

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

Client Details			
Scope of Certification	Procurement and sale of plantation and native forest woodchips for export. Physical separation method.		
Certificate Number	PEFC 693186	Expiry date	27 June 2028
SMO/s	3780244	ABN/ACN	91 628 769 359
Applicable Standard/s	PEFC ST 2002:2013 and PEFC ST 2002:2020		
Site Name/s	Head Office and Burnie Chip Export Facility	Assessment method:	On-site Assessment
Location Reference	FOREST-0047483115-001	No of employees (FTE)	3
Site Address	Level 1, 99 Bathurst Street HOBART Tasmania 7000		
Client Representative	[REDACTED]		
Product group/s	Woodchips, roundwood and sawn timber products		
Annual Turnover (\$)	[REDACTED]	Notification Fee Category	Large
RW Logo Identifier	RW/1-31-324	PEFC Logo Identifier	PEFC/21-31-324
Assessor Details			
Assessor	[REDACTED]	Role	Team Leader
Witness/Observer	N/A		

Objective and Scope of Audit	
Objective:	Verify conformance with the nominated Standard/s.
Scope of audit:	Procurement and sale of plantation and native forest woodchips for export. Physical separation method.
Criteria:	PEFC ST 2002:2020
Recommendation:	Certification continued

Executive Summary
<p>This report presents the findings of a surveillance assessment of Sustainable Timber Tasmania's chain of custody processes, with respect to conformance with PEFC ST 2002:2013 and PEFC ST 2002:2020.</p> <p>The audit included interviews with key personnel from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and inspection at the Burnie Chip Export Terminal site to assess implementation of the Chain of Custody system.</p> <p>STT continues to operate a very simple chain of custody system with 100% certified input. Key system processes such as internal audit and management review are effective. Non-conformances identified as part of a recent internal audit are being managed.</p> <p>There were no non-conformances to close from the previous assessment and no new non-conformances were identified in this assessment. Opportunities for improvement are included in this report.</p> <p>This assessment has confirmed that the management system continues to meet the requirements of the nominated Standards and supports a recommendation for continued certification to PEFC ST 2002-2020.</p>

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

Audit Participants				
Name	Position	Entry Meeting	Exit Meeting	Int.
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Summary of Findings and Actions

Major and Minor non-conformances identified during the previous assessment		
Reference	Verification of actions taken.	Status
	(Delete table or rows if not applicable)	Choose an item.
		Choose an item.
		Choose an item.

Observations identified during this assessment	
Reference	Findings
Observation #1	It was stated that sawmill residues from [REDACTED] are no longer supplied and can be removed from the product category descriptions as a supplied product in the Woodchip Operation Chain of Custody Procedure. Similarly, the chipping activity at [REDACTED] is not within the boundaries of the Chain of Custody System being the point of transfer and claim input at the TasPort weighbridge and output as the claim on the STT Invoice to the customer FOB the Ship.
Observation #2	The SOP Woodchip Unloading V3 [REDACTED] Woodchip Unloading Truck Platform 2020 does not include training for [REDACTED] drivers delivery to South Stockpile (nor other drivers delivering material to North and East Stockpiles) of which stockpile to select when tipping Chips.
Observation #3	It could not be confirmed that non-conformities arising from the most recent internal audit conducted on the 8 May 2024 and which related to procedural updates since the auditor had not yet been provided with the most recent version of the procedure.
Observation #4	[REDACTED] are a contracted service provider, however the reference to the definition refers to the superseded AS4707:2014 standard. [REDACTED] may be deemed to be an outsourced process under the new standard.
Observation #5	The Chain of Custody Procedure states that if wrong supplier material i.e. from stockpile North of East is placed on South Stockpile then a equal weight will be removed from the South Stockpile. Whilst this has apparently not happened in recent years this may require that the entire stockpile is reduce to 0% certified or required recognition (and due diligence processes to be applied) of certification claim of contaminant supplier and their percentage of claim to be applied to the entire stockpile.

Minor non-conformances identified during this assessment		
Reference	Statement of non-conformance	Status

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

	(Delete table or rows if not applicable)	Choose an item.
		Choose an item.

Major non-conformances identified during this assessment		
Reference	Statement of non-conformance	Status
	(Delete table or rows if not applicable)	Choose an item.
		Choose an item.

Next Visit Plan

Next Visit Plan					
Audit type	Surveillance	Duration	8 hrs	Date	1-May-25

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

Audit Findings.

