

Certified by:



SmartWood Headquarters  
65 Millet St. Suite 201  
Richmond, VT 05477 USA  
Tel: 802-434-5491  
Fax: 802-434-3116  
[www.smartwood.org](http://www.smartwood.org)

Contact person: Jon Jickling  
jjickling@smartwood.org

Certification Assessment  
Performed by:

SmartWood Regional Office  
NEPCon  
Czapińskiego 3/311, 30-048 Kraków, Poland  
Tel: +481 229 503 73  
Fax: + 481 229 503 73  
Contact person: Andrzej Czech, director  
Email: ac@nepcon.net



ACCREDITED  
FSC-ACC-004

© 1996 Forest Stewardship Council A.C.

FM-02 Aug 2006



# SmartWood

*Practical conservation through certified forestry*

## Forest Management Certification Assessment Report for:

### Hlavní město Praha In Praha, the Czech Republic

Report Finalized: 26<sup>th</sup> March 2006  
Assessment Date: 27<sup>th</sup>–29<sup>th</sup> November,  
2006

Assessment Team: Andrzej Czech  
Václava Hrubá

Certificate issue date: May 10, 2007  
Certificate code: SW-FM/COC-  
002345

Operation Contact: Ing. Dan Frantík  
Address: room 464, Jungmannova  
35, 110 00 Praha 1, the Czech Republic

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3
1. SCOPE OF THE CERTIFICATE.....	4
1.1. SCOPE OF THE CERTIFICATE.....	4
1.2. EXCLUSION OF AREAS FROM THE SCOPE OF CERTIFICATE.....	4
2. ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....	5
2.1. CERTIFICATION STANDARD USED.....	5
2.2. ASSESSMENT TEAM AND QUALIFICATIONS.....	5
2.3. REPORT PEER REVIEWERS.....	5
2.4. ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE (INCLUDING PRE-ASSESSMENT AND STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION).....	5
2.5. EVALUATION STRATEGY.....	6
2.6. STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION PROCESS.....	7
3. ASSESSMENT FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS.....	9
3.1. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS RECEIVED.....	9
3.2. MAIN STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES.....	10
3.3. IDENTIFIED NON-COMPLIANCES AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS.....	11
3.4. FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS BY CLIENT TO MEET CERTIFICATION.....	13
3.5. OBSERVATIONS.....	13
3.6. CERTIFICATION RECOMMENDATION.....	14
4. CLIENT SPECIFIC BACKGROUND INFORMATION.....	15
4.1. OWNERSHIP AND LAND TENURE DESCRIPTION.....	15
4.2. LEGISLATIVE AND GOVERNMENT REGULATORY CONTEXT.....	15
4.3. ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT.....	16
4.4. SOCIOECONOMIC CONTEXT.....	17
APPENDIX I: FSC Reporting Form: Detailed FMO information.....	19
APPENDIX II: Public summary of the management plan.....	22
APPENDIX III: Certification standard conformance checklist (confidential).....	25
APPENDIX IV: Chain of Custody Standard Conformance Checklist (confidential).....	55
APPENDIX VI: List of all visited sites (confidential).....	57
APPENDIX VII: Detailed list of stakeholders consulted (confidential).....	58
APPENDIX VIII: Peer review addenda (confidential).....	61
APPENDIX X: FMO map.....	64

## INTRODUCTION

This report presents the findings of an independent certification assessment conducted by a team of specialists representing the SmartWood Program of the Rainforest Alliance. The purpose of the assessment was to evaluate the ecological, economic and social sustainability of Hlavní město Praha forest management as defined by the Forest Stewardship Council.

This report contains four main sections of information and findings and several appendixes. The whole report plus appendixes I and II will become public information about the forest management operation that may be distributed by SmartWood or the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) to interested parties. The remainder of the appendixes are confidential, to be reviewed only by authorized SmartWood and FSC staff and reviewers bound by confidentiality agreements.

The purpose of the SmartWood program is to recognize conscientious land stewardship through independent evaluation and certification of forestry practices. Forestry operations that attain SmartWood certification may use the SmartWood and FSC labels for public marketing and advertising.

## **1. SCOPE OF THE CERTIFICATE**

### **1.1. Scope of the certificate**

Hlavní město Praha owns almost all evaluated forest - 2394 ha, with the exception of 35 ha, that are also included in scope of certificate and that historically belongs to monastic order (Ordo militaris Crucigenorum cum rubea stella), currently this stands have no owner, Hlavní město Praha is legal manager of this forest.

See more detailed information about the FMO and areas covered by the certificate in Appendix II and III.

### **1.2. Exclusion of areas from the scope of certificate**

All forest owned and managed by Hlavní město Praha are included in scope of the assessment. Hlavní město Praha does not own nor manage any other forest land.

## 2. ASSESSMENT PROCESS

### 2.1. Certification Standard Used

For certification assessment of Hlavní město Praha forest management Czech FSC Standard accredited by Accreditation Services International GmbH in Bonn, 30<sup>th</sup> of August 2006 has been used.

### 2.2. Assessment team and qualifications

Dr. Andrzej Czech - Nature, Ecology and People Consult (NEPCon).

