

Comparison of Timber Procurement Policies

An analysis of commonalities and differences
of
six EU member states



Produced by

ISAFOR

Erik Lammerts van Bueren

Comparison of selected TPP's
(17 January 2016)

Content

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Context	4
1.2	Purpose of the analysis.....	4
1.3	Scope of the analysis.....	5
2	Comparison.....	6
2.1	General TPP topics, Matrix I	6
2.1.1	Objective	6
2.1.2	Procurement requirement.....	6
2.1.3	Field of application mandatory or voluntary	7
2.1.4	Product type	7
2.1.5	Evidence of compliance.....	7
2.2	Definition of legal and sustainable timber	8
2.2.1	Criteria for legality(details in Matrix II a).....	8
2.2.2	SFM definition (details in Matrix II a).....	9
2.3	Requirements for certification systems, Matrix II b	11
2.3.1	Standard.....	11
2.3.2	Governance of certification systems (and umbrella systems like PEFC).....	11
2.3.3	Certification and certification bodies	12
2.3.4	Accreditation.....	12
2.3.5	Chain of Custody, logo's and labels are shown in Matrix II c.....	12
2.4	Ways of Implementation.....	13
2.4.1	Assessment of certification systems	13
2.4.2	Capacity for the assessments.....	15
3	Analysis and discussion	15
3.1	General topics that constitute the TPP	15
3.1.1	Objectives of TPP	15
3.1.2	Procurement requirement.....	16
3.1.3	Application of the TPP	17
3.1.4	Product type	17
3.1.5	Evidence of compliance.....	18
3.2	Definition of legal and sustainable timber	19
3.2.1	Legality definition.....	19
3.2.2	SFM definition	19
3.3	Requirements for category A-evidence	21
3.3.1	Standard (Applicability; characteristics and standard setting)	21
3.3.2	Governance of CS.....	22
3.3.3	Certification and Certification bodies.....	22
3.3.4	Accreditation.....	23
3.3.5	Chain of Custody.....	23
3.4	Assessment of certification systems.....	24
3.4.1	Entity responsible for the assessment	24
3.4.2	Status of advice.....	24
3.4.3	Objects of assessment	24
3.4.4	Check actual performance.....	25
3.4.5	Scoring system.....	25
3.4.6	Feedback from certification system	26
3.4.7	Objection and appeal system	26

4 Concluding remarks27

Annex I Matrices I, II, II a, b, c, III29

Annex II Other TPP comparisons and a selection of relevant documents57

Annex III Example of a possible common SFM definition58



Note:
Information used for this analysis has been derived from the official government websites and complemented directly by officials from Ministries and agencies responsible for TPP in the related member states. The summarized information is shown in the matrices I-III.

The actual comparison (chapter 2), analysis and discussion (Chapter 3) and concluding remarks (chapter 4) and Annex III are the sole responsibility of the author. The ministry of I&M and other ministries may hold different views.

1 Introduction

1.1 Context

Various EU member states have a form of Timber Procurement Policy (TPP) in place. Most important overall goal is to contribute to sustainable development and sustainable forest management (SFM) in trade partner countries, in particularly but not exclusively, in developing countries.

Specific objectives of TPP's may include:

- promoting the use of timber and wood from sustainably managed forests
- increasing the demand for sustainable produced timber
- providing leadership in timber product markets by setting standards for procurement
- to secure that SFM certification systems deliver what they claim, (by monitoring the deliverables of legality and SFM certification systems).

Therefore TPP's contain requirements and evaluation procedures regarding sustainable and legal timber production and trade. However the national TPP's vary in set up and implementation. EU member states show differences in ambition (i.e. no specific TPP other than compliance with European Timber Regulation 995/2010 (EUTR); acceptance of FLEGT - licensed timber on equal footing or not; as well as differences in requirements for sustainable produced timber and evaluation procedures). These differences may cause confusion and constraints with the timber trade and certification systems. Increasing consistency among member states regarding these policies is therefore highly recommended. Apart from that, cooperation in evaluating timber certification systems can avoid double efforts and save financial and human resources within various member states.

In order to bring TPP's to the next level, informal discussions were started between government officials from a number of frontrunner member states regarding TPP. Initially Germany (DE), Denmark (DK), the Netherlands (NL), and United Kingdom (UK) participated in the discussion later joined by Belgium (BE)¹ and Luxemburg (LU). These member states represent a great volume of tropical timber imports. They decided to explore ways to improve compatibility and synergy between national timber procurement policies.

As a first step on the road to improved consistency the frontrunner countries decided to compare and analyse their TPP's. To that end the Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment has commissioned **ISAFOR** to conduct this study. Formal documents were studied and member states have provided direct input regarding the facts of their own TPP's. Most recent publications on similar comparisons have been studied (see **Annex II**).

1.2 Purpose of the analysis

The purpose of this analysis is:

- To identify differences and similarities in TPP's with a focus on:
 - SFM requirements for timber, position of FLEGT licensed and recycled wood
 - criteria for defining SFM

¹ The presented TPP of BE is only applicable to Flanders

- ways of assessment of certification systems
- To provide insight in the effect of the differences, in particularly with a view on the promotion of SFM and the quality and credibility of certification systems.

This document presents the results of the comparison and analysis and serves as a background document for further steps on the road of improving consistency and gaining synergy between EU member states TPP's.

1.3 Scope of the analysis:

The comparison and the analysis are confined to a selection of member states with a substantially elaborated TPP e.g. BE, DE, DK, LU, NL, and UK. In Chapter 2 the similarities and differences of existing policies are being presented. It is a presentation of facts without interpretation. The various matrices in **Annex I** contain the information directly offered by the member states. The matrices are the basis for the comparison in Chapter 2. Each matrix shows which specific elements of a TPP are being addressed by the selected member states. First, in Matrix I, general topics will be compared such as: *objectives of the TPP; procurement requirement e.g. sustainable produced timber and acceptance of FLEGT-licensed timber; product type that is included in the TPP such as the products included in the EUTR and recycled wood; domain of application e.g. national government; means of evidence of compliance.* Secondly, in Matrices II, a, b and c, the requirements for accepting means of evidence for sustainably produced timber will be compared. The following topics will be reviewed: *criteria for legal timber and SFM; requirements for certification systems (Category A evidence); requirements for Chain of Custody (CoC).* Finally matrix III presents *the procedures by which certification systems are being assessed.*

Chapter 3 summarizes the commonalities and differences of the facts of Chapter 2 followed by a discussion on the effect of the differences.

Concluding remarks are being made in Chapter 4, highlighting the main issues.



2 Comparison

The similarities and differences of existing policies are being presented in various matrices. (See **Annex I**). Each matrix shows which specific elements of a TPP are being addressed by the selected member states.

2.1 General TPP topics

Matrix I shows the year the TPP was established and the last year it was revised, as well as the following general topics that constitute the TPP:

Objective

Procurement requirement

Field of application, mandatory or voluntary

Product type

Evidence of compliance

2.1.1 Objective

In Matrix I a summary is presented of the formally adopted specific objective(s) that each member state pursues with its TPP.