4.1 General Requirements

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
4.1.1 (5.1.3, 8.1)	Is the organisation operating a management system in accordance with the requirements of this Standard, to ensure correct implementation and maintenance of the PEFC chain of custody processes?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Is the management system appropriate to the type, range and volume of work performed, and cover outsourced activities relevant for the organisation's chain of custody (and all sites in the case of multi-site organisations)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.1.2	Scope Has the organisation defined the scope of its PEFC chain of custody by specifying the PEFC product groups for which the requirements of the PEFC chain of custody are implemented?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.1.3	Can the organisation demonstrate that it only makes PEFC claims and PEFC related statements that are correct to the best of its knowledge and covered by its PEFC chain of custody?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Objective evidence:

- Woodchip Operation Chain of Custody Procedure V 8 May 2024

Comments:

The scope of the STT Chain of Custody system does not clearly describe the point at which the transfer of products and claims are made from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] at BCET weighbridge. The product group identified as part of the site visit was E0 which was a mix of native forest and plantations nitens chip.

It was demonstrated that only PEFC Claims are made as part for product categories that are part of the chain of custody system.

Observation #1 - It was stated that sawmill residues from [REDACTED] are no longer supplied and can be removed from the product category descriptions as a supplied product in the Woodchip Operation Chain of Custody Procedure. Similarly, the chipping activity at [REDACTED] is not within the boundaries being the point of transfer and claim input at the Port weighbridge and output as the claim on the Invoice to the customer FOB the Ship.

Assessment conclusion:

Compliant: The company is generally compliant with the requirements of the Standard, however an opportunity for improvement is noted. Refer to comments for details.

4.2 Documented procedures

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
4.2.1 (8.3, 8.4)	Has the organisation established documented procedures for its PEFC chain of custody?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Do the documented procedures include at least the following elements: a) a description of responsibilities and authorities relating to the PEFC chain of custody?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

b) a description of the raw material flow/s within the production/trading process(es), including definition of product groups?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) procedures for PEFC chain of custody process(es) covering all requirements of this standard, including:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. identification of material categories	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. physical separation of PEFC certified material, PEFC controlled sources material and other material	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. definition of product groups, calculation of certified content, management of credit accounts, transfer to outputs (for organisations applying percentage or credit method)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. sale/transfer of products and PEFC claims, including documentation in which PEFC claims are made, and other on- and off-product trademark use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v. record keeping	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
vi. internal audits and non-conformity control	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
vii. the Due Diligence System	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
viii. complaints resolution processes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ix. outsourcing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Objective evidence:

- STT Woodchip Operation Chain of Custody Procedure V 8 May 2024

Comments:

The Chain of Custody Procedure describes the chain of custody management system and its scheme-specific processes.

Records required under the Chain of Custody system are maintained by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

Assessment conclusion:

Compliant: The company is fully compliant with the requirements of the Standard.

4.3 Responsibilities and authorities

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
4.3.1.1 (8.2.1.1)	Policy Has the organisation's management defined and documented its commitment to implement and maintain the chain of custody requirements in accordance with this standard?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Is the organisation's commitment available to the organisation's personnel, suppliers, customers, and other interested parties?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.3.1.2 (8.2.2)	Authorised representative Has the organisation's management appointed a member of the management who, irrespective of other responsibilities, has overall responsibility and authority for the organisation's PEFC chain of custody?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

4.3.2	Has the organisation identified the personnel performing activities for the implementation and maintenance of its PEFC chain of custody and established personnel responsibilities and authorities for the implementation of the procedures 4.2.1 c) i-viii.?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Objective evidence:

- STT Chain of Custody Policy – July 2020
- STT website

Comments:

The Chain of Custody Policy is unchanged and is communicated on the STT website. Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined. The Business Development Manager has overall responsibility for the implementation and maintenance of the Chain of Custody system.

Assessment conclusion:

Compliant: The company is fully compliant with the requirements of the Standard.

4.4 Record keeping

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
4.4.1 (8.4)	In order to provide evidence of conformity with the requirements of this standard, has the organisation established and maintained at least the following records relating to the product groups covered by its PEFC chain of custody?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	a) Records of all suppliers of input material delivered with a PEFC claim, including evidence of the suppliers' PEFC certified status.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Records of all input material, including PEFC claims and documents associated to the delivery of the input material, and for recycled input material, information demonstrating that the definition of recycled material is met.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Records of calculation of the certified content, transfer of the percentage to output products and management of the credit account, as applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d) Records of all products sold/transferred, including PEFC claims and documents associated to the delivery of the output products.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Records of the Due Diligence System, including records of risk assessments and significant risk supplies management, as applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	f) Records of internal audits, periodic chain of custody review, non-conformities and corrective actions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	g) Records on complaints and their resolution.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.4.2	Are records maintained for a minimum period of five years?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

Objective evidence:

- Verification record for [REDACTED] on Responsible Wood Website

Comments:

All relevant records are maintained electronically either in hard copy or electronically.

Records of the due diligence process were available for review where a verification of certification on the Responsible Wood Website was undertaken. Inputs from a certified supplier are deemed to be negligible risk.

