

# 2015 Independent Forest Audit Provincial Action Plan Status Report

***Dog River-Matawin Forest (2010-2015)***

***English River Forest (2010-2015)***

***Kenogami Forest (2010-2015)***

***Red Lake Forest (2010-2015)***

***Trout Lake Forest (2009-2015)***

***Wabigoon Forest (2010-2015)***

***Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry***



## Contents

2015 Independent Forest Audit Provincial Action Plan Status Report .....	1
2015 Provincial Action Plan Status Report Submission Signature Page .....	4
2015 Provincial Action Plan Endorsement Signature Page .....	6
Introduction .....	7
Recommendations .....	8
Principle 2: Public Consultation and Aboriginal Involvement .....	8
Trout Lake Forest Recommendation #2: .....	8
Principle 3: Forest Management Planning .....	8
English River Forest Recommendation #2: .....	8
Dog River-Matawin Forest Recommendation #1:.....	8
Kenogami Forest Recommendation #1:.....	9
Kenogami Forest Recommendation #2:.....	9
Principle 4: Plan Assessment and Implementation .....	10
English River Forest Recommendation #4: .....	10
English River Forest Recommendation #5: .....	10
English River Forest Recommendation #6: .....	12
English River Forest Recommendation #8: .....	12
Trout Lake Forest Recommendation #8: .....	13
Trout Lake Forest Recommendation #10: .....	13
Principle 6: Monitoring .....	14
Dog River-Matawin Forest Recommendation #3:.....	14
Red Lake Forest Recommendation #17:.....	14
Trout Lake Forest Recommendation #13: .....	16
Principle 8: Contractual Obligations.....	18
English River Recommendation #10:.....	18
Other (outside of Principles 1-8):.....	18
Trout Lake Forest Recommendation #7: .....	18
SFL Licences .....	19
Licence Extension .....	19
<i>English River Forest</i> .....	19
<i>Dog River-Matawin Forest</i> .....	19
<i>Wabigoon Forest</i> .....	20

<i>Red Lake Forest</i> .....	20
<i>Trout Lake Forest</i> .....	20
Licence review .....	20

## 2015 Provincial Action Plan Status Report Submission Signature Page

### **Prepared By:**

*Linda Touzin, R.P.F.*  
*Sr. Program Advisor - Forestry, Program Coordination Section*  
MNRF, Regional Operations Division, Integration Branch

### **Reviewed By:**

Date: December 3, 2020  
*Stephen Duda*  
*A/Manager, Divisional Support Section*  
MNRF, Regional Operations Division, Integration Branch

Date: January 19, 2021  
*Kevin Ride*  
*Manager, Forest Initiatives Lead*  
MNRF, Regional Operations Division, Northwest Region

Date: January 4, 2021  
*Hugh Lougheed*  
*Manager, Forest Management Policy Section*  
MNRF, Policy Division, Crown Forests and Lands Policy Branch

Date: January 12, 2021  
*Spooner Collins*  
*Manager, Forest Planning Policy Section*  
MNRF, Policy Division, Crown Forests and Lands Policy Branch

Date: January 4, 2021  
*David de Geus*  
*Manager, Timber Allocation and Licensing Section*  
MNRF, Forest Industry Division, Operations Branch

Date: December 21, 2020

*Michelle Colley,*

*Manager, Natural Resources Information Section*

MNRF, Provincial Services Division, Science and Research Branch

## 2015 Provincial Action Plan Endorsement Signature Page

### **Approved By:**

Date: February 4, 2021

*Michael Gluck*

*Regional Director*

MNRF, Regional Operations Division, Northwest Region

Date: February 9, 2021

*Andrew Lock*

*A/Regional Director*

MNRF, Regional Operations Division, Northeast Region-Far North

Date: February 8, 2021

*Deb Weedon*

*A/Director*

MNRF, Forest Industry Division, Operations Branch

Date: February 9, 2021

*Dan Puddister on behalf of Trisha Westman*

*A/Director*

MNRF, Provincial Services Division, Science and Research Branch

Date: February 5, 2021

*Peter Henry*

*Director*

MNRF, Policy Division, Crown Forests and Lands Policy Branch

Date: February 19, 2021

*Kathy Woeller*

*Director*

MNRF, Regional Operations Division, Integration Branch

## Introduction

Independent Forest Audits (IFAs) were conducted on the following six Forest Management Units (FMUs) in Ontario in 2015, for the years described:

