

**KENOGAMI FOREST
2015 INDEPENDENT FOREST AUDIT
MANAGEMENT UNIT ACTION PLAN**

Status Report



Table of Contents

Status Report Signature Page	3
Status Report Signature Page- continued	4
Introduction	5
Recommendations	5
Principle 3: Forest Management Planning	5
Recommendation #3:	5
Recommendation #9:	7
Principle 4: Plan Assessment and Implementation	9
Recommendation #4:	9
Recommendation #5:	11
Recommendation #6:	13
Principle 5: System Support	14
Recommendation #7:	14
Principle 6: Monitoring	15
Recommendation #8:	15
Recommendation #10:	16
Recommendation #11:	17
Principle 7: Achievement of Management Objectives & Forest Sustainability	19
Recommendation #12:	19
Principle 8: Contractual Obligations	20
Recommendation #13:	20

Status Report Signature Page

Prepared by:

Deanna Hoffman, R.P.F.
Chief Forester
Ne-Daa-Kii-Me-Naan Inc.
Date original signed: April 20, 2018

Kimberly Parr
Resource Liaison Specialist
MNRF Nipigon District
Date original signed: April 24, 2018

Dean Hample, R.P.F.
Regional Forest Operations Specialist
MNRF Northwest Region
Date original signed: April 23, 2018

Reviewed by:

Charlotte Bourdignon, R.P.F.
Management Forester
MNRF Nipigon District
Date original signed: April 20, 2018

Darcy Waboose
Director
Ne-Daa-Kii-Me-Naan Inc.
Date original signed: April 23, 2018

Status Report Signature Page- continued

Submitted by:

Chris Magee
District Manager
MNRN Nipigon District
Date original signed: April 24, 2018

Approved by:

Amanda Holmes
Regional Director
MNRN Northwest Region
Date original signed: May 2, 2018

Introduction

In September 2015 an Independent Forest Audit (IFA) was conducted on the Kenogami Forest by Arbex Forest Resource Consultants Ltd. for the period April 1, 2010 to March 31, 2015. The audit report was accepted as final by the Forestry Futures Committee on February 8, 2016. The action plan was signed and submitted by the due date April 8, 2016.

The status report is required to be submitted by April 7th, 2018.

This status report includes the original approved actions for recommendations from the Management Unit Action Plan. The progress to date is listed below the actions required.

Future tracking is shown for any actions not yet completed.

The audit included recommendations under six of the headings of the eight IFA Principles (Principles 3 to 8).

Recommendations

Principle 3: Forest Management Planning

Recommendation #3:

Nedaak must improve the quality of its AWS revisions and FMP amendment requests and the MNR District must adhere to FMPM/FIM schedules for the approval of amendments and revisions.

Action required:

1. Nedaak will work with Overlapping Licensees to facilitate advance notice of, and the nature of, revisions and amendments to prior to their submission to MNR through the FI Portal.
2. Prior to the initial submission of any amendment or a revision Nedaak will have discussions with the MNR Resources Management Forester to ensure that necessary information is contained within the initial (pre) submission and also to discuss timelines.
3. Nedaak will ensure that FMP amendments address the FMPM requirements in Part C, Section 2.2. This will include precise textual descriptions, and where appropriate maps that depict specifically what the amendments and revisions are about, not just the required updated required maps.

4. For amendments, once a satisfactory product is developed, MNRF will review the initial request and provide the MNRF decision documentation on whether to proceed with the amendment and the category of amendment normally within 15 days of receipt of an acceptable document as per the FMPM, which will then allow Nedaak to submit to the FI Portal.
5. For revisions or amendments, there is no specific FMPM or FIM related timeline for approval and MNRF will endeavor to review the FI Portal submission as quickly as possible.

Progress to date:

1. **This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. Nedaak Plan Author and Operations Forester will continue work with Licensees to ensure details are obtained prior to submission of amendments and revisions. Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) email records indicate that there is dialogue between Nedaak and pertinent licensees conducting forest operations (AVTB, Ginoogam etc).
2. **This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. The Nedaak Plan Author and Operations Forester will continue to have discussions with MNRF prior to formal submissions to ensure necessary info will be included in the submission. These discussions should include informal submissions of draft revisions and amendments. The communication between Nedaak and MNRF is improving as Nedaak staff becomes solidified in their roles. In October 2016 Nedaak hired a Planning and Development Forester; this position was responsible for amendments and revisions, as well as authoring the AWS and AR. During this staff transition it would be expected that submissions through the portal might increase as communication pathways are being developed and tested. Nedaak also hired an Operations Forester in May 2018 and subsequently reorganised. The new planning forester is now dedicating their time to another forest, while the Operations Forester has assumed responsibility for the submission of quality FMP Amendments and AWS Revisions, ongoing monitoring and attention by both parties will continue; however the protocol is now in place for such discussions
3. **This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. The Nedaak Plan Author will follow the outline of amendment requirements in the FMPM and when needed or requested or required by the FMPM, supply spatial data. As a whole, amendments are addressing FMPM requirements adequately.

