



2006 Review of forest certification schemes

Submitted Comments and responses on the Canadian Standards Association

December 22, 2006

1. Forest Standards	2
1.1 Content of standards for legal compliance.....	2
1.2 Content of standards for sustainable variant	4
1.3 Standard-setting process	12
2. Certification	17
3. Accreditation.....	23
4. Chain of Custody.....	18
5. Non-criteria-related comments.....	23

These comments were submitted as part of the 2006 Review of forest certification schemes. The comment period closed on the 24 of June 2006. Each comment has been assigned a number, based on the order in which they appear in the document below. Though the names of the stakeholders have been kept anonymous, each group or individual has been assigned a numbers which is consistent through all five of the 'scheme comment' documents, to facilitate identification of their comments by the stakeholders. These numbers are found under the heading 'Commentator'.

1. Forest Standards

1.1 Content of standards for legal compliance

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
1.1.1 The standard requires that the forest owner/manager holds legal use rights to the forest	If schemes are only applicable to countries where legal use rights are clear then an explicit requirement for legal compliance is sufficient for a score of 1 even if legal use rights are not explicitly addressed. However, if the scheme can be applied in countries where legal use rights are not clear, there must be an explicit requirement.		
Comments on 1.1.1			
No comments received.			
1.1.2 The standard requires compliance from both the forest management organisation and any contractors with local and national legal requirements including those relevant to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest management 	In general, compliance with the law means compliance with all relevant laws. However, it is now recognised in some countries laws may be unclear or conflicting making clear definition of legality difficult to achieve. The FLEGT ¹ process has proposed that in such countries it will be necessary to have or develop a practical		

¹ Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade is the European Union's response to the problem of illegal logging and trade in associated timber products. The process of developing a working definition of 'legal' has been initiated for Indonesia.

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Labour and welfare • Health & safety • Other parties' tenure and use rights 	<p>working definition of 'legal' or a set of core laws which must be met which has support from major stakeholder groups. This can be done through a national standard-setting process or other appropriate means.</p>		
Comments on 1.1.2			
No comments received.			
1.1.3 The standard requires payment of all relevant royalties and taxes	Where payment is clearly required by law, then an explicit requirement for legal compliance is sufficient for a score of 1.		
Comments on 1.1.3			
No comments received.			
1.1.4 The standard requires compliance with the requirements of CITES.	For standards which can only be applied in countries which are CITES signatories and have incorporated the requirements into national law this can be implicit under legal requirements. However, it must be explicit if the scheme can be used in non-signatory countries or countries which have not incorporated CITES requirements into national law.		
Comments on 1.1.4			
No comments received.			

1.2 Content of standards for sustainable variant

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
<p>1.2.1 Certification standards must be consistent with a widely accepted set of international principles and criteria defining sustainable or responsible forest management at the forest management unit level.</p>	<p>It is not possible to define a detailed global standard for forest management because of the huge variation in climate, vegetation, topography, socio-economic context etc. Therefore, certification standards need to be adapted to local conditions, but to ensure consistency and avoid trade barriers, it is important to base each standard on accepted international principles such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intergovernmental processes designed for use at FMU level, for example the Pan-European Operational Level Guidelines (PEOLG). • Requirements developed by an international organisation such as the ITTO Criteria • International principles developed explicitly for forest certification such as the FSC Principles and Criteria <p>Such international principles can be developed either to guide national planning and reporting,</p>		

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
	<p>or to guide management at the scale of the forest management unit. As certification applies at the latter level it is appropriate to base certification standards on international principles designed for this use. However, use of a set of appropriate international criteria developed for national reporting or other uses is sufficient for a score of 1.</p>		
Comments on 1.2.1			
No comments received.			
1.2.2 The standard must be performance-based.	<p>There are two types of requirements – performance and management system. Only performance requirements guarantee a defined level of performance. Therefore, only standards which include performance requirements (which may be in addition to system requirements) can provide the basis for the delivery of the UK government requirements for legal compliance or sustainability.</p> <p>To score 2, the standard must address all of the requirements set out in 1.2.3 – 1.2.6 as performance elements, not as issues to be addressed by a management system without any minimum threshold of performance. To score 1, each of the criteria 1.2.3 – 1.2.6 must be at least partially addressed.</p>		

