

Dr. Martin Walter

September 2006
Updated August 2008

Analysis of the FSC and PEFC Systems for
Forest Management Certification
using the
Forest Certification Assessment Guide (FCAG)

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

Executive Summary

I Introduction

Background

Methodology

II Assessment of the FSC and PEFC System

Part 1 Compliance with international norms and standards

Part 2 Standards and the Standard-Setting Process

Part 3 Conformity assessment, Certification, and Accreditation

Summary analysis of findings for the PEFC system

Summary analysis of findings for the FSC system

Annex 1 Reference List

List of Abbreviations

ASI	Accreditation Services International
AFS	Australian Forestry Standard
ATO	African Timber Organisation
FCAG	Forest Certification Assessment Guide
FMU	Forest Management Unit
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
IAF	International Accreditation Forum
ILO	International Labour Organisation
INN	Instituto Nacional de Acreditación
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organisation
ISEAL	International Social and Environmental Labelling Alliance
ISO/IEC	International Standardisation Organisation
JAS-ANZ	Joint Accreditation System for Australia and New Zealand
NA	Not applicable
NRIS	Not required by the international system
PCI	Principles, Criteria and Indicators
PEOLG	Pan European Operational Level Guidelines
PEFC,	Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification Schemes
POL	Policy
PRO	Procedure
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management
SME	Small and medium sized enterprises
STD	Standard
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

Note about the author

Martin Walter is lecturer at the University of Applied Sciences in Weihenstephan, Germany on forest certification and forest product markets. His recent work includes contributions to the development of World Bank guidelines for the assessment of certification systems and to the World Bank Sourcebook on Forests. He is member of the FSC economic chamber.

Executive Summary

In this study the two international systems for forest management certification, PEFC (Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification Systems) and FSC (Forest Stewardship Council), were analyzed against the requirements of the Forest Certification Assessment Guide (FCAG), an analytical framework for the evaluation of forest certification systems jointly developed by WWF and the World Bank.

Evaluation focused on the rules and regulations set by these systems at the international level. For those requirements not addressed at the international level a sample of national systems' rules and regulations was evaluated against the requirements of FCAG.

The analysis was carried out as a desk study, based solely on the publicly available documentation. The findings at this stage were not cross-checked with other evidence, such as interviews or observations of the systems' performance in the field.

The PEFC system proved to be organised in a decentralised way leaving considerable flexibility to the local level interpretation of the international rules and regulations. This applies to the development of national standards and also to the certification procedures applied in different national schemes. This study identified a number of issues resulting from the decentralised structure which were not addressed by the international PEFC system and were therefore evaluated at the level of national PEFC systems in the sample.

The flexibility resulting from PEFC's structure allows for a wide range of different approaches to be taken by national schemes in standard setting and certification. While this flexibility is used by the national schemes to accommodate national circumstances, this results in differences in the requirements between the national PEFC schemes. Examples include:

- availability of certification reports which can be downloaded in the case of the Chilean system but are only available on request from certificate holders in the case of PEFC Australia;
- the scope of certification which in the case of Chile and Australia is the actual forest management, while in the case of Germany the scope is limited to the services provided by regional working groups.;

Analysis of the PEFC system against the FCAG requirements identified key issues relating to stakeholder involvement and balanced decision making.

Governance structures at international and national level as well as procedures for national standard setting do not include sufficient rigor or detail to ensure the level of participation envisaged in the FCAG. While stakeholder involvement is intended by PEFC, final decision making processes are permissible without broader participation of stakeholder groups. In addition, decision making structures at national level do not ensure a balance of interests and can be dominated by representatives of one stakeholder group.

There is little information on the results of accreditation audits as reports are not made available by accreditation bodies. This reduces the transparency of decisions and limits the possibilities of stakeholders to make a judgement on the quality of the accreditation process. More ample information is provided for the work of certification bodies but with huge differences with regard to content and availability of certification reports.

The FSC system can be characterised as more centralised as key functions are carried out by international bodies and the rules for national and local level interpretation are more rigorous.

Few deficits of the FSC system with regard to the FCAG requirements could be identified. The most critical aspect is certainly the use of 'interim standards' at a national or local level which are not developed along the lines envisaged in the FCAG for local level adaptation of international framework standards.

Analysis of the FSC and PEFC Systems for Forest Management Certification using the Forest Certification Assessment Guide (FCAG)

Background

With the Forest Certification Assessment Guide (FCAG), WWF developed in close collaboration with the World Bank a tool which allows analysis of forest certification systems for their compliance with a number of principles. These principles were defined as a result of intensive discussions over a three year period with a range of different stakeholders. They encompass the elements regarded essential for the content of forest management standards and the means and mechanisms applied for their development. They also include structural and operational requirements which are deemed necessary to ensure independent and credible certification. Analysis of systems against the elements in the FCAG provides insights into the strengths and weaknesses and can support decisions taken in the context of WWF programmes, for example the Global Forest & Trade Network (GFTN).

At present, two forest certification systems are operational at the international level, FSC (Forest Stewardship Council) and PEFC (Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification Systems). They provide a framework under which the four main elements of credible certification systems; scheme governance, certification, accreditation and standard setting are regulated. Consequently, it is assumed that activities of schemes operating at national level which have been endorsed by an international system are operating in accordance with the international requirements. Issues not addressed at international level can then be assessed at national level, allowing a more efficient assessment process. However, this assumption requires that the endorsement mechanisms of the international systems are sufficient to ensure adherence to international requirements at all subordinate levels. An analysis of the independence, effectiveness and accuracy of the approval mechanisms over and above the issues analysed here is, although recommendable, outside the scope of this study.

It is the purpose of this study to provide information on the strengths and weaknesses of the international system and internationally governed national schemes for FSC and PEFC certification. This is carried out using the Forest Certification Assessment Guide (FCAG) as the relevant framework. In a first step the analysis looks into the international rules for the systems. Where national schemes exceed the international provisions, compliance with certain elements can also be achieved at the national level depending on the system-specific distribution of tasks and responsibilities. Additionally, a sample of national systems is analysed but only for those aspects which did not yield satisfactory results at the international level. For the analysis at national level a sampling strategy was used. For both systems the sample encompassed the national schemes or procedures of Australia, Chile and Germany. This two-level approach to assessment of certification systems allows comparison of the two systems and identification of those elements of the FCAG which are not sufficiently addressed at either the international or national level.

WWF has commissioned this study in order to develop a position and strategy with regards to forest certification.

The results of this analysis allow comparison of the two systems for each element. However, it should also be noted that a comprehensive statement on the overall performance of the two systems is only possible on the basis of a mechanism which would allow weighing the different elements of the FCAG for their importance which is outside the scope of this study.

2. Methodology

For the FSC system all evaluation was first carried out on the basis of documentation available in August 2006. The FSC documents used for the assessment have not changed since this date up to the reference date for this study in August 2008 with the exception of one document related to the accreditation bodies' procedures. Documents for PEFC system were analysed first on the basis of the same reference date (August 2006). In a later survey the findings were revised taking into account changes in the PEFC documentation in the PEFC General Assembly 2006. Analysis therefore refers to the documents as of October 2007. Again the relevant documents of the PEFC system remained unchanged since this date.

In this report the findings are presented in one table for both assessed systems. The respective position and the document where corresponding text could be found in the system's documentation are included in the tables. Main findings and conclusions are summarised in analyses of PEFC and FSC respectively which also include more ample comments on some issues which were more complicated to assess or for which it was more difficult to reach a judgement.

On the background of the overall purpose of the study the different findings were classified into the following categories:

Fulfilled: content of documentation is adequately addressing the FCAG requirement

Not required by the international system (N.R.I.S.): the documentation of the international system does not adequately address the FCAG requirement but compliance could still be achieved by bodies operating under the system (certification bodies or national initiatives in the FSC system; certification bodies, accreditation bodies or national schemes in the PEFC system). This entry leads to the assessment of these issues for the national systems in the sample.

Not fulfilled in the case of the international system: the FCAG requirement can only be fulfilled by the international system but no adequate procedure could be found in the documentation.

Not fulfilled in the case of national system: this entry follows when at the international level the requirement is not addressed and also at the national level compliance could not be achieved.

Not applicable: in a few cases the rules of the FCAG were not applicable to the provisions set by the system. Reasons vary and are therefore directly given when this category of finding was chosen.

In most cases this classification could be consistently applied. Given the wording of some FCAG requirements and the complexity of the assessed systems, intermediary situations for which findings could not be classified without doubt were also encountered during analysis. The following entries were made in each of these situations:

- o The system addresses the aspect but the wording in the documentation does not fully correspond to the meaning or intention of the FCAG requirement. In this case the findings were classified 'fulfilled' and an additional comment is explaining this classification.
- o Some FCAG requirements include more than one aspect and the system complies with one but not with the other. In these cases the different parts were assessed

separately and the findings were classified for each of the elements in the FCAG requirement.