The quality and inclusion of spatial data associated with amendments has also improved.

4. **This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. The MNRF Management Forester will continue to review and provide decision documentation in a timely fashion (normally within 15 days of receipt of an acceptable document) on requirements to proceed. MNRF is ensuring that best efforts are being made to ensure the timely delivery of the decision documentation back to the plan author.

5. **This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. There is no specific timelines for approval of a revision. The MNRF Management Forester will continue striving to review FI Portal submissions as quickly as possible. The MNRF has made a concerted effort to decrease the amount of time between the submission of an acceptable revision or amendment and the date of its approval.

Recommendation #9:

The MNRF District and Nedaak must adhere to compliance direction and targets described in the FMP, approved compliance plans and the AWS.

Action required:

1. Review the 2011 Kenogami FMP Compliance section with respect to roles and responsibilities with all parties (MNRF, Nedaak, Overlapping Licensees, etc.) to ensure it is correct and amend the FMP where appropriate.
2. To ensure that an adequate MNRF presence is made, Nipigon District MNRF will utilise staff from both the Geraldton and Nipigon offices so that the planned annual compliance workload targets on the Kenogami Forest are met.
3. Nedaak will develop a tracking system that will document by Compliance Reporting Area (CRA), compliance related notifications (i.e. start-up, release) and compliance reports (i.e. FOIP reports) to facilitate meeting the targets defined in the Compliance section of the 2011 Kenogami FMP.

Progress to date:

1. **This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. The compliance amendment was completed. The Kenogami Phase II FMP updated responsibilities to better reflect the licencing arrangement on the forest. Subsequent to the approval of the Phase II FMP, amendment 2011-038 updated the compliance section of the FMP even further to be consistent with Nedaak's updated business plan. The updated compliance section of the FMP includes updates to the responsibilities of all parties involved in compliance reporting. Whereas Nedaak was previously responsible for conducting compliance inspections and submitting reports for all licensees working on the Kenogami, each individual overlapping licensee will now complete their own inspections and submit the corresponding report to Nedaak for approval. The 2017-2018 Kenogami AWS reflects the change in the amendment, which was approved by the end of February 14, 2017. In May 2017, Nedaak hired an Operations

Forester who now oversees the compliance activities for the overlapping licensees and monitors the compliance reports.

Joint Inspections - There has been effort made to increase the number of joint inspections made by the MNRF and industry operating on the Kenogami. MNRF technicians in Geraldton suggest that these joint inspections were successful in the fall of 2016. Availability of industry compliance staff and a limited amount of certified MNRF inspectors often limited the amount of joint inspections; however, when compliance issues were noted, joint inspections were encouraged.

Quarterly Meetings - Quarterly meetings between MNRF, AVTB, and Nedaak have been implemented on the Kenogami. These meetings provide an opportunity for dialogue regarding compliance issues and monitoring on the forest. They are attended by Nedaak's compliance manager and AVTB's compliance manager. These have been replaced (June 2017) with operational meetings held quarterly with all Kenogami Licensees.

Nedaak hired a new Operations Forester in May 2017. The Operations Forester is directing Nedaak staff in daily spot checks and has established goals for such. Each Licensee operation will have a spot check completed at least once per week. Each check is accompanied by an internal monitoring form that documents the visit. These forms note good practices as well as operational issues and are kept in the block file. This will assist in tracking if issues start to occur and/or were corrected. When operational issues are found, the foreman on site, operator (either/both if available) and the Licensee are made aware. FOIP reports are created for operational issues if required.

Weekly calls are being held with AVTB and Nedaak to update each party on operation status and highlights any operational issues that may be occurring.