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
Comments on 1.2.2			
1	<p>We believe that our Review demonstrates that Z809-02 does not act as a performance standard because it does not define the range of performance in any meaningful matter, as demonstrated both on a plain reading and as revealed by information obtained as a result of our Review. Simply put, CSA criteria are vague and do not provide sufficient direction to guide forest companies seeking certification.</p> <p>Beyond a plain reading, this is illustrated by the attached chart, which summarizes actions proposed by forest companies in their Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMPs) in relation to criteria concerning sustainability. As the chart illustrates, forest companies' SFMPs demonstrated a dramatic variance in plans and strategies to address the CSA standard even though few bore any meaningful relationship to achieving sustainable forestry.</p>	8	<p>This CPET requirement was partially addressed by the CSA scheme. <i>CAN/CSA-Z809-02</i> section 6 sets out the performance requirements that the organisation needs to address. Specific performance thresholds for each element in section 6 must be defined as a result of the required public consultation process (section 5). However, evidence from certified organisations shows that there is considerable scope for variability in these thresholds, and the CSA has accordingly been noted as only partially addressing this criterion.</p>
<p>1.2.3 The standard must ensure that harm to ecosystems is minimised. In order to do this the standard must include requirements for:</p> <p>a. Appropriate assessment of impacts and planning to minimise impacts;</p> <p>b. Protection of soil, water and biodiversity;</p> <p>c. Controlled and appropriate use of chemicals and use of Integrated Pest Management wherever possible.</p>	<p>The first sentence sets out the goal of the criterion. Compliance will be assessed against the list of requirements.</p> <p>To score a 2, each requirement must be adequately addressed. Where this is not achieved, but there are no major omissions, a score of 1 can be awarded.</p> <p>Where an issue (for example, waste disposal) is adequately covered by legal requirements in all countries where a scheme can be used, it need</p>		

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
d. Proper disposal of wastes to minimise any negative impacts.	not be explicit provided that legal compliance is required by the standard.		
Comments on 1.2.3			
2	<p>Perhaps because the standard is not performance based, issues related to environmental impact are not adequately addressed. The lack of prescriptive elements is worrisome in the context of Canada’s trend toward deregulation which is leaving forest companies with the discretion to determine results. In provinces such as British Columbia, whose recently introduced forest law, the <i>Forest Range and Practices Act</i>, expressly prioritizes maintaining timber supply over minimizing ecosystem harm, the lack of explicit protection in Z809-02 provides little in the way of addressing this Criteria.</p> <p>Moreover, as again illustrated by the attached Chart, licensees certified to the CSA standard can propose dubious strategies to address elements. Because of this, it cannot be said that the Z809-02 contains “requirements” to address this criteria.</p>	8	<p>The CPET requirement for appropriate assessment of environmental impacts is adequately addressed by the CSA scheme. <i>CAN/CSA-Z809-02</i> does not contain specific requirements on impact assessments and planning to minimise impacts that are applicable to all applicants. However, sections 7.3.6 <i>Setting DFA-Specific Performance Requirements</i> and 7.3.7 <i>SFM Plan</i> contains requirements on evaluation and review to minimise impacts. In addition, the legal framework relating to forest management includes requirements for forest plans to adequately assess and minimise environmental impacts.</p> <p>See also response to comment no. 1 relating to performance levels.</p>
1.2.4 The standard must seek to ensure that productivity of the forest is maintained. In order to do this the standard must include requirements for:	<p>The first sentence sets out the goal of the criterion. Compliance will be assessed against the list of requirements.</p> <p>To score a 2, each requirement must be</p>		

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
<p>a. Management planning and implementation of management activities to avoid significant negative impacts on forest productivity.</p> <p>b. Monitoring which is adequate to check compliance with all requirements, together with review and feedback into planning.</p> <p>c. Operations and operational procedures which minimise impacts on the range of forest resources and services.</p> <p>d. Adequate training of all personnel, both employees and contractors.</p> <p>e. Harvest levels that do not exceed the long-term production capacity of the forest, based on adequate inventory and growth and yield data.</p>	<p>adequately addressed. Where this is not achieved, but there are no major omissions, a score of 1 can be awarded.</p> <p>Where an issue is adequately covered by legal requirements in all countries where a scheme can be used, it need not be explicit provided that legal compliance is required by the standard.</p>		
Comments on 1.2.4			
No comments received.			
<p>1.2.5 The standard must seek to ensure that forest ecosystem health and vitality is maintained. In order to do this the standard must include requirements for:</p> <p>a. Management planning which aims to</p>	<p>The first sentence sets out the goal of the criterion. Compliance will be assessed against the list of requirements.</p> <p>To score a 2, each requirement must be adequately addressed. Where this is not</p>		