- o The issue is mentioned in the system's documentation but not elaborated with sufficient detail. The corresponding entry was 'not fulfilled' or 'not required by the international system' together with a brief comment explaining the judgment.

Summary analysis of findings for the PEFC system

General aspects

The PEFC system can be characterized as decentralized as accreditation, certification and standard setting functions are carried out through nationally operating bodies. Although the structures of the involved bodies and the applied procedures are guided by the internationally applicable PEFC rules, national PEFC schemes are provided with a range of possibilities to adapt the system to the specific national situation. This flexibility allows for a greater variety of approaches concerning the different elements of the certification process.

The decentralized structure results in a number of FCAG elements not being addressed through international PEFC documentation. However, national schemes have the possibility to complement or exceed the internationally set framework. Compliance with FCAG criteria can therefore be still achieved through the provisions set by national systems.

During analysis no indication could be found that international rules prohibit national PEFC systems from establishing structures and procedures in line with the FCAG.

Part 1 Compliance with International Norms and Standards

It could be observed that in most cases the rules set at the international level are fulfilling the basic requirements as defined in FCAG criterion 1.

PEFC or affiliated national schemes are not members of the ISEAL Alliance. In the context of this study this situation would require an analysis of the internationally applicable PEFC requirements against the ISEAL Code of Good Practice for Setting for Social and Environmental Standards. However as this study is based on publicly available documentation additional analysis is not attempted here.

Part 2 Standards and the Standard-Setting Process

In general the international PEFC frameworks for the content of national standards cover the respective elements of the FCAG. For the ATO/ITTO Principles Criteria and Indicators (ATO/ITTO PCI) for natural forests in African countries deviations from the requirements for the content of standards (criterion 2) were identified in a limited number of instances mainly related to aspects of management planning and the internal monitoring systems of operations.

Some gaps were found for the PEOLG, specifically FCAG requirements for planning and monitoring. In addition, two elements were identified as not being sufficiently addressed in the standard. The PEOLG has no explicit requirements for the maintenance of critical forest areas and natural critical habitats. Although wording of the PEOLG mentions issues referenced in World Bank policies, the underlying concept of the PEOLG in this regard is not fully aligned with the World Bank's approach (s. Box 1 in part 2). Furthermore, the PEOLG lacks a requirement avoiding conversion of critical natural habitats or critical forest areas during the establishment of plantations.

In one of its most recent decisions (October 2007) the PEFC council also accepted the ITTO Guidelines for the management of tropical forests as a basis for certification in tropical regions. The rules set in these guidelines are providing a framework for setting the policies for sustainable development of forests at government level and are only partly applicable at the operational level. This may be the reason for substantial deficits of the ITTO Guidelines when compared to the FCAG requirements. The same deficits could be found as mentioned above for the PEOLG. In addition, the ITTO guidelines lack provision for traditional rights of indigenous and other communities, for community relations and for worker's rights.

For all areas where FCAG stipulates broad stakeholder involvement in decision making processes, the internationally applicable rules and regulations fall short of complying with the FCAG principles specified in criterion 3. The PEFC governance structures at international level allow for the invitation of external parties for General Assembly meetings but their participation is limited to an observer status without influence on decisions. Full membership in the international governing bodies is granted to national schemes which are represented by nominated delegates in the General Assembly and the Governing Board.

Provisions of the PEFC system governing the standard setting processes at national level are more flexible in allowing external views to influence decision making. However, some difficulties could be found when assessing the FCAG requirements for the international PEFC system. In the international procedures for national standard setting it is clearly defined that decision making procedures for the approval of national standards must be based on consensus. However, procedures do not specify that consensus in the group has to be achieved among stakeholders representing different interests. Non-conformance with FCAG requirements is based on the interpretation that endorsement of a national standard by PEFC is possible even when in extreme cases only one interest may have participated in the standard development process.

While allowing flexibility the international system does not prevent national schemes to exceed the PEFC provisions and allow for broader participation. However, in no case could more inclusive procedures for the involvement of stakeholders be found during assessment of national schemes.

Except from standard setting procedures, governance structures applied in national PEFC schemes, are not intensively regulated by the international PEFC system. National bodies have considerable flexibility when establishing their governance structures and can limit or broaden stakeholder participation. Assessment of decision making procedures and processes applied can therefore only be done in the assessment of national PEFC schemes. For the selected national systems it could be found that the governance structures applied by national systems were for most aspects also not conformant to FCAG requirements.

Part 3 Conformity Assessment, Certification, and Accreditation

The FCAG criteria 7-11 are mainly conceived to supplement the respective ISO rules which govern the general organizational set-up and the procedures applied by bodies conducting conformity assessment, certification and accreditation. It can be concluded from the analysis that the internationally applicable rules for the certification and accreditation applied in the PEFC system do not substantially exceed the international framework set by ISO.

For some aspects it could be found during analysis of national systems that although the issues are mentioned in the PEFC documentation in a general manner, the provisions lack the necessary level of detail required by the FCAG criteria. This is particularly the case for 'transparency' (criterion 7) and 'stakeholder involvement' (8.4). Although the procedures require public reports, the provisions for content and availability are not compliant with FCAG requirements. The same applies to stakeholder consultation during assessment which is mentioned in a general way in the documentation but without procedures detailing who should be consulted and how consultation should be carried out.

Reliance solely on ISO requirement also leads to deficits of PEFC certification and accreditation with regard to the intensity of surveillance and the periods allowed for achieving full compliance in case of non-conformities identified during surveillance (criterion 9). As ISO rules are less rigorous for these aspects compared to the FCAG requirements these aspects are not covered by the PEFC system.

Not all interested forest owners can access the PEFC certification systems as these are so far operational only in countries where an endorsed national scheme exists. This is particularly problematic as with only few exceptions developing countries are currently not members of PEFC and do not have an endorsed national system.

The PEFC system complies with almost all requirements from ISO standards (14020 and 14021) related to the claims made on the environmental performance. However, PEFC uses the term 'sustainable' in the context of its claim what should be avoided according to ISO 14021. The ISO standard considers the term as being too complex and not verifiable with sufficient scientific rigor to use it in the context of an environmental product claim. Following this understanding it had to be concluded that the respective requirements in the ISO 14021 for clarity, accuracy and verifiability of claims are also not fulfilled by PEFC. Moreover, the term is often not well understood by consumers, as suggested by research on this subject.

There is another more intricate issue related to claims which results from the certification of intermediary organizations between forest management operations and certification bodies, in group certification systems or regional certification. In these situations the certificate is not issued to the forest management unit but to this intermediate organization for its management system. However, the certificate holder has no control of the forest management or monitoring function at the FMU level.

The PEFC system provides a number of approaches particularly tailored for owners of smaller land holdings in order to provide comparably easy access to certification. This is coupled with group certification requirements which in extreme cases allow for the participation of forest owners without their commitment to adhere to the standards set by PEFC for the operational level. In some regional certifications the scope of certification does not cover the operational level, i.e. compliance with the PEOLG at the forest level does not lie with the holder of the certificate.

Conclusions

In the PEFC system many functions for all three areas of a certification system, standard setting, certification and accreditation are carried out or are regulated by decentralised national bodies and related schemes. The work of the national systems is partly but not fully regulated by rules set at the international level. In relation to the FCAG requirements there remain deficits particularly for the aspects of participation and involvement of stakeholders in decision making. In the sample of national systems assessed in this study cases were identified that national rules are available despite the absence of guidance at the international level. However, for the majority of deficits at international level, the national systems have not developed additional policies which result in non-conformance of these systems with FCAG requirements at national level.

Summary analysis of findings for the FSC system

General aspects

In the FSC system central functions of the certification system, namely certification, including conformity assessment and accreditation are carried out by internationally operating bodies. Only in the standard setting function is the process of local adaptation of international standards devolved to national or local level organizations or procedures. Consequently, it could be found in the context of this study that for many elements an analysis at international level is sufficient to classify the findings either as fulfilled or not fulfilled. Only in few cases analysis of the national systems was necessary.

Part 1 Compliance with International Norms and Standards

With regard to the elements in part 1 of the FCAG, analysing international surveillance of the system's operations it can be concluded that the FSC standard setting system is addressed through the monitoring and surveillance structures of the ISEAL Alliance. FSC maintains an internationally operating accreditation programme, which recognises certification body's structures and operations according to ISO guide 65 and additional requirements developed by FSC. So far Accreditation Services International (ASI), the accreditation branch of FSC is not a full member of ISEAL, thus adherence to ISO standard 17011 which sets the rules for accreditation bodies is not ensured by international umbrella systems. In the context of this study this is not analysed further due to methodological problems but this remains an important deficit of the FCS system in relation to FCAG requirements.