2. **This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. To ensure that an adequate MNRF presence is made, Nipigon District MNRF will utilise staff from both the Geraldton and Nipigon offices so that the planned annual compliance workload targets on the Kenogami Forest are met. The Nipigon District MNRF Compliance Team met on January 24th, 2017 to discuss the forest compliance program. This included a review of the program and problems as encountered, the method of designating CRA's for staff, as well as how to mentor technicians and increase MNRF presence on the land base. The utilization of MNRF staff was discussed at the meeting; sharing staff between FMU's was still identified as a problem and acknowledged as an area for improvement.

As it currently stands there is a shortage of certified compliance inspectors within the MNRF Nipigon district, particularly with technicians who fill the Resource Management Technician (RT3) role. In several instances certified inspectors are in roles where forest compliance is not considered part of the workload (e.g. Aggregate Specialist, Fish & Wildlife Technical Specialist). Managing workloads while achieving compliance targets is a challenge and will require certified staff to mentor non-certified technicians. The Nipigon District has included this as part of their compliance strategy moving forward. In addition to regular compliance inspections, a week-long compliance field monitoring effort occurred in August 2017 which utilized staff from both the Geraldton and Nipigon Offices.

- 3. This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. Nedaak's Operations Forester will continue to follow and track operations to ensure FOIP reports are being completed and operational issues are being resolved. A master compliance table was created and maintained by Nedaak which tracked all blocks, compliance activities; documented all issues and/or resolutions and associated reports (start-up, suspended, released and completed). The new Operations Forester has made changes and simplified this tracking table.

As part of the compliance amendment, Nedaak has created an electronic compliance reporting table to track notifications by Licensee. This table is harmonized with the tracking systems used on the Lake Nipigon Forest and Ogoki Forest, both Nipigon District forests. The table allows overlapping licensees to update Nedaak on harvest operations (start-up, release) and provide details as to what activities are being undertaken at the block. The Kenogami table is unique in that it has an additional column to track who is responsible for slash management at a particular site.

Principle 4: Plan Assessment and Implementation

Recommendation #4:

Nedaak must augment its forest renewal program to reduce the gap between the area harvested and the area renewed.

Action required:

1. Nedaak will complete a GIS exercise to determine where and what the differences are between areas renewed and harvest area.
2. Based on the GIS exercise Nedaak will survey outstanding areas to determine best silvicultural treatment(s) for the site and will implement the treatments.

- Nedaak will survey areas where treatment is not needed and area may meet Free-to-grow (FTG) standards with a FTG survey and report the results in the Annual Report.

Progress to date:

- This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. Nedaak's GIS officer completed a GIS exercise on June 7, 2016. Depletion history was used for areas between 2000 and 2014 (current harvest data). In total, 21,675 ha were identified as not having any silvicultural treatment applied at that time (i.e. harvested with no follow-up). See the table 1 below.

Table 1: Total area untreated (2004-2014)		21,675 Hectares
Activity	Area in Hectares (ha)	
2016 declared FTG	2,787	
2016 Plant	764	
2016 SIP	4	
2016 declared natural regeneration	1,395	
2017 SIP	549	
2017 declared FTG	8,218	
2017 Plant	1,043	
2017 assessment surveys	880	
2017 declared natural regeneration	332	
2018 scheduled assessment surveys	610	
2018 scheduled FTG surveys	5,093	
Total 'gap' area planned/treated	21,675	

- This action is considered ongoing.** The audit action plan indicated that surveys based on the GIS exercise would begin in the summer of 2016 and be completed by the end of the summer 2017. Of the 21,675 ha gap identified in

the GIS exercise, Nedaak's Plan Author has determined that there are 610 ha still requiring an assessment survey in 2018 to determine a future treatment. The 880 ha that were surveyed in 2017 were determined to be a mix of natural regeneration and areas that are FTG. These are being compiled by Nedaak's Plan Author and will be reported in the 2017-18 AR.

3. **This action is considered ongoing.** See Table 1 above. Of the 21,675 ha of back-log identified, 8,218 ha were FTG surveyed in 2017 with 5,093 ha still requiring a FTG survey in 2018. Nedaak's Plan Author will be responsible for reporting any survey results in the 2018-19 AR.

