in PROMAPP. RMF is not engaged in afforestation of land not previously in plantation forestry and is now not planting species other than Radiata Pine which has a low risk of spread.

Principles & Criteria Summary

18.01 Standard Requirement	18.02 Num CARs	18.03 Summary Assessment
The Organization shall not use genetically modified organisms in the Management Unit.	0	
The Organization shall use silvicultural practices that are ecologically appropriate for the vegetation, species, sites and management objectives.	0	
The Organization shall minimize or avoid the use of fertilizers. When fertilizers are used, The Organization shall demonstrate that use is equally or more ecologically and economically beneficial than use of silvicultural systems that do not require fertilizers, and prevent, mitigate, and/or repair damage to environmental values, including soils.	0	The company uses fertiliser but minimises its use. Fertiliser application is about tree health and resistance to disease, e.g. red needle cast. Fertiliser use is for occasional stands that show significant nutrient deficiency to justify the application of fertiliser, e.g. a loss in basal area of more than 10% to offset the cost of fertiliser application. Therefore the cost benefit is on getting the stand to an acceptable basal area compared to stands that do not show the deficiency. The company does not apply fertiliser at planting but rather bases its assessment, typically on 6-year-old trees where deficiencies have time to become evident.
The Organization shall use integrated pest management and silviculture systems which avoid, or aim at eliminating, the use of chemical pesticides. The Organization shall not use any chemical pesticides prohibited by FSC policy. When pesticides are used, The Organization shall prevent, mitigate, and/or repair damage to environmental values and human health.	0	The company has several documents that collectively are the IPM which meet the requirements of the indicator. The company uses Atlas Geomaster which is a GIS based stand record system. The company plans and records use and location within the system. This allows for location base records. The flight paths are also recorded which gives specific GPS location of each flight path including potential gaps (striping) or overlapping. The reporting function within GeoMaster provides for summaries by job, forest, region or company depending on reporting needs.
The Organization shall minimize, monitor and strictly control the use of biological control agents in accordance with internationally accepted scientific protocols. When biological control agents are used, The Organization shall prevent, mitigate, and/or repair damage to environmental values.	0	
The Organization shall assess risks and implement activities that reduce potential negative impacts from natural hazards proportionate to scale, intensity, and risk.	0	
The Organization shall manage infrastructural development, transport activities and silviculture so that water resources and soils are protected, and disturbance of and damage to rare and threatened species, habitats, ecosystems and landscape values are prevented, mitigated and/or repaired.	0	
The Organization shall manage activities associated with harvesting and extraction of timber and non-timber forest products so that environmental values are conserved, merchantable waste is reduced, and damage to other products and services is avoided.	0	
The Organization shall dispose of waste materials in an environmentally appropriate manner.	0	The Environmental guide, referenced in all operational prescriptions, contains the following statements: Rubbish All rubbish must be kept in a suitable rubbish bin or bag with all rubbish removed from the site at completion of the sale area. (Rubbish includes old wire rope, drums, containers, spray cans, plastic bottles, etc.) What comes into the forest is what goes out of the forest. Hazardous substances such as waste oil, fuel, or herbicide wash water, must not be deliberately released onto soil or buried. All spills must be remedied as soon as possible if they occur. Observations during the field visits indicated no issues with conformance to this indicator.