Assessment conclusion:

Compliant: The company is fully compliant with the requirements of the Standard.

4.5 Resource management

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
4.5.1 (8.5.1)	Human resources / personnel Has the organisation ensured and demonstrated that all personnel performing activities affecting the implementation and maintenance of its PEFC chain of custody are competent on the basis of appropriate training, education, skills and experience?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.5.2 (8.5.2)	Technical facilities Has the organisation identified, provided and maintained the infrastructure and technical facilities needed for effective implementation and maintenance of its PEFC chain of custody with the requirements of this standard?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Objective evidence:

- SOP for Weighbridge V1
- SOP Woodchip Unloading V3 [REDACTED] Woodchip Unloading Truck Platform 2020

Comments:

[REDACTED] provide induction training to all [REDACTED] personnel who access the facility to tip chips and are trained in both the SOP for Weighbridge and SOP Woodchip Unloading V3 [REDACTED] Woodchip Unloading Truck Platform 2020

Observation #2: The SOP Woodchip Unloading V3 [REDACTED] Woodchip Unloading Truck Platform 2020 does not include training for [REDACTED] drivers delivery to South Stockpile (nor other drivers delivering material to North and East Stockpiles) of which stockpile to select when tipping Chips.

Assessment conclusion:

Compliant: The company is generally compliant with the requirements of the Standard, however an opportunity for improvement is noted. Refer to comments for details.

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

4.6 Inspection and control

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
4.6.1 (8.6)	Internal audit Has the organisation conducted internal audits at least annually, and prior to the initial certification audit, covering its compliance with all requirements of this standard applicable to the organisation, including activities covered by outsourcing, and established corrective and preventive measures if required?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.6.2 (8.2.1.3, 8.6.2)	Management review Has the organisation's top management reviewed the results of the internal audits and the organisation's PEFC chain of custody at least annually?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Objective evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stewardship and Environment Review Aug 23 Forest Management System - Management Review Day Minutes Internal Audit Schedule 2023/24 Internal Audit Woodchip Management 8 May 2024 <p>Comments:</p> <p>A review of the results of the internal audit of the Woodchip procedure as part of the Stewardship and Environment Review Aug 23 indicated no issues. The management review meeting held on the 29 August included Chain of Custody.</p> <p>Records required under the Chain of Custody system are maintained by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]</p> <p>There are planned audits against the Chain of Custody processes for Bell Bay Operations under 4707. The corrective actions included updating the procedure to reflect the due diligence process, revise the procedure to reflect actual product categories, substantiated claim process, and product definition for claims.</p> <p>Assessment conclusion:</p> <p>Compliant: The company is fully compliant with the requirements of the Standard.</p>				

4.7 Complaints

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
4.7.1 (8.3.1)	Has the organisation established procedures for dealing with complaints from suppliers, customers and other parties relating to its chain of custody, reflecting the requirements of 4.7.2 (below)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.7.2 (8.7)	For any complaints received in writing, can the organisation demonstrate that it has:			
	a) formally acknowledged the complaint to the complainant within ten workdays	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) gathered and verified all necessary information to evaluate and validate the complaint and make a decision on the complaint;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

c) formally communicated the decision on the complaint and of the complaint handling process to the complainant; and	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) ensured that appropriate corrective and preventive actions are taken, if necessary?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Objective evidence: N/A Comments: Not assessed as part of this assessment			
Assessment conclusion: Compliant: The company is fully compliant with the requirements of the Standard.			

4.8 Nonconformity and corrective action

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
4.8.1 (8.4)	When a nonconformity with the requirements of this standard is identified through internal or external auditing (or any other process), has the organisation established procedures to: a) react to the nonconformity and, as applicable: i. take action to control and correct it ii. address the consequences b) evaluate the need for action to eliminate the causes of the nonconformity, in order that it does not recur or occur elsewhere, by: i reviewing the nonconformity ii determining the causes of the nonconformity iii determining if similar nonconformities exist, or could potentially occur c) implement any action needed d) review the effectiveness of any corrective action taken e) make changes to the management system, if necessary?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.8.2	Are corrective actions appropriate to the effects of the nonconformities encountered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4.8.3	Has the organisation retained documented information as evidence of: a) the nature of the nonconformities and any subsequent actions taken	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) the results of any corrective action	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Objective evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> STT Woodchip Operation Chain of Custody Procedure - V.8 May 2024 Comments: Observation #3: It could not be confirmed that non-conformities arising from the most recent internal audit conducted on the 8 May 2024 have been actioned and which related to procedural updates since the auditor had not yet been provided with the most recent version of the procedure.				

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

Assessment conclusion:

Compliant: The company is generally compliant with the requirements of the Standard, however an opportunity for improvement is noted. Refer to comments for details.