Future tracking requirements:

2. Outstanding reporting based on the 21,675 ha of back-log:
 - a. The 2019-20 AWS will outline required treatments based on survey results from the 610 ha surveyed in 2018.
 - b. The 2017-18 annual report due November 15, 2018 will report the results of the 8,218 ha of FTG area surveyed in 2017.
 - c. The 2018-19 annual report due November 15, 2019 will report the results of the FTG area surveyed in 2018.
 - d. The 2018-19 annual report due November 15, 2019 will report the results of any area determined as natural regeneration from the 2018 ground surveys.
3. Outstanding FTG survey results will be reported:
 - a. The 2017-2018 annual report due November 15, 2018 will report the total hectares of FTG completed in 2017.
 - b. The 2018-19 annual report due November 15, 2019 will report the FTG area surveyed in 2018.

Recommendation #5:

Nedaak must assess the efficacy of the reducing the active ingredient (a.i.) in herbicide tending program to determine 1) the effectiveness of reduced levels of a.i. in suppressing competing vegetation and preventing/minimizing the establishment of undesirable species 2) cost-effectiveness and 3) its implications on the achievement of FMP desired future forest condition.

Action required:

1. Nedaak has been made aware that there is potential for crop damage with higher rates active ingredient (a.i.) of VisionMax® used in aerial tending operations. Three forests (Dog River-Matawan, Lac Seul, Crossroute) are investigating the causes of damage (different rates of a.i, litres of application per hectare and damage results) and are trying different scenarios (a.i., water, timing of application) to determine the conditions that cause crop damage. Once

causes are determined, Nedaak will use the information to assess their program and direction for future use of VisionMax®.

2. Cost effectiveness will be determined using the future forest condition expected against the resulting costs with varying rates of a.i. and potential crop damage and/or replacement.
3. Nedaak will determine the effect of different rates of a.i. on the tending program with respect to the FMP desired future forest condition and reduction of hardwood species/stunted growth and then confirm the application a.i. rate to be used.

Progress to date:

1. **This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. The investigation has been completed May 20, 2016. Nedaak's Chief Forester has investigated and found that those forests that were suffering from crop damage when using VisionMax® were using 20 l/ha application rates with higher kg a.i./ha rates of herbicide (i.e. less water and more chemical). Nedaak has been using 30 l/ha application rates and kg a.i./ha rates on the lower end of the label rate (i.e. more water and less chemical). Nedaak will continue to use the application rate of 30 l/ha and will no longer use the rate of 1.26 kg a.i./ha.
2. **This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. Aerial tending areas observed by Nedaak have not been found to have damaged crop trees. It is more cost efficient to aerial tend up to 4 times at a higher application rate/lower chemical rate combination, than treat once with a lower application rate/higher chemical combination rate and refill plant areas of damage. To increase the a.i. rate from 1.26 kg a.i. to 1.89 kg a.i. increases the chemical cost by 30%. The lowest application rate out of the 2015, 2016 and 2017 Herbicide Plans was 1.42 kg a.i./ha.

Since the audit determined that on some sites, the competition was being damaged and not eliminated when using the lower application rates of 1.26 kg a.i./ha, Nedaak no longer uses that rate, and is now using 1.42 kg a.i./ha as the minimum rate. This increased chemical costs by approximately 12%, but should increase the level of competition reduction, therefore increasing the chances of achieving the intended future forest condition. It is more cost effective to use the 30 l/ha with variable a.i. rates to achieve the FMP objectives even if the area requires tending more than once.

3. **This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. No further investigation on the effect of different rates of herbicide application rates will be conducted as only existing inventory of VisionMax® will be used. Once

that inventory is exhausted, Nedaak's Chief Forester has confirmed that an alternate glyphosate product to VisonMax® will be used moving forward. In 2018 the VisonMax® product on hand will be used up, and in 2019 a different glyphosate product will be used. There are products on the market for forestry use based on the original glyphosate formula widely used in forestry prior to VisonMax®. Forza® is one of these and the one that will be investigated for use on the Kenogami. Advances in, and accessibility to, weather prediction models relating to the development and approach of adverse weather, will enable other herbicides to be considered, as the one of the advantages of VisonMax® was the short rain-fastness timeframe. It is felt that using the different chemical will result in more consistent results with less risk of crop damage when used with higher chemical rates and lower application rates. With more consistent results, and variable rates to use without the fear of crop damage, FMP objectives will be more likely to be met. There is still the issue of the public perception of herbicide use and was an additional reason to use low rates and stunt growth instead of completely deleting the competition.

Recommendation #6:

Nedaak must effectively track OFRL operations merchandizing poplar veneer and ensure that slash from the operations is appropriately managed.