Results of comparison: objective

The six selected frontrunner countries Belgium (BE), Denmark (DK), Germany (DE), Luxembourg (LU), the Netherlands (NL) and United Kingdom (UK) pursue similar formal objectives with their TPP's notably *promoting the use of timber and wood from sustainably managed forests as well as increasing the demand for sustainable produced wood*. As additional benefits TPP's may contribute to *defining SFM and to securing that SFM certification systems deliver what they claim*.

2.1.2 Procurement requirement

Three requirement levels are being distinguished: legal timber in compliance with EUTR, FLEGT-licensed timber and timber from SFM forests. EUTR compliance is the minimal legal requirement for all member states. Member states show whether they require sustainably produced timber and what status they will grant FLEGT-licensed timber in their TPP.

Results of comparison: procurement requirement

All six countries require sustainable produced timber. They accept the use of mass balance systems and a mix of minimal 70% sustainable with 30% legal timber when a percentage based system is applied in the Chain of Custody, (more information under 2.1.5 Evidence of compliance). Most countries have not yet formally stated what status they will grant FLEGT-licensed timber in their TPP. Formally, only UK and LU accept FLEGT-Licensed timber on equal footing irrespective from what country the timber is coming from. Accepting on equal footing means that both sustainable produced timber and FLEGT licensed timber are accepted. It does not mean that FLEGT licensed timber is considered to be the same as sustainably produced timber. UK will evaluate its position after it has imported FLEGT licensed timber from 3 countries during 3 years.

2.1.3 Field of application mandatory or voluntary

Here member states show the reach of the TPP. Which public and/or private institutions are required to implement the TPP. Distinction is made between a mandatory implementation and a voluntary implementation e.g. mandatory for all government agencies and voluntary for municipalities.

Results of comparison: field of application

Presently the requirement for sustainable produced timber is mandatory for all National government institutions and agencies and voluntary for local governments, in the six countries. Due to the different legal status, the German TPP includes a distinction between timber from forest and from non-forest land. The requirement for sustainable produced timber is mandatory for the Federal government. Some States and publicly funded institutions have adopted the TPP. In LU the requirement for sustainable produced timber is also mandatory for publicly funded projects.

2.1.4 Product type

Type of product refers to the kind of wood products that the TPP includes. For the sake of consistency the EUTR categories are taken as a basis. The EUTR categories which are not included in the TPP are shown for each member state. In addition information is shown whether or not the TPP applies to post-consumer recycled wood.

Results of comparison: product type

The sustainability requirement applies to most, in LU and UK to all, EUTR product categories. In UK the TPP applies to all wood including biomass. Suppliers and buyers of heat and electricity, that are not covered by the TPP and claim payments under specific incentive schemes, have to meet the land criteria for legal and sustainable as per the Timber Standard for Heat and Electricity. The Timber Standard takes a regional risk based approach for Timber Standard Category B to prove compliance at company level. Compliance with the Timber Standard will be a requirement from 5 October 2015. In NL a similar policy is under development for the use of biomass for heat and electricity. LU follows on main issues the UK policy.

Pulp and paper is excluded in BE and DE but subject to a specific policy. In DE the public purchase of paper and paper products is regulated by the environmental label "Blue Angle".

Post-consumer recycled wood is not an EUTR category. DK accepts on equal footing with sustainable produced timber post recycled wood, including by-products from the secondary wood processing industries, such as the furniture industry. UK accepts recycled wood as an alternative and DE even prefers recycled wood. BE, LU and NL have recycled wood not explicitly included in the TPP but it seems to be accepted on equal footing.

2.1.5 Evidence of compliance

Certificates of SFM certification systems may be accepted as proof of evidence for sustainable produced timber. UK and NL classify this type of evidence as category A evidence. In the matrix member states show the certification systems from which they accept certificates as proof of evidence for sustainable produced timber, irrespective of what the justification for that acceptance is.

Member states are legally required also to accept other types of evidence as long as the particular evidence provides sufficient and verifiable proof that, in case of the SFM requirement, the timber originates from a sustainable managed forest. UK and NL

classify this type of evidence as category B evidence. Member states show whether they have an operational system in place to assess category B evidence including a reference standard to comply with and specific documented procedures.

Results of comparison: evidence of compliance

Presently all six countries accept certificates and labels of FSC and PEFC as evidence (category A evidence) of compliance for buying and using sustainable produced timber, albeit the justification may be different. FSC and PEFC allow three different ways of timber tracking through the supply chain, physical segregation, percent based volume, and mass balance.

Only UK and the Netherlands have a fully operational and transparent system in place for assessing category B evidence. LU has an expert committee to analyse Category B evidence, but procedures have not yet been documented. In DE the Federal Institutions Johann Heinrich von Thünen Institute (TI) in Hamburg and the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN) in Bonn are responsible for the assessment of category B evidence i.e. the products are produced in compliance with the FSC or PEFC standards applicable for the respective country of origin. DK provide guidance on the use and assessment of other types of documentation than certificates, including advice for demanding independent assessment thereof, if documentation presented on request is not considered appropriate in the first place.

2.2 Definition of legal and sustainable timber

Matrix II is an introduction to matrices II a-c and is meant to provide a quick insight in commonalities and differences of topics concerning legality and sustainability definitions and requirements for certification systems. The results of comparison of matrix II are not being presented separately but are integrated in the results of comparison of the matrices II a-c. Matrix II shows which member states have adopted separate definitions for legal and sustainably produced timber and requirements for specific elements of certification systems in order to assess the quality and reliability of certification systems. A fairly complete assessment system constitutes requirements for:

- Legal and SFM definition (Independent reference framework)
- Standard setting
- Governance of the certification system,
- Certification and certification bodies,
- Accreditation
- Chain of Custody (CoC).

2.2.1 Criteria for legality(details in Matrix II a)

Matrix II a. shows the legality criteria and SFM criteria of the member states that have developed an independent set of criteria to define SFM. Since the EUTR has become into force in March 2013 all member states have the obligation to prevent that illegally harvested timber is placed on the market. The EUTR provides the following definition of legally harvested timber in Article 2 g: "*Harvested in accordance with the applicable legislation in the country of harvest*". Applicable legislation means the "*legislation in force in the country of harvest*". Member states should incorporate the EUTR requirements in their TPP. Some member states may have additional legal requirements as the EUTR requirements are limited to legal harvesting, which has a more limited scope than legal forest management. Compliance with the legality requirements is a prerequisite for SFM.

Results of comparison: legality criteria

Results of comparison pertain to the five frontrunner countries with a separate definition for legality and SFM. DK, NL and UK, have incorporated the EUTR definition of legally harvested timber in their TPP requirements. NL has three additional legality criteria in order to capture the legislation, that applies to the full gamut of SFM and not just to harvesting. These criteria require the forest manager to have full use rights, to comply with all obligations to pay taxes and royalties and to respect international agreements including CITES. BE and LU have similar criteria as NL but they have not included the EUTR definition of legal timber. They lack reference to trade and customs legislation in so far as the forest sector is concerned. BE has two criteria requiring that the forest manager will live up to all contractual obligations and will comply with all criteria of the BE standard. UK has one additional criterion that explicitly requires compliance with labour, health and safety legislation. Also DK and NL refer to labour legislation in one of their social criteria.

