



KPMG Performance Registrar Inc.

Box 10426, 777 Dunsmuir Street
Vancouver BC V7Y 1K3
Canada

Telephone (604) 691-3000
(604) 691-3401
Telefax (604) 691-3031
www.kpmg.ca

Samuel Elkins, R.P.F.T.
Continuous Improvement Coordinator
Daishowa-Marubeni International Ltd.
Peace River Pulp Division
Forest Resources Business Unit
Postal Bag 6500, Pulp Mill Site
Peace River, AB T8S 1V5

August 15, 2008

Dear Sam:

Re: 2008 ISO 14001 Re-Certification/CSA Z809 Certification Report for Daishowa-Marubeni International Ltd. – Peace River Pulp Division

Our 2008 ISO 14001 re-certification/CSA Z809 certification report for Daishowa-Marubeni International Ltd. – Peace River Pulp Division (DMI-PRPD) is attached. The report documents the results of the field audit that took place during the period August 11-15, 2008.

As communicated to you in the audit notification letter, you are required to submit corrective action plans to address all identified non-conformities within 30 days of the date of the closing meeting. Upon receipt by KPMG PRI, these will be reviewed to verify that they adequately address the root cause(s) of the non-conformities identified during the audit, and either approved or returned to you for revision.

We value the ongoing working relationship that we have with DMI-PRPD, and appreciate the assistance provided to the audit team by Company staff and contractors during the audit process.

If you have any questions regarding the results of the audit or what is required in the way of corrective actions, please call me at the phone number listed below.

Yours truly,

Dave Bebb, RPF, EMS(LA), CEA(SFM)
Vice President, Certification Operations

Enc: 2008 ISO 14001 Re-certification/CSA Z809 Certification Report for Daishowa-Marubeni International Ltd. – Peace River Pulp Division.



**2008 ISO 14001 Re-certification/CSA Z809 Certification
Audit Report for
Daishowa-Marubeni International Ltd.
Peace River Pulp Division**

August 15, 2008

The information in this audit report is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the use of the intended recipient, Daishowa-Marubeni International Ltd. Access to this audit report by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. Any opinions contained in this audit report are subject to the terms and conditions expressed in the governing KPMG PRI client engagement contract.



Table of Contents

A.	Client Information.....	1
B.	Document Review Findings.....	1
C.	Audit Details	1
D.	Audit Findings.....	2
E.	Corrective Action Plans	11
F.	Focus Areas for Next Audit Visit	11

A. Client Information

Client Name:	Daishowa-Marubeni International Ltd. – Peace River Pulp Division (DMI-PRPD)
Audit Criteria:	ISO 14001:2004 and CSA Z809-02
Scope of Certification:	ISO 14001: All Sustainable Forest Management and operational activities on public and private lands required to supply the fibre requirements of the Peace River Pulp Mill. CSA Z809: Daishowa-Marubeni International Ltd. Forest Management Agreement (FMA 8900027).
Client Representative:	Samuel Elkins, Continuous Improvement Coordinator
Assessment Number:	ISO 14001: #2438 CSA Z809: #2438.02

B. Document Review Findings

The document review did not identify any non-conformities with the requirements of the ISO 14001 or CSA Z809 standards. As a result, no corrective actions were required prior to the certification audit taking place.

C. Audit Details

Type of Audit:	ISO 14001 Re-Certification audit CSA Z809 Certification Audit
Date of Document Review	July 7-11, 2008
Date(s) of Audit:	August 11 – 15, 2008
Date of Next Assessment:	Summer 2009
Audit team:	Lead auditor: Dave Bebb Audit team members: Byron Grundberg
Audit Report Distribution:	Daishowa-Marubeni International Ltd. KPMG PRI audit files
Audit objective(s):	The objective of the audit was to evaluate the sustainable forest management (SFM) system at DMI-PRPD, its implementation, effectiveness and conformance with the requirements of PEFC Annex 4. These objectives have been met.