Polish citizen, SmartWood expert and director of NEPCon, which is the certification partner of SmartWood in Poland. He has been involved in the development of the Polish FSC Working Group and the Polish FSC standards since 1998, gaining extensive knowledge in this field. For two years he was the FSC Contact Person and Chairman of the Interim FSC Working Group. Mr. Andrzej Czech has a PhD in Biology. He has an interest in close to nature forestry and ecotourism. As for certification experience, Dr. Czech has participated in several forest management and chain of custody certification assessments in Poland, Latvia and Lithuania. He has been coordinating SmartWood activities in Poland since June 2002. Dr. Czech has been through SmartWood's lead assessor training course. Leading auditor during certification of RDSF Poznań, RDSF Piła, RDSF Łódź, RDSF Radom, RDSF Krosno, EF in Rogów and several State Forest Enterprises in Lithuania and Romania.

Ing. Václava Hrubá - Nature, Ecology and People Consult (NEPCon).

The Czech Republic citizen, M.Sc. in forest management – Mendel University of Agriculture and Forestry, Brno, The Faculty of Forestry and Wood Processing, specialization on silviculture and protection of forests. She has experiences from Forest Management Institute, Brno, where she has worked as GIS expert. She is employee of Czech and Slovak Office of Nature, Ecology and People Consult (NEPCon) from 2004. She has been trained in chain of custody FSC standard FSC-STD-40-004. She participated in FSC Forest Management assessor training course and FSC Chain-of-Custody and Controlled Wood assessor training course held on October 2006 at Druskininkai, Lithuania. She has participated in several forest management and chain of custody certification assessments and audits in the Czech Republic and Slovakia.

### 2.3. Report peer reviewers

Peer reviewer possess MSc. in physical geography and landscape ecology. Czech citizen. Former employee of several environmental NGOs, currently involved in projects related to the development and implementation of FSC forest certification on national and international level.

### 2.4. Assessment schedule (including pre-assessment and stakeholder consultation)

Date	General Location* (main sites)	Main activities
12 <sup>th</sup> of June, 2006	Office and field of Hlavní město Praha	Preassessment
27 <sup>th</sup> of October, 2006	Global	Stakeholder notification on homepage NEPCon and SmartWood

27 <sup>th</sup> of October, 2006	The Czech Republic	Stakeholder notification via emails and mails
27 <sup>th</sup> of November, 2006	Environment Protection Department office	Main assessment: Introduction of audit team, introduction of manager staff, forest manager interview, document inspection
27 <sup>th</sup> of November, 2006	Natural Park Prokopské a Dalejské údolí Nature reserve Prokopské údolí	Main assessment: Meeting with a stakeholder, forest visit with the stakeholder
27 <sup>th</sup> of November, 2006	Prague	Main assessment: Meeting with a stakeholder, interview about protected area management
28 <sup>th</sup> of November, 2006	Nature monument Modřanská rokle	Main assessment: Field visit focused on management of protected area, final cutting and forest regeneration.
28 <sup>th</sup> of November, 2006	Nature monument Údolí Kunratického potoka	Main assessment: Field visit focused on management of protected area, thinning, nature regeneration and sanitary cutting.
28 <sup>th</sup> of November, 2006	Lesy hlavního města Prahy office	Main assessment: Contractor for most forest activities – staff interview, document inspection.
29 <sup>th</sup> of November, 2006	Environment Protection Department office	Main assessment: Forest manager interview, document inspection, final debriefing.
Total number of person-days used for the assessment:5 = number of assessors participating 2 times total number of days spent for the audit (including pre-assessment activities) 2,5 * Detail on sites visited provided in Appendix x.		

## 2.5. Evaluation strategy

The auditor team developed a sampling design so as to obtain an overview of all different types of activities and sites in Hlavní město Praha during the assessment. The visit was organized to ensure that the team assessed a representative cross section of management and forest conditions in Hlavní město Praha. In Hlavní město Praha those districts were chosen, which represented different management conditions, forest types and localization in region. Special emphasis was put on potential problem areas such as ongoing harvesting, proximity of sensitive areas, etc. The selection technique reduced the possibility for Hlavní město Praha to present sites that would reflect better-than-actual situation of forest management in Hlavní město Praha regions under assessment. The assessment team visited 22 sites in total. List of sites visited is presented in table below.

### List of management aspects reviewed by assessment team:

Type of site	Sites visited	Type of site	Sites visited
Road construction		Illegal settlement	X
Soil drainage	NA	Bridges/stream crossing	X
Workshop		Chemical storage	X
Tree nursery	X	Wetland	

Planned Harvest site	X	Steep slope/erosion	X
Ongoing Harvest site	X	Riparian zone	NA
Completed logging	X	Planting	X
Soil scarification	NA	Direct seeding	NA
Planting site	X	Weed control	X
Felling by harvester	NA	Natural regeneration	X
Felling by forest worker	X	Endangered species	
Skidding/Forwarding	X	Wildlife management	
Clearfelling		Nature Reserve	X
Shelterwood management	X	Key Biotope	
Selective felling		Special management area	X
Sanitary cutting	X	Historical site	
Pre-commercial thinning	X	Recreational site	X
Commercial thinning		Buffer zone	X
Logging camp	NA	Local community	NA

## 2.6. Stakeholder consultation process

The purpose of the stakeholder consultation strategy for this assessment was threefold:

- 1) To ensure that the public is aware of and informed about the assessment process and its objectives;
- 2) To assist the field assessment team in identifying potential issues; and,
- 3) To provide diverse opportunities for the public to discuss and act upon the findings of the assessment.