Part 2 Standards and the Standard-Setting Process

The international framework standard applied by FSC includes the great majority of issues listed in FCAG criterion 2 which details the required content of forest management standards. Inconsistencies in terminology could be identified for the elements dealing with protected forest areas. While the FCAG uses the terms 'critical forest areas' and 'critical natural habitats' as defined in the World Bank policies the FSC international standard builds upon the concept of 'High Conservation Value Forests'. As stated in the footnote to FCAG criterion 2, point g, the relation between these terms and the underlying concepts will be elucidated in the forthcoming World Bank Forests Sourcebook. In the meantime it is after a preliminary analysis concluded that critical forest areas are a sub-set of 'high conservation value forests'. Consequently, their maintenance as required in FCAG criterion 2, point g, can be assumed by the application of FSC Principle 9. However, ecologically valuable areas outside the forest, and classifiable as 'critical natural habitats', are not explicitly covered under this FSC principle. Accordingly, this part of the FCAG criterion was categorised as not fulfilled.

The standard setting activities and the governance structures of the FSC system are further analysed under criterion 3. Local adaptation of the international framework standard can be developed in two different ways. National or sub-national standards can be produced by working groups which have to be endorsed by FSC. In addition, the possibility exists, that so-called 'interim standards' are elaborated by certification bodies as the locally applicable interpretation of the international standard. Assessment of the standard development processes was therefore carried out for both mechanisms. The distribution of tasks between international bodies and national initiatives required a separate analysis of the governance structures for each level. For evaluating governance of national initiatives, the provisions set by the international system were considered.

For standard development processes carried out by national initiatives, it can be concluded that the rules of the FSC system for steering the structures and procedures at national level, are in conformance with the respective FCAG requirements. More deficits could be identified for interim standards which are developed by certification bodies. Although the process includes consultation, the decision making in this case not based upon consensus among

stakeholders or a balanced voting system as required in the FCAG criterion. However, the availability of this procedure permits the FSC system to offer certification services globally and to comply with the FCAG requirement for equity of access independent from location of the operation.

With regard to the governance structures of the international system analysis showed for most of the required elements a broad overlap between the FCAG concept as outlined in criterion 3 and the FSC approach. However, decision making procedures in the General Assembly are not oriented towards consensus but are based on a voting system. The voting procedures avoid that no major interest group can be dominated what leads to decisions which at least consider the need for consensus. Eligibility criteria for NGOs as outlined in the guidance to this FCAG criterion are partially covered under FSC membership requirements. Nonetheless, the FSC system does not dispose of strict selection criteria for NGOs which would reflect all elements of the list included in the guidance to FCAG criterion 3.

Requirements for governance of national level operations are laid down in the FSC National Initiatives Manual. The provisions in this document are to some extent confusing, particularly with regard to voting rights and the distinction between the decision making procedures for standard setting committees (part 12) and for other tasks of these bodies. Assessment of the documentation therefore identified non-compliance for various aspects.

Part 3 Conformity assessment, Certification, and Accreditation

The FSC certification and accreditation procedures exceed the rules set by the International Standardisation Organisation (ISO) for these activities and comply with the FCAG requirements listed in this part. The only exception relates to the procedures for complaints and appeals which are not at all stages free of cost for the party forwarding the complaint or the appeal.

Conclusions

In the more centralised FSC system, the necessary information for assessing compliance with the respective FCAG requirement was for the majority of issues available in the documentation of the international system. For a large number of examined issues the FSC documentation delivered adequate evidence of conformance with FCAG requirements. Exceptions are related to involvement of all the stakeholder groups listed in the FCAG in the governance of national initiatives and in the standard setting procedures for developing national or local standards.

For accreditation compliance of the accreditation procedures with the relevant ISO standards is not ensured through membership of the FSC accreditation branch (ASI) in an international umbrella organisation. An assessment of ASI procedures against ISO standard 17011 was outside the scope of this study.

Particularly, the development of “interim standards” is consistently identified as weakness in assessments of the FSC system, including this analysis as the requirements at international level for the input of stakeholder groups to this process are comparably weak. The assessment of the processes at national level did not provide additional evidence adequate to result in conformance of the development process for interim standards with FCAG requirements.

PART 1

Compliance with international norms and standards

Criterion 1 — Compliance with international frameworks for certification, accreditation, and standard setting

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
a. The accreditation body is affiliated with an international accreditation organization (alliance/forum) such as the International Accreditation Forum (IAF; iaf.org) or the International Social and Environmental Accreditation and Labeling Alliance (ISEAL isealalliance.org).	Fulfilled PEFC Technical document, Annex 6, point 5;				Not fulfilled			
b. Monitoring and surveillance carried out by the organizations under point a cover the activities of accreditation in the field of forest management	Fulfilled				Fulfilled			
c. All certification bodies are accredited for their activities carried out for the forest management certification scheme under assessment.	Fulfilled (update October 2006) PEFC Technical document, Annex 6, 4;			Note: forest management is not covered by the scope of certification	Fulfilled FSC STD 20-001 to 20-009			
d. Accreditation requires compliance with ISO Guide 62 ¹ , 65 ² , or 66 ³	Fulfilled PEFC Technical document, Annex 6, 5;				Fulfilled FSC STD 20-001 to 20-009			
e. Standard-setting bodies are affiliated with the ISEAL Alliance	Not fulfilled				Fulfilled ISEAL membership list			

1 ISO/IEC Guide 62 (1996): General Requirements for Bodies Operating Assessment and Certification/Registration of Quality Systems, Geneva.

2 ISO/IEC Guide 65 (1996): General Requirements for Bodies Operating Product Certification Systems, Geneva.

3 ISO/IEC Guide 66 (1996): General Requirements for Bodies Operating Assessment and Certification/Registration of Environmental Management Systems, Geneva.

Note: The ISO Guides 62 and 66 were replaced by the ISO Standard 17021: Conformity assessment -- Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems.

Guidance								
Point a—Affiliation with IAF or ISEAL should be as an accreditation or standard-setting body, respectively. Other forms of membership exist with these bodies but do not require compliance with relevant requirements (ISO 17011 ⁴ , ISEAL Code of Good Practice for Setting Social and Environmental Standards ⁵)								
Point b—International bodies for mutual recognition of accreditation often limit their services to specific scopes, such as for quality management certification or environmental management certification. Monitoring and surveillance should therefore be evaluated if the activities of accreditation bodies in the field of forest management certification are in fact covered by international umbrella organizations.								
Point c—It is important to assess that certification bodies are accredited for their activities in the field of forest management and carried out for the specific certification scheme. Accreditation for ISO 14001 or ISO 9000 is not sufficient.								
Point d—Alternatively, a certification system can provide evidence of compliance with the above referenced documents (ISO 17011; ISO Guide 62, 65 and 66; and ISEAL Code of Good Practice) through other means. In this case the elements of the certification system have to be assessed against the requirements specified therein.								

⁴ ISO/IEC 17011:2004, Conformity Assessment — General Requirements for Accreditation Bodies Accrediting Conformity Assessment Bodies, Geneva.

⁵ ISEAL Alliance (2004): ISEAL Code of Good Practice for Setting Social and Environmental Standards, Bonn.

Comment: the assessment of the FSC accreditation procedures according to ISO standard 17011 and the PEFC standard setting procedures according to the ISEAL Code of Good Practice (s. guidance to point d) are not carried out in this study as this would require more in-depths analysis of the applied procedures which was not feasible on the basis of a desk study alone.

PART 2

Standards and the Standard-Setting Process

Criterion 2—Compatible with globally applicable principles that balance economic, ecological, and equity dimensions of forest management and meet Global Forest Alliance requirements

Comment: The PEFC system uses the Pan European Operational Level Guidelines (PEOLG) as the internationally applicable reference for the development of national standards. These guidelines were developed by the Helsinki process, a ministerial conference established by the European forest ministers. The outcome of similar processes in other regions can be approved by PEFC as being an acceptable basis for the development of national standards in countries of these regions. As of today, the ATO/ITTO Principles, criteria and indicators for the sustainable forest management of African natural tropical forests (ATO/ITTO PCI), as well as the ITTO Guidelines for the management of forests in tropical countries (ITTO Guidelines on the conservation of biological diversity in tropical production forests; ITTO Guidelines for the establishment and sustainable management of planted tropical forests) were endorsed by the PEFC. Consequently, all three international framework standards are assessed in this study.

For the further evaluation if national schemes exceed international requirements only the PEOLG are taken as the reference due to the selection of national PEFC schemes in the sample for which only the PEOLG apply.

In the FSC system the FSC Standard 01-001 (FSC Principles and Criteria for Forest Stewardship FSC P&C) is the international framework for FSC standard setting initiatives at national or local level.