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
<p>maintain or increase the health and vitality of forest ecosystems</p> <p>b. Management of natural processes, fires, pests and diseases.</p> <p>c. Adequate protection of the forest from unauthorised activities such as illegal logging, mining and encroachment.</p>	<p>achieved, but there are no major omissions, a score of 1 can be awarded.</p> <p>Where an issue is adequately covered by legal requirements in all countries where a scheme can be used, it need not be explicit provided that the standard assures legal compliance.</p>		
Comments on 1.2.5			
3	<p>Again, we found the CSA standard to provide no meaningful direction in terms of prescribing operations by licensees. As a result, we found that companies identified widely varying strategies for addressing this criteria. Certainly, there is no basis for concluding that the CSA standard requires or will “ensure” ecosystem health.</p>	8	<p>This CPET requirement is adequately addressed by the CSA scheme.</p> <p>Requirement (a) is addressed by CAN/CSA-Z809-02 CCFM Criteria 2 ‘<i>Conserve forest ecosystem condition and productivity by maintaining the health, vitality, and rates of biological production</i>’ and requirements for an SFM plan (section 7.3.7).</p> <p>Requirement (b) is addressed by CAN/CSA-Z809-02 requirements relating to maintenance of ecosystem processes, in terms of species diversity (element 1.2), genetic diversity (element 1.3), forest ecosystem resilience (element 2.1), forest ecosystem productivity (element 2.2), carbon uptake and storage (element</p>

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
			<p>4.1) and forest land conversion (element 4.2), such as CSA SFM Element 2.1 ‘<i>Conserve ecosystem resilience by maintaining both ecosystem processes and ecosystem condition</i>’. <i>CAN/CSA-Z809-02</i> does not include specific references to fire, pests and diseases, apart from the general requirements for legal compliance. Legal requirements include provincial government fire prevention regulations (such as Fire Prevention New Brunswick, Forest Fire Prevention and Suppression Regulations in British Columbia).</p> <p>Requirement (c) is addressed by <i>CAN/CSA-Z809-02</i> requirements concerning protection from unauthorised activities are implicit, although this is considered to be adequately addressed by the legal framework and interpretation of SFM elements during the public participation process.</p> <p>See also response to comment no. 1 relating to performance levels.</p>
1.2.6 The standard must seek to ensure that biodiversity is maintained. In order to do this the standard must include	The first sentence sets out the goal of the criterion. Compliance will be assessed against the list of requirements.		

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
<p>requirements for:</p> <p>a. Implementation of safeguards to protect rare, threatened and endangered species.</p> <p>b. The conservation/set-aside of key ecosystems or habitats in their natural state.</p> <p>c. The protection of features and species of outstanding or exceptional value.</p>	<p>To score a 2, each requirement must be adequately addressed. Where this is not achieved, but there are no major omissions, a score of 1 can be awarded.</p> <p>Where an issue is adequately covered by legal requirements in all countries where a scheme can be used, it need not be explicit provided that the standard assures legal compliance.</p>		
Comments on 1.2.6			
4	<p>The CSA standard does not protect at-risk species. In fact, woodland caribou (which are listed as threatened under the federal Species At Risk Act) continue to decline in a number of CSA-certified forest management units, primarily due to the impact of logging on caribou habitat. Although Z809 guides managers to conserve protected areas and sites of special biological significance, there is little to no direction for identifying key ecosystems, and, as a result, conservation of key ecosystems (such as intact boreal forest or caribou habitat) is not happening on the ground in CSA-certified forests.</p>	8	<p>Maintenance of biodiversity is partially addressed in <i>CAN/CSA-Z809-02</i> section 6 CCFM Criterion 1 Conservation of biological diversity:</p> <p>CPET requirement (a) is partially addressed by Element 1.2 <i>Species Diversity</i> and element 1.3 <i>Genetic Diversity</i>. However, the protection of rare, threatened and endangered species is not explicit, and this depends on local values set by the public participation process. Although there are legal controls, these would not fully amount to the implementation of safeguards.</p>