- Dog River-Matawin Forest (2010-2015)
- English River Forest (2010-2015)
- Kenogami Forest (2010-2015)
- Red Lake Forest (2010-2015)
- Trout Lake Forest (2009-2015)
- Wabigoon Forest (2010-2015)

The audits were undertaken according to the Independent Forest Audit Process and Protocol 2015 (IFAPP) which met the requirements of the Crown Forest Sustainability Act (CFSA) and the conditions of MNR's Class Environmental Assessment for Forest Management in Ontario (2003) as amended. It also met the requirements of Ontario Regulation 160/04 made under the CFSA (governing Independent Forest Audits).

The status report addresses the 16 recommendations directed at corporate or regional levels of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) in the 2015 IFAs. The information in this status report is organized according to the Independent Forest Audit Process and Protocol (IFAPP) principles. The status of each recommendation is reported according to Appendix F of the IFAPP and includes each recommendation and its corresponding required actions (as written in the approved Provincial Action Plan), associated progress to date and future tracking requirements, if applicable.

The IFAPP requires the submission of a provincial status report two years following provincial action plan approval or more frequently as may be required by the action plan or Minister. The 2015 Provincial Action Plan was approved November 30, 2018.

The approved 2015 Provincial Action Plan Status Report will be made available on the Ontario government website.

## Recommendations

### Principle 2: Public Consultation and Aboriginal Involvement

#### **Trout Lake Forest Recommendation #2:**

Corporate MNRF shall consult with the Métis Nation of Ontario regarding the asserted Métis rights on the Trout Lake Forest and attempt to reach a common understanding regarding those rights.

#### **Action Required:**

Action has been completed. MNRF is committed to building a strong relationship with the Métis Nation of Ontario and ensuring that rights bearing Métis communities are respected. Recently, Ontario and the Métis Nation of Ontario collaborated on the identification of six historic Métis communities in Ontario. One of the communities identified is the Rainy River/Lake of the Woods Historic Métis Community. MNRF is working directly with the Métis Nation of Ontario to develop mechanisms that will enhance participation by Métis rights bearing communities in forest management planning. This participation will provide MNRF with a better understanding of the nature, location, and extent of asserted Métis rights and lead to better decision making, respect and protection of these asserted rights.

### Principle 3: Forest Management Planning

#### **English River Forest Recommendation #2:**

Corporate MNRF shall provide financial compensation to the SFL holder and additional staff and budget resources to the MNRF District and Region in the event the late delivery of the Forest Resources Inventory (FRI) delays the preparation of the 2019-2029 forest management plan to a point that necessitates the preparation of a contingency plan or plan extension.

#### **Action Required:**

1. No Action Required. The English River Forest FRI was delivered November 2015 as scheduled; as of November 2017, the SFL holder has not submitted a proposal for a plan extension or a contingency plan.
2. If a Contingency Plan or Extension is proposed by the SFL, adequate resources to support the planning requirements will be made available to the MNRF District and Region.

#### ***Progress to date:***

1. Complete at time of action plan preparation.
2. Complete. A six-month extension was requested by the SFL and approved by the MNRF with no compensation required.

#### **Dog River-Matawin Forest Recommendation #1:**



The Forest Resources Inventory Unit must ensure the timely delivery of FRI products in order to facilitate the incorporation of more current forest resource information in forest management plans.