Audit scope:	<p>The scope of the audit included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The elements of the ISO 14001 and CSA Z809 standards outlined in the audit plan. • Activities conducted under the Company’s environmental management system during the period August 31, 2007 – August 15, 2008. • Visits to: (1) the DMI-PRPD woodlands office, and (2) various field sites at the Company’s Peace River, Alberta woodlands operation.
Audit sample size:	<p>Number of field sites visited during the audit:</p> <p>Roads: 19</p> <p>Harvesting: 16</p> <p>Silviculture: 14</p> <p>Camps: 1</p>

D. Audit Findings

Good Practices

The following good practices were noted during the audit:

1. The Operation has developed a very thorough, risk-based internal audit process that covers regulatory compliance as well as conformance with ISO 14001 and CSA Z809 requirements.
2. The DMI-PRPB website contains a wide range of information on the Company’s forest management plans and practices. In addition, the level of public disclosure (e.g., posting of copies of detailed internal and external audit reports on the website) goes significantly beyond standard industry practice, and reflects a very open and proactive approach to informing the public and various stakeholder groups regarding the Company’s forest management activities.
3. The operation has been working towards the implementation of a wet areas mapping tool as a means to reduce costs and the environmental impacts associated with roads and harvesting activities.
4. DMI-PRPD has developed and implemented a broad, multi-faceted approach to the identification and management of the habitat needs of the forest dependent species present on the FMA. A number of the approaches taken by the Company (e.g., voluntary curtailment of falling and skidding activity on the entire FMA between the 3rd week of April and mid-July as a means to avoid the peak nesting/rearing season for migratory bird species) represent a level of commitment that goes beyond many of the Company’s industry peers.
5. The recently developed Forest Resources Field Guide provides key emergency response information for staff and contractors in a handy, easy to read flip-chart format.
6. DMI-PRPD has implemented a variable retention strategy (including retention of large patches, small patches and single trees on harvested areas) that requires a minimum of 15%

retention of the pre-harvest area as measured at the landscape level. This level of retention, which is intended to mimic the level, type and distribution of retention present following wildfires, is considerably above what many other forest companies have committed to.

7. DMI-PRPD's extension of its EMS to operations on private land helps to ensure a high standard of forest practices on private land and is notable in that many other Alberta forest companies specifically exclude private land from the scope of their certifications. For example, the audit noted that the detailed block plan for timber harvest on one quarter section of private land (SW5/SE6-87-25-W5 – Fitzgerald) included provisions to deal with complex site issues such as landowners residence, creek and wetlands, a bear den, pasture land and a pipeline. The site plan appears appropriate for the key feature identified. In addition, the willingness of the landowner to engage the Company to harvest timber on such a complex site (and one that they live on) is a testament to their faith in DMI-PRPD's ability to follow BMPs on private land harvest operations.

Follow-up on open findings from previous audits

At the time of this assessment there were a no open non-conformities from previous audits. There were however 3 open opportunities for improvement that were identified during the August 2007 ISO 14001 surveillance audit. The audit team reviewed the implementation of the action plans developed by DMI-PRPD to address these findings and found that for 2 out of the 3 previously-identified opportunities for improvement: (1) they had been effectively implemented, and (2) there was no recurrence of the issues that gave rise to these findings. As a result, the associated opportunities for improvement identified during the 2007 surveillance audit have now been closed. However, the audit did identify some recurrence of the issues that gave rise to 2438-OFI-A3-01 (isolated weaknesses in the implementation of fuel handling procedures and the provision of required spill kit materials on active sites). Examples of issues noted during the 2008 audit included:

- There was no spill kit on the Pine Ridge Logging chipper operating on E25-72-20 W5 or the Peace River Logging grader doing maintenance work near km 100 of DMI-PRPD's east haul road.
- There were a number of fire extinguishers that were missing or had expired inspection tags (Pine Ridge Logging and Garden River Logging).
- WHMIS labels were missing on some small fuel jugs at Garden River Logging's camp.
- There was no TDG placard on one 1300 liter diesel tank (GRL unit #802).

As a result of the above-noted issues, opportunity for improvement 2438-OFI-A3-01 remains open. Future surveillance audit will include an evaluation of the Company's efforts to address the issues that gave rise to this finding.

Major non-conformities

No major non-conformities were identified during the audit.