Action required:

1. The locations of where poplar veneer operations are occurring will be tracked through the Kenogami Forest compliance start-up notification form that is submitted by all licensees prior to start-up of their harvest operations. Poplar intent will be added as a requirement to be identified on this form (i.e. hog, veneer, no market).
2. Nedaak will ensure follow-up inspections are completed on all areas where veneer operations are occurring to check that these operations are being conducted in accordance with the veneer harvest operation direction in the phase II 2016 Kenogami Forest FMP (section 8.3.5.1.2 veneer harvest operations and 8.2.2.2 conditions on regular operations). This FMP direction includes reducing the loss of productive land at roadside and within the cutover from veneer operations. Any identified operational issues will be addressed.

Progress to date:

1. **This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. Start-ups etc. are monitored by Nedaak's Operations Forester on an ongoing basis using the compliance spreadsheet. The Kenogami Forest compliance notification form is being utilized by licensees to track poplar veneer operations to varying degrees of success. Also, a column to indicate Poplar usage intent has been added to the required forest compliance notification form.

2. **This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. Follow-up inspections on all harvest blocks where there is a veneer-only recovery operation will specifically be targeted and documented separately by Nedaak field staff. If any operational issues are noted they will be reported in FOIP reports. Nedaak now conducts follow-up inspections on veneer operations as part of its regular ongoing compliance inspection program. Since the audit, operations are now in accordance with the FMP with no operational issues noted by Nedaak.

Principle 5: System Support

Recommendation #7:

Nedaak must enhance its training of seasonal staff to include broader contextual information on FMP requirements and their implementation rationale.

Action required:

1. Nedaak will continue to train seasonal staff specific to the tasks they are hired for and continue to provide rationale specific to those tasks and its part in the FMP process. Nedaak will also provide general knowledge information e.g. a handout about the Kenogami Forest as well as general information about forest management planning such as MNR's Help Shape Ontario's Forests and a website link for further details about forest management:
<https://www.ontario.ca/page/forestry>

Progress to date:

This action is considered complete. No future tracking is required. Nedaak's Chief Forester now uses employee sign off sheets and approved procedures that track progress. As part of Nedaak's continual efforts to educate its members, "FMP planning 101" is being developed in conjunction with the Nedaak newsletter. In addition, Nedaak took advantage of a field tour given by the Ministry regarding PSP/PGP's and used it to spur on discussion regarding forest management planning processes.

Procedure handbooks are being developed for silvicultural projects (tree plant, mechanical site preparation, surveys, aerial tending and manual cleaning) with an introductory section outlining the projects importance within FMP planning and implementation, and sustainability.

Principle 6: Monitoring

Recommendation #8:

The MNRF District must ensure that outstanding MNRF FOIP inspections are closed and Nedaak must monitor the compliance program implemented by the OFRLs to ensure that all obligations and responsibilities for compliance monitoring and reporting are met.

Action required:

1. Nipigon District will use their compliance tracking data base to track the status of those operations where the district has received a start-up report. Information for the data base tracking status will come from bi-weekly MNRF district compliance meetings. Outstanding MNRF FOIP reports will be reviewed at these meetings, assigned a deadline for action and followed up until they are closed.
2. Nedaak will monitor the OFRLs compliance program on a weekly basis to ensure they are meeting their obligations and responsibilities as per the FMP compliance plan and Forest Compliance Manual and provide updates on outstanding reports to OFRLs as issues develop. The tracking system to be developed by April 1, 2016 as noted in recommendation #9 will facilitate this monitoring.

Progress to date:

1. **This action is considered partially complete.** No future tracking is required. MNRF district compliance staff will continue to conduct monthly meetings and improve on closing issues in FOIP in a timely manner. FOIP will track the amount of open and overdue operational issues. Starting in 2016 the Nipigon District MNRF team began conducting bi-weekly meetings to discuss compliance issues. These meetings were not tracked through formal meeting minutes; however, informal minutes collected by various staff members involved have been used to track meeting progress. The tracking data base is also updated at each meeting. Not all compliance meetings in 2016 included a review of open FOIP issues. During the 2017 fiscal year, MNRF district staff moved to monthly meetings as bi-weekly was too frequent. Meetings included a review and discussion of open FOIP issues at each meeting.