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
			<p>CPET requirement (b) is adequately addressed by Element 1.1 <i>Ecosystem Diversity</i>.</p> <p>CPET requirement (c) is partially addressed by Element 1.4 <i>Protected Areas and Sites of Special Biological Significance</i>. However, the protection of species of exceptional value is not explicit, and depends on local values set by the public participation process.</p> <p>The CSA has accordingly been noted as only partially addressing this criterion.</p> <p>This review does not include assessments of the actual outcomes of certification in the forest.</p>

1.3 Standard-setting process

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
<p>1.3.1 The standard-setting process must be consistent with the requirements of <i>ISO Guide 59: Code of Good Practice for Standardisation</i> or the <i>ISEAL Code of Good Practice for Setting Social and</i></p>	<p>Consistency or equivalence can be assessed by reference to the list of key requirements in Annex 1.</p>		

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
<i>Environmental Standards</i> or equivalent.			
Comments on 1.3.1			
No comments received.			
<p>1.3.2 The standard-setting process must seek to ensure balanced representation and input from the economic, environmental and social interest categories.</p>	<p>It is widely accepted that ‘sustainable forest management’ is management which delivers an appropriate combination of economic, environmental and social benefits. In practice it is rarely possible to deliver all possible benefits all of the time so it is necessary to find appropriate compromises between competing interests.</p> <p>The only way to achieve balanced representation in practice is to ensure that the range of issues and viewpoints of the different stakeholder groups making up the economic, environmental and social interest categories are fed into and influence the standard-setting process.</p> <p>Major stakeholder groups include such groups as forest owners and managers, processors, buyers, governments, academics, conservation organisations, NGOs, workers, forest users, indigenous groups, and communities.</p> <p>To score 2 the process must actively seek to ensure that the full range of stakeholder groups</p>		

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
	<p>within each interest category are engaged and involved. A score of 1 can be achieved if the range of stakeholder groups within each interest category have access to the standard-setting process.</p>		
Comments on 1.3.2			
5	<p>As there are no specific chambers outlined for forming the standard-setting body, there are numerous reports of bodies in which environmental perspectives are vastly outnumbered by economic interests.</p>	8	<p>The standard development process was managed by CSA, with considerable public consultation. The standard-setting forum is the CSA SFM Technical Committee (TC).</p> <p><i>CAN/CSA-Z809-02 section 0.2 states that 'One-quarter of the CSA SFM Technical Committee membership consisted of timber producers, including woodlot owners, while the remainder were scientists, academics, and representatives of the provincial and federal governments, as well as environmental, consumer, union, and Aboriginal representatives.'</i></p> <p>In reviewing the original standard in 2000, CSA '<i>strengthened the conservation representation on its SFM Technical Committee, which now includes</i></p>

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
			<p><i>representatives from Wildlife Habitat Canada, the Canadian Wildlife Federation, and the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters.'</i></p> <p><i>CSA-SDP-2.1-99 states that 'The composition (matrix) of SSCs and TCs shall be set with the objective of ensuring that all points of view pertinent to the subject matter are represented in reasonable proportion, and that any lack of balance of representation through attrition is immediately apparent.'</i> (section 3.3.1)</p> <p>Section 3.3.3.2 identifies four interest categories: producer interest, user interest, regulatory authority and general interest. Section 3.3.3.3 states that <i>'Different description of interest categories or categories additional to the above, or both, may be required.'</i></p> <p>According to CSA application document for PEFC endorsement, the TC is broken down into four categories: Environmental & General Interest, Government/Regulatory, Industry and Academic/Consultant.</p>

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
			3.3.4 states that ' <i>Balance of representation means that the actual number of voting members in any one interest category is not more than the sum of the actual number of voting members in the two smallest interest categories.</i> '
<p>1.3.3 The standard-setting and decision-making process adopted must seek to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No single interest can dominate the process; • No decision can be made in the absence of agreement from the majority of an interest category. 	<p>The way in which the process is run and decisions are made is as important as the range of interests represented since an appropriate compromise will only be achieved if all the interest categories are able to influence the standard-setting and decision-making process.</p> <p>To achieve a score of 2 the standard-setting process must be designed to ensure that all three interest categories can influence the process equally and that the standard cannot be finalised in the absence of agreement from a majority of an interest category. In practice this can be achieved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A process based on consensus where this means that a decision cannot be reached if 		

² If a process provides a genuine opportunity for any major stakeholder group to influence the content of the standard, but a group chooses not to participate, this would not constitute a failure.