Minor non-conformities

The following 1 minor non-conformity was identified during the audit:

1. **Minor non-conformity: 2438/2438.02-NC-IA-01**

Standard/Element(s): ISO 14001: N/A
CSA Z809: Element 7.3.6.1 DFA-Specific Performance Requirements

Client Procedure(s): DFMP Indicators and Targets

Element 3.1 of the CSA Z809 standard defines an indicator as “a variable that measures or describes the state or condition of a value”. It also defines a target as “a specific statement describing a desired future state of condition of an indicator. Targets should be clearly defined, time-limited and quantified, if possible”. In addition, element 7.3.6.1 of the standard requires that the organization: (1) establish DFA-specific performance requirements (i.e., VOITs – Values, Objectives, Indicators and Targets) that address all of the CSA SFM elements, (2) identify one or more indicator for each value identified, and (3) set one target for each indicator that includes clear timeframes for achievement and acceptable levels of variance.

Then audit found that the 2007 Detailed Forest Management Plan (DFMP) includes VOITs in relation to all of the CSA SFM elements. However, a number of the indicators and/or targets included in the plan are either vague, poorly defined, difficult to measure or of questionable utility in achieving the objectives outlined in the DFMP. The weaknesses noted included the following:

- **Indicator #3 (second growth patch size distribution by seral stage)** – The targets for this indicator are included in a reference document entitled “Forecasting Documentation – Detailed Forest Management Plan Revision 2007”. However: (1) review of the targets as presented indicates a shift towards younger seral stages and smaller patch sizes over time, and (2) the DFMP indicates that the targets associated with this indicator are simply modeling outputs associated with the preferred management strategy, and that no attempt was made to control future outputs. As such: (1) it is not clear what the justification is for the targets chosen (i.e. are they within the range of natural variability?), and (2) as currently written, the targets would appear to be of questionable value as a management system indicator/target.
- **Indicator/target #6 (block level down woody debris measure)** – No target has been set for this indicator. In addition, the DFMP does not include a definition of what constitutes down woody debris, so it is not clear what the Company would measure even if a target had been set. NB: The DFMP indicates that the Company intends to develop a field protocol and reporting mechanism for this indicator by 2009.
- **Indicator/target #7 (caribou and grizzly populations)** – The target for this indicator is simply defined as “species persistence”. However, it is not clear what this means (e.g., presence or absence of one or more individuals in some portion of the FMA, specific numbers of animals of defined herds within specified ranges, provision of a specific amount of core habitat, etc.), or how it will be measured. NB: It is recognized that there are a number of outside parties (e.g., oil and gas exploration and development companies,

etc.) whose activities can have an impact on caribou and grizzly populations, and that any solution to addressing these species will require the cooperation of all parties involved in the development and implementation of appropriate recovery plans. As such, it may be difficult to establish a clear target for this indicator until an integrated land management program is in place.

- **Indicator/target #9 (continuous reserve network inventory)** – The target for this indicator is to “implement special planning measures as defined in HCVF framework.” However, the target is poorly defined, and does not meet the CSA Z809 definition of a target (i.e., it is an action item rather than a target).

- **Indicator/target #11 (open all-weather forestry road density)** – This indicator provides a measure of the amount of open all-weather roads within the various FMUs included in the FMA. It is listed in the DFMP as one of a number of indicators that are intended to help monitor forest management impacts on ecosystem diversity. However, the amount of open road also has an impact on species diversity, including both woodland caribou and grizzly bear (two species at risk that occur on the FMA). Review of the current status information provided for this indicator in the DFMP indicates that the current road densities within many FMUs are significantly above the threshold (road density of up to almost 30 km/km² in some FMUs versus a threshold of 0.5 km/km²) that is generally considered necessary for the maintenance of caribou and grizzly populations. However, the current targets included in the DFMP:
 - Only provide an upper threshold for the construction of high grade gravel roads by the Company, and do not address new construction of other classes of road or the decommissioning of roads for which the Company retains management responsibility.

 - Are not sufficiently specific to address those FMUs where critical habitat for these species is known to exist.

NB: While it is understood that the management of road density on the FMA is not completely within the control of the Company, there is a need to engage other parties (particularly oil and gas exploration and development companies) in a cooperative effort in order to reduce road density over time. There is also a need to develop and implement species recovery plans for these species in a timely manner – something that has to date has been lacking in the province.

- **Indicator/target #12 (open temporary road density)** – No target has been set for this indicator (although the DFMP indicates that a target was to be established by June 2008).