4.9 Outsourcing

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
4.9.1 (8.8)	Has the organisation outsourced activities covered by its PEFC chain of custody to another entity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.9.2 (8.8)	Through all stages of outsourcing the organisation is responsible for ensuring that all outsourced activities meet the requirements of this standard, including management system requirements. Does the organisation have a written agreement with all entities to whom activities have been outsourced, ensuring that: a) The material/products covered by the organisation's PEFC chain of custody are physically separated from other material or products; and b) The organisation has access to the entity's site(s) for internal and external auditing of outsourced activities for conformity with the requirements of this standard?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Objective evidence:

- STT Woodchip Operation Chain of Custody Procedure - V.8 May 2024

Comments:

Observation #4: [REDACTED] are a contracted service provider, however the reference to the definition refers to the superseded AS4707:2014 standard. [REDACTED] may be deemed to be an outsourced process under the new standard.

Assessment conclusion:

Compliant: The company is generally compliant with the requirements of the Standard, however an opportunity for improvement is noted. Refer to comments for details.

4.10 Social, health and safety requirements in chain of custody

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
4.10.1 (9.2.1)	Can the organisation demonstrate its commitment to comply with the social, health and safety requirements defined in this standard?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.10.2 (9.2.2)	Can the organisation demonstrate that:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	a) workers are not prevented from associating freely, choosing their representatives and bargaining collectively with their employer:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) forced labour is not used:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) workers, who are under the minimum legal age, the age of 15, or the compulsory school attendance age, whichever is higher, are not used:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) workers are not denied equal employment opportunities and treatment; and	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

e) working conditions do not endanger safety or health?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Objective evidence:</p> <p>Site visit identified LOTO Board to isolate heavy plant.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Onsite visit to BCET indicated safety systems were in place to support the management of major shut. Isolation and work permit processes were in place for heavy plant whilst crane lifting activities and other works were being undertaken.</p> <p>PPE is required to be worn as part of site visit. A major maintenance shut was underway at the site the site manager explained traffic management and communications as part of site visit.</p> <p>Assessment conclusion:</p> <p>Compliant: The company is fully compliant with the requirements of the Standard.</p>			

5 Identification of inputs and declaration of outputs

5.1 Identification of input material

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
5.1.1 (4.1.1, 4.1.2)	For each delivery of material used as input for a PEFC product group, has the organisation obtained documentation with the following information from the supplier: a) supplier identification b) product identification c) quantity of products d) delivery identification based on date of delivery, delivery period, or accounting period?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	For inputs with a PEFC claim, does the associated documentation also include: e) the organisation's name as the PEFC customer of the delivery; f) the applicable PEFC claim specifically for each claimed product covered by the documentation; and g) the certificate number of the supplier's PEFC recognised certificate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.1.2	Identification at supplier level:			
5.1.2.1 (4.2.1)	For all inputs delivered with a PEFC claim, has the organisation verified that the supplier is covered by a PEFC recognised certificate on the PEFC website?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.1.2.2 (4.2.2)	For each delivery of material used as input for a PEFC product group, has the organisation classified the material category of the procured material?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

Objective evidence:

- BCET Daily Run
- CO_PLOG_BNCR-4090250524
- Weighbridge calibration Certificate [REDACTED] QA No. [REDACTED] dated 26 Sept 2023
- Burnie Nitens CoMngling Woodchip Vessel - Production Schedule - Weekly Perspective

Comments:

All inputs are 100% PEFC Certified and sourced from the [REDACTED] Chip facility at [REDACTED]. The claim is from STT BNCR-100% RW / PEFC Certified #666543 for delivery on 24.05.24 at 09:32

Assessment conclusion:

Compliant: The company is fully compliant with the requirements of the Standard.

5.2 Declaration of outputs

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
5.2.1 (7.1.3)	For outputs from a PEFC product group for which the organisation makes a PEFC claim to a PEFC customer, has the organisation supplied the customer with documentation that includes the following information for each delivery: a) PEFC customer identification b) the organisation's name as the supplier of the material c) product identification d) quantity of product(s) e) date of delivery / delivery period / accounting period f) the applicable PEFC claim specifically for each claimed product covered by the documentation g) the certificate number of the organisation's PEFC recognised certificate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.2.2	Has the organisation specified the type of documentation in which PEFC claims on outputs are made?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Objective evidence:

- Invoice for V2404 [REDACTED]
- Email dated 1/04/24 [REDACTED]
- Mates Receipt V2404
- Cargo Manifest of MV [REDACTED]/2404
- Certificate of Moisture and Chip Size Analysis

Comments:

Review of process for determining outputs from tonnes over weighbridge to management of stockpile using physical segregation method and shiploading to conversion as part of sales process to Bone Dry Metric Tonnes as part of laboratory report which stated that 53.6% was Dry Fibre Content and therefore quantity was 15,827 BDMT for [REDACTED] where weight loaded was 29,528MT.