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
	<p>any major stakeholder group sustains a strong objection; or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A process based on majority voting within each of the three interest categories. <p>Where neither of these approaches is followed, in order to achieve a score of 1 the scheme must ensure² that it would not be possible for a standard to be finalised if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be possible for a major stakeholder group to be involved in the process but not able to significantly influence the content of the standard; and • The stakeholder group was strongly opposed to the content of the standard. 		
Comments on 1.3.3			
No comments received.			

2. Certification

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
2.1 Certification must be undertaken by a	Applicable ISO guidance includes:		

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
body whose organisation, systems and procedures conform to applicable ISO guidance, or publicly available equivalent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISO Guide 62:1996 General requirements for bodies operating assessment and certification/registration of quality systems • ISO Guide 65: 1996 General Requirements for bodies operating product certification systems • ISO Guide 66: 1999 General requirements for bodies operating assessment and certification/registration of environmental management systems (EMS). <p>Note if this is not delivered by the scope of the accreditation, then the checklist in Annex 2 must be completed.</p>		
Comments on 2.1			
No comments received.			
2.2 Certification is undertaken by a-body which is accredited to evaluate against forest management standards.	The scope of the accreditation should include the elements set out in 2.3 - 2.6.		
Comments on 2.2			
No comments received.			
2.3 The requirements for certification audits must include assessment of systems	The make-up of the team, the sampling strategy and the amount of time spent carrying		

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
and documentation together with verification of outcomes in the forest adequate to ensure that both system and performance requirements in the standard are being met.	<p>out the audit are all important in ensuring that sufficient objective evidence of compliance with the standard is collected to make the final decision robust.</p> <p>The possible scores against this criterion are either 0 or 2.</p>		
Comments on 2.3			
6	<p>We believe that our Review demonstrates that auditors failed to ensure that requirements in the standard (in the form of Criterion) were being met; that is, the certifiers certified forest management units based on the implementation of identified targets and objectives with little consideration for how these targets and objectives met or failed to meet CSA's Criterion.</p>	8	<p><i>CAN/CSA-Z809-02 Annex A states that 'The audit ensures that the SFM requirements are met and includes an on-site audit of the DFA, including field inspections of forest sites.'</i> (A.1 General).</p> <p><i>'A high proportion of the audit time is spent in the DFA assessing actual forest conditions, operations, and the organisation's field interpretation and implementation of values, objectives and indicators.'</i> (A.2.3 Certification audit)</p> <p>In addition, <i>ISO Guide 66</i> for certification bodies specifies that the first stage of the audit <i>'shall be based on, but not limited to, document review....Stage 2 shall take place at the location of the organization, and is the audit performed to evaluate the implementation of the organization's</i></p>

Criteria		Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
				<p><i>EMS.</i> Additional guidance is provided by <i>CSA PLUS 1133</i>.</p> <p>This review does not include assessments of the actual outcome of certification in the forest.</p>
2.4	<p>The certification audit must include sufficient consultation with external stakeholders to ensure that all relevant issues are identified relating to compliance with the requirements of the standard.</p>	<p>Consultation with external stakeholders is very important to establish whether there are any issues which might prevent full compliance with the standard which the audit team has not identified (eg seasonal issues not evident at the time of the audit, ongoing social conflicts) and to ensure that any interpretation of the requirements of the standard for the immediate local conditions is appropriate.</p> <p>To score 2, the stakeholder consultation must be designed to ensure identification of all relevant issues. To score 1, there must be some provision for consultation.</p>		
Comments on 2.4				
7	<p>Our Review demonstrates insufficient or no consultation with numerous First Nation communities adjacent to certified forests.</p>		8	<p>This CPET requirement was partially addressed by the CSA scheme.</p> <p><i>CAN/CSA-Z809-02</i> requires public participation as a component of the SFM standard:</p>