**Action Required:**

Complete. According to the Forest Management Planning Schedule, the Dog River-Matawin FRI was to be delivered on December 15, 2015. The Dog-River-Matawin FRI was delivered on October 26, 2015.

**Kenogami Forest Recommendation #1:**

The MNRF Region must ensure that the FMP Steering Committee meets its obligations and responsibilities to provide guidance and direction to the FMP Planning Team to ensure that the FMP is produced and approved on time.

**Actions Required:**

1. A steering committee will be formed which will include the District Manager, SFL Holder (or a Senior member of the Plan Author's company in the case of a Crown unit) and Regional Forest Resources Planning Supervisor and be included in the Phase 2 2016 Kenogami FMP Terms of Reference. Together, the committee will meet to provide direction or solutions for planning team issues identified by the planning team.
2. An MNRF representative will document minutes and any action items resulting from steering committee meetings that occur during the development of the phase 2 Kenogami FMP. The Draft Minutes/Action Items will be distributed amongst the Steering Committee members for review and acceptance. The decisions as well as action items will be communicated to the planning team through the project manager in a timely manner and any action items will be assigned to the appropriate task team. Should a task team not exist the Project Manager and Plan author will form an appropriate task team to ensure the steering committee decision or action item is addressed.

***Progress to date:***

1. Complete. A steering committee was established and in place for the Phase II 2011-2021 Kenogami Forest Management Plan. The list of Steering Committee members is documented in the MNRF Regional Director approved Terms of Reference for the 2011- 2021 Phase II plan and is available on the eFMP website.
2. Complete. No planning team decisions/action items, as a result of planning team meetings, required Steering Committee intervention, therefore no steering committee meeting minutes or decisions are on record

**Kenogami Forest Recommendation #2:**

The MNRF Natural Resource Information Section (Forest Resources Inventory Unit) must meet planned timelines for the delivery of the Forest Resource Inventory and ensure the quality of the inventory products.

**Action Required:**

1. The Kenogami Forest was on track to produce a 2010 Forest Management Plan (FMP). A one-year contingency plan (CP) was developed to enable the planning team to utilise a newer 2005 vintage Forest Resources Inventory (FRI). A 2011 Kenogami FMP was produced using the new 2005 FRI.
2. Phase II of that plan was completed for 2016. The next plan will be a 2021 - 2031 FMP. A new FRI-will not be fully delivered ahead of the upcoming FMP schedule. As products from the FRI production process, such as, aerial imagery and LiDAR become available, they will be utilized to the full extent possible to inform operational decisions as the plan will be built on a 2005 FRI.

***Progress to date:***

1. Complete at time of action plan preparation.
2. Partially complete. LiDAR data have been collected in the northern portion of the Kenogami forest. LiDAR calibration field plots are being collected in 2020, in collaboration with the Sustainable Forest Licensee and the Forestry Futures Trust. LiDAR data are scheduled to be collected across the balance of the unit in 2020-21.

***Organization and position responsible:***

1. N/A
2. MNRF, Provincial Services Division, Natural Resources Information Section Manager

***Deadline date:*** 2022-23 fiscal year.

***Future tracking requirements:***

1. N/A
2. Continue to track data acquisition across the unit on an annual basis and annual updates to the Sustainable Forest Licence holder and Regional Operations Division.

## Principle 4: Plan Assessment and Implementation

### **English River Forest Recommendation #4:**

Regional MNRF staff shall provide guidance to District MNRF staff on the "sign off" process for completion/approval of harvest block road rehabilitation efforts by Resolute Forest Products.

**Action Required:**

Complete at time of action plan preparation.

No action required. Regional staff are now involved directly in FMP planning and reporting and are providing the necessary guidance when road use management strategies are being developed.

### **English River Forest Recommendation #5:**

Regional MNRF staff should provide clear criteria and expected outcomes for decommissioning and reclaiming of roads.