- **Indicator/target #19 (ex-situ provenances and gene lines inventory – tree improvement program tour guide)** – The target for this indicator is stated as “cooperate with Alberta in an active conservation program for applicable controlled parentage plan species.” However, this is an action item and does not meet the CSA Z809 definition of a target. NB: We understand that this “target” is a mandatory requirement of the Alberta Forest Management Planning Standard, and that ASRD requires that the Company include it in the DFMP.

- **Indicator/target #20 (stakeholder consultation records – summary report)** – The “target” identified in relation to this indicator is an action item and does not meet the CSA Z809 definition of a target.
- **Indicator/target #21 (annual weed control report)** – The “target” identified in relation to this indicator is an action item and does not meet the CSA Z809 definition of a target.
- **Indicator/target #25 (annual status report on integrated planning initiatives)** – The target for this indicator is to have “an active ILM program to minimize footprint”. However, it is not entirely clear what is meant by “an active ILM program”, or how the Company intends to measure performance in relation to this indicator.
- **Indicator/target #26 (% area of roads and bared areas by block)** – The target for this indicator requires that the total area of roads and cleared areas within each harvest block be less than or equal to 5% of the total block area. However, it is not clear why this target has been set at the block rather than at the landscape level. If the intent is to minimize the area of the FMA that is occupied by roads and cleared areas, then a landscape level target would be more appropriate. There will always be instances (e.g., small, irregular shaped blocks) where it is not possible to meet a 5% block level target. However, such deviations are not material provided that the landscape level target has been met.
- **Indicator/target #29 (water flow forecasts from water yield models)** – The target for this indicator is stated as “default to WRENS output”. However, there is no detail in the DFMP Summary Documentation as to what this actually means. In addition, it appears that the target is a model output only that is not tied to the harvest sequence upon which the DFMP is based. As such, it would appear to be of questionable value as a management system indicator/target.
- **Indicator/target #35 (summary document of aboriginal values identified versus aboriginal values achieved)** – The “target” identified in relation to this indicator is an action item and does not meet the CSA Z809 definition of a target.
- **Indicator/target #36 (public advisory committee write-up included in DFMP)** – The value associated with this indicator/target is stated as “public satisfaction with consultation process”. The associated target is stated as “open disclosure of all views expressed by public consultation participants”. However, it is not clear how this indicator/target can be used to measure public satisfaction. In addition, the “target” identified in relation to this indicator is an action item and does not meet the CSA Z809 definition of a target.

Opportunities for improvement

The following 9 opportunities for improvement were identified during the audit:

1. **Opportunity for improvement: 2438/2438.02-OFI-IA-01**

Standard/Element(s): ISO 14001: N/A
CSA Z809: Element 7.3.6.4 Choosing Indicators
Client Procedure(s): Effectiveness Monitoring Program

The 2007 DFMP places a significant degree of reliance on the use of a coarse filter approach for the management of biodiversity. However, the 2007 DFMP plan currently lacks a long term effectiveness monitoring program (EMP) to: (1) test the assumptions upon which the selection of indicators and targets were based, and (2) evaluate whether the indicators and targets that have been selected are effective in achieving the underlying objectives outlined in the plan.

NB: The DFMP includes a commitment to develop an EMP, and DMI has developed a draft framework for an effectiveness monitoring program in a document dated July 2007 which, if implemented, would help the Company to test the validity of its coarse filter approach. However, the monitoring framework recommended in this document has yet to be adopted by the Company.

NB: The current CSA Z809-02 is not explicit in defining the need for an effectiveness monitoring program. However, the standard alludes to the need for such a program under section 7.3.6.4 where it states "In some instances, direct measurements of forest conditions are not feasible, and an indirect measurement is necessary. If this occurs, the relationship between the selected indicator and the condition being measured should be clearly established and periodically checked to ensure that the stated relationship remains valid".

2. **Opportunity for improvement: 2438/2438.02-OFI-IA-02**

Standard/Element(s): ISO 14001: N/A
CSA Z809: 7.3.7 SFM Plan
Client Procedure(s): DFMP Indicator & Target Matrices

The CSA Z809 standard requires the organization to develop an SFM plan that includes a variety of components, one of which is information on the current status for the indicators included in the plan. However, although information on the current status for a number of indicators (particularly those associated with coarse filter landscape level biodiversity targets) is included in the background DFMP forecasting documentation, information on current status (or where to find it) for many of the DFMP indicators is not included in the detailed indicator and target matrices included in the DFMP summary documentation. As a result, it is difficult for a casual reader of the DFMP to obtain a clear picture of the current status of many of the indicators included in the plan.