2.2.2 SFM definition (details in Matrix II a)

The SFM criteria serve as reference to assess compliance with the requirement for sustainable produced timber. Again, for the sake of consistence with current European policies, the structure of the SFM definition is based on the six general criteria adopted by Forest Europe, formerly the Ministerial Conference on the Protection on Forest in Europe (MCPFE), and one additional general criterion on the forest management system. UK criteria corresponding with these seven general criteria are placed in the second column. The UK criteria serve as a basis for comparison. Differences between one of the other countries and the UK criteria are marked turquoise.

Results of comparison: definition of SFM (criteria for SFM).

Five countries, BE, DK, LU, NL and UK have an elaborated SFM definition, which serves as a reference to value the SFM standards of certification systems and to check category B evidence. DE has not developed or adopted one SFM definition. DE refers directly to FSC and PEFC.

When comparing the various SFM definitions, i.e. reference standards, similarities and differences are being noticed in three aspects: 1) content i.e. the themes that are being addressed; 2) the degree of detail and the formulation of criteria and 3) the structure of the reference standard (Principles, Criteria and Indicators; method of categorizing criteria).

Themes

Definitions of all five countries BE, DK, LU, NL and UK cover the six general criteria of Forest Europe, albeit here and there with different approaches and formulations, notably but not exclusively between UK on one hand and BE and NL on the other hand. In addition to the six Forest Europe general criteria, BE and NL have a general criterion on the forest management system. Most DK and LU criteria are more or less identical to UK criteria, while some other criteria differ both in formulation and substance. Below communalities and the most noticeable differences among the definitions of the five countries are being highlighted while following the Forest Europe SFM criteria structure.

1) Forest resources and global cycles

All five countries have criteria to prevent unauthorized activities, including encroachment. The main criteria in DK is maintenance of forest resources and their contribution to global carbon cycles. BE, DK and NL show criteria to prevent conversion of forest to plantations and other land uses. They are part of the SFM definition. UK includes conversion as a criterion for the auditor to consider when awarding certification. BE and NL have a criterion on the maintenance of ecological processes and cycles including carbon. BE requires that forest management stays within the limits of the ecological carrying capacity.

2) Forest ecosystems' health and vitality

Countries show similar criteria addressing health and vitality and pest control.

3) Protective functions

Countries show similar criteria addressing soil, water, use of chemicals and waste.

4) Productive function

All countries have criteria that address timber harvesting levels and forms of reduced impact logging (RIL). In addition BE has criteria on production and maintenance of a wide range of goods and ecosystem services; pursuing economic viability and an age and species structure of the forest. BE and NL have a criterion on the production of non-timber forest products (NTFP) including hunting and fishing. Furthermore BE and NL have formulated some restrictions for plantations.

5) Biological diversity

All countries include criteria regarding rare and endangered species, set-aside areas and objects of high conservation value. Part of a BE Principle is the protection of landscapes. BE sets conditions for the use of exotic species. In addition LU and NL have a criterion that does not allow genetic modified organisms (GMO).

6) Socio economic functions

Common themes that are being addressed by all countries are: *identification and respect for traditional tenure and use rights; mechanisms for resolving disputes; labour conditions and health and safety of forest workers.*

Differences are manifest in the way the topics are being categorised (UK) and elaborated on (BE and NL). With a view on the EC Procurement directive, UK has visually separated the social criteria from the other SFM criteria. BE and NL elucidate more in detail on topics requiring: *protection of objects of cultural and traditional value; say in forest management based on free, prior informed consent.* Moreover NL criteria require *effective communication and consultation and public availability of forest management plans and maps.* NL has an additional criterion on the *promotion of local employment.*

7) Management system

All countries address one way or the other environmental and social impact assessment and training of employees. The BE and NL definitions feature a general criterion (shown as a Principle) on the management system. The criteria address topics like management cycle, including monitoring; management plan. NL requires explicitly the availability of maps. NL has a criterion on group management. UK and DK address management cycle elements dispersed in their standard under the different general criteria 1-6. They do not have explicit requirements regarding management plans and maps.

Degree of detail and formulation

LU has all of its criteria copied from UK. The majority of the DK criteria are more or less identical to corresponding UK criteria. However, DK applies a separate criterion on *maintenance of forest resources and their contribution to global carbon cycles.* Further, DK applies a social SFM criterion that is in substance more or less identical to those currently used for evaluation of certification schemes in the UK, but not part of the UK definition of sustainable timber. BE and NL have articulated their criteria generally more extensively, and being thus more specific. Closely related to the level of detail are differences noticed in the way criteria are being formulated. In many cases the UK definition requires *that* a theme should be addressed e.g. *protection of water,* whereas NL requires specifically *how* the theme should be addressed e.g. *the water quality of ground water and surface water is maintained.*

Structure of the reference standard

Most SFM definitions are being constructed at two levels. The top level covers a broad theme e.g. biodiversity or social conditions. At that level one finds Principles or General criteria. At the second level these Principles/General criteria are broken down into criteria. In first instance the structure of the various SFM definitions looks quite different. The UK SFM definition is construed by 5 General criteria (standard setting; ecosystem; productivity; health and safety; and biodiversity), one criterion on legal requirements for

labour, and 3 social criteria. Each of the General criteria is followed by a number of themes comparable to criteria, albeit the UK definition does not call those themes explicitly criteria. With a view on the EC Procurement directive, UK has visually separated the social criteria from the other SFM criteria.

LU follows the structure of UK but the social criteria are an integral part of the definition. DK follows the main structure of the SFM definition of Forest Europe. Social criteria are an integral part of the DK SFM definition. The 6 General criteria are elaborated in a number of criteria and they are preceded by legal criteria and criteria for standard setting.

The NL definition is divided in 4 aspects (social-; ecological-; economic-; and management aspects). Under each aspect 2 Principles appear, comparable with General criteria. Each Principle is articulated in a number of criteria.

The BE definition is divided in 5 aspects (social-; economic-; ecological-; biodiversity and management aspects). Under each aspect 1 Principle appears. Unlike UK and DK the BE and NL standards start with the social themes and the economic themes are separated from the social themes. Standard setting appears with BE and NL under governance of certification systems and is thus not considered to be part of SFM.

2.3 Requirements for certification systems. Matrix II b

2.3.1 Standard

In the context of this analysis a SFM standard is the same as a SFM definition. Various features of a standard, other than the themes and structure, are being addressed e.g. applicability, characteristics and the standard setting procedure.

Results of comparison: standards

All five countries have similar requirements regarding the applicability and characteristics referring to international principles. All countries refer to ISO 59 and ISEAL codes. The standard must be consistent with widely accepted international P & I and applicable in various local conditions. DK, NL and UK explicitly refer to the need for performance based criteria. BE requires that the criteria are objective and verifiable.

All five countries require a balanced representation of stakeholders with standard setting. No single interest shall dominate decision making. BE and NL require explicitly transparency and reporting on the development process. NL requires procedures for public input. BE and NL consider standard setting as an element of governance of certification systems. DK, LU and UK include requirements for standard setting in their requirements for the SFM definition.

2.3.2 Governance of certification systems (and umbrella systems like PEFC)

Governance requirements regard the certification system as a whole i.e. setting rules for standard setting; supervision of performance of tasks; design and use of logo's and claims; objection and appeal handling; division of responsibilities and decision making

Results of comparison: Governance of certification systems

BE and NL have specific requirements for the governance of certification systems. Criteria refer to the necessity of having a legal entity and a management which has overall responsibility including, setting rules for standard setting; supervision of performance of tasks; design and use of logo's and claims; objection and appeal handling; division of responsibilities and decision making. BE requires as a prerequisite that the SFM system should be credible to the user, the forest owner and environmental NGO's.