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
a. Compliance with all relevant laws. The scheme/system requires that forest management respect all applicable laws in the country in which operations occur and international treaties and agreements to which the country is signatory.	PEOLG: Fulfilled PEFC Technical document, 4.6 and 4.7 ATO/ITTO PC&I: Fulfilled ATO/ITTO PCI 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 ITTO Guidelines N.R.I.S.				Fulfilled			
b. Respect for tenure and use rights. The scheme/ system requires respect for any legally documented or customary land tenure and use rights.	PEOLG Fulfilled PEOLG 6.1 b ATO/ITTO PC&I: Fulfilled ATO/ITTO PCI, 4.1 ITTO Guidelines N.R.I.S.				Fulfilled FSC Standard 01-001, 2.2			
c. Respect for indigenous peoples' rights. The scheme/system explicitly requires respect for the legal and customary rights of indigenous people to own, use, and/or manage their lands, territories, and resources.	PEOLG N.R.I.S. ATO/ITTO PCI Fulfilled ATO/ITTO PCI, 4.1 ITTO Guidelines N.R.I.S.	Fulfilled (some deficits remain)	Not fulfilled	NA for Germany	Fulfilled FSC Standard 01-001, 3			
d. Respect for community relations. The scheme/system explicitly requires recognition and respect for the rights of communities (1) as well as the maintenance and enhancement of the long-term social and economic well-being of forest communities (2).	PEOLG Part 1 fulfilled PEOLG 6.1 b Part 2 N.R.I.S. ATO/ITTO PC&I Fulfilled ATO/ITTO PCI, 4.2-4.4 ITTO Guidelines N.R.I.S.	Part 2 fulfilled	Part 2 fulfilled Principle 5 of SFM Standard	Part 2 fulfilled Criterion 6, German PEFC standard	Fulfilled FSC Standard 01-001, 4			
e. Respect for workers' rights. The scheme/system explicitly requires recognition and respect for the rights of workers.	PEOLG Fulfilled PEOLG 6.1b ATO/ITTO PC&I:				Fulfilled FSC standard 01-001, 4 FSC policy 30-			

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
	Fulfilled ATO/ITTO PCI, 4.1.3 ITTO Guidelines N.R.I.S.				401			
f. Delivery of multiple benefits from the forest. The scheme/system explicitly requires management systems that encourage the efficient use of the multiple products and services of the forest to enhance economic viability and foster a wide range of environmental and social services.	PEOLG Fulfilled PEOLG 3.1c, 3.2a ATO/ITTO PC&I Fulfilled ATO/ITTO PCI, 2.5, 3.5 ITTO Guidelines Fulfilled for plantations, principle 27 N.R.I.S. For natural forests				Fulfilled FSC Standard 01-001, 5			
g. Assessment and mitigation of environmental impacts. The scheme/system explicitly requires that management systems assess and manage environmental impacts(including issues addressed in either World Bank or WWF policies) to conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes.	PEOLG Fulfilled PEOLG 2.1, 4.1b), 5.1 a) ATO/ITTO PC&I Fulfilled ATO/ITTO PCI, 3.1-3.5 ITTO Guidelines Fulfilled ITTO Guidelines plantations 4.1, ITTO Guidelines for natural forest management 3.1.7				Fulfilled FSC Standard 01-001, 6.1			
h. Maintenance of critical forest areas and related natural critical habitats. The scheme/system explicitly requires that forest operations maintain critical forest areas and other critical natural habitats affected by the operation	PEOLG N.R.I.S. The respective requirements in the PEOLG do not coincide with the concept and definition of critical forest areas and	Not fulfilled Require-ments of the AFS do not fully reflect the specific definitions of 'critical natural habitats' as defined in the	Not fulfilled s. comment for Inter-national and Australia	Not fulfilled s. comment for Inter-national and Australia	Fulfilled for critical forest areas FSC Standard 01-001, 9 N.R.I.S. for natural critical habitats The FSC P&C	Not fulfilled for natural critical habitats The definitions	Not fulfilled for natural critical habitats s. comments	Not fulfilled for natural critical habitats s. comments

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
	natural critical habitats as defined in the World Bank policies ATO/ITTO PCI Fulfilled ATO/ITTO PCI, 3.3.1, 3.3.2 ITTO Guidelines N.R.I.S.	World Bank policies (s. also box 1 below)			only consider forest habitats not natural habitats in general (s. also box 1 below)	used by the World Bank and the concept of High Conservation Value Forests do not fully coincide (s. also box 1 below)	on the left	on the left
i. Specific provisions for plantations. The scheme/system has adequate and explicit requirements to ensure that the establishment of plantations does not lead to the conversion of critical natural habitats.	PEOLG N.R.I.S. ATO/ITTO PCI Fulfilled ATO/ITTO PCI, 3.2.2.1 ITTO Guidelines For natural forests N.A. For plantations Fulfilled ITTO Guidelines plantations, appendix 1	Fulfilled AFS 4708-2007, 4.3.2 (but s. note in the cell above)	Fulfilled Criterion 2.1 SFM standard	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled FSC Standard 01-001, 6.10, 10.9			
j. Implementation of management plan. The scheme/system requires effective forest management planning through the maintenance of a comprehensive and up-to-date management plan appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operation concerned (1). The scheme/system explicitly requires these management plans to have clearly articulated goals for continual improvement and descriptions of the means for achieving these goals (2).	PEOLG Part 1 fulfilled PEOLG,1.1c Part 2 (on continual improvement) N.R.I.S. ATO/ITTO PCI Fulfilled ATO/ITTO PCI, 2.2.3, 3.1.4 ITTO Guidelines Fulfilled for plantations ITTO Guidelines plantations, 4.1 and 5.1.1	Part 2 Fulfilled AFS 4708-2007, 4.1.1 The AFS requirement does not fully address this issue	Part 2 not fulfilled	Part 2 not fulfilled	Part 1: Fulfilled FSC Standard 01-001, 7 Part 2 N.R.I.S.	Part 2 not fulfilled	Part 2 not fulfilled	Part 2 not fulfilled

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
	N.R.I.S. for natural forest management							
k. Effective monitoring and assessment. The scheme/ system explicitly requires the use of monitoring systems appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operation to assess the condition of the forest, yields of forest products, chain of custody (where relevant), management activities, and social and environmental impacts.	PEOLG N.R.I.S. The PEOLG describe monitoring in general without specifying the more detailed issues included in the FCAG requirement ATO/ITTO PCI Fulfilled ATO/ITTO PCI, 2.6.1.1, 3.1.2 ITTO Guidelines N.R.I.S.	Fulfilled AFS 4708-2007, 4.1.4 The AFS require monitoring but not for exactly the same issues as included in the FCAG	Fulfilled	Not fulfilled Note: monitoring is carried out at the regional level not at the FMU or operational level	Fulfilled FSC Standard 01-001, 8			
Guidance								
Points c and d—Standards should require the protection of the rights of indigenous people and local communities where use is made of their cultural knowledge or of the biological diversity on which they traditionally depend. Reference should be made in the standard to the rights of indigenous people and local communities with respect to tenure, customary use, and sites of cultural or religious significance.								
Point e—Standards should, at a minimum, meet the core International Labour Organization (ILO) requirements outlined in the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work								
Point k—Standards should include the requirement that results of monitoring be taken into account during review of plans								

Box 1: Comparison of the World Bank definition of ‘natural critical habitats’ and the provisions form protected areas as set in the PEFC and FSC certification system

World Bank definition	Related elements in the PEOLG	Related elements of the FSC Principles & Criteria
<i>Critical natural habitats</i> are: (i) existing protected areas and areas officially proposed by governments as protected areas (e.g. reserves that meet the criteria of the IUCN classifications), areas initially recognized as protected by traditional local communities (e.g. sacred groves), and sites that maintain conditions vital for the viability of these protected areas (as determined by the environmental assessment process); or (ii) sites identified on supplementary lists prepared by the Bank or an authoritative source determined by the Regional Environment Sector Unit (RESU). Such sites may include areas recognized by traditional local communities (e.g. sacred groves); areas with known high suitability for bio-diversity conservation; and sites that are critical for rare, vulnerable, migratory, or endangered species. Listings are based on systematic evaluations of such factors as species richness; the degree of endemism, rarity, and vulnerability of component species; representativeness; and integrity of ecosystem processes.	Forest management planning and terrestrial inventory and mapping of forest resources should include ecologically important forest biotopes, taking into account protected, rare, sensitive or representative forest ecosystems such as riparian areas and wetland biotopes, areas containing endemic species and habitats of threatened species, as defined in recognised reference lists, as well as endangered or protected genetic <i>in situ</i> resources. Special key biotopes in the forest such as water sources, wetlands, rocky outcrops and ravines should be protected or, where appropriate, restored when damaged by forest practices.	6.4 Representative samples of existing ecosystems within the landscape shall be protected in their natural state and recorded on maps, appropriate to the scale and intensity of operations and the uniqueness of the affected resources. Principle #9: Maintenance of high conservation value forests Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach. 9.1 Assessment to determine the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests will be completed, appropriate to scale and intensity of forest management. 9.2 The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof. 9.3 The management plan shall include and implement specific measures that ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. These measures shall be specifically included in the publicly available management plan summary. 9.4 Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.