This process is not just stakeholder notification, but wherever possible, detailed and meaningful stakeholder interaction. The process of stakeholder interaction does not stop after the field visits, or for that matter, after even a certification decision is made. SmartWood welcomes, at any time, comments on certified operations and such comments often provide a basis for field assessment.

In the case of Hlavní město Praha prior to the actual assessment process, a public consultation stakeholder document was developed. Through input from Czech FSC Working Group an initial list of stakeholders was modified. Stakeholders were contacted via e-mail, mail and phone. The public was informed also by means of web pages [www.nepcon.net](http://www.nepcon.net) and [www.smartwood.org](http://www.smartwood.org) about beginning of assessment process. Auditors provided phone consultation to stakeholders and registered stakeholders' comments to Hlavní město Praha forest management during the whole evaluation process. Two stakeholders were interested in personal meeting with the auditor team; auditors met both stakeholders and with one of them went through field visit in the forest. No stakeholders expressed their wish to participate in public meeting.

Stakeholder Type (NGO, government bodies, local inhabitant, contractor etc.)	Stakeholders informed (#)	Stakeholders consulted or providing input (#)
All stakeholders	Unknown (homepage)	1
NGO	55	4
State organizations	1	1

Neighbouring owners	6	2
Contractors	-	1
FSC working group	1	1

### 3. ASSESSMENT FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS

#### 3.1. Stakeholder comments received

The stakeholder consultation activities were organized to give participants the opportunity to provide comments according to general categories of interest based upon the assessment criteria. The table below summarizes the issues identified by the assessment team with a brief discussion of each based upon specific interview and/or public meeting comments.

<b>FSC Principle</b>	<b>Stakeholder comment</b>	<b>SmartWood response</b>
<b>P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance</b>	Environmental NGO: Noncompliance in the administrative decisions during the approval of road ring around Prague near Holubická bažantnice NR and across a biocorridor in Modřanská rokle.	The indicated localities are located about 2 kilometers away from forests owned by the Hlavní město Praha. Comment considered as not relevant.
<b>P2: Tenure &amp; Use Rights &amp; Responsibilities</b>	Local people: The boundaries are clearly marked and use rights are clarified.	No response needed.
<b>P3 – Indigenous Peoples’ Rights</b>	Not applicable.	
<b>P4: Community Relations &amp; Workers’ Rights</b>	No comments received	No response needed.
<b>P5: Benefits from the Forest</b>	No comments received	No response needed.
<b>P6: Environmental Impact</b>	Visitors: Systematic elimination of bushes in Prague-Modřany and Prague-Hodkovičky areas.	The team of auditors visited the indicated forest compartment. Hlavní město Praha carried out the felling of the bushes along the pathway for the visitors of the wood in a 2 meters wide strip. The reason for this was to improve recreational function of the forest. There is no evidence that the clearing has been done to eliminate bush layer of the stand.
	Environmental NGO: Using of tractors in forest is inappropriate.	The team of auditors checked this issue during field visit. Lesy hlavního města Prahy (the major contractor) uses small tractors that are powered by bio-fuel. Damages in environment in visited stands were not significant and in accordance with the FSC requirements..
	Environmental NGO: Dalejský háj NR is drying up.	The team of auditors checked this issue

	<p>Local government: Quality forest management that corresponds with the state of stands and natural conditions as well as maintaining all the functions of the forest.</p> <p>Local government: The owner takes care about the forest and its regeneration.</p> <p>Local government: The owner treats all pests in this way that neighboring stands are not violated.</p>	<p>during field visit and documents control. The process of Dalejský háj's Natural Reserve drying up is caused by the drainage of the lands located above the Natural Reserve and the following human settlement. Forest management of the Hlavní město Praha has no influence on this process.</p> <p>No response needed.</p> <p>No response needed.</p> <p>No response needed.</p>
<b>P7: Management Plan</b>	<p>Local people: FMP is not adhered to because the workers are lazy and try to harvest maximum volume of the timber on site.</p> <p>Environmental NGO: The trees are harvested when they reach their felling age.</p>	<p>The team of auditors has not encountered neither any violation of FMP rules or bigger harvesting than allowed. The harvesting areas were clearly demarcated in the terrain. Forest workers are controlled by rangers several times a day.</p> <p>The team of auditors has not found during audit any signs of excessive harvesting;</p>
<b>P8: Monitoring &amp; Assessment</b>	No comments received	
<b>P9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forest</b>	Environmental NGO: NR's Zlatnice protective zone was threatened by its transformation to non-forest land.	The Hlavní město Praha is neither the owner nor manager of the indicated lands.
<b>P10 - Plantations</b>	Not applicable.	No response needed.