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
			<p>Section 5 <i>Public Participation Requirements</i> specifies requirements and rules on public participation process.</p> <p>CSA SFM Element 6.3 <i>Public Participation</i>: ‘<i>Demonstrate that the SFM public participation process is designed and functioning to the satisfaction of the participants</i>’.</p> <p>These requirements for public consultation must be checked during an SFM audit.</p> <p>No objective verifiable evidence has been submitted that the requirements for a public participation process are not being implemented. This review does not include assessments of the actual outcomes of the process.</p>
<p>2.5 A summary of the results of the certification audit (excluding confidential information) must be publicly available to interested parties.</p>	<p>Sustainability can only be delivered by an appropriate balance of economic, social and environmental imperatives. It is important that representatives of each of these groups can monitor certification to make sure that the appropriate balance is being delivered.</p> <p>The information must, at a minimum, provide a summary of the findings with respect to</p>		

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
	<p>conformance with the requirements of the forest management standard.</p> <p>To score 2, the public summary must be available on a relevant website. To score 1, the summary must be electronically available to any interested party on request within a defined timescale.</p>		
No comments received.			
2.6 There is an accessible and functioning mechanism for dealing with complaints and disputes which is open to any interested party.	It is widely accepted good practice to ensure that any issues or concerns are dealt with efficiently and transparently, whatever their origin.		
Comments on 2.6			
8	<p>Our Review raised troubling concerns regarding CSA's approach to public complaints which concern failure to ensure the standard is implemented. To summarize, in response to our complaints regarding improper certification of the forest companies, CSA refused to provide adequate information about the means of our seeking review of the certifications and/or seeking to limit our ability to appeal certifications. These are fully addressed in our complaints to the Standard's Council of Canada but may be summarized as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) CSA's appeal procedure is unfair and/or intended to discourage public involvement; 2) CSA's appeal procedure is unfair in that it is unclear what standard they will apply in reviewing their certification of forest companies to the CSA SFM 	8	<p><i>CAN/CSA-Z809-02 Annex A A.2.8 Dispute resolution states 'Appeals, complaints, and disputes regarding an organisation's accredited certification to this Standard can be filed by any interested party, including those involved in the public participation process.'</i></p> <p><i>ISO Guide 66 for certification bodies includes requirements on dealing with complaints and disputes:</i></p> <p><i>Section 4.1.2 p: 'have policies and procedures for the resolution of</i></p>

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
<p>standard;</p> <p>If CSA's appeal standard is limited as they describe, then the appeal procedure unfairly limits review of certifications.</p>			<p><i>complaints, impartial and independent resolution of appeals, and disputes received from organization or other parties about the handling of certification/ registration or any other related matters'.</i></p> <p>Section 4.4 <i>Appeals, complaints and disputes</i> also include requirements on dealing with complaints.</p> <p>No objective verifiable evidence has been submitted that the requirements for a disputes and complaints process are not being implemented. This review does not include assessments of the actual outcomes of the process.</p>

3. Accreditation

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
<p>3.1 Accreditation must be undertaken by a national or international body whose organisation, systems and procedures are consistent with ISO 17011:2004 <i>Conformity assessment -- General requirements for</i></p>	<p>Note if this is not provided by the requirements of the certification system, or through other mechanisms such as the International Accreditation Forum's Multilateral Recognitions Arrangements then</p>		

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
<i>accreditation bodies accrediting conformity assessment bodies</i> or equivalent.	the checklist in Annex 3 must be completed.		
Comments on 3.1			
No comments received.			

4. Chain of Custody

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
4.1 Assessment of chain of custody must be undertaken by a certification body operating in accordance with ISO Guide 65 or equivalent and accredited by an accreditation body operating in accordance with ISO 17011 or equivalent.	Chain of custody certification must be undertaken by an accredited competent third-party just as for forest management certification.		
Comments on 4.1			
No comments received.			
4.2 There must be a certified chain of custody in place from the forest of origin to the final certified product which provides a link between the certified material in the product or product line and certified forests.	This means that each organisation in the chain from forest to final certified product which owns or processes the material in any way must have been audited to confirm that they are implementing chain of custody requirements and have a valid chain of		