Criterion 3 — Meaningful and equitable participation of all major stakeholder groups in governance and standard setting

Comment: The set of elements included in this section refers to standard setting procedures and governance of the systems. Both aspects have an international and a national component.

The assessment of the two systems against the requirements of criterion 2 is therefore carried out in the following sections:

- a) Rules for the development of national standards
- b) Rules for the governance of the international system
- c) Rules for the governance of national systems

According to criterion 5, the FCAG does not set requirements for the development of international standards. The procedures for the standard development at international level are therefore not evaluated.

In the PEFC system the standard setting processes are carried out at the national level within the framework set, as of today, either by the PEOLG (Pan European Operational Level Guidelines), the ATO/ITTO PCI for African Natural Forests or the ITTO Guidelines (s. criterion 2). Development of these international standards is done at government level and, thus, is outside the scope of the PEFC system.

In the FSC system two different procedures exist for developing guidance to the local interpretation of the international framework standard, the FSC Principles and Criteria. This process can be organized by national initiatives or working groups which develop FSC national standards. In addition, the FSC system provides for the possibility that this adaptation process is carried out by accredited certification bodies which are then auditing against these so-called 'interim standards'. In the analysis these different procedures for standard development at national or local level are therefore assessed separately. The examples for national application of the international principles and criteria allow analyzing both procedures. In Germany a national FSC standard exists, in Australia and Chile certification is carried out according to 'interim standards'.

a) Rules for development of national standards

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
Effective stakeholder involvement								
a. Relevant stakeholder groups (see annex 2 checklist) have been officially invited to participate.	Fulfilled PEFC Technical Document , Annex 2, 3.5.1				For national standards: Fulfilled, FSC National Initiatives Manual, 12.3.1 Interim standards: Fulfilled FSC Standard 20-003, 3.1			
b. Relevant stakeholder groups (see annex 2 checklist) participated meaningfully	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled No participation from social, environmental NGOs and indigenous peoples representative	Not fulfilled s. comment at the end of this section	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled FSC Germany membership list
c. A procedure is in place to involve stakeholders in case of failure to achieve meaningful participation of relevant major stakeholder groups.	N.R.I.S.	Fulfilled AFS, Record of process	Not fulfilled Participants in the process were nominated	Fulfilled	For national standards Fulfilled FSC National Initiatives Manual, 12.3.1 For interim standards Fulfilled FSC Standard 20-003, 3.14			
d. Written documents are available on what efforts have been taken to include stakeholders as well as on how issues raised by stakeholders have been addressed.	Fulfilled PEFC Technical document , annex 2, 3.5.1				For national standards Part 1 fulfilled FSC National Initiatives Manual, 12.5.1 For interim			

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
					standards Fulfilled FSC Standard 20-003, 4.4 and 5.1b)			
Balanced decision-making procedures								
e. The decision-making process is striving for consensus among relevant stakeholder groups.	N.R.I.S. PEFC Technical Document , Annex 2, 4.3.1 Consensus does not have to be achieved among the below mentioned stakeholder groups.	Not fulfilled s. comment left	Not fulfilled No participation of social, environmental NGOs, indigenous peoples representative	Not fulfilled s. comment for the international system	For national standards Fulfilled FSC National Initiatives Manual, 12.3.1 For interim standards N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled
f. Procedures are in place to achieve balanced decision making in the absence of consensus. These procedures do the following:	N.A. PEFC only allows consensus based decisions. No voting mechanism is therefore defined.	s. comment for PEFC Germany		Note: in contradiction to the international requirements PEFC Germany specifies a voting mechanism				
o Ensure that no major interest group can dominate nor be dominated in the decision-making process.	N.A. s. above	Not fulfilled Note: the voting process is dominated by economic interests	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	For national standards Fulfilled FSC National Initiatives Manual, 12.3.1 For interim standards N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled
o Specify a voting system that prevents major environmental, social, or economic interests from being overruled.	N.A. s. above	Not fulfilled s. above	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	For national standards Fulfilled FSC National Initiatives Manual, 5.5	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
o Contain a mechanism that prevents decision making in the absence of any representative of one of the major interest groups	N.A.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	For interim standards N.R.I.S. For national standards Fulfilled FSC National Initiatives Manual 6.4.2 For interim standards N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled
Guidance								
Point a—Definition of the two terms relevant stakeholder groups and major interest groups: The following relevant stakeholder groups should be represented in the standard-setting process and in the governance of the scheme/system:								
o Forest owners, including governments, and/or representatives of their associations								
o Product manufacturers, distributors, retailers								
o Scientists/scientific bodies								
o Environmental NGOs, Social NGOs/organizations (e.g., worker unions and consumer associations)								
o Representatives of indigenous peoples				Indigenous people do not occur in Germany				Indigenous people do not occur in Germany
Major interest groups are divided into economic, social, and ecological interests and are relevant for decision making in the absence of consensus								

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
Point b—NGOs participating in standard setting and governance should								
o Legitimately represent the respective interests								
o Ensure that representatives are accountable to their constituencies								
o Have a proven record in the subject matter								
o Be interested and affected by the certification system								
o Have a broad membership base								

Comments on participation in standard setting (point b)

General: it cannot be evaluated on the basis of publicly available information if the groups and persons listed as participants participated 'meaningfully'. This would require in-depth knowledge of the events and discussions in meetings. Moreover, the term 'meaningful' is vague and it is difficult to come to a judgment if or if not the participation of a given group or individual is sufficient to be conformant with this term. It was therefore evaluated if the stakeholder groups listed in point a) of the guidance note participated at all in the process. In a second step the NGOs which participated were evaluated for the aspects listed in point b) of the guidance.

The following documents were consulted for the assessment of participation:

FSC Germany: Membership list

PEFC Chile: Conformity assessment of the Certfor forest certification scheme to the PEFC requirements; Indufor 2004

PEFC Australia: Development of Australia Forestry Standard, Record of Process (2002)

PEFC Germany: Participants list 'Würzburg Seminar'

b) Rules for the governance of the international system

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
Effective stakeholder involvement								
a. Relevant stakeholder groups (see annex 2 checklist) have been officially invited to participate.	Not fulfilled				Fulfilled Note: membership enrollment is a continuous process			
b. Relevant stakeholder groups (see annex 2 checklist) participated meaningfully	Not fulfilled				Fulfilled Note: it is difficult to evaluate this requirement on the basis of available information			
c. A procedure is in place to involve stakeholders in case of failure to achieve meaningful participation of relevant major stakeholder groups.	Not fulfilled				Not fulfilled			
d. Written documents are available on what efforts have been taken to include stakeholders (1) as well as on how issues raised by stakeholders have been addressed (2).	Not fulfilled				Part 1 Not fulfilled Part 2 fulfilled Minutes of the General Assembly			
Balanced decision-making procedures								
e. The decision-making process is striving for consensus among relevant stakeholder groups.	Not fulfilled				Fulfilled FSC By-laws, 16			
f. Procedures are in place to achieve balanced decision making in the absence of consensus. These procedures do the following:								

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
o Ensure that no major interest group can dominate nor be dominated in the decision-making process.	Not fulfilled				Fulfilled FSC By-laws 11-15			
o Specify a voting system that prevents major environmental, social, or economic interests from being overruled.	Not fulfilled				Fulfilled FSC By-laws 11-15			
o Contain a mechanism that prevents decision making in the absence of any representative of one of the major interest groups	Not fulfilled				Fulfilled FSC By-laws 15			
Guidance								
Point a—Definition of the two terms relevant stakeholder groups and major interest groups:								
The following relevant stakeholder groups should be represented in the standard-setting process and in the governance of the scheme/system:								
o Forest owners, including governments, and/or representatives of their associations								
o Product manufacturers, distributors, retailers								
o Scientists/scientific bodies								
o Environmental NGOs, Social NGOs/organizations (e.g., worker unions and consumer associations)								
o Representatives of indigenous peoples								
Major interest groups are divided into economic, social, and ecological interests and are								

Requirements	Results								
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany		FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
relevant for decision making in the absence of consensus									
Point b—NGOs participating in standard setting and governance should									
o Legitimately represent the respective interests									
o Ensure that representatives are accountable to their constituencies									
o Have a proven record in the subject matter									
o Be interested and affected by the certification system									
o Have a broad membership base									

c) Rules for the governance of national systems

The PEFC did not specify requirements for the governance structures to be applied by national PEFC schemes. All aspects concerning the governance of national schemes are therefore assessed at national level.