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

Manifest report states that for V2404 was 51,969 tonnes and sailing 13 April 2024

The email from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] communicated that there was 38,175.71 available chips for ship loading. Load drafted 29,528 tonnes (as per Mates Receipt) with a remaining stock being 8,647.71 with 2,647t written off and a residual stock after write down of 2,647 t.

Assessment conclusion:

Compliant: The company is fully compliant with the requirements of the Standard.

5.3 Trademark use

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
5.3.1 (7.2)	Is the use of the PEFC trademarks i.e. PEFC logo and labels, chain of custody claims on-product and PEFC initials, in compliance with <i>PEFC ST 2001, PEFC Trademarks Rules – Requirements</i> ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.3.2 (7.2)	Has the organisation obtained a valid trademark license from the PEFC Council or another PEFC authorised body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Objective evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invoice for V2404 [REDACTED] <p>Comments:</p> <p>The chain of custody claim is made on the customer invoice however no logos are used on product</p> <p>Assessment conclusion:</p> <p>Compliant: The company is fully compliant with the requirements of the Standard.</p>				

5.4 Content of recycled material

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
5.4.1 (1.4)	For products covered by the organisation's PEFC chain of custody that include recycled material, has the organisation calculated the content of recycled material based on ISO 14021 and is the organisation able to provide information about it upon request?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Objective evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not required <p>Comments:</p> <p>[REDACTED] does not use or handle recycled material.</p> <p>Assessment conclusion:</p> <p>Compliant: The company is fully compliant with the requirements of the Standard.</p>				

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

6 Chain of custody methods

6.1 General

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
6.1.1	The Chain of custody method/s chosen include:			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Physical separation method	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/> Percentage method			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Credit method			
	Has the organisation chosen the appropriate method/s?			
6.1.2	Has the organisation implemented the chosen chain of custody method(s) of this standard for the specific PEFC product groups?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.1.3	Are PEFC product groups established for products with equivalent input material, with the same measurement unit or units that can be converted into a single measurement unit/?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.1.4	Does the organisation only use PEFC certified material and PEFC controlled sources material as input for PEFC product groups?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Objective evidence: CO_PLOG-BNCM-4090250524 Comments: All input material is 100% PEFC certified as per weighbridge claims.				
Assessment conclusion: Compliant: The company is fully compliant with the requirements of the Standard.				

6.2 Physical separation method

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
6.2.1	Where the organisation is applying the physical separation method, is material with different material categories and different certified content kept separate or clearly identifiable at all stages of the production or trading process?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.2.2	Where material with different certified content is used as input in the same PEFC product group, has the organisation used the lowest certified content of the input as certified content of the output?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6.2.2.1	Where PEFC certified material and PEFC controlled sources material is used as input in the same PEFC product group under the physical separation method, has the organisation claimed the output as PEFC controlled sources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

Objective evidence:

- STT Woodchip Operations – Chain of Custody Procedure V.8 May 2024

Comments:

There is only one material category entering the BCET. There are however other woodchips from other suppliers, namely [REDACTED] that are not within the scope of STT Chain of Custody system. Segregated stockpiles are maintained namely the 'South Stockpile' for STT equipment. Once south stockpile is selected all chip is automatically run out of the conveyer if a change is required before [REDACTED] chip is tipped.

Observation #5: The Chain of Custody Procedure states that if wrong supplier material i.e. from stockpile North or East is placed on South Stockpile, then chips of an equal weight will be removed from the South Stockpile. Whilst this has apparently not happened in recent years this may require that the entire stockpile is reduce to 0% if chip is not certified or require recognition (and due diligence processes to be applied) of certification claim of contaminant chip supplier and their percentage of claim to be applied to the entire stockpile since it may be a lower percentage than 100%.

Assessment conclusion:

Compliant: The company is generally compliant with the requirements of the Standard, however an opportunity for improvement is noted. Refer to comments for details.

6.3 Percentage method

Ref	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
6.3.1	Are PEFC-certified material and PEFC controlled sources material used as input material for the purpose of calculation of certified content?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.3.2	Calculation of certified content			
6.3.2.1	Has the organisation calculated the certified content separately for each PEFC product group and for a specific claim period according to the correct formula?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.3.2.2	Has the organisation calculated the certified content based on a single measurement unit used for all material covered by the calculation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	In case of conversion to a single measurement unit for calculation purposes, has the organisation used generally recognised conversion ratios and methods?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	If a suitable, generally recognised conversion ratio does not exist, has the organisation defined and used a reasonable and credible conversion ratio?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.3.2.3	Has the organisation ensured that, if input material/products include only a proportion of PEFC-certified material, then only the quantity corresponding to the certified content can enter the calculation formula as PEFC-certified material?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Has the organisation ensured that the rest of the material enters the calculation as PEFC controlled sources material?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.3.3	Is the certified content calculated for a PEFC product group used as that percentage in the PEFC claim "X% PEFC certified"?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.3.4	Has the organisation applied the percentage method as rolling percentage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

6.3.5	For organisations applying the rolling percentage, has the organisation calculated the certified content of a PEFC product group and claim period based on material procured during an input period preceding the claim period?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Does the claim period, in the case of rolling percentage, not exceed 3 months and the input period not exceed 12 months (unless justified)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Objective evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note required Comments: Not applicable.				
Assessment conclusion: Choose an item.				