More over NL has specific requirements for umbrella systems¹, *Procedure on endorsement of certification systems*. An umbrella system is a system which approves and endorses national certification schemes which comply with the requirements of the umbrella system. It has a set of requirements regarding standard setting, certification, accreditation, objection and appeal handling and the chain of custody. Endorsed systems are allowed to use the umbrella system trademarks and logo's. UK has a general requirement, *Criterion 5 National level application*, for international certification programmes that endorse national schemes or standards. This criterion is not only applicable to Umbrella systems but also to e.g. FSC which endorses national standards.

2.3.3 Certification and certification bodies

Certification refers to the actual auditing and decision making regarding compliance. Usually third party certification, executed by independent certification bodies, is required

Results of comparison: Certification and certification bodies

All five countries require certification by an independent body, which complies with relevant ISO guidelines and which is accredited to evaluate against forest management standards. All countries require that the audit procedures include study of documents, sufficient consultation of stakeholders and field checks. Furthermore summaries of audit reports should be publicly available and certification bodies should have an accessible objection and appeal procedure. NL has a criterion on group certification and UK has a criterion requiring to describe measures which limit circumstances in which certification may be awarded, e.g. conversion.

2.3.4 Accreditation

Independent third parties are usually required to show evidence of their professionalism and specific knowledge through accreditation by a competent Accreditation authority.

Results of comparison: Accreditation

All countries require that accreditation must be undertaken by an (inter)national body that fulfils the requirements of ISO 17011. NL requires that the accreditation body takes part in a peer review process with sister organisations

2.3.5 Chain of Custody, logo's and labels are shown in Matrix II c.

The main objective of a CoC is to guarantee that the certified product that enters the supply chain is carried through the supply chain from the origin to the final customer.

Results of comparison: requirements for the Chain of Custody

BE, DK, LU, NL and UK require all that participants in the supply chain, from the forest to the final point of sale, are being certified, by an independent third party. All countries allow mixing of sustainable produced timber with timber from verifiable legal sources through a volume credit system and a percentage based system. When the percentage based method is applied, the content of sustainable must be minimal 70%.

¹ PEFC is an umbrella system which endorses certification systems. FSC is an international operating certification scheme. Difference between the two systems can best be illustrated by the following. A forest management unit cannot be certified by PEFC, but only by one of the schemes (so far most national schemes) that it has endorsed. Theoretically PEFC could endorse FSC and then FSC certified forests may use the PEFC labels for their timber. The other way around is not possible. FSC may recognize PEFC with its endorsed systems as equivalent but that would not automatically mean that they may use the FSC label.

NL requires explicitly that material from non-verified sources is administratively and physically separated from certified sustainable timber and or verified legal timber. DK allows recycled wood instead of sustainably produced wood and any combination thereof unless otherwise specified in the concrete requirements. BE, DK, LU and UK have specific criteria on the use of pre- and post-consumer recycled wood. BE and NL have a separate criterion on group certification. BE has a criterion on the competence of the certification body.

All countries require that the CoC guarantees that the product claims are clear and accurate. NL elaborates that topic in specific requirements for mass-balance, and percentage based systems. NL specifies also rules for labelling e.g. visual specifications, unambiguous description, instructions regarding the use of labels and logo's.

2.4 Ways of Implementation

Matrix III shows how BE, DK, LU, NL and UK assess certification systems. The following topics constitute the assessment system:

2.4.1 Assessment of certification systems

Entity responsible for the assessment

Binding conclusions or advice

Object of assessment

Check actual performance

Scoring system

Procedure for receiving feedback from certification system

Objection and appeal procedure

Validity period of recognition (years)

Results of comparison: assessment of certification systems.

Entity responsible for the assessment

Countries have assigned a government agency to make the assessment or they may have set up an independent body for that specific purpose.

Government agencies in BE (Agency for Nature and Forests), DE (Thünen-Institute and Federal Agency for Nature Conservation). NL and UK have installed independent advisory bodies respectively Timber Procurement Assessment Committee (TPAC) with the Foundation for Environmental Hallmarks (SMK) and the Technical Expert Panel of the Central Point of Expertise on Timber (CPET). In DK The Nature Agency assesses the quality and the credibility of the certification systems while giving full consideration to the results of CPET assessments. LU has not a formal assessment process. LU relies on the outcomes of the assessment by CPET, but might seek for further assessment if the outcome of CPET is not validated by a special committee.

Binding conclusions or advice

The conclusions of the assessment agency or committee may serve either as a *binding conclusion* for (non-)acceptance of the certificates as evidence for sustainable produced timber or as an *advice* for the Government institution that takes the final decision.

In all six countries the results of the assessment serve as an advice to the government. Generally LU follows the UK unless the government has a compelling reason to deviate.

Object of assessment

Most important objects of the certification system are the standard, the other normative documents and the policy documents.

NL and UK study all relevant documents i.e. SFM and CoC standards, other normative documents and policy documents. BE and DK include in its evaluation the SFM and CoC standard and a selection of other documents. LU does not undertake evaluations themselves.

Check actual performance

Assessment of compliance of certification systems with the requirements contained in the TPP may be limited to the study of formal Certification system documents but could also include information on actual performance in the field. There are various ways to get an impression of the actual performance, among them are: public internet forum; (public) reports; direct communication with certification system and certification bodies; audit reports and field visits.

BE, NL and UK acquire information on the actual performance through audit reports and other reports or publications. NL has installed an internet forum where it publicly solicits for comments on the certification system that is being assessed. UK circulates a request for information among stakeholders. Also the Agency for Nature and forests, TPAC and CPET undertake direct communication with the certification system and some certification bodies in order to obtain insight in the actual performance. Field visits may in exceptional circumstances contribute to a better insight and understanding of the actual situation. They are included as a possible option in BE and NL the assessment procedure but neither country has used this opportunity. UK has a piloted with a CoC audit. The added value of field visits was questioned.

Scoring system

It is important to have transparent decision rules. For that purpose scoring systems may be part of the assessment scheme. Most SFM definitions are being constructed at two levels. The top level covers a broad theme e.g. biodiversity or social conditions. At that level one finds Principles or General criteria. At the second level these Principles/General criteria are broken down into criteria. Scoring systems may show what the required value is for compliance of each criterion and or each Principle/General criterion. The systems should indicate what the decision rules are for the judgement of acceptance.

BE, NL and UK have a scoring system. DK, which has a similar standard as UK, follows a scoring system also similar to the UK. The NL and UK scoring system show a great correspondence. Both system score on the level of Principle/General criteria with 2, 1, 0. Both systems have clear decision rules for acceptance of the certification systems based on the scores at that level. Both systems score also compliance with each criterion which appears under a Principle. That score is the result of the interpretation of CS documents and information from other sources about the actual performance. UK exercises a mechanical method to establish the score at the level of Principle depending on the scores at the criterion level, i.e. rules are set regarding the scores at the criterion level that result in 2, 1 or 0 at the Principle level. NL relies on the interpretation of the experts to translate the scores at the Criterion level to the Principle level.