### 3.2. Main strengths and weaknesses

Principle	Strengths	Weaknesses
<b>P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance</b>	Well-established system for obtaining up-to-date legal information. The employees are familiar with applicable legal regulations related to their activities.	<p>Lack of public commitment to FSC Principles and Criteria (CAR 1/07).</p> <p>Contractors are not fully observing the FSC requirements (CAR 2/07)</p>

		.
<b>P2: Tenure &amp; Use Rights &amp; Responsibilities</b>	Clear land ownership and the rights resulting from the ownership.	
<b>P3 – Indigenous Peoples’ Rights</b>	Not applicable.	Not applicable
<b>P4: Community Relations &amp; Workers’ Rights</b>	A good system for resolving problems with NGOs and local community.	Pro-active approach to the public should be implemented (OBS 1/07).
<b>P5: Benefits from the Forest</b>	The volume of harvesting is under the forest capacity. The forest management is well adapted to the forest functions.	
<b>P6: Environmental Impact</b>	An impact on the environment is carefully evaluated during the process of forest management.	Reference sites are not defined.(CAR 3/07) FSC banned chemical has been used (Major CAR 4/07) The use of natural regeneration can be increased (OBS 2/07) Written rationale for using chemicals are not prepared (OBS 3/07)
<b>P7: Management Plan</b>	Very good maps both in paper and digital form are used during the forest management.	
<b>P8: Monitoring &amp; Assessment</b>	Detailed monitoring takes place every 10 years before a FMP is developed.	Monitoring of the incidence of highly-protected plant and animal species outside protected areas should be improved (OBS 4/07).
<b>P9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forest</b>	Sensitive management of potential high conservation value forests.	High conservation value forests are not formally identified, however known to the staff (CAR 5/07).
<b>P10 - Plantations</b>	Not applicable.	
<b>Chain of custody</b>	Low risk of a replacement certified products by non-certified ones.	

### 3.3. Identified non-compliances and corrective actions

A non-compliance is a discrepancy or gap identified during the assessment between some aspect of the FMO’s management system and one or more of the requirements of the forest stewardship standard. Depending on the severity of the non-compliance the assessment team differentiates between major and minor non compliances.

- **Major non-compliance** results where there is a fundamental failure to achieve the objective of the relevant FSC criterion. A number of minor non-compliances against one requirement may be considered to have a cumulative effect, and therefore be considered a major noncompliance.
- **Minor non-compliance** is a temporary, unusual or non-systematic non-compliance, for which the effects are limited.

Major non compliances must be corrected **before** the certificate can be issued. While minor non-compliances do not prohibit issuing the certificate, they must be addressed within the given timeframe to maintain the certificate.

Each non-compliance is addressed by the audit team by issuing a corrective action request (CAR) CARs are requirements that candidate operations must agree to, and which must be addressed, within the given timeframe of a maximum of one year period.

CAR #: 1/07	Reference Standard #: 1.6.I
Non-compliance: Major <input type="checkbox"/> Minor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FMU has not made a written public commitment to manage its forests in accordance with FSC Principles and Criteria.
Corrective Action Request: Hlavní město Praha shall publicly commit to manage its forests in accordance with FSC Principles and Criteria.	
Timeline for Compliance: 3 months from the date of this report, to be verified during first annual audit.	

CAR #: 2/07	Reference Standard #: 1.6.III.
Non-compliance: Major <input type="checkbox"/> Minor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hlavní město Praha ensured adherence general requirements of the Czech FSC Standard in contracts with contractors, but some specific requirements are lacking, for example use of chemicals banned by FSC.
Corrective Action Request: The Hlavní město Praha shall include in contracts adherence of contractors to the requirements of the Czech FSC Standard.	
Timeline for Compliance: Prior to first annual audit.	

CAR #: 3/07	Reference Standard #: 6.4.I. 6.4.III, 6.4.IV and 6.4.V.
Non-compliance: Major <input type="checkbox"/> Minor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The FMO has not designed yet 3% of forest area as reference sites; however has good orientation where they will be located. They are already kept in their natural state. About 30 % of the total forest area is already protected by law in form of nature reserves and nature monuments, however theoretically some activities are allowed for enhancement of natural state.
Corrective Action Request: The Hlavní město Praha shall formally define minimum 3% of the area as reference sites. Preference shall be given to larger areas, these areas shall be delineated on the maps and their boundaries indicated in the field, if possible. Reference sites shall be removed from the forest management and left without intervention.	
Timeline for Compliance: Prior to first annual audit.	

CAR #: 4/07	Reference Standard #: 6.6.II
Non-compliance: Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor <input type="checkbox"/>	One of the chemicals used in the forest - Furry 10 EW – contains zeta-cypermethrin which is banned by FSC.
Corrective Action Request: Hlavní město Praha shall elaborate and implement procedure that will assure that FSC-banned chemicals are not used in the forest.	
Timeline for Compliance: Precondition has been closed – see below.	
Client follow up: After submitting of draft report to client, Hlavní město Praha signed special agreement with major contractor which ensures that no FSC-banned chemical will be used during conducting forest operation send copy of this agreement to NEPCon. Based on above	

auditor team decided to close major CAR 4/07.