**Actions Required:**

1. Regional staff are now involved directly in FMP planning and reporting and are providing the necessary guidance to increase clarity and consistency in Road Use Management Strategies (RUMS).
2. The MNRF Regional Planning Unit Supervisor will form a task team to review current RUMS and develop a suite of new Road Use Management Strategies that are consistent across the region and address specific criteria and expected outcomes for decommissioning and reclaiming of roads.

**Progress to date:**

1. Complete at time of action plan preparation.
2. Partially Complete. The development of a suite of RUMs for the northwest region was dependent upon the completion of the roads renewal and rehabilitation project task team (RRRP). Work undertaken by the RRRP task team to facilitate the transfer of SLF roads has led to the development the *Roads Transfer Implementation Bulletin (NER MNRF- June, 2019)* which will inform planning teams as well as industry and MNRF staff practitioners on an accepted process in the NER to transfer the responsibility of roads and road networks, with associated infrastructure, from the SFL to the MNRF or a third party (e.g., cottage association).

This bulletin is currently in the review and approvals stage for similar implementation in the NWR and has not been formally distributed for use. However, in anticipation of similar direction being adopted by planning teams working on the development of forthcoming FMPs, the NW Regional Planning Unit's (RPU) Forest Management Planning Specialist provided the NER roads transfer bulletin to NWR planning teams to incorporate into new FMPs at their discretion with a caveat to this effect and to provide the most recently available guidance to industry and MNRF staff on roads use management strategies (RUMS); transferring roads responsibility, decommissioning, and reporting.

**Future Tracking:**

1. N/A
2. FMP roads supplementary documentation

**Organization and position responsible:**

1. N/A
2. Regional Planning Unit Supervisor

**Deadline date:**

1. N/A
2. April 1, 2023 and ongoing

### **English River Forest Recommendation #6:**

Regional MNRD shall provide MNRD District with interim direction on the criteria to be used for closure of an “A” caribou block.

#### **Action Required:**

Regional staff are now involved directly in FMP planning and are providing the necessary guidance for the identification of factors for consideration when closing caribou “A” blocks.

#### **Progress to date:**

Complete. During Long Term Management Direction (LTMD) FMP training sessions in Thunder Bay on October 24-25, 2018, the NW Regional Planning Unit (Regional Forest Management Specialist, Regional Planning Biologist) presented new information outlining a process for determining the appropriate pathways of end of term DCHS blocks (e.g. block carryover, closures etc.) in addition to a DCHS Block Status Evaluation report template to guide teams for compiling information when examining the pathways of planned or existing DCHS blocks. This template which was not available during development of the English River FMP has now been made available to 2021 planning teams.

The DCHS Block Status Report provides the reader with an appropriate level of detail and user-friendly information about the status of harvesting activities and forest condition within a DCHS block. This information should assist teams to determine the recommended future pathway for individual DCHS blocks that near the end of their open-timed period.

In practise, the results of this report’s assessment will assist Planning Teams in determining whether to close a DCHS block to harvest, or to carry forward the DCHS block (or a portion of the block) as open for harvest into the next plan term.

Teams were advised that this assessment should occur before or during the development of the Long-Term Management Direction (LTMD), specifically the early stages of reviewing and revising the DCHS.

### **English River Forest Recommendation #8:**

Corporate MNRD should provide a glossary of commonly used words and phrases, including operational terms, related to decommissioning or reclamation of roads and linear features.

#### **Action Required:**

Complete at time of action plan preparation.

The Forest Management Planning Manual (FMPM), 2009 contains a glossary which included the term Decommissioning. The FMPM, 2017 also includes a glossary in which the term Decommissioning was updated to provide further clarity regarding the required physical activity to be completed to decommission forest access roads (e.g., site preparation and regeneration, removal of water crossing(s)). The FMPM, 2017 only

refers to road construction and decommissioning. The FMPM, 2017 does not refer to terms such as rehabilitated, reclaimed, retired, or restored in relation to forest access roads, therefore, these terms were not included in the Glossary. No further action required.