6.4 Credit method

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
6.4.1	Is the credit method used to transfer credits gained from the input of PEFC-certified material to PEFC-controlled sources material within the same PEFC product group?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.4.2	Has the organisation created and managed a credit account for credits gained from input of PEFC-certified material?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Are the credits calculated in a single measurement unit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Has the organisation defined conversion factor(s) for the conversion of the measurement unit(s) of the input components to the output products?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.4.3	Can the organisation demonstrate that the total quantity of credits accumulated in the credit account does not exceed the sum of credits entered into the credit account during the last 24 months?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Has the 24-month maximum period been extended?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	If so, can the organisation justify why the average production period of the product in question is longer than 24 months?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.4.4	Has the organisation applied the credit method for a single claim?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	In situations where the organisation is receiving deliveries of material with a PEFC claim and a claim against another certification system, has the organisation either used it as a combined credit covering both claims or only used one of the received claims for calculating the volume credits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.4.5	Has the organisation calculated the credits using:			
	a) certified content and volume of output products (clause 6.4.8) or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) input material and input-to-output ratio (clause 6.4.7)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.4.6	Does the organisation applying the credit method calculate the credits by multiplying the volume of output products of the claim period with the certified content for the relevant claim period?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

6.4.7	Can the organisation demonstrate that a verifiable ratio between the input material and output products has been used to calculate the credits directly from input of PEFC certified material by multiplying the volume of PEFC certified material input with the input to output ratio?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.4.8	Has the organisation distributed the credits from the credit account to the output products covered by the credit account?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Are the credits distributed to the output products in a way that the certified products will be considered as either having 100% certified content or as having less than 100% certified content and meeting the organisation's own threshold?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Is the result of the volume of output products multiplied by the certified content of the output products equal to the distributed credits withdrawn from the credit account?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Objective evidence:

- Not required

Comments:

Not applicable.

Assessment conclusion:

Choose an item.

7 Due Diligence System (DDS) requirements

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
7.1.1 (5.1, 5.2, 5.3)	Has the organisation exercised due diligence (in line with the PEFC Due Diligence System (DDS) for the avoidance of material from controversial sources laid down in Appendix 1 of this standard) for all material used as input for a PEFC product group, except recycled material?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Has the organisation established that (for material used as input for PEFC product groups) there is "negligible risk" that it originates from controversial sources and that it meets the definition of PEFC controlled sources material?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7.1.2 (5.4)	Has the organisation met the following requirements for PEFC product groups where only input material used was delivered with a PEFC claim by a supplier covered by a PEFC recognised certificate, in implementing its PEFC DDS? by meeting the following requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	a) In order to enable PEFC certified and uncertified entities further down the supply chain to implement a DDS, has the organisation, upon request, provided the information specified in Appendix 1, 2.1 for material passed on with a PEFC claim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	If the organisation did not possess the requested information, was the request passed on to relevant supplier(s) of the organisation (Appendix 1, 2.2)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Where internal or external substantiated concerns on the origin of input material from controversial sources were raised, has the organisation followed up on these concerns following Appendix 1, 4?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

c) Has the organisation defined, documented and implemented a commitment and a procedure, also covering forest and tree based material/products not covered by the organisation's PEFC chain of custody, ensuring that where it is known to the organisation, or where it has received substantiated concerns, that forest and tree based material/products originates in illegal sources (controversial sources, 3.7a), it will not be placed on the market until the concern has been resolved in accordance with Appendix 1, 4?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Objective evidence: N/A Comments: Not assessed as part of this assessment			
Assessment conclusion: Choose an item.			