Feedback from certification system

The assessment team may overlook relevant documentation and information or may make misinterpretations. Therefore assessment procedures may include one or more checks with the management of the certification system before the final judgement is being made.

During the NL assessment procedure TPAC gives twice the opportunity to the certification system to provide feedback on preliminary assessment results. CPET in the UK follows a similar procedure. BE and DK have no formal procedure to obtain feedback from the Certification system.

Objection and appeal procedure

Even after a fair communication, the management of the certification system may wish to make objections against the final judgement of the assessment team. Also other stakeholders may wish to make objections against the procedure and or the final judgement. These objections could be channelled through a transparent objection and appeal procedure.

NL and UK have a specific objection and appeal system in place which may be used by both the certification system and other stakeholders, e.g. NGO's.

Validity period of recognition (years)

Acceptance of certificates of a particular certification system is restricted to a limited period, after which a full new assessment takes place. Acceptance procedures may also include (partly) re-assessments before the termination of the validity period e.g. in case of changes made in the certification system or when irregularities within the certification system are noticed.

NL and UK award acceptance of the certificates of a certification system for 5 years. After five years a thorough new assessment takes place. Within the period of five years assessment of specific topics may take place whenever there is a reason to do so e.g. changes of the standard and or other elements of the system and notifications of noncompliance of the management of certified forests.

2.4.2 Capacity for the assessments

The number of certification system documents is gradually building up as a result of noticed omissions and ambiguities that needed to be fixed. This in itself makes the assessment a meticulous work requiring experience and expertise.

The Netherlands and UK have both an independent entity charged with the assessment of certification systems and category B evidence respectively TPAC and CPET. The work method shows very many similarities. A secretary or consultant prepares a preliminary assessment which is presented to an expert committee. The committee counts four to six members. It is important that knowledge about the three pillars of SFM, ecology, economy and social issues are represented. Also a notion of legal issues is helpful. The secretary/consultant maintains contact with the manager of the certification system. The expert committee makes the final judgement.

3 Analysis and discussion

3.1 General topics that constitute the TPP

3.1.1 Objectives of TPP

Common formal objectives of the TPP's:

- promoting the use of timber and wood from sustainably managed forests
- increasing the demand for sustainable produced wood.

Alternatives:

- in addition, providing leadership in timber product markets by setting standards for procurement
- in addition, to secure that SFM certification systems deliver what they claim (by monitoring the deliverables of legality and SFM certification systems)

Discussion: Objectives of TPP

Requiring exclusively sustainable produced timber will no doubt increase the demand for and promote the use of sustainable produced timber. But it is necessary to clarify what

we mean with sustainable produced timber. Without a clear definition we do not know what we buy.

Countries contribute to the world wide discourse of defining SFM by developing their own standard and applying it, in their TPP, as a reference for other standards. This may be advantageous for securing a high level of sustainable forest management. Without such a reference the rationale of accepting certificates and labels may be questioned. unambiguous definition of SFM is also a prerequisite for assessing category B evidence.

On the other hand, setting internationally applicable standards by individual countries is a contentious exercise. In fact the standard setting process would require input from a wide variety of international stakeholders. The member states that have developed a SFM standard involved national stakeholders but very few or none international stakeholders. This may question the legitimacy of valuing standards of certification systems against the national standard. A commonly developed and or accepted standard by various member states will diminish this disadvantage.

Monitoring the actual performance of SFM certification systems may be required in order to secure that they deliver what they claim. From a TPP perspective, monitoring makes more sense when the level of detail of the TPP definition is not lower than the level of detail of the certification scheme definition For instance imagine that the TPP definition is less specific than a certification scheme definition. If than non-compliances in the forests are found with the SFM definition of the certification system itself, it may be difficult to prove that management of the forest does not comply with the TPP definition. There may be no cause for rejecting the certificates. The impact on the certification system and thus on forest management is then negligible.

3.1.2 Procurement requirement

Common procurement requirements are:

- sustainable produced timber, accepting mass balance method and a percentage base method. For the percentage based method a threshold applies of a mix containing minimal 70% sustainable with 30% legal timber.

Alternatives:

- in addition, accepting FLEGT-licensed timber on equal footing (LU, UK)

Discussion: Procurement requirement

The limit of 70%/30% mix in a percentage based system matches with the labels used for mixed sources percentage based methods of FSC and PEFC. FSC allows 50% in their labelled fibre products, such as paper. FSC has more stringent rules for the non-SFM certified material than PEFC. The non SFM certified product has to originate from non-controversial sources which for FSC covers five categories of controversy among which illegal timber. For PEFC legality is the main issue regarding non-controversial sources.

Status of FLEGT licensed timber

Part of the Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPA)'s is a commitment of the EU to provide a green lane for FLEGT-licensed timber as being recognized legal timber. This green lane has the form of preferential treatment in the EUTR. In addition, such preferential treatment could be established by giving FLEGT-licensed timber a status in the national TPP.

FLEGT-licensed timber is still not yet available, but when it comes governments have to decide what status they will give FLEGT-licensed timber. As the EU has formally entered into VPA with the countries, which will produce FLEGT-licensed timber, it is hard to believe that member states would not, one way or the other, give FLEGT-licensed timber a status in the national TPP. There are three options:

- a) accepting FLEGT-licensed timber on equal footing with sustainable produced timber, (as LU and UK do while other countries have formally not yet decided how to treat FLEGT-licensed timber) or,
- b) accepting FLEGT-licensed timber second to sustainable produced timber (for example: "if sustainable is not available)
- c) accepting FLEGT-licensed timber merely as legal timber

Accepting on equal footing is most generous and may be considered fair to the VPA countries, which after all made great efforts to implement a Legality Assurance System (LAS). At the same time it might give the impression that FLEGT is equivalent to sustainable. This position will be hard to defend as legislation varies from country to country while SFM requirements are equal for all countries. Accepting on equal footing might also be perceived by suppliers of SFM-certified timber as a disregard for their efforts and thus reducing the incentive for certification. To overcome this discrepancy countries could be selected, for accepting FLEGT licensed timber on equal footing, to the extent by which their legislation meets the SFM requirements. In that case a mechanism is required to establish compliance of the legislation with the SFM requirements. Vice versa, accepting FLEGT timber second to sustainable produced timber, or even less, merely as legal timber may not be understood by the VAP countries and may cause some hurdles in the market.

A practical problem is how procurers can recognize FLEGT-licensed timber. This would require a separate chain of custody for FLEGT-licensed timber. An alternative could be that procurers identify FLEGT-licensed timber by identifying the country of origin. This may be difficult in cases where the FLEGT-licensed timber has been (further) processed in a non FLEGT-VPA country. Anyway thorough guidance is needed for procurers on how to recognise FLEGT-licensed timber.

3.1.3 Application of the TPP

Common application models are:

- TPP is mandatory for all national government institutions and agencies and voluntary for local governments. (Be, DE, DK, NL and UK) (In DE the requirement is mandatory for the Federal government while some States and public funded institutions have adopted the TPP).

Alternatives:

- in addition, mandatory for publicly funded projects.(LU)

Discussion: Application of TPP

TPP could be applied in more situations to broaden the reach and spin-off effect to the private sector; for example by implementing it for public funded institutions and projects and local governments. Various municipalities in member states have their own TPP, which can differ from the national policy, e.g. by preferring, sometimes requiring, certificates from one single certification scheme may create confusion for suppliers.