### **Trout Lake Forest Recommendation #8:**

Corporate MNRF shall explore the value of engaging in a broader modeling exercise during forest management planning that includes scenarios based on maximum possible harvest rates, recent historic rates, and probable future rates to strengthen the basis for identifying objectives and planning for the future forest.

#### **Action Required:**

Complete at time of action plan preparation.

This recommendation was addressed by revisions made to the Forest Management Planning Manual (FMPM). The 2017 FMPM includes a requirement to conduct a risk assessment during the preparation of the long-term management direction. When identifying risks, the planning team will consider access limitations, recommendations identified in independent forest audits, and the year five management unit annual report. The risk assessment will include an investigation of recent wood utilization and an evaluation of the potential implications on the achievement of management objectives.

### **Trout Lake Forest Recommendation #10:**

Corporate MNRF shall strongly consider retaining an active role in assisting MNRF Districts and companies in training compliance inspectors.

#### **Action Required:**

MNRF's responsibilities with respect to the provincial forest compliance program rests with the Regional Operations Division, specifically with Integration Branch in consultation with the Regional offices.

1. On an annual basis, in order to achieve a higher forest compliance examination success rate, Integration Branch will ensure MNRF districts and companies are aware of the prerequisites needed prior to taking the forest compliance certification field exam.
2. MNRF Integration Branch will consider input from the regions as to the forest compliance training needs of district and/or company staff and will work with the regions to deliver pertinent training.

#### **Progress to date:**

1. Complete. Integration Branch has communicated the pre-requisites of the forest compliance certification session through email correspondence when outlining details of an upcoming forest compliance certification session. In addition, the candidate inspectors, their supervisor and their mentor must complete a "checklist" to confirm that they have completed the pre-requisites and confirm their commitment to the endeavours of the candidate.

2. Partially complete. In 2019, Integration Branch initiated a project to modernize the forest compliance program. Two surveys were sent to MNRF and forest industry staff soliciting input on how best to improve the program. This input is being used to modernize the program, a component of which is the training and support for current and future forest compliance inspectors.

***Future tracking requirements:***

1. N/A
2. The project team will continue to work on the project with an expected partial roll-out in 2021. Documentation related to the project to modernize the forest compliance program are found in the Integration Branch files

***Organization and position responsible:***

1. N/A
2. Regional Operations Division, Integration Branch, Divisional Support Section Manager

***Deadline date:***

Anticipated implementation in 2021-2023.

**Principle 6: Monitoring**

**Dog River-Matawin Forest Recommendation #3:**

The Crown Forests and Lands Policy Branch should evaluate the adoption of broadly defined forest type groups for the reporting of silviculture success.

**Action Required:**

Complete at time of action plan preparation.

Forest Health & Silviculture Section (FHSS) has commenced a Silviculture Enhancement Initiative (SEI) with the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of renewal and maintenance efforts and making improvements where required. Through this initiative FHSS will review its direction for Silviculture Effectiveness Monitoring (SEM) Free-to-Grow (FTG) assessments including the sequencing of FTG reporting in Annual Reports.

In 2017, the Forest Management Planning Manual (FMPM), Forest Information Manual (FIM) and the Forest Operations and Silviculture Manual (FOSM) were revised to incorporate the direction of the Minister's decisions made in the SEI. This includes the reporting of regeneration status according to the forest types defined in the forest management plan.

**Red Lake Forest Recommendation #17:**

Regional or Corporate MNRF compliance staff shall work with all certified Red Lake Forest Management Company Ltd. (RLFMC) and District MNRF compliance inspectors

active on the RLF to review Procedure 07 03 05 in the Forest Compliance Handbook, particularly the sections dealing with non-compliance identification and the operational issue management process, to ensure that the intent of the system is clearly understood and applied appropriately by industry and MNRF compliance inspectors on the Red Lake Forest.