CAR #: 5/07	Reference Standard #: 9.1.I, 9.2.I.
Non-compliance: Major <input type="checkbox"/> Minor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The owner has not formally identified stands with attributes of high conservation value forests although he is aware of such stands and takes care of them with high respect. 33 protected areas with total area of 787 ha occurs in the forest land, that is 32% of the total area FMU. They are composed out of following categories: protected landscape areas, nature reserves, national nature reserves, nature monuments, forest on steep slopes, slide rocks, peat bogs and in slopes with low production potential and prevalent soil protection function. All forests are forests of special purpose – with increased recreational function. They serve for recreation of more than one million of Prague inhabitants.
Corrective Action Request: Hlavní město Praha shall identify stands with attributes of high conservation value forests in cooperation with stakeholders.	
Timeline for Compliance: Prior to first annual audit.	

### 3.4. Follow-up actions by client to meet certification

One of the chemicals used in the forest - Furry 10 EW – contained zeta-cypermethrin which is banned by FSC.

After submitting of draft report to client, Hlavní město Praha signed special agreement with major contractor which ensures that no FSC-banned chemical will be used during conducting forest operation and send copy of this agreement to NEPCo. Based on above auditor team decided to close major CAR 4/07.

### 3.5. Observations

**Observations** are voluntary actions suggested by the assessment team, but are not mandated or required.

Observation	Standard Reference
<b>Observation 1/07:</b> Stakeholders have been identified and there are records from communication with them. However, taking into account fact that forest is very close to city and number of stakeholders comments is very high it is recommended that Hlavní město Praha is more pro-active and oriented more at the explanation of forest operations that are planned to be carried out in the forest.	4.4.III.
<b>Observation 2/07:</b> About 8.7% of the regeneration is natural. Taking into account natural conditions it is recommended to increase share of natural regeneration.	6.3.I.
<b>Observation 3/07:</b> It is recommended that rationale for using synthetic chemicals is justified in writing.	6.6.IV
<b>Observation 4/07:</b> It is recommended to improve monitoring of the	8.2.III.

highly-protected plant and animal species outside protected areas and impact of the forest management on their locations.	
---	--

### 3.6. Certification Recommendation

Based on a thorough field review, analysis and compilation of findings by this SmartWood assessment team the FMO has demonstrated that their described system of management is being implemented consistently over the whole forest areas covered by the scope of the evaluation.

One exemption, which according to FSC requirements prevented issuance of positive certification recommendation, was using one FSC banned chemical (see original CAR 4/07). After submitting of draft report to client, Hlavní město Praha signed special agreement with major contractor which ensures that no FSC-banned chemical will be used during conducting forest operation and send copy of this agreement to NEPCon. Based on above auditor team decided to close major CAR 4/07, however this issue will be checked during upcoming audits.

SmartWood concludes that FMO's management system, if implemented as described, is capable of ensuring that all the requirements of the certification standards are met across the scope of the certificate. In order to fully compliance with standards, improvement is needed in some indicators –within principles 1, 6 and 9. A FSC/SmartWood Forest Management and Chain of Custody (FM/COC) Certification will be issued based upon agreement to the stipulated corrective action requests.

In order to maintain certification, the FMO will be audited annually on-site and required to remain in compliance with the FSC principles and criteria as further defined by regional guidelines developed by SmartWood or the FSC. The FMO will also be required to fulfil the corrective actions as described below. Experts from SmartWood will review continued forest management performance and compliance with the corrective action requests described in this report, annually during scheduled and random audits.

## **4. CLIENT SPECIFIC BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

### **4.1. Ownership and land tenure description**

The Czech Republic belongs amongst European states with medium percentage of the forest cover. Its area is 7.73 mil ha out of which 34.03% (2.65 mil ha) is covered by forests. Prague forests are fragmented composed by several larger complexes and a range of small woods. Its total area is 4,911 ha, i.e. 9% of the city area. The Hlavní město Praha is the owner of about a half of the forests.

After 1918 (the formation of Czechoslovakia) the state forests were created that took over the property of former Austrian state forests, properties of area larger than 250 ha, properties of people from neighbouring countries, members of formerly royal Habsburg-Lorraine family, property of foundations resulting from the noblemen rights, property of those who committed an offence against the nation in WW I. These forest ownership changes did not include the forests of the Hlavní město Praha and were in progress until 1938 and ceased definitively after the Munich Agreement and during Nazi occupation between 1939 – 1945.

The first legal provision regarding the tenure was the President's decree on the Confiscation and Accelerated Division of German, Hungarian and Republic's enemy properties in 1945. Forests expropriated in accordance with this decree were mostly allotted to the state. Land Reform Law was issued in 1948. The land that was not permanently cultivated and land of corporate entities (except for state and cooperative enterprises) were expropriated. Private Forest management, with the exception of small area forests, almost ended by this expropriation. Based on the 1949 Law on Financial Management of National Committees and consequential government Ordinance on the National Property Administration executed by national committees, regarding the nationalization of the national committees' forests, the state took over most of the public and municipal forests with the exception of several cities and towns including Prague.