In the FSC system the so called 'national initiatives' are the bodies operating at this level. The aspects are therefore evaluated for the three national working groups in Germany, Australia and Chile.

Requirements	Results								
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany		FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
Effective stakeholder involvement									
a. Relevant stakeholder groups (see annex 2 checklist) have been officially invited to participate.	N.R.I.S. PEFC only requires the participation of forest owners	Fulfilled Membership is open to any interested party	Fulfilled Membership is open to any interested party	Fulfilled		N.R.I.S.	Fulfilled	Fulfilled Membership is open to everybody and enrollment is an ongoing process	Fulfilled Membership is open to everybody and enrollment is an ongoing process

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
b. Relevant stakeholder groups (see annex 2 checklist) participated meaningfully	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled s. comment at the end	Not fulfilled s. comment at the end of this section	N.R.I.S.	Fulfilled FSC Australia membership list	Fulfilled FSC Chile membership list	Fulfilled FSC Germany membership list
c. A procedure is in place to involve stakeholders in case of failure to achieve meaningful participation of relevant major stakeholder groups.	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled
d. Written documents are available on what efforts have been taken to include stakeholders as well as on how issues raised by stakeholders have been addressed.	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled
Balanced decision-making procedures								
e. The decision-making process is striving for consensus among relevant stakeholder groups.	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled 'Satzung PEFC Deutschland e.V., 4	Fulfilled FSC National Initiatives Manual, 5.5			
f. Procedures are in place to achieve balanced decision making in the absence of consensus. These procedures do the following:								
o Ensure that no major interest group can dominate nor be dominated in the decision-making process.	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled FSC National Initiatives Manual, 5.5 together with FSC by-laws 50, 51			
o Specify a voting system that prevents major environmental, social, or economic interests from being overruled.	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled FSC National Initiatives Manual, 5.5 together with FSC by-laws 50, 51			
o Contain a mechanism that prevents decision making in	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled FSC National			

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
the absence of any representative of one of the major interest groups					Initiatives Manual, 5.5 together with FSC by-laws 50, 51			
Guidance								
Point a—Definition of the two terms relevant stakeholder groups and major interest groups:								
The following relevant stakeholder groups should be represented in the standard-setting process and in the governance of the scheme/system: - o Forest owners, including governments, and/or representatives of their associations - o Product manufacturers, distributors, retailers - o Scientists/scientific bodies - o Environmental NGOs, Social NGOs/organizations (e.g., worker unions and consumer associations) - o Representatives of indigenous peoples								
Major interest groups are divided into economic, social, and ecological interests and are relevant for decision making in the absence of consensus								
Point b—NGOs participating in standard setting and governance should - o Legitimately represent the respective interests - o Ensure that representatives are accountable to their								

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
o constituencies o Have a proven record in the subject matter o Be interested and affected by the certification system o Have a broad membership base								

Comments on participation in the governance of national systems (point b):

General: due to lack of access to information required for the assessment of the issues in points c) and d) the statements only refer to the available documents and do not consider other evidence like meeting protocols, interviews or factual observations. It should also be noted that the requirements in points b) and c) are tailored to the standard setting processes but are not meaningful for the governance processes, particularly when membership is open and the enrollment is an ongoing process.

The following documents were consulted for the evaluation:

- FSC Germany: By laws of the FSC national working group
- FSC Australia: FSC Australia membership list
- FSC Chile: FSC Chile membership list
- PEFC Germany: By-laws of the German Forest Certification Council
- PEFC Chile: Conformity assessment of the Certfor forest certification scheme to the PEFC requirements; Indufor 2004
- PEFC Australia: list of directors of Australian Standards Ltd

Criterion 4 — Avoidance of unnecessary obstacles to trade

No criteria specified

Criterion 5 — Based on objective and measurable performance standards that are adapted to local conditions

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
a. The standard contains explicit performance requirements, including chain of custody, if relevant.	Fulfilled PEOLG				Fulfilled FSC P&C			
b. The standard is written in measurable terms, with guidance on interpretation if flexibility is required.	N.A. at international level	Fulfilled AFS 4708-2007	Fulfilled SFM Standards for Chile	Fulfilled German PEFC Standards	Fulfilled FSC P&C			
c. International principles and criteria used as the basis for development of national standards include provisions for the operational level (forest management unit).	Fulfilled PEOLG				Fulfilled FSC P&C			
In case of internationally operating systems:								
d. Mechanisms and processes are in place to facilitate the harmonization/equivalence of national standards or national schemes within the international system.	Fulfilled PEFC Technical document, annex 7 PEFC requires consistency with international standards				Fulfilled FSC National Initiatives Manual 12.3.3, 12.3.4			
e. Processes exist by which consistency between national standards can be sought.	Fulfilled PEFC Technical document, annex 7 s. also comment above				Fulfilled FSC National Initiatives Manual 12.3.3, 12.3.4			
f. National standards are endorsed by the international system.	Fulfilled PEFC Technical document, annex 7				Fulfilled FSC National Initiatives Manual, 12.3.4			

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
Guidance								
Although the national standard may include requirements for the management systems in place, the Global Forest Alliance requirements should be translated into performance indicators that are applicable at the national or sub-national level. Wording of the indicators should prevent ambiguities and potentially inconsistent interpretation by avoiding terms such as "where applicable" or "where appropriate" without explanations for interpretation.	N.A at international level			Note: the certificate is issued for system elements only				

PART 3

Conformity Assessment, Certification, and Accreditation

Criterion 6 — Certification decisions free of conflicts of interest from parties with vested interests

Given the detailed provisions for these elements in the relevant ISO documents, evidence of a scheme's compliance with ISO rules (i.e., monitoring mechanisms are in place) ensures the independence of the assessment and the absence of conflicts of interest in a scheme's certification decision-making process. Therefore no additional guidance is needed for evaluating compliance of a scheme with criterion 6.

Criterion 7 — Transparency in decision making and public reporting

7.1 Public availability of scheme requirements

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
The certification scheme/system makes its documents publicly available, specifying all its requirements related to accreditation, standardization, and certification, including chain of custody and control of claims, where applicable.	Fulfilled PEFC Technical document with annexes	Fulfilled Available from the website	Not fulfilled Accreditation procedures and the exact rules for standard setting could not be found	Fulfilled Available from the website	Fulfilled Available from the FSC website			
Guidance								
Certification schemes frequently specify regulations for certification and accreditation, normally requiring ISO compliance or exceeding ISO rules. All these scheme-specific rules have to be publicly available.								

7.2 Public availability of certification and accreditation reports

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
a. Public reports on forest management evaluation (1) and surveillance (2) provide the rationale for the certification decision or the maintenance of certification, respectively.	Part 1 Fulfilled Part 2 N.R.I.S.	Part 1 Fulfilled Part 2 not fulfilled Note: it is not clear if the requirements apply also for surveillance reports	Fulfilled Reports available from the website of certification bodies	Fulfilled PEFC Germany website	Fulfilled Evaluation FSC-Std 20-009, 5, Surveillance FSC-Std 20-009, 7.2			

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
b. Public reports on forest management evaluation justify the certification decision by providing key findings with respect to compliance with the standard.	Fulfilled PEFC Technical document, annex 6, 4				Fulfilled FSC-Std 20-009, 4			
c. Public reports on forest management evaluation and surveillance include the corrective action requests raised in regard to the performance of the operation being evaluated.	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled Reports on FM evaluation on Certfor website	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled Evaluation FSC-Std 20-009, 4.1.3, 5.2 Surveillance FSC-Std 20-009, 7.2, f			
d. Public reports on accreditation provide the rationale for the accreditation decision.	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled ASI-PRO 10-173, 5.1			
e. Public reports on accreditation provide the corrective action requests raised in regard to the performance of the evaluated certification body.	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled ASI-PRO 10-173, 5.1.1.6 e, 5.1.73 c			
f. Public reports are readily available.	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled Note: only available on request from the certified operations.	Fulfilled Available from website	Fulfilled Available from website	Fulfilled Certification FSC-Std 20-009, 2 Accreditation ASI-PRO 10-173, 5.1.8			
Guidance								
Point c—The main strengths of the assessed operation should be summarized in the public report and provide the evidence for standard compliance. Point f—Public reports should be available from the Web sites of certification and accreditation bodies. Otherwise they should be sent to any interested party at no charge and without delay.								