3.1.4 Product type

Common product types are:

- all EUTR categories, except pulp and paper (BE and DE) and biomass (BE, DE, DK, and NL)
- post-consumer **recycled wood** is not an EUTR category. DK accepts and DE even prefers recycled wood, as UK does for specific applications e.g. paper and furniture. BE, LU and NL have recycled wood not explicitly included in the TPP but it seems to be accepted on equal footing.

Alternatives:

- specific policy for **pulp and paper** (BE, and DE)
- specific policy for (woody) **biomass** (UK, and specific policy seems to be discussed in BE, DE, DK, and NL))

Discussion: Product type

Various countries promote the use of recycled wood. Post recycled wood is treated on equal footing with sustainably produced wood. This means in practice acceptance of certified timber no matter what the share of recycled vs. sustainably produced timber is in a given certified mix. Pre-consumer recycled wood, e.g. chips from saw mills are subject to the same requirements as fresh timber.

The specific pulp and paper policy in BE and DE seem to involve lower requirements for forest management. In general it is not desirable to have different requirements for different applications of the wood as most of the wood can technically be used for many purposes.

In UK, suppliers and buyers of heat and electricity, that are not covered by the TPP and claim payments under specific incentive schemes, have to meet the land criteria for legal and sustainable as per the Timber Standard for Heat and Electricity. The Timber Standard draws upon the principles set out in the TPP. Any timber/woodfuel that meets the TPP will automatically comply with the Timber Standard, but not vice versa, as the Timber standard allows a risk based approach while the TPP does not.

Companies may also receive biomass from small wooded patches in the landscape and trees along roads and borders. In that case legality is the main issue.

3.1.5 Evidence of compliance

Presently, commonly accepted evidences of compliance with requirements for sustainable produced timber are:

- certificates of FSC and PEFC
- category B evidence (only UK and NL have a fully operational assessment system, LU has an expert committee, DK provides guidance on the use and assessment of other types of documentation than certificates, including advice for demanding independent assessment thereof, if documentation presented on request is not considered appropriate in the first place.)

Alternatives:

- no alternatives are being provided by the six countries. However some other EU member states, out of the scope of this study, refer also to eco-labels as (possible) proof of evidence

Discussion: Evidence of compliance

Category A

Presently all six countries accept certificates of FSC and PEFC as evidence of compliance for buying and using sustainable produced timber, although the justification for acceptance may differ. Eco-labels can in principle be another way of showing compliance.

Accepting certificates and labels of different schemes, including eco-labels, calls for a transparent decision procedure. Most appropriate seems an objective unambiguous reference framework against which labels or certification systems can be assessed. The reference framework should consist of a clear definition of SFM, i.e. a set of criteria and a guidance for assessing evidence of compliance. An independently developed SFM definition prevents discrimination of certification systems. Member states may work with a simpler system by referring to the requirements (or equivalent) of one or more major certification systems. Without such a reference or a clear definition of SFM the basis for accepting certificates and labels may be questioned. February 2014 the Public Procurement Directive 2014/24/EU was approved by the EU Parliament. Article 43

regards labels. Contracting authorities may require a specific label when purchasing works, supplies with specific environmental, social or other characteristics, as means of proof that the works, supplies correspond to the required characteristics. This seems to imply that the required characteristics must have been defined independently from any standard represented by a label.

A mere reference to the SFM standard of one certification system, or to a copy of the standard serving as a standalone definition, tends to be discriminatory for suppliers. In any case, favouring one certification system in a context where various certification systems compete, is considered undesirable with a view on non-discrimination and equal treatment. Referring to standards of two certification systems as a basis for assessing compliance introduces an additional problem i.e. the reference basis is not unambiguous.

Category B

An unambiguous definition of SFM is also a prerequisite for assessing category B evidence. NL and UK have procedures in place for assessment. It is obvious that procurement officers will not have the time and resources nor the expertise to assess the management of the forests themselves. Therefore TPAC and CPET are assigned to provide support. In practice, timber accompanied by category B evidence is seldom offered. SFM is not a simple case to prove by other evidence than a certificate. Another situation is where timber, sourced from a certified forest, has lost its certificate in the course of the CoC. The challenge is then that category B evidence traces the timber back to the last connection in the supply chain where it still had its certificate.

3.2 Definition of legal and sustainable timber

3.2.1 Legality definition

Common elements of the legality definition:

- incorporation of EUTR definition of legally harvested timber in the TPP requirements. (DE, NL and UK)

Alternatives

- in addition, legality criteria in order to capture the legislation, that applies to the full gamut of SFM and not just to harvesting (BE, LU and NL)

Discussion: Legality definition

As EUTR is binding for all member states the EUTR definition must be part of the legality requirements. Presently BE and LU lack reference to trade and customs legislation in so far as the forest sector is concerned. The EUTR definition of legality has a limited scope i.e. *legal harvesting*. Other matters of *forest management* have also legal aspects. They should also be addressed in the legal component of a SFM definition.

3.2.2 SFM definition

When comparing the various SFM definitions, i.e. reference standards, similarities and differences are being noticed in three aspects: content i.e. the themes that are being addressed; the structure of the reference standard (P and C, categorizing criteria) and the degree of detail and the formulation of criteria.

Common themes:

- definitions of all five countries are based on the three pillars, environmental, social and economic aspects. (UK has social aspects separated from the definition)
- Definitions of all five countries cover the six general criteria of Forest Europe, albeit here and there with different approaches and formulations.

Alternatives

- in addition, a general criterion on the management system (BE and NL)
- most DK and LU criteria are identical to UK criteria. BE and NL have different approaches and formulations resulting in more criteria.

Discussion: themes of SFM definition

Communalities and the noticeable differences among the definitions of the five countries are being more extensively highlighted in section 2.2.2 and Matrix II a which is designed according to the structure of the Forest Europe SFM definition. The most compelling differences regard the following themes: *maintenance of forest resources and their contribution to global carbon cycles; conversion; ecological processes and cycles; non-timber forest products; economic viability; structure of the forests; use of exotic species and GMO's; plantations; cultural and traditional values; free, prior informed consent; consultation of stakeholders and public availability of forest management plans and maps; local employment; and the management system.*

Common Structure

- The five member states have constructed their SFM definitions at two levels. The top level covering broad themes, e.g. biodiversity or social conditions, is the domain of Principles or General criteria. At the second level these Principles/General criteria are broken down into criteria.
- Social criteria are an integral part of the BE, DK, LU and NL definitions

Alternatives,

- differences are in the number of criteria and grouping of criteria.
- UK SFM definition is construed by 5 General criteria and 3 social criteria. Each General criterion is followed by a number of themes comparable to criteria, albeit the UK definition does not name those themes explicitly criteria.
- UK has visually separated the social criteria from the other SFM criteria, with a view on the EC Procurement directive.
- LU follows the structure of UK but the social criteria are an integral part of SFM.
- DK follows the structure of six Forest Europe General Criteria.
- BE and NL have organized their definition in 5 respectively 4 aspects. Each aspect has been worked out in one or two Principles with a number of criteria.
- DK, LU and UK include requirements for standard setting in their requirements for the SFM definition, while BE and NL consider standard setting as an element of governance of certification systems.