**Action Required:**

A Northwest regional forest compliance committee (NWFCC) has been formed to assist in the delivery of the Ministry's Forestry Compliance Program in the Northwest by sharing information and expertise, liaising with other Branches/Divisions and industry on forestry compliance matters. The committee's mandate is intended to provide advice, information, leadership and direction to Districts, the Regional Director, and Integration Branch on forestry compliance matters. One of the purposes of the committee is to identify the need for workshops, district visits or other compliance training needs from the field. The committee will assess and work with all certified RLFMC and District MNRF compliance inspectors active on the Red Lake Forest to ensure the intent of the forest compliance handbook is being met and any gaps in training are addressed.

**Progress to date:**

Ongoing. The northwest regional compliance committee continues to convene as necessary or as requested to discuss compliance issues, training concerns or for clarification on existing and new interpretation as well as implementation of the compliance manual's directives and remedies. Outside of this, the region provides on-going support and advice to districts as requested or upon change in compliance manual directives and their application.

**Future tracking requirements:**

Committee meetings convened as issues brought forth.

**Organization and position responsible:**

MNRF Regional Operations Division Northwest Region Compliance Committee Members (i.e. Northwest Regional Operations Specialist/District Management Foresters/ Resources Supervisors and Integrated resource Management Technicians)

**Deadline date:**

N/A- ongoing and part of regular business extending beyond the scope of the approved action plan. The committee meets as required as issues are brought forward.

**Method of tracking progress:**

Northwest region compliance committee minutes and agendas, compliance training and certification program attendance lists; list of newly certified or recertified inspectors, adhoc meeting minutes and agendas, email correspondence.

### **Trout Lake Forest Recommendation #13:**

Until appropriate standards, field methods and corresponding technical specifications for silvicultural effectiveness monitoring are developed, Corporate MNRF shall provide support to Red Lake District to ensure that an appropriate program for silvicultural effectiveness monitoring is implemented for the Trout Lake Forest.

#### **Action Required:**

1. The Northwest Regional office will develop and deliver annually direction for District SEM programs until ROD implementation direction is completed for the Silviculture Enhancement Initiative. This will include direction on setting targets and appropriate methodologies to use when reviewing the SFLs Annual Report's renewal results (i.e FTG).
2. The Regional Office will provide training to the District office on assessment methodologies and data gathering software and hardware.

#### **Progress to date:**

1. Ongoing. Since the 2015 IFA and during the recent discussions related to the development of the Silvicultural Effectiveness Monitoring Program, the regional office has provided direction each year to the Districts with respect to the goals and focus of the SEM program. Each district has been allowed to identify areas of concern regarding areas identified as FTG and subsequently investigate to determine the efficacy/quality and success of silvicultural treatments.

Up until 2019, this direction has since provided,

- the flexibility for MNRF Districts to identify targets that they believed they were sufficiently resourced to achieve
- focus on areas of concern that may have been raised by the previous MNRF SEM program, IFA audits or specific MNRF District concerns or priorities

District offices annually provided the results to the Regional office in spring and winter.

From 2019 and up to until recently, the direction provided by the MNRF Regional Operations Division (ROD) has focused on the following objectives:

- Transition period to implementing Silvicultural Enhancement Initiative (SEI) direction that has been incorporated into the 2017 FMPM and 2017 FOSM
- Validate the accuracy of the Forest Managers establishment assessment results

The associated targets: currently under development, were intended to be regionally MNRF developed using associated policies as well as technical documents enabled through the Forest Operations and Silviculture Manual (FOSM).