Appendix 1: Due Diligence System (DDS) requirements

1. General requirements

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
1.1	Does the organisation operate a Due Diligence System (DDS), in accordance with the requirements of this standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Does the PEFC DDS apply to all input forest and tree based material covered by the organisation's PEFC chain of custody and PEFC product groups, with the exception of recycled material?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1.3	Does the PEFC DDS incorporate three steps relating to: a) gathering information b) risk assessment c) management of significant risk supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1.4	If the organisation procures raw material originating from species listed in Appendix I to III of CITES, can it demonstrate that it complies with applicable legislation relating to CITES?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

2. Access to information

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
2.1	In order to enable the organisation to implement the PEFC DDS, does the organisation have access to the following information from its supplier(s): a) Identification of tree species included, or list of tree species potentially included, in the material/product by their common name and/or their scientific name where applicable; and b) Country of harvest of the material and where applicable sub-national region and/or concession of harvest.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

2.2	In order to enable PEFC certified and uncertified entities further down the supply chain to implement a DDS, does the organisation, upon request, provide the information specified in 2.1 of this appendix for material passed on with a PEFC claim?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	If the organisation does not possess the requested information, is the request passed on to relevant supplier(s) of the organisation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3. Risk assessment

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
3.1	Does the organisation carry out a risk assessment, assessing the risk of procuring raw material from controversial sources for all input forest and tree based material covered by the organisation's PEFC chain of custody, with the exception of material/products delivered with a PEFC claim by a supplier with a PEFC recognised certificate, as this material can be considered as having "negligible risk" of originating in controversial sources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.2	Does the organisation's risk assessment result in the classification of material into "negligible" or "significant" risk category.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.3	Is the organisation's risk assessment based on the indicators for risk at origin and supply chain level listed in Tables 1- 3 in Appendix 1?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.4	Where the organisation's risk assessment identifies indicators specified in Table 1, does the organisation consider the material as having "negligible risk" to originate in controversial sources, and conclude the risk assessment without having to consider the indicators outlined in tables 2 and 3?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.5	Where the organisation's risk assessment does not identify indicators specified in Table 1, is the risk assessment continued against indicators outlined in Tables 2 and 3; and where any of these indicators apply, does the organisation consider the material as having "significant risk" to originate from controversial sources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.6	Where none of the indicators outlined in tables 2 and 3 are identified, does the organisation consider the supplies as having "negligible risk" to originate from controversial sources, and conclude the risk assessment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.7	Is the risk assessment carried out for the first delivery of every individual supplier, or for several suppliers, with the same characteristics (as listed in 2.1 of Appendix 1), and the same applicability of indicators according to Tables 1-3?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.8	For all material that is subject to the organisation's risk assessment, does the organisation keep an updated list of characteristics (as listed in 2.1 of Appendix 1) and indicators according to Tables 1-3 for supplies of individual suppliers and suppliers that share the same characteristics?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.9	Is the risk assessment reviewed and if necessary revised at least annually, and when changes regarding the characteristics (as listed in 2.1 of Appendix 1) occur?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4. Substantiated concerns

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
4.1	Does the organisation ensure that substantiated concerns about the potential origin of material covered by the organisation's DDS in controversial sources are promptly investigated, starting no later than ten workdays as of identification of the substantiated concern?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

4.2	If the concern cannot be resolved by the organisation's investigation, is the risk of the relevant material being from controversial sources determined as "significant" and managed in accordance with clause 5 of Appendix 1?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

5. Management of significant risk supplies

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
5.1	General			
5.1.1	For supplies identified as having "significant risk", does the organisation request the supplier to provide additional information and evidence that allows the organisation to classify the supply as having "negligible risk"? Does the organisation request the supplier to: a) Provide the organisation with necessary information to identify the forest area(s) of the raw material and the whole supply chain relating to the "significant risk" supply? b) Enable the organisation to carry out a second party or a third party inspection of the supplier's operation as well as operations of the previous suppliers in the chain?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.1.2	Has the organisation established a second or third party verification program for supplies classified as "significant risk"? Does the verification program cover: a) identification of the whole supply chain and forest area(s) of the supply's origin b) on-site inspection as appropriate; and c) corrective measures as required	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.2	Identification of the supply chain			
5.2.1	Does the organisation require, from all suppliers of "significant risk" supplies, detailed information on the whole supply chain and forest area(s) of the supply's origin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.2.2	Note: In cases where the supplies can be verified as "negligible risk" (according to the indicators in Table 1 in Appendix 1) at one step in the supply chain the organisation is not required to track the whole supply chain to the forest area. Otherwise, has the organisation dealt with any substantiated concerns, and were they addressed as outlined in Appendix 1, clause 4?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.2.3	Does the organisation require the supplier of the information submitted to allow the organisation to plan and execute on-site inspections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.3	On-site inspections			
5.3.1	Does the organisation's verification program include on-site inspections of suppliers delivering "significant risk" supplies? Are the on-site inspections be carried out by the organisation itself (second party inspection) or by a third party on behalf of the organisation? Does the organisation substitute the on-site inspection with documentation review where the documentation provides sufficient confidence in the material origin in non-controversial sources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.3.2	Can the organisation demonstrate that personnel carrying out inspections has sufficient knowledge and competence in the local business, cultural and social customs, and applicable treaties, conventions legislation, governance and law enforcement, relevant to the origin of "significant risk" supplies and to the risk(s) identified?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.3.3	Has the organisation determined the sample of "significant risk" supplies from the supplier to be verified by the verification program?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