Degree of detail and formulation

the formulation of most of the DK and LU criteria is identical to the UK criteria with only here and there some differences. However, DK applies a separate criterion on maintenance of forest resources and their contribution to global carbon cycles. Further, DK applies a social SFM criterion that are in substance more or less identical to those currently used for evaluation of certification schemes in the UK, but not part of the UK definition of sustainable timber. Generally the BE and NL criteria are more articulated and being thus more specific.

Discussion: structure and formulation of SFM definition

Structure has little impact on the content of the definition. However structure is important for placing the topics in the right order. Generally the P, C and I structure is being recognised as a useful logical frame work. It distinguishes clearly between the forest policy, i.e. level of principles, the requirements for adhering to those principles, i.e. level of criteria, and the elements that should be assessed, i.e. indicators, in order to establish (non)compliance with the criteria. The actual formulation of each criterion should allow for giving a judgement. It is a matter of semantics whether the elements which constitute the policy level are being referred to as Principles or (General) criteria. The P, C and I structure is appropriate for monitoring, reporting and certification and may serve as a practical basis for drafting forest management guidelines.

The different applications of the definition require however different levels of detail and formulation of the criteria. Standards resulting from international governmental processes have been developed for monitoring and reporting at the national level. Civil society standards were initially developed to advance timber harvesting methods at the FMU level. They should be, and indeed are, more specific and detailed than the standards from international governmental processes. As TPP's refer among others to certification systems operating at the FMU level, SFM definitions in the TPP context must also be relevant for assessing forest management at the FMU level.

The scope of each criterion is important. Using broad formulated criteria in the TPP SFM definition implies leaving out specifics and allowing more freedom of interpretation for assessors of certification systems. Crucial elements which are implicitly regarded to be covered by a broad formulated criterion may not be assessed and complied with. Broad formulation of requirements in TPP's may also relieve pressure on certification systems because compliance with the TPP criteria is realised with less stringent criteria. On the other hand, formulation of more specific requirements may lead to an array of criteria which may create a disproportional and unnecessary burden for procurement officers, certification bodies and forest managers. Also the flexibility may be lost which is necessary for coping with certification systems operating in different regions in the world.

The challenge is to develop and agree on a set of TPP criteria with a coverage and a level of detail which makes a difference for forest management and provides sufficient warranty that certification systems live up to their promises. At the same time it should be flexible enough to be applied in different circumstances (non-discrimination) and meet the requirements of proportionality and transparency.

An example of an SFM definition which may match these requirements is presented in Annex III. Various topics for discussion are being raised notably regarding the appropriate level of detail. The structure is based on the Forest Europe criteria.

3.3 Requirements for category A-evidence

Requirements for certification Systems

Five (BE, DK, LU, NL and UK) out of the six member states have developed a reference framework for assessing SFM standards and SFM certification systems. DE has no reference framework but accepts FSC and PEFC certificate as evidence for sustainable produced timber.

3.3.1 Standard (Applicability; characteristics and standard setting)

Common standard requirements:

- standard must be consistent with widely accepted international P & I and applicable in various local conditions.
- requirements refer to ISO 59 and ISEAL codes.
- balanced representation of stakeholders with standard setting
- no single interest shall dominate decision making.

Alternatives

- in addition, explicitly refer to the need for performance based criteria (NL and UK).
- in addition, criteria are objective and verifiable (BE).
- transparency and obligation to report on the development process (BE and NL)

Discussion: Standard

The common requirements guarantee to a great extent that the standard itself and the standard setting process are compatible with current international views. Explicit reference to the need for performance based criteria may be useful. Performance based criteria describe results of forest management. Emphasis on performance based criteria may prevent a sole focus on management processes. Emphasis on objective and verifiable criteria contributes to a correct formulation of the criteria.

3.3.2 Governance of CS

Common approach

- specific criteria for the governance of the system. (Be and NL)
- specific criteria for international certification programmes, including umbrella systems (umbrella system endorses national certification schemes).

Alternative

- in addition, the SFM system should be credible. (BE)
- DK, LU and UK have no requirements as to the governance of the certification system other than criteria for standard setting.

Discussion: Governance of CS

Requirements for governance of the certification system as a whole can complement the requirements for certification and accreditation. Important issues are setting rules for standard setting; supervision of performance of tasks; design and use of logo's and claims; objection and appeal handling; division of responsibilities and decision making. Practice have shown that certification systems tend to purely rely on accreditation bodies for supervision of performance of tasks. In addition, in house procedures for monitoring the actual performance strengthen the robustness of the system. CS have their own responsibility for monitoring the implementation of their policy and procedures. Decisions of the CS itself should be transparent and open for objections and appeal. Therefore it is desirable that certification bodies are obliged to have an objection and appeal mechanism.

International certification programmes have an additional dimension which is crucial for their performance i.e. endorsement procedures and monitor procedures. Therefore a full assessment of their performance should include the development, existence and implementation of these procedures. NL has separate requirements for governance of international operating certification schemes, like FSC, and international umbrella systems, like PEFC, because the nature of both systems is different. UK has one general criteria for the governance of both systems.

3.3.3 Certification and Certification bodies

Common requirements are:

- certification by an independent body, which complies with relevant ISO guidelines and which is accredited to evaluate against forest management standards.
- audit procedures include study of documents, sufficient consultation of stakeholders and field checks.
- summaries of audit reports should be publicly available
- an accessible objection and appeal procedure shall be in place.

Alternatives

- in addition, a criterion on group certification (NL).
- in addition, a criterion requiring to describe measures which limit circumstances in which certification may be awarded, e.g. conversion (UK).

Discussion: Certification and Certification bodies

The common requirements guarantee that certification is executed professionally, independent, transparent and involving relevant stakeholders. As group certification involves additional management procedures, it seems appropriate that the SFM standard itself contains requirements for group management. One or two requirements e.g. auditing a sufficient number of group participants seem sufficient.

DK and NL deal with conversion in their SFM standard. Conversion is basically not allowed unless in exceptional cases. It is at variance with the general criterion to maintain the forest resource. UK and LU made a provision to address conversion in the certification process without a specific SFM criterion to be audited. Inclusion of the conversion issue in the SFM definition creates transparency on how to deal with it. If a conversion criterion is an obstacle for referring to the SFM definition in the Technical specification, the UK concept may provide a solution.

3.3.4 Accreditation

Common requirements are:

- accreditation must be undertaken by an (inter)national body that fulfils the requirements of ISO 17011.

Alternatives

- in addition, the accreditation body takes part in a peer review process with sister organisations (NL)

Discussion: Accreditation

The common requirements promote that accreditation is executed professionally and independent. Accreditation bodies which are members of the International Accreditation Federation (IAF) are subject to a peer review by other accreditation bodies. This is an extra guarantee for professionalism and a correct accreditation process. Therefore it seems desirable to require a peer review procedure for those accreditation bodies which are not a member of the IAF.

3.3.5 Chain of Custody

Common requirements are:

- Chain of Custody is certified, by an independent third party, from the forest to the final point of sale.
- Mixing of sustainable produced timber only with timber from verified legal sources. The content of sustainable must be minimal 70%, when applying the percentage based system.
- CoC guarantees that the product claims are clear and accurate.