The current framework (ROD developed and delivered MNRF SEM 2015-2018) should be considered transitioning to a different model. As a response to the 2011 Auditor



General's Report, Policy Division undertook a review of silviculture monitoring which culminated in the Silviculture Enhancement Initiative (SEI). This initiative identified opportunities for improvement that were incorporated into the Regulated Manuals in 2017 (FMPM, FIM, FOSM). Implementation direction (i.e. associated policies which are identified/enabled in FOSM) for the new direction in the FMPM has been in development since late 2016 through a collaborative effort between MNRF Policy Division and ROD.

The implications of the draft direction for the current MNRF SEM program is significant and will once again result in changes to the objectives and the direction that is provided to District offices in the future. The direction that pertains to MNRF District SEM (which will become "SM" or simply "Silviculture Monitoring") programs is still in a draft format and has at this time not been approved. The intent of the direction is to continue with a ROD led SM program model, implemented out of the District offices, and which would be tasked with the validation of the SFL holder/Forest Manager's accuracy of establishment (Free To Grow) assessment information.

During this transitional period (i.e. until the implementation direction receives approval) MNRF District offices have been instructed to:

- Subject to current resourcing levels and the priority of field activities, continue to assess the Forest Manger's renewal results with the objective of identifying the accuracy of the submission
  - Apply the concept of risk when selecting appropriate assessment methodologies (more to less intensive) for survey blocks by reviewing the complexity of the attribute information to be validated.
2. Ongoing. Since 2010, the northwest regional office has regularly provided proprietary data gathering software as well as annual online and Adobe-based training through the license provider as part of the subscription, in order to provide districts with current in-field data gathering technology.

More recently, in 2018, the region increased and provided each district office with additional field tablets and GIS hardware which work in real time to provide advanced geospatial abilities with the data acquisition software for facilitating sample accuracy and navigation by crews in the field.

Software training for MNRF staff is made available annually as part of the license renewal with the service and training on the GIS software and tablets is provided by the Regional GIS officers each year. In addition, MNRF staff have access to the software providers technical staff as they encounter issues.

***Future tracking requirements:***

1. Annual correspondence providing direction on annual SEM targets and field data and GIS software training
2. N/A: training with software and hardware systems is being provided annually by the region

**Organization and position responsible:**

1. MNRF Regional Operations Division, Regional Operations Specialist, Forested Ecosystems Science Specialists;
2. MNRF Regional Operations Division, Forested Ecosystems Science Specialists; Regional Forest Operations Specialists; Regional RIAU GIS RIAU staff.

**Deadline date:**

1. N/A
2. N/A

**Method of tracking progress:**

1. Correspondence, training attendance lists, survey reports/data
2. Hardware and Software Training attendance lists and agendas; correspondence with software service provider, district software licenses and user lists.

**Principle 8: Contractual Obligations**

**English River Recommendation #10:**

Corporate MNRF must either extend Sustainable Forest License #542454 or notify the license holder of the reasons why the license is not being extended.

**Action Required:**

Complete at time of action plan preparation. No action required. The licence was extended to March 31, 2033 in January of 2018.

**Other (outside of Principles 1-8):**

**Trout Lake Forest Recommendation #7:**

The Forest Industry Division of MNRF and Domtar shall seek to increase the use of wood from the Trout Lake Forest, including making unused wood available to users who have not been traditional users of wood from the Forest.

**Action Required:**

Timber Allocation and Licensing Section will continue to report on wood supply opportunities for all forests, including the Trout Lake Forest, via public facing Available Wood Reports. To ensure the report is accurately reflecting available supplies on the

Trout Lake Forest, MNRF will complete a Wood Utilization Review in accordance with Forest Management Directives and Procedures FOR 03 01 19, Monitoring the Use of Crown Wood Supply. Results of this review, if applicable, will be reflected in future Available Wood Reports.

***Progress to date:***

Complete. As part of its regular business, the MNRF works with forest management unit managers and existing industry stake holders to estimate the available wood supplies on each management unit in Ontario, and produces the Ontario Available Wood Report that identifies the annual wood supply estimated to be potentially available and provides contact information for unit managers who can market available wood supplies. This report is available through the Ontario Open Data Catalogue.