3. Opportunity for improvement: 2438/2438.02-OFI-IA-03

Standard/Element(s): ISO 14001: N/A
CSA Z809: 7.3.3.1 Shared Responsibilities - General
Client Procedure(s): DFMP; Integrated Land Management Program

Element 7.3.3.1 of the CSA Z809 standard requires the organization to ensure that all parties necessary to address the CSA Z809 elements for the DFA are involved in the process, and that the respective roles of the parties involved be clearly defined.

There are a number of organizations (e.g., DMI-PRPD, various oil and gas exploration and development companies, etc.) whose activities on the FMA (harvesting, roads, seismic lines, well sites, etc.) contribute to the cumulative ecological footprint. DMI-PRPD is able to exercise a degree of control over some of the other players on the FMA (although only at the operational level) through their review and approval of oil and gas permit applications. However, DMI-PRPD does not currently have the ability to exercise management control over the other players on the FMA at the strategic (i.e., landscape planning) level, and the oil and gas sector has to date declined to participate on the Public Advisory Committee (PAC). In addition, although DFMP indicator/target #25 (annual status report on integrated planning initiatives) addresses the need for a strategic level integrated land management (ILM) program as a means to facilitate cooperative planning of industrial activities so as to minimize the cumulative impacts on the landbase, the development of such a program remains in its infancy. Going forward, there is a critical need to develop and implement an ILM program as soon as possible in order to effectively manage for a variety of values present on the FMA, including sensitive species such as woodland caribou and grizzly.

4. Opportunity for improvement: 2438/2438.02-OFI-IA-04

Standard/Element(s): ISO 14001: N/A
CSA Z809: Element 5.3.1 Basic Operating Rules
Client Procedure(s): PAC Terms of Reference

The CSA Z809 standard requires that a set of basic operating rules (i.e., a terms of reference) be developed to govern the functioning of the public participation process. The audit found that a documented terms of reference had been developed for the PAC that addressed the large majority of the requirements of the CSA Z809 standard. However, the current version of the PAC terms of reference (dated February 5, 2008) does not appear to adequately address conflict of interest.

5. Opportunity for improvement: 2438/2438.02-OFI-IA-05

Standard/Element(s): ISO 14001: N/A
CSA Z809: 7.3.6.1 Setting DFA-Specific Performance Requirements – General
Client Procedure(s): Public Advisory Committee (PAC)

PAC questionnaire responses and interview evidence obtained during the audit identified a number of concerns regarding the public participation process. In particular, several PAC members expressed a belief that: (1) they weren't given an adequate opportunity to review and provide input regarding the 2007 DFMP revision and the VOITs included within it, and (2) that the current list of VOITs does not adequately address the values expressed by the group. Although these concerns may be in part the result of a lack of understanding on the

part of some PAC members regarding some of the more technical elements of the DFMP, there appears to be an opportunity to engage the PAC in a more comprehensive discussion regarding the VOITs to be included in the upcoming 2009 DFMP.

6. Opportunity for improvement: 2438/2438.02-OFI-IA-06

Standard/Element(s): ISO 14001: N/A
CSA Z809: 7.3.6.1 Setting DFA-Specific Performance Requirements – General

Client Procedure(s): DFMP Indicator & Target Matrices

The CSA Z809 standard requires that the organization establish DFA-specific performance requirements that address all of the CSA SFM elements. In addition, it requires that at least one indicator/target be established for each of the values identified in the plan.

The audit found that DMI-PRPD had met the above requirements. However, the 2007 DFMP revision only includes one indicator/target (#30 – government approval and industry sign-off of ACC calculation) in relation to Element 5.1 – Timber and Non-Timber Benefits. Although the maintenance of an approved AAC is important for a variety of reasons (maintenance of a viable wood processing industry, community stability, etc.) it would appear that there may be other non-timber benefits (e.g., recreational opportunities, local employment, etc.) that are not adequately addressed by the current set of VOITs.