Criterion 8 — Reliable and independent assessment of forest management performance and chain of custody

8.1 Independence of assessments

No criteria specified

8.2 Field evaluation of forest management and certification body performance

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
a. Accreditation procedures for the initial evaluation and surveillance of certification bodies foresee field visits to certified forest management units.	N.R.I.S. ISO 17011 does not explicitly require field visits to certified operations	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled Note: forest management units are not certified	Fulfilled ASI-PRO 10170			
b. Accreditation requirements specify evaluation and surveillance intensity to be applied by certification bodies.	N.R.I.S.	Fulfilled JAS-ANZ Procedure 26, annex B	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled DAP-ZE-PEFC	Fulfilled FSC Standard 20-007, 3.4.2			
c. Certification procedures require field visits to applicant forest management units before a certificate can be issued.	N.R.I.S.	Fulfilled JAS-ANZ Procedure 26, J.9.2.3.2.1	Fulfilled System Manual 01-01, point 8	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled FSC Standard 20-007, 3.4.2			
Guidance								
According to ISO rules, accreditation and certification bodies have to make the applied assessment methodology and surveillance intensity publicly available. Information about the documented procedures can therefore be obtained from these bodies.								

8.3 Chain-of-custody requirements

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
a. The scheme has a standard for the control of chain of custody that covers production and trade from the forest of origin to the final product.	Fulfilled PEFC Technical document, annex 4, 1.1				Fulfilled FSC Standard 40-004; Accreditation Manual, part 3.6			
b. Standards and control mechanisms exist to prevent application of logos on uncertified timber.	Fulfilled PEFC Technical document, annex 4 and 5				Fulfilled FSC Standard 40-004, part 4 Accreditation Manual, part 3.6,			
c. Chain-of-custody certificate holders are required to exclude timber from illegal sources (1) and from conversion of forests (2).	Part 1 fulfilled PEFC Technical document, annex 4, 1.3.4 and 3.6				Fulfilled FSC Standard 40-005, 4.1 in connection with 40-004, 9.5			
	Part 2 N.R.I.S.	Part 2 Not fulfilled	Part 2 Not fulfilled	Part 2 Not fulfilled				
d. Procedures for use of claims comply with ISO standards 14020 ⁶ and 14021 ⁷ .	Fulfilled s. comment below				Fulfilled FSC-TMK 50-201			
Guidance								
None								

⁶ ISO/IEC 2000: ISO standard 14020 - Environmental labels and declarations — General principles

⁷ ISO/IEC 1999: ISO standard 14021 - Environmental labels and declarations – Self-declared environmental claims (Type II environmental labelling)

Compliance of the PEFC system with ISO standards 14020 and 14021

For most aspects the PEFC Logo use rules are conformant with the ISO. However, PEFC still uses the term 'Sustainability' for marketing of certified timber what should be avoided according to ISO Standard 14021, 5.5. It is also questionable if the claim made for the German PEFC system for the sustainable management of forests is covered by certification as the scope chosen for certification and accreditation covers the services provide by the regional working groups as certificate holders but not the forest management.

8.4 Stakeholder consultation in the certification and accreditation process

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
a. Accreditation bodies undertake proactive and culturally appropriate external consultation as part of initial assessment and surveillance of certification bodies.	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled 5.5.3.3 For surveillance: ASI-PRO 20-113, 5.4.7			
b. Certification bodies undertake proactive and culturally appropriate external consultation as part of initial assessment and surveillance of certificate holders.	N.R.I.S.	Fulfilled JAS-ANZ Procedure 26 J.9.3.1.2 e) and J.9.2.3.2.2d) Audits include stakeholder consultation as one requirement	Fulfilled System Manual 01-01, point 8	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled FSC Standard 20-006			
c. Appropriate procedures exist to take stakeholders' comments into account in the decision-making process for certification (1) and accreditation (2).	Part 1 Fulfilled PEFC Technical document, annex 6, 4				Part 1 Fulfilled FSC Standard 20-001, 12.1			
	Part 2 N.R.I.S.	Part 2 Not fulfilled	Part 2 Not fulfilled	Part 2 Not fulfilled	Part 2 Fulfilled ASI PRO 20-112, 5.6.3.6-7 and 5.8.4			
Guidance								
Points a and b— Time and place of initial evaluation and surveillance audits should be made known to stakeholders,								

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
together with an invitation to provide comments about the assessed operation to the certification or accreditation body. Point c—The certification decision-making committee within the certification or accreditation body should be required to take note of stakeholder comments and to justify its decision accordingly in the public report. The groups to be consulted must correspond to the groups as outlined in criterion 6.								

8.5 Complaints and appeals mechanisms

Comment: The requirements in this section apply to three parts of certification systems, namely the standard setting, certification and accreditation procedures. Analysis is therefore done separately for each of these activities.

a) Standard setting

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
Complaints and appeals mechanisms of accreditation, certification, and standard-setting bodies are								
a. accessible to any interested party,	Fulfilled Technical documents, annex 2, 3.5.1				Fulfilled FSC National Initiatives Manual, 5.4 and 12.3.1			
b. publicly available, and	Fulfilled Technical documents,				Fulfilled FSC National Initiatives			

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
	annex 2, 3.5.1				Manual 12.3.1			
c. free of cost implications for the complainant	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled Requirement could not be found in the documentation	Not fulfilled s. comment left	Not fulfilled s. comment left	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled s. comment left	Not fulfilled s. comment left	Not fulfilled s. comment left
Guidance								
This point implies that anybody who wishes to do so can raise a complaint against decisions taken by accreditation, certification, and standard-setting bodies. Relevant documentation can normally be found in the documents on complaints and appeals procedures of certification, accreditation, and standard-setting bodies, which have to be published under ISO and ISEAL rules.								

b) Certification

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
Complaints and appeals mechanisms of accreditation, certification, and standard-setting bodies are								
a. accessible to any interested party,	Fulfilled, Required through ISO Guides, e.g. ISO Guide 65, 7.1				Fulfilled FSC-STD- 20-001, 7.1			
b. publicly available, and	Fulfilled Required through ISO Guides, eg. ISO Guide 65, 7.1				Fulfilled FSC-STD- 20-001, 7.1			
c. free of cost implications for the complainant	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled Requirement not	Not fulfilled s. comment left	Not fulfilled s. comment left	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled s. comment left	Not fulfilled s. comment left	Not fulfilled s. comment left

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
		be found in the documentation						
Guidance This point implies that anybody who wishes to do so can raise a complaint against decisions taken by accreditation, certification, and standard-setting bodies. Relevant documentation can normally be found in the documents on complaints and appeals procedures of certification, accreditation, and standard-setting bodies, which have to be published under ISO and ISEAL rules.								

c) Accreditation

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
Complaints and appeals mechanisms of accreditation, certification, and standard-setting bodies are								
a. accessible to any interested party,	Fulfilled ISO 17011, 5.9				Fulfilled ASI-PRO 10-198			
b. publicly available, and	Fulfilled ISO 17011, 5.9				Fulfilled ASI-PRO 10-198			
c. free of cost implications for the complainant	N.R.I.S.	Not fulfilled Requirement could not be	Not fulfilled s. comment left	Not fulfilled s. comment left	Not fulfilled	N.A. Accreditation is carried out at	N. A. Accreditation is carried out at	N. A. Accreditation is carried out at

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
		found in the documentation				international level	international level	international level
Guidance								
This point implies that anybody who wishes to do so can raise a complaint against decisions taken by accreditation, certification, and standard-setting bodies. Relevant documentation can normally be found in the documents on complaints and appeals procedures of certification, accreditation, and standard-setting bodies, which have to be published under ISO and ISEAL rules.								

Note on the assessment of the cost aspect of complaints: the entry 'not fulfilled' together with the comment that no requirement could be found was made in cases where this aspect is not dealt with in the documentation. This does not necessarily mean that the participants in the system charge the costs to complainants.

Criterion 9 — Delivers continual improvement in forest management

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
a. The scheme sets deadlines for full compliance if certificates are issued under the condition of fulfillment of outstanding non-compliances.	N.A. Certificates are not issued under this condition	N.A. s. comment left	N.A. s. comment left	N.A. s. comment left	Fulfilled FSC standard 20-002, 8.3 and 8.6			
b. Surveillance visits from certification bodies (1) and accreditation bodies (2) are carried out at least annually.	Part 1 Fulfilled PEFC Technical document, annex 6, 4			Fulfilled PEFC Manual for on-site-audits, 2b	Fulfilled FSC standard 20-001; FSC guidance 20.1			

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
	Part 2 N.R.I.S.	Part 2 Not fulfilled	Part 2 Not fulfilled					
c. Clear deadlines exist for compliance, with corrective action requests issued as a result of surveillance.	N.R.I.S. Deadlines are at the discretion of the certification or accreditation body	Not fulfilled s. comment left	Not fulfilled s. comment left	Not fulfilled s. comment left	Fulfilled Certification FSC standard 20-002, 8.3 Accreditation ASI-PRO 20-116,5.4.2			
Guidance								
Point a—Normally, deadlines specified for full compliance of certificate holders with all standard requirements should not exceed two years. Point b—The minimum requirement of most certification schemes is an annual visit by certification bodies to certificate holders and by accreditation organizations to certification bodies. In high-risk areas and in cases of complaints, a more frequent schedule of visits should be foreseen. Point c—Deadlines set for compliance with corrective action requests should not exceed six months.								