The MNRF is finalizing the Wood Utilization Review of the Trout Lake Forest in accordance with Forest Management Directives and Procedure FOR 03 01 19, Monitoring the Use of Crown Wood Supply. Development of Wood Utilization Reviews has become part of the MNRF's regular business.

## SFL Licences

### Licence Extension

This section describes the licence extension recommendations made by the applicable auditors in 2015. The Kenogami Forest is managed by the Crown and is therefore not included in the list below.

#### ***English River Forest Recommendation on Licence Extension***

The audit team concludes that management of the English River Forest was generally in compliance with the legislation, regulations and policies that were in effect during the term covered by the audit, and the English River Forest was managed in compliance with the terms and conditions of the Sustainable Forest License held by Resolute Forest Products. Forest sustainability is being achieved, as assessed through the Independent Forest Audit Process and Protocol. The audit team recommends the Minister extend the term of Sustainable Forest Licence #542454 for a further five years.

#### ***Dog River-Matawin Forest Recommendation on Licence Extension***

The audit team concludes that management of the Dog River-Matawin Forest was generally in compliance with the legislation, regulations and policies that were in effect during the term covered by the audit, and the Forest was managed in compliance with the terms and conditions of the Sustainable Forest Licence held by Resolute FP Canada Inc. Forest sustainability is being achieved, as assessed through the Independent Forest Audit Process and Protocol. The audit team recommends the Minister extend the term of the Sustainable Forest Licence # 542459 for a further five years.

### **Wabigoon Forest Recommendation on Licence Extension**

The audit team concluded that forest sustainability as assessed through the 2015 Independent Forest Audit Process and Protocol is being achieved. The audit team recommends the Minister extend the term of the Sustainable Forest Licence # 541953 for a further five years.

### **Red Lake Forest Recommendation on Licence Extension**

The audit team recommends the Minister extend the term of Sustainable Forest Licence 542548 for a further five years, only upon confirmation that the following two conditions have been satisfied: a) RLFMC shall develop a more robust and integrated information management system, paying particular attention to the aspects of document control, filing systems, organizing field notes, maintaining records, and developing procedures for storing back-ups off-site and performing quality control checks on mapped information; and b) the Company shall revise its business plan, for the acceptance of MNRF, to demonstrate the continued viability of the RLFMC and its ability to fully meet the obligations and responsibilities as an SFL-holder.

### **Trout Lake Forest Recommendation on Licence Extension**

The audit team concludes that management of the Trout Lake Forest was generally in compliance with the legislation, regulations and policies that were in effect during the term covered by the audit, and the Forest was managed in compliance with the terms and Sustainable Forest Licence held by Domtar Inc. Forest sustainability is being achieved, as assessed through the Independent Forest Audit Process and Protocol. The audit team recommends the Minister extend the term of Sustainable Forest Licence 542461 for a further five years.

### **Licence review**

MNRF will undertake a review of the Sustainable Forest Licences (SFLs) to ensure the terms and conditions of the licence have been achieved by the licensee. The following outlines the planned details of this review program.

#### **2015 SFL Licence Reviews**

#### **Actions:**

1. A review of the applicable SFLs for the above forests will be conducted to ensure the licensees have complied with the terms and conditions of the licence. As part of the review, IFA recommendations will be considered in accordance with Section 9 of the SFL.
2. Results of the reviews will be evaluated and if satisfactory, will be advanced to the Minister for his/her consideration.

#### **Progress to date:**

1. Complete. The licence reviews for the applicable SFLs for the above forests have been completed. IFA reports and recommendations which were approved and tabled

in the legislature at the time the reviews were completed were considered. However, the approved results of the 2015 IFAs were not tabled in the legislature at that time and will be considered during the next SFL reviews.

2. Complete. The licences on the above forests have been extended by the Minister.