7. Opportunity for improvement: 2438/2438.02-OFI-IA-07

Standard/Element(s): ISO 14001: 4.4.7 Emergency Preparedness and Response
CSA Z809: 7.4.7 Emergency Preparedness and Response

Client Procedure(s): Emergency Response Testing

The ISO 14001 and CSA Z809 standards require the organization to conduct period tests of its emergency response procedures. The audit found that the Operation has conducted a number of drills to test both first aid and fire emergency response procedures within the past few years. However, a review of the EMS records did not identify any evidence of recent tests of the Operation's spill response procedures.

8. Opportunity for improvement: 2438/2438.02-OFI-IA-08

Standard/Element(s): ISO 14001: 4.4.6 Operational Control
CSA Z809: 7.4.6 Operational Procedures and Control

Client Procedure(s): FR-G002 – Project Supervision Procedure

FR-G002 requires the start-up meetings and inspections be completed for all field activities on DMI-PRPD's crown tenures, and documentation that these occurred on CHK-003 and CHK-006 respectively. However, these documents were not available for the winter 2008 mechanical site preparation completed by Boucher Bros on FMAP050102 block 36 and 74, nor for the joint DMI-PRPD/Canfor 2007 spray program in FMAP020105. DMI-PRPD appears to delegate considerable responsibility for effective implementation of these activities to third parties, even though the activities are occurring on their tenure blocks. As such, there appears to be a weakness in the implementation of DMI-PRPD's operational controls by third parties.

9. Opportunity for improvement: 2438/2438.02-OFI-IA-09

Standard/Element(s): ISO 14001: 4.5.1 Monitoring and Measurement

CSA Z809: 7.5.1 Monitoring and Measurement

Client Procedure(s): FR-G002 – Project Supervision Procedure

FR-G002 requires weekly inspections of harvest, chipping and hog fuel procurement activities (CHK-005) and inspections once per project (CHK-006) for establishment and performance surveys. The audit found that compliance with inspections procedures for harvest operations was high. However, there were some gaps in the timing or detail of the inspections completed. For example:

- The Pine Ridge Logging operations at E25-72-20-W5 was into its second week of operations but had not yet received a formal, documented inspection.
- Regular inspections had occurred for FMAP030166 block 24, but inspections in late winter 2008 indicated that debris disposal was satisfactory when in fact there was an issue with one debris pile that was too close to standing timber.
- There did not appear to be any documented inspection that noted the unsatisfactory litter control issue associated with planting boxes in FMAP0500102 block 130/131.
- There did not appear to be completed CHK-006 forms for all of the silviculture survey projects completed in 2007.

Audit conclusions

The audit found that the DMI-PRPD SFM system:

- Was in full conformance with the requirements of the ISO 14001 and CSA Z809 requirements included within the scope of the audit, except where noted otherwise in this report;
- Continues to be effectively implemented, and;
- Is sufficient to systematically meet the commitments included within the Company's environmental policy and SFM principles, provided that the system continues to be implemented and maintained as required.

As a result, a decision has been reached by the lead auditor to recommend that DMI-PRPD be registered to the ISO 14001 and CSA Z809 standards.

NB: Our assessment by its nature is a sample and is not intended to be as comprehensive as your internal audit. It is possible for nonconforming issues to remain undetected. Our next assessment will verify that your internal audits have continued to operate as the primary mechanism to ensure that your management system remains effectively implemented and continues to improve.

E. Corrective Action Plans

Written corrective action plans that are designed to address the root causes of all identified non-conformities are required within 30 days of the closing meeting. These will be reviewed by KPMG PRI for adequacy, and either approved or returned for revision.

A template for DMI-PRPD to develop the required corrective action plans will be provided to you for this purpose. Please complete the appropriate section of this template and e-mail your proposed corrective actions to the KPMG PRI lead auditor for review.

F. Focus Areas for Next Audit Visit

The following issues/potential concerns have been identified as focus areas for the next audit visit:

1. Implementation of the action plans developed by DMI-PRPD to address the open findings identified during previous (2007 and 2008) external audits.
2. Progress towards the completion of the 2009 DFMP.
3. Development and implementation of a strategic level integrated land management program as a means to: (1) conduct cooperative planning amongst all industry players with an interest in the FMA, and (2) minimize the ecological footprint associated with industrial activities.