Criterion 10 — Accessible to and cost-effective for all parties

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
a. Mechanisms exist that allow equity of access to all participants, regardless of the size, location, or forest type under the operation's management.	Fulfilled for size and forest type PEFC Technical document, annex 3,4.1 a, b Not fulfilled for location	Fulfilled also for location s. comment below	Not fulfilled for natural forests	Fulfilled also for location s. comment below	Fulfilled FSC Standard 20-007, 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.3,			
b. The above mechanisms provide access to forest certification at a cost that does not exclude small forest owners, communities, and other groups that may have limited access.	Fulfilled Land holders with small areas participate in the scheme in great numbers				Fulfilled Listed groups are participating in FSC certification			
Guidance								
Provisions for better access to certification for owners of small forest areas can be made at two levels: a. On the level of accreditation, by reducing evaluation intensity, e.g., in the framework of group certification or multi-site certification. b. On the level of standards, by reducing performance levels or waiving compliance with certain standard requirements for this group. Compliance can normally be assumed when these forest owners participate in the scheme. Information may be obtained from the list of certificate holders published by the certification bodies according to ISO rules. However, the possibility that substantial subsidies are provided to these								

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
groups should be considered for the evaluation of the accessibility of the schemes for this forest owner group. The notion of the area that is considered as small may vary from region to region, depending on the traditional forest ownership structures. A definition should therefore be developed in the context of the national standard-setting process.								

Comment on PEFC systems' restriction of location (criterion 10 a): PEFC certification can only be carried out in countries with an endorsed national system i.e. forest owners in countries where no such system exists do not have access to the system. Although not explicitly mentioned in the documentation of national systems no restrictions could be found which would limit the access to PEFC certification for forest owners having their forest areas in Germany and Australia. However, the Chilean system is applicable to plantation forestry only and not to natural forest management.

Criterion 11 — Voluntary participation

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
a. In cases of group certification, a set of contractual arrangements exists between the owners or their designated intermediary and the entity that holds the group certificate for the requirements of certification.	N.R.I.S.	Fulfilled JAS-ANZ Procedure 26 – Annex B, 4.5.3	Fulfilled Group Standard 2.6	Not fulfilled	Fulfilled FSC Policy 20- 001, 3.3.2			
b. A mechanism exists to ensure that each member of the group must meet the standard or will have to leave the group.	N.R.I.S.	Fulfilled JAS-ANZ Procedure 26 – Annex B, 4.5.3	Fulfilled Group Standard 2.18	Not fulfilled No formal relationship betw. certificate holder and forest owners	Fulfilled FSC Policy 20- 001, 3.1.5, 3.1.6			
c. Enforcement mechanisms exist in case of breach of the	N.R.I.S.	Fulfilled JAS-ANZ	Fulfilled Group Standard	Fulfilled PEFC Germany,	Fulfilled FSC Policy 20-			

Requirements	Results							
	PEFC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany	FSC Int'l	Australia	Chile	Germany
group's rules.		Procedure 26 – Annex B, 2.1.4	2.18.1-3	system description, 8.4	001, 3.1.5, 3.1.6			
d. All participating forest owners have signed a commitment to adhere to the standards set by the scheme.	N.R.I.S.	Fulfilled JAS-ANZ Procedure 26 – Annex B, 2.1.4	Fulfilled Group Standard 2.6	Not fulfilled No commitment required for forest owners associations	Fulfilled FSC Policy 20-001, 1.6 in connection with 3.3.2			
Guidance								
Point a—The contractual relationship between the group member and the entity that holds the group certificate should foresee that members can be removed from the group in case of unresolved corrective action requests.								

References

Unless otherwise indicated all documents are available from the website of the named institutions

Documents used for assessment

WWF/World Bank (2006): Forest Certification Assessment Guide; a framework for assessing credible certification systems/schemes; a publication of the WWF/World Bank Global Forest Alliance; July 2006; in press

ISEAL Alliance (2004): ISEAL Code of Good Practice for Setting Social and Environmental Standards, Bonn.

ISO/IEC Standard 14021 (1999): Environmental labels and declarations – Self-declared environmental claims (Type II environmental labelling), Geneva

ISO/IEC ISO standard 14020 (2000): Environmental labels and declarations — General principles, Geneva

PEFC Documents (International)

ITTO (1993): Guidelines on the sustainable management of natural tropical forests

ITTO (1993) Guidelines on the conservation of biological diversity in tropical production forests

ITTO (1993) Guidelines for the establishment and sustainable management of planted tropical forests

ITTO (2003): ATO/ITTO principles, criteria and indicators for the sustainable management of African natural tropical forests; ITTO Policy Development Series No 14; Yokohama

PEFC Council (2007): Technical Document

Annex 1: Terms and Definitions (2006)

Annex 2: Rules for Standard Setting (2006)

Annex 3: Basis for Certification Schemes and their Implementation (2007)

Annex 4: Chain of Custody (2005)

Annex 5: PEFC Logo Use Rules (2007)

Annex 6: Certification and Accreditation Procedures (2007)

Annex 7: Mutual Recognition (2007)

PEFC Council (2002): Statutes (as approved at General Assembly 22 November 2002)

Third Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (1998): Annex 2 of the Resolution L2 Pan-European Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management; Lisbon

PEFC Documents (Germany)

Deutsches Akkreditierungssystem Prüfwesen DAP (2005): PEFC Checkliste

PEFC in Deutschland (2006): Kriterien, Empfehlungen und Indikatoren für nachhaltige Waldbewirtschaftung auf regionaler Ebene (Indikatorenliste)

PEFC in Deutschland (2006): Satzung des PEFC Deutschland e.V.

PEFC in Deutschland (2006): Verfahren der Standard-Revision

PEFC in Deutschland (2006): PEFC-Standards für Deutschland - Leitlinie für nachhaltige Waldbewirtschaftung zur Einbindung des Waldbesitzers in den regionalen Rahmen

PEFC in Deutschland (2006): Systembeschreibung zur Zertifizierung einer nachhaltigen Waldbewirtschaftung

PEFC Documents (Australia)

Australian Forestry Standard (2007): Complaints and Grievances Procedure

Standards Australia (2002): Development of Australia Forestry Standards - Record of Process

Standards Australia (2002): Development of Australia Forestry Standards - Formation of Technical Reference Committee

Standards Australia (2007): The Australian Forestry Standard

Joint Accreditation System of Australia and New Zealand (2003): General requirements for bodies operating assessment and certification of forest management systems

PEFC Documents (Chile)

Certfor 2002: Incorporation agreement and by-laws of the private non-profit organization Corporación Certfor Chile de certificación

Certfor 2004: Standard for sustainable forest management

Certfor 2004: Certfor standard for group certification

Indufor 2004: Conformity assessment of the Certfor Forest Certification Scheme to the PEFC Requirements

Instituto Nacional de Normalización (INN) 2007 : Reglamento para la acreditación de organismos de evaluación de la conformidad INN- R401

FSC Documents

Forest Stewardship Council A.C. (2005): FSC By-laws
Forest Stewardship Council (2002): Statutes

Forest Stewardship Council (1996): FSC-STD-01-001 (version 4-0), FSC Principles and Criteria for Forest Stewardship

Forest Stewardship Council (2004): FSC-STD-20-001 (version 1-0): The application of ISO/IEC Guide 65:1996 (E) by FSC accredited certification bodies

Forest Stewardship Council (2004): FSC-STD-20-002 (version 1-0): Structure and Content of Forest Stewardship Standards

Forest Stewardship Council (2004): FSC-STD-20-003 (version 1-0): Local adaptation of certification body generic forest stewardship standards

Forest Stewardship Council (2004): FSC-STD-20-006 (version 1-0): Stakeholder consultation for forest evaluation

Forest Stewardship Council (2004): FSC-STD-20-007 (version 1-0): Forest Management Evaluation

Forest Stewardship Council (2004): FSC-STD-20-009 (version 1-0): Forest certification public summary reports

Forest Stewardship Council (1998): National Initiatives Manual

Forest Stewardship Council (2004): FSC-STD-40-201: FSC on-product labelling requirements (version 2.0)

Accreditation Services International; ASI-PRO-10-173: Reporting Procedure; (*publication pending until finalisation*)

Accreditation Services International; ASI-PRO-20-112: Procedure for the evaluation of applicant certification bodies for FSC accreditation; (*publication pending until finalisation*)

Accreditation Services International; ASI-PRO-20-113: Procedure for the surveillance of FSC accredited certification bodies; (*publication pending until finalisation*)