Forest property of the Hlavní město Praha was managed by "Sady, Lesy and Zahradnictví Enterprise". Lesy hlavního města Prahy became a major contractor for managing the forest, as it is until today. Based on the same law, historic property of the Hlavní město Praha and local areas was identified during the following years and included under the property of the Hlavní město Praha. More than 375ha of forest was obtained as the historic property.

### **4.2. Legislative and government regulatory context**

The Czech Republic is an independent parliamentary republic. The executive power is headed by the President and the Government which issues ordinances and is responsible to the Parliament. The central organ of state forest administration is the Ministry of Agriculture which administers legislative setting for forest management and protection, executes the state control over forest management, supervises state forest management, submits and approves forest development regional plans and establishes a forest guard. State forest management in the forests of the Hlavní město Praha is also regulated by Central Bohemia Region Council, Environmental and Agricultural Department.

Forest management of the Hlavní město Praha is subject to the State Conservation bodies. The Ministry of the Environment makes specification and evaluation of the regional system of ecological stability, declares National Natural Reserves and Natural Reserves, identify protected plant and animal species as well as minerals, demarcates protective zones of the National Parks and Landscape Protected Areas and approves the FMPs of National Natural Reserves, Natural Reserves and Landscape Protected Areas.

Prague City Council, Environmental and Agricultural Department as well as the Town of Říčany, Environmental and Agricultural Department demarcate the system of local ecological stability and supervise in the field of environmental and landscape protection. Central Bohemia Region Council, Environmental and Agricultural Department makes specification and evaluation of the regional system of ecological stability, issues obligatory perspective leading towards the approval of management plans and approves the FMPs of National Natural Monuments and Natural Monuments. Administration of Český kras Protected Landscape Area executes state administration in the field of environmental and landscape protection on relevant sites as well as meets objectives given by expert environmental protection organizations, carries out inventory of natural scientific objects, the documentation and examination in the field of the environmental protection. They cooperate with research and scientific institutes.

Czech Environmental Inspectorate monitors legal compliance and decisions regarding the functions of the forests as an environmental element.

#### **4.3. Environmental Context**

There are three forests districts on the Hlavní město Praha territory:

17 – Polabí (Elbe River Lowland), the majority of the territory

8 – Český kras ( Bohemian Crast), southwest part of the territory

10 – Středočeská pahorkatina (Central Bohemien Upland), only welt of south and southeast part of territory

FMU has very varied geologic structure. The territory was created by three ancient seas (proteozoic, paleozoic and mesozoic) that periodically inundated Bohemia and felled back in period of mountain creation.

The forest constitutes several minor stands and many little forests surrounded by urban area. The majority of forest is located on steep slopes and inaccessible places where the forest was forced out by urbanization.

The FMU elevation vary from the lowest point at the river Vltava (175 m above the sea) to the highest point in Říčany near forest spring (418 m above the sea).

FMU is located at basin of river	Vltava.
Sea-drainage area	North Sea
Main river-basin of the I. rank	Labe
Main river-basin	1-12-01 Vltava
Right affluets	streams: Botič, Rokytka, Kunratický, Počernický, Bohnický
Left affluets	streams: Šárecký, Motolský, Hlubočský
Water reservoirs	Hostivař, Džbán

Ponds

Šeberovské, Kyjské, Krčské, Velký Počernický rybník

Climate of FMU is characterized by long, warm and dry summer, very short intermediate period with warm up to gentle warm spring and autumn, short, gentle warm, dry up to very dry winter with very short persistency of snow cover.

Average annual temperature varies between 8,1 – 9,4°C Temperature in vegetation period varies between 14, 2 – 15,7°C. Duration of vegetation period (i.e. number of days with average temperature above 10°C and more) is 161- 176 days long. Vegetation period begins 19<sup>th</sup> of April and ends 10<sup>th</sup> of October in average. Average annual rainfall sum is 476 – 545 mm. The minimum of rainfall rains in February and maximum of rainfall is in July.

Potential natural vegetation is primarily *Carpinion* alliance groves, particularly *Melampyro nemorosi- Carpinetum*, *Tilio – Betuletum* characteristically on heavy water logging soils. Acidophilous oak forests (*Genisto germanicae – Quercion*) are marginally reached this area. Natural substitute vegetation is primarily represented by grass-herbaceous vegetation with character of Hercynian grove flora.

#### 4.4. Socioeconomic Context

The Hlavní město Praha is the owner of 2,394 ha of forest. The administration of the forests owned by the Hlavní město Praha is the responsibility of Environmental and Agricultural Department. The management is executed by Lesy hlavního města Prahy. State Forests are responsible for forest administration. Harvesting and silvicultural activities are carried out by private companies.