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
	<p>custody certificate.</p> <p>The possible scores against this criterion are either 0 or 2.</p>		
Comments on 4.2			
No comments received.			
<p>4.3 If mixing of certified and uncertified material in a product or product line is allowed, the uncertified material must be covered by a verifiable system which is designed to ensure that it is from legal sources.</p>	<p>This requirement is relevant when mixing of certified and non-certified material is allowed. Mixing occurs whenever the following approaches are used: percentage labelling, volume accounting, input-output or processor certification.</p> <p>In such cases, in order to meet UK government requirements for legality, there must be a system in place which provides assurance that the uncertified material is from a legal source.</p> <p>The UK government requires all timber and wood products to be from legal sources. Therefore, if mixing of certified and uncertified material is allowed, in order to meet UK government requirements for legality, there must be a system in place which provides assurance that the uncertified material is from a legal source.</p> <p>If the certification system does not include requirements to ensure that the uncertified</p>		

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
	<p>material is from legal sources, then only products which are 100% certified can be accepted as providing assurance of legality.</p> <p>NB If a scheme scores 0 for this criterion, it only affects acceptance of products containing uncertified material.</p>		
Comments on 4.3			
No comments received.			
<p>4.4 If mixing of certified and uncertified material in a product or product line is allowed and the proportion of uncertified material can exceed 30%, then the uncertified material must be covered by a verifiable system which ensures that it is from sustainable forest sources where the requirements for sustainability set out in criteria 1.2.3 – 1.2.6 above are being met.</p>	<p>This requirement is relevant when mixing of certified and non-certified material is allowed. Mixing occurs whenever the following approaches are used: percentage labelling, volume accounting, input-output or processor certification.</p> <p>The UK government requires that 70% of the material in a product or product line is from sustainable sources. To meet this requirement, if the proportion of uncertified material is more than 30% then there must be a system in place which provides assurance that the uncertified material is from a sustainable source.</p> <p>If such a system is not in place, then only material which contains 70% or more certified material can be accepted. Examples of</p>		

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
	<p>approaches which provide such information include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Segregation: material from a certified forest is kept separate from uncertified material throughout the production process. • Percentage-based claims: the percentage of material in the product or product line from a certified forest is reported. • Mass-balance: the proportion of product sold as certified is equivalent to the proportion of certified raw material entering the process. <p>NB If a scheme scores 0 for this criterion, it only affects acceptance of products or product lines containing more than 30% uncertified material.</p>		
Comments on 4.4			
No comments received.			
4.5 There is a clearly defined mechanism for controlling all claims made about the certified nature of products which ensures that claims are clear and accurate and that action is taken to prevent any false or misleading claims.	<p>If claims are not controlled, then the veracity of any claim made is in question.</p> <p>Note ISO 14020 contains general guidance on environmental labels and declarations.</p>		

Criteria	Guidance on implementation	Commentator	CPET responses
Comments on 4.5			
No comments received.			
<p>4.6 If recycled material is used there must be a verifiable system in place which is designed to ensure that recycled material is from the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-consumer recycled wood and wood fibre or industrial by-products but excluding sawmill co-products • Post-consumer recycled wood and wood fibre • Drift wood 	<p>Further guidance needs to be developed.</p> <p>NB If a scheme scores 0 for this criterion, it only affects acceptance of products containing recycled material</p>		
Comments on 4.6			
No comments received.			

5. Non-criteria-related comments

	Commentator	CPET responses
The EAC inquiry's parliamentary hearings included misinformation with regards to the CSA SFM Program. The CSA informed the EAC of the inaccuracies in their parliamentary record,	17	Comment noted.

	Commentator	CPET responses
however the EAC felt that it was not their responsibility to change the record but rather more appropriate for the CSA to simply inform FERN of the inaccuracies. I find it surprising that a parliamentary agency is not interested in ensuring a factual record, and I know that DEFRA does not have oversight for the EAC inquiry. Nonetheless, should DEFRA/CPET utilize the parliamentary hearings as part of their follow-up work in terms of the CSA review, it would be useful for DEFRA/CPET Reference Board to have some of the facts related to the parliamentary hearing statements (see 1 st and 2 nd attachment which I prepared and sent to the EAC earlier in the year). I write this not as an official representative of the CSA, but rather as a member of the CSA SFM TC and a consultant who follows these issues in general.		