Closing issues in FOIP has been complicated by staffing changes. There has been an increased effort throughout 2017 to ensure FOIP reports are resolved in a timely manner by assigning deadlines for action and following up during each meeting. There are currently 16 open current issues as of the last compliance meeting (March 8, 2018). There are 3 unresolved FOIP reports dating back to 2015. A large portion of the open issues in FOIP need to be addressed in snow free conditions.

2. **This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. Nedaak's master compliance tracking table will be used in the future. Nedaak's Operations Forester is continually updating the master file and in contact with Licensees on a weekly basis regarding the status of operations and reports. The tracking system as noted in recommendation #9 is being updated with results and is also being discussed with overlapping licensees at a quarterly operations meeting hosted by Nedaak.

Future tracking requirements:

1. The Forest Operations Information Program (FOIP) will track any open issues.

Recommendation #10:

MNRF District and Nedaak staff must investigate the reasons for the differences in FTG survey results and adjust their FTG survey methodologies to address the discrepancies in the results reported for silviculture and regeneration success.

Action required:

1. For the 2016 field season, MNRF will work together with Nedaak on a subset of their individual FTG programs. The blocks will be surveyed via both methodologies (industry and MNRF). The selected blocks will then jointly be analysed for results. In addition MNRF and Nedaak will review how the applicable SGR being evaluated is determined, how areas are stratified for sampling and MNRF SEM report recommendations. The reasons for discrepancies will be summarized with how they will be addressed e.g. any changes to company or MNRF survey methods to provide for comparability/acceptable range of variance, area stratification, applicable SGR documentation.

Progress to date:

This action is considered complete. No future tracking is required. The MNRF Management Forester and other supporting MNRF staff will continue to work with the Nedaak Chief Forester to attempt to eliminate discrepancies in FTG results. Emphasis will be placed on the FTG backlog during the next few years. There have been discussions regarding using large scale photography as a method to help complete backlog. This will eliminate some discrepancies found in the field surveys. MNRF's provincially lead Silviculture Enhancement Initiative (SEI) which remains under development at the time of this report may also play a role in both MNRF's and Industry's SEM programs moving forward. At this point, direction on advancing this program has not been widely shared and the roll-out remains to be seen.

Nedaak's General Manager has committed to a change to their ground survey methodology; if ground surveys are to be utilized, the survey methodology will be changed from a randomized zig zag to a grid like pattern. There has also been discussions regarding investigating other field survey methods to use in the future that

are more similar to MNRF's methodology. Nedaak staff participated in SEM surveys with the MNRF in 2016 where both methods of survey were utilized at both survey plot locations (i.e. MNRF stratified plot locations versus Nedaak stratified plot locations). Preliminary observations from the field indicate the difference in Free-to-Grow (FTG) survey results is highly linked to the plot locations. MNRF has completed the silviculture effectiveness monitoring (SEM) summary report outlining the summary of survey results, trends and recommendations. The results have been reviewed with Nedaak during meetings held in 2017 and 2018. These meetings were held to discuss the reasons for discrepancies and how they will be addressed.

Two main action items were identified:

Data mining – the data (inventory) needs to be updated to improve applicable SGR's

Survey methodology – field survey methodology needs to be changed as the current industry method creates inconsistencies. Plot location has also been identified as a key factor. The methodology used by Nedaak is quite different than the Well-Spaced-Free-Growing (WSFG) methodology used by MNRF, for example: square plots vs circular plots and height classes differed.

Having qualified staff also appears to be a factor in discrepancies. Nedaak staff have varied backgrounds which may not be forestry based. Although Nedaak trains their staff to perform the tasks required, there may be differences in their level of comprehension. Free growing data was rarely filled out/tallied in the Nedaak survey tally sheets. This information is important in determining if the block meets FTG status.

Surveys conducted by Nedaak in 2017 were ocular surveys from a helicopter. This is an approved methodology in the FMP so long as it is coupled with the required ground truthing exercise that needs to happen at the same time.

Recommendation #11:

The MNRF District should place a priority emphasis on the completion of Core Task 1 and Core Task 2 SEM monitoring functions until there is less discrepancy between industry and MNRF statistics for regeneration and silviculture success.

Action required:

1. MNRF will conduct field tasks as required of the NWR SEM strategy which began in 2015-16. For 2016-17 field task 1 is to conduct surveys of FTG prior to the AR where practical or FTG results reported in a recent AR with the District to identify their priorities/amounts. The actions required to address R#10 are the key SEM priorities for the 2016 field season.