5.3.4	Do the on-site inspections cover: a) The direct supplier and all previous suppliers in the supply chain in order to assess compliance with the supplier claims on the origin of the raw material; and b) the forest owner / manager of the forest area of the supply origin, or any other party responsible for management activities on that forest area, in order to assess their compliance with legal requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.4	Corrective measures			
5.4.1	Has the organisation defined written procedures for implementing corrective measures for noncompliance for suppliers identified by the organisation's verification program?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.4.2	Is the range of corrective measures based on the scale and seriousness of the risk that forest and tree based product(s) may be from controversial sources and does it include at least one or more of the following: a) Clear communication of the risk identified with a request for addressing the risk identified within a specific timeline so as to ensure that forest and tree-based product(s) from controversial sources is not supplied to the organisation; and/or b) Requiring suppliers to define risk mitigation measures relating to compliance with legal requirements in the forest area(s) or efficiency of the information flow in the supply chain; and/or c) Cancellation or suspension of any contract or order for forest and tree-based product(s) until the supplier can demonstrate that appropriate risk mitigation measures have been implemented?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

6. Non placement on the market

Ref:	Assessment criteria	Yes	No	N/A
6.1	Can the organisation demonstrate that forest and tree-based material/products from unknown sources or from controversial sources cannot be included in a PEFC product group?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6.2	Can the organisation demonstrate that where it is known to the organisation that forest and tree based materials/products not covered by the organisation's PEFC chain of custody originate in illegal sources (controversial sources, 3.7a), it will not be placed on the market?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6.3	Where the organisation has received substantiated concerns that forest and tree based materials/products not covered by the organisation's PEFC chain of custody originate in illegal sources (controversial sources, 3.7a), can the organisation demonstrate that any such material will not be placed on the market until the concern has been resolved in accordance with clause 4 of Appendix 1.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Objective evidence: N/A Comments: Not assessed as part of this assessment				
Assessment conclusion: Choose an item.				

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

Appendix 2: Corrective and Preventive Action Plan

(copy and paste findings from ereport)

Instructions to client

For each finding, you are required to determine the cause and describe the proposed action plan in order to address each finding. BSI will finalise this report once the action plan is accepted.

Finding Reference		Certificate Reference	
Certificate Standard		Clause	
Category			
Area/Process			
Details			
Cause			
Correction/containment			
Corrective action			
Status			

COMPANY NAME	AUDIT DATE/S	ASSESSMENT TYPE
Sustainable Timber Tasmania	30-05-24	Surveillance

DEFINITIONS

Major nonconformity

The absence of, or failure to implement and maintain, one or more requirements of the chain of custody standard, that may result in a systemic risk to the function and effectiveness of the chain of custody and/or effects confidence in the client organisation's claims on certified raw material.

Note: A major nonconformity may be an individual nonconformity or a number of minor but related nonconformities, that when considered in total are judged to constitute a major nonconformity.

Minor nonconformity

A single failure to fulfil the requirements of the chain of custody standard that may result in no systemic risk to the function and effectiveness of the chain of custody and/or effects confidence in the supplier's claims on certified raw material.

Observation (Opportunity for improvement)

An evaluation finding that does not warrant nonconformity but is identified by the audit team as an opportunity for improvement.

CONFIDENTIALITY

This report is prepared by representatives of BSI in relation to the above-named client's conformance to the nominated standard(s), and is relevant only to the scope of business sites and activities defined in the 'Scope of Certification'. Audits are undertaken using a sampling process, and the report and its recommendations are reflective only of activities and records sighted during this audit.

BSI shall not be liable for loss or damage caused to, or actions taken by, third parties as a consequence of reliance on the information contained within this report or its accompanying documentation. Unless required by the Standard Owners, or BSI Accreditation Bodies during periodic audits, information concerning the organisations audit report, findings or records will not be disclosed to an external 3rd party without the organisations consent.

PROVISION FOR CUSTOMER FEEDBACK

BSI appreciates the feedback on the BSI auditor's performance and the overall experience with the certification process. The Client Feedback Policy and Procedure can be accessed on the BSI website. <http://www.bsigroup.com/en-AU/Our-services/Client-Feedback/>

REVISION HISTORY

Date	Revision Number	Revised by:	Approved by	Description of changes
April 2020	Version 9			Complete rewrite in line with new version of Standard.
July 2020	Version 10			Add references to PEFC ST 2002:2013
Oct 2020	Version 11			Update of DDS requirements (Appendix 1).
Nov 2020	Version 12			Correction to section 4.3 and 5.2.2.
Nov 2020	Version 13			Addition of Appendix 2 (CAPA). Next visit plan moved to front.