The main functions of Hlavní město Praha's forests are non-profit services such as recreational, ecological and environmental protection. The average volume of harvesting in the Czech Republic is about 5.73 m<sup>3</sup> / ha per year. For Hlavní město Praha it is only 1.9 m<sup>3</sup> / ha per year which is just one third of the national level. The harvesting in Prague composes 28% of estimated annual increment (the average felling in the CR is 74% of annual increment). All forest lands are declared special assignment forests – suburban forests and forests with special recreation function by the resolution of the Ministry of Agriculture, Prague regional bureau. The Hlavní město Praha's forests are used by 1.1 million Praguers. To support the recreational functions a number of facilities have been established such as recreational pavements, nature trails, rest meadows, health areas, playgrounds, summer houses, rubbish bins, benches and many other facilities. At present the number of people coming to visit some of the easily available localities (Hostivař forest park, Kunratický wood, Hvězda game preserve and others) is close to the carrying capacity of these areas. The damage done by visitors has markedly increased here during the past years.

The Hlavní město Praha is a member of all hunting associations whose hunting grounds overlap with the forest area. The hunting rented out to the hunting associations in most cases. Some forests, especially in the urban area, are non-hunting grounds (Hvězda game preserve, Kunratický wood, Hodkovičky, Cibulka, Čimický grove and others). In case of infestation of some animal species, it is possible to allow a regulation shooting upon individual requests.



## APPENDIX I: FSC Reporting Form: Detailed FMO information

(NOTE: To be prepared by the client prior to assessment, Information verified by assessment team)

### SCOPE OF CERTIFICATE

Type of certificate:	single FMU		
SLIMF status:	no SLIMF		
Number of group members (if applicable):	no		
Total number of Forest Management Units FMUs: 2394 ha (if applicable, list each below):			
Division of the FMUs within the scope:	# of FMU-s	total forest area FMU group	
< 100 ha		ha	
100 – 1000 ha		ha	
1000 – 10 000 ha	1	2394 ha	
> 10 000 ha		ha	
SLIMF FMUs		ha	
List of each FMU included in the certificate:			
FMU	FMU Owner	Area	Forest Type
Městské lesy hlavního města Prahy	Hlavní město Praha	2394 ha	City forests
Product categories included in the scope (note: use FSC product category classification system):			
Type of product:	Description		
Standing stock round wood	Logs from spruce, oak, pine, robinia		
Other:			

### FMO INFO

Location of certified forests	Latitude: N 50 degrees 05 minutes Longitude: E 14 degrees 25 minutes
Forest zone	Temperate
Management tenure:	managed by local municipality
Number of FMO employees:	2
Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within the scope of certificate:	50

### Species and annual allowable cut

Botanical name	Common trade name	Annual allowable	Actual harvest in	Projected harvest for
----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------	-----------------------

		cut	last year	next year
Picea excelsior	Spruce	1100 m3	1496m3	1300 m3
Quercus sp.	Oak	2700 m3	1234 m3	1600 m3
Pinus sylvestris	Pine	1600 m3	2230m3	1800 m3
Robina pseudoacacia	Robinia	950 m3	481 m3	800 m3
Other species		2550 m3		2550 m3
Total		8900 m3	5441 m3	8000 m3
Total annual estimated log production:		6600 m3		
Total annual estimates production of NTFP:		0 m3		
(list all NTFP by product type)		m3		
Christmas trees		150 pieces		
		m3		

### FOREST AREA CLASSIFICATION

Total certified area	2394 ha
Total forest area in scope of certificate	2394 ha
Forest area that is:	
Privately managed	ha
State managed	ha
Community managed	2394 ha
Area of production forests (areas where timber may be harvested)	1609 ha
Area without any harvesting or management activities (strict reserves)	785 ha
Area without timber harvesting and managed only for production of non-timber forest products or services	0 ha
Area classified as plantations <sup>1</sup>	2,69ha

Area or share of the total production forest area regenerated naturally	6 ha
Area or share of the total production forest area regenerated by planting or seeding	100 ha
Area or share of the total production forest are regenerated by other or mixed methods (describe)	0 ha

Conservation values present in the forest (High Conservation Value Forests or HCVF) and respective areas		
HCVF Attributes	Description: Location on FMU	Area (ha)

<sup>1</sup> According to FSC definition “plantations” in this context should be understood as forest areas lacking most of the principal characteristics and key elements of native ecosystems as defined by FSC-approved national and regional standards of forest stewardship, which result from the human activities of either planting, sowing or intensive silvicultural treatments.

A forest contains globally, regionally or nationally significant: concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia)		
A forest contains globally, regionally or nationally significant: large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance		
They are in, or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems	Forests protected by state in the category: Protected landscape area 2,5 ha Nature reserve 177 ha National nature reserve 35 ha Nature monument 573 ha	787,5 ha
They provide basic services of nature in critical or unique situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control);	Forest on steep slopes, slide rocks, peat bogs and in slopes with low production potential and prevalent soil protection function.	273 ha
They are fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health) and/or critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).	All Prague forests are forests of special purpose – with increased recreational function. They serve for recreation of more than one million of Prague inhabitants.	2394 ha

## APPENDIX II: Public summary of the management plan

(NOTE: To be prepared by the client prior to assessment, Information verified by assessment team)

Main objectives of the forest management are:

Main priority: To restore and retain stable forest ecosystems in special assignment forests - suburban forests and forests with increased recreational function.