Alternatives

- in addition, material from non-verified sources is administratively and physically separated from certified sustainable timber and or verified legal timber (NL)
- in addition, specific criterion on the use of pre- and post-consumer recycled wood (BE, LU and UK) acceptance of recycled wood on equal footing as sustainable produced wood (DK)
- in addition, criterion on group certification (BE and NL)
- in addition, criterion on the competence of the certification body (BE)
- in addition, rules for labelling (NL)

Discussion: Chain of Custody

The common requirements guarantee that the timber can be traced from the forest to the final point of sale, at least administratively. The additional NL requirement for physical separation seems already to be covered by the other criteria as sustainable produced timber may *only* be mixed with timber from verified legal sources. The other

additions on *group certification, competence of the certification body and rules for labelling* will probably lead to a more robust CoC.

Various countries promote the use of recycled wood. Post recycled wood is usually treated on equal footing with sustainably produced wood. Pre-consumer recycled wood such as sawing chips is a by-product of the logs which should be sustainably harvested. Therefore it should be traceable and have similar requirements. Post-consumer recycled wood is difficult to track. Requirements for mixing pre- and post-consumer recycled wood with sustainable produced wood should be part of the CoC requirements. Because of the international trade of both pre- and post-consumer wood a common approach of member countries would be beneficial.

3.4 Assessment of certification systems

3.4.1 Entity responsible for the assessment

Commonalities assessment entities:

- independent assessment bodies (NL- TPAC and UK- CPET)

Alternative

- government agencies (BE-Agency for Nature and Forests, DE -Thünen-Institute and Federal Agency for Nature Conservation)
- relying on the outcomes of the assessment body of another member state.(LU relies on CPET, while keeping an option for further assessment.)
- combination of the two alternatives (DK's July 2014 assessment relies partly on CPET))

Discussion: Entity responsible for the assessment

A prerequisite for an objective assessment is that the people who undertake the assessment are competent, independent and not biased. Therefore it is important that the assessment body is composed of various individuals who are selected for their specific expertise and who do not have to cope with conflicts of interests. Accepting the outcome of an assessment body of another member state is an interesting option. Such a procedure pre-assumes that the TPP requirements for accepting category A evidence are more or less the same in both countries. Otherwise, assessment results from other countries may be used for selected criteria only (those most similar), whilst other more diverging or additional criteria (if any) could be assess separately.

3.4.2 Status of advice

Commonalities of the status of the result of the assessment:

- In all 6 countries results of the assessment serve as an advice to the government (BE, DE, DK, LU, NL and UK)

Discussion: Binding conclusions or advice

Conclusions in the form of an advice leave the possibility for the responsible minister to combine the advice with other considerations in the decision. This may be useful in cases where the effect of non-acceptance reaches far beyond the signal that the forest management is not (yet) fully in compliance with the reference standard. For instance, non-acceptance may be interpreted as a negative reaction on serious efforts for improvement and/or it may lead to inconvenient shortages of specific wood qualities.

3.4.3. Objects of assessment

Common valuation objects:

- all relevant documents i.e. SFM and CoC standards, all other normative documents and policy documents. (NL and UK)

Alternative:

- the SFM and CoC standard and a selection of other documents. (BE and DK)

Discussion: Objects of assessment

A serious assessment requires a thorough study of all relevant normative documents and policy documents of a certification system. Where the SFM standard formulates the requirements for forest management, the other documents may contain interpretations of SFM criteria; instructions for awarding minor and major corrective action requirements (CAR's); consequences of CAR's; scoring rules; standard development and requirements for numerous other topics that direct or indirect affect the quality and credibility of the certification system. Therefore a mere appraisal of the standard is not enough for providing an accountable judgement of a certification system.

3.4.4 Check actual performance

Common procedures:

- study audit reports and other reports or publications (BE, NL and UK)
- direct communication with the certification system and some certification bodies (DK, NL and UK)
- field visits are included as a possible option (BE and NL,)

Alternatives:

- an internet forum where stakeholders are invited to comment on the certification system that is being assessed. (NL)
- circulate a request for information among stakeholders. (UK)

Discussion: check actual performance

Practice may be at variance from the formal procedures and instructions of the certification system or may show undesired outcomes. The proof is in the eating of the pudding. Issues to pay attention to include the intensity of field checks by certification bodies; actual interpretation of compliance with Criteria and Principles. Study of audit reports may reveal much about the thoroughness of the audits and about the actual treatment of CAR's. Another source of information are stakeholders. They can be approached directly or may be invited to use an internet forum run by the TPP assessment entity. Advantage of the latter is that the comments are publicly available. Stakeholders may notice irregularities and share their knowledge with the TPP assessment entity. One indicator of a reliable certification system is a properly functioning objection and appeal mechanism. Therefore it may be wise to require that stakeholders have approached the certification system with their claim or objection before they bring it to the TPP assessment process.

Field visits are included in the assessment procedure if and when deemed necessary, but neither BE and NL have used this opportunity thus far.

3.4.5 Scoring system

Common scoring system elements:

- scoring system in place (BE, DK, NL and UK)
- score at the level of Principles/General criteria (BE, DK, NL and UK)
- three possible scores 0, 1 and 2 (DK, NL and UK.) (BE five scores; 0, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5)
- written decision rules (BE, DK, NL and UK)

Alternatives:

- in addition, also scores for each criterion which appears under a Principle (NL, UK)

Discussion: Scoring system

LU follows the results of UK (CPET). Denmark has a similar system as UK. Also the NL and UK scoring system show a great correspondence. Both systems score on the level of

Principle/General criteria with 2, 1, 0. Both systems have clear decision rules for acceptance of the certification systems based on the scores at that level. Both systems score also compliance with each criterion which appears under a Principle. UK exercises a mechanical method to establish the score at the level of Principle as a result from the scores at the criterion level, i.e. rules are set regarding the scores at the criterion level that result in 2, 1 or 0 at the Principle level. This requires a balance in the weight between the criteria under each P. The weight of the NL criteria is more diverse. Therefore it does not allow for a mechanical translation of the scores at the criterion level to the level of Principles. The score on P level relies then more on professional interpretation and is as a result less transparent.

3.4.6 Feedback from certification system

Common procedures:

- consulting the certification system on preliminary assessment results (NL and UK)

Alternatives:

- no formal procedure to obtain feedback (BE and DK)

Discussion: Feedback from certification systems

Experience with TPAC and CPET have learned that allowing certification systems to comment on preliminary findings is not only a fair process but also is crucial to avoid misinterpretations and to include overlooked information.

3.4.7 Objection and appeal system

Common objection and appeal systems:

- objection and appeal system in place which may be used by both the certification system and other stakeholders, e.g. NGO's. (NL and UK)

Alternatives:

- No specific objection and appeal procedures (BE and DK)

Discussion: Objection and appeal system

Accepting certificates as evidence for timber sourced from sustainable managed forests is a serious matter. Not accepting may have major consequences for the certification system and the use of timber from the certified forests. Therefore a clear and accessible objection and appeal system should be in place where certification systems are being assessed in view of accepting their certificates as evidence for sustainable produced wood and wood products.

3.4.8 Valid period of recognition (years)

Common time period:

- acceptance of the certificates of a certification system for 5 years, after five years a thorough new assessment takes place (NL and