Surveying areas after FTG in Field task 2 will not occur in 2016-17 as post FTG assessments requires further considerations through the Provincial Silviculture Enhancement Initiative (SEI) including purpose, methods, timing, and what organization should be conducting those surveys.

The field tasks to be completed will be reviewed annually including how the SEI will be implemented.

Progress to date:

1. **This action is considered ongoing.** The Nipigon District MNRF team focused on completing Core Task 1 for the 2016/17 field season, which is the completion of Recommendation #10. MNRF will continue to place a priority on Core Task 1 until such time as there is confidence in the differences between the industry FTG and MNRF SEM results, and make increased efforts to completing the task targets. Core Task 2 is no longer a priority of the district. During the 2016/17 field season, the target for Core Task 1 was 100-200 ha and a minimum 1 day of flying. The area surveyed was 104 ha through ground surveys and 1 day of flying occurred to conduct aerial FTG surveys. The target for the 2017/18 field season was 200 ha. The area surveyed was 135 ha (67.5% of the target).'

The SEM reports have provided some explanations for discrepancies (refer to SEM Reports 2016/17 and 2017/18)

Future tracking requirements:

1. District SEM reports will track the results of completed surveys; and an annual review the results with Nedaak will occur so that both companies can gain a better understanding on the discrepancies in results, if they are still occurring. .

MNRF will continue to work with the FRL holder to develop an improved field survey methodology. MNRF is committed to working with Nedaak to decreasing/eliminating the discrepancies identified in recommendation #10

MNRF's provincially lead SEI program may also play a role in MNRF's targets for the district SEM workload. At this point, direction on advancing this program has not been widely shared and the roll-out remains to be seen.

Principle 7: Achievement of Management Objectives & Forest Sustainability

Recommendation #12:

The MNRF District Office and Nedaak must reconcile area reported as lands below regeneration standards in the forest inventory and make the appropriate corrections to tables in the ARs, FMP and Trends Analysis Report. Forest management surveys and/or assessments within this area should be completed as necessary, and if required, silviculture treatments implemented to ensure that renewal standards are achieved.

Action required:

1. The area noted as below regeneration standards is what was reported at the time of development of the 2011 FMP. Nedaak will complete an inventory update to provide an updated summary of the amount of area below regeneration standards as of 2016. This update will account for areas that have been declared FTG including naturally regenerated areas. Therefore, past Annual Reports, the past 2011 FMP, and the Trend Analysis Report that was based on past ARs would not be updated. The results of this exercise will be shared with the MNRF District.
2. Areas that may require surveys and/or silviculture treatments will be completed as part of actions 2 and 3 in recommendation #4.

Progress to date:

1. **This action is considered not complete.** As a result of recommendation #4, an assessment of the inventory was completed, however an inventory update has not yet commenced. The MNRF District Forester organised a meeting in March 2018 with various Nedaak staff including their GIS Officer and MNRF Regional staff to go over deficiencies in the inventory as a result of the discrepancies resulting from the FTG/SEM exercise in recommendation #10. Due to the delay in actioning this recommendation, and the fact that the results of the updated inventory will also be required to initiate the 2021 Kenogami FMP, the completion of this action item is delayed.
2. **This action is considered ongoing.** See recommendation #4

Future tracking requirements:

1. The Planning Inventory Checkpoint (as per FMPM Page A-20) for 2021 Kenogami FMP will document progress in meeting this recommendation.
2. See Recommendation #4

Principle 8: Contractual Obligations

Recommendation #13:

The MNRF District Manager must ensure that the IFA Action Plan is submitted in accordance with the due date established in the Independent Forest Audit Process and Protocol (IFAPP) and that all Action Plan items are addressed within an appropriate period of time.

Action required:

1. An action plan production schedule will be prepared to ensure the action plan will be submitted by the District Manager within 2 months of acceptance of the final audit report by the Forestry Futures Committee.
2. The action plan will be prepared in accordance with the action plan production schedule.
3. For each audit recommendation the action plan will include actions required and deadline dates to address the issues identified in the audit report as soon as possible. These actions required will be implemented by the deadline dates.

Progress to date:

1. **This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. In March 2016, the submission of the action plan followed the 2015 audit recommendations and outlines actions required.
2. **This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. The action plan production schedule was followed.
3. **This action is considered complete.** No future tracking is required. The audit recommendations had varying timelines. All but one deadline was met (recommendation #12 is not complete) and some recommendations are ongoing (i.e. tracking).