Secondary priority: To increase ecologically stabilizing and recreational functions of the forests by means of species composition conversion

Other priorities:

- 1) To increase species diversity of forest tree species and come closer to natural forest composition
- 2) To adapt the forest management to the dominating recreational, aesthetic and ecological functions of the forests, mainly in the realm of management conditions, during the process of species composition choice and tending of the stands etc.
- 3) To adapt the forest management to the nature conservation requirements and interests in those forest stands that have been included into extra-protected areas.
- 4) To differentiate the management according to the site conditions, current tree species composition, health conditions, position of a stand within the recreational use of forest.
- 5) To use natural regeneration in stands with appropriate tree composition for all genetically suitable tree species aimed at maximalization of the proportion of natural restoration on total afforestation.
- 6) To convert inappropriate genetically stands into the ones with wider diversity of age, space and species.
- 7) To develop more compact and homogenous stands with an emphasis on small area and shelter wood forms of restoration (gap felling, cutting faces, shelterwood felling, plantings in advance)

Forest composition:

Quercus petraea	25%
Robinia pseudosacacia	11%
Tilius cordata	7%
Pinus sylvestris	12%
Picea excelsior	8%
Pinus nigra	6%
Larix decidua	5%

Description of Silvicultural system(s) used:

FMU is working with small regeneration elements, shelterwood felling is used widely.

Silvicultural system	% of forest under this management
Even aged management	%
Clearfelling (clearcut size range      )	%
Shelterwood	100 %
Uneven aged management	%

Individual tree selection	%
Group selection (group harvested of less than 1 ha in size)	%
Other types of management (explain)	%

Harvest methods and equipment used: logging with chainsaws is used. Tractors and cableways are used for skidding.

Estimate of maximum sustainable yield for main commercial species: 89 000 m<sup>3</sup> / 10 years

**The volume of main felling** includes sanitary cutting, lightening cuttings for saplings. Due to a lack in the number of intermediate stands, moderate prevalence of undeveloped felling stands and a considerable number of unsuitable species (Robinia, coppice oak, shrubs), the total volume of main felling is low.

Total main felling, 71,600 m<sup>3</sup> was estimated by summing-up of the main felling outside national natural monuments (67,794 m<sup>3</sup>), main felling of the national natural monuments zones (3,210 m<sup>3</sup>) and national natural monuments (596 m<sup>3</sup>).

**The volume of thinnings** is estimated based on level of single tree harvesting, thinning intensity and an average stand density in age-classes. Having been increased by 19.9 % of incidental felling, it amounts to total 17,400 m<sup>3</sup>/10 years

**Maximum total cut** felling is determined by summing-up of the total volume of main felling (71,600 m<sup>3</sup>) and total volume of intermediate felling (17,400 m<sup>3</sup>) for all forest categories. Maximum total cut for the whole FMU was determined in accordance with the above mentioned criteria – 89,000 m<sup>3</sup> for a 10 year period.

Forest management organizational structure and management responsibilities from senior management to operational level (how is management organized, who controls and takes decisions etc.)

Forest manager is the person who is responsible for taking all decision concerning to forest management actions. 8 rangers are directly subordinated. Forest manger in cooperation with rangers also marks all thinnings and final cuttings. Rangers supervise on forest workers. Forest manager controls quality of finished work. Forest management actions in protected areas are managed and controlled by Protection Areas Manager.

Structure of forest management units (division of forest area into manageable units etc.):

FMU is divided to 8 forest districts and 77 compartments according to following table:

Number and name of forest district	Compartment	Area /ha/
11 - Šárka	101 – 115	479,08
12 - Cibulka	116 – 125	294,45
13 - Chuchle	126 -134	408,05
14 - Hodkovičky	135 – 145	278,87
15 - Kunratice	146 – 153	326,51
16 - Hostivař	154 – 161	147,09
17 - Hloubětín	162 – 170	278,65
18 - Bohnice	171 – 177	227,49
Celkem	101 – 177	2 443,19

**Monitoring procedures** (including yield of all forest products harvested, growth rates, regeneration, and forest condition, composition/changes in flora and fauna, environmental and social impacts of forest management, costs, productivity and efficiency of forest management)

Yield of forest products harvested is recorded by Lesy hl. města Prahy. Information on harvested volumes is forwarded to forest manager for control and planning of forest management actions.

Grow rates are counted every ten year by independent company when FMP is renewed. Regeneration and forest condition is monitored visually by forest manager and rangers during field visits. The owner is cooperate on monitoring of composition and changes in flora and fauna with several institutions and experts. Grants are available for such monitoring. Environmental and some social impacts are monitored when the FMP is renewed. Income from forest, its productivity and efficiency are analyzed by Financial Department of City of Prague Council; data are easily available for forest manager.

Environmental protection measures, e.g. buffer zones for streams, riparian areas, etc., protection measures for Rare Threatened and Endangered Species and habitat  
There is appointed a person responsible for Protected areas, rare threatened and endangered species management. Management is described by approved Protected Area Management Plans.

Other Sections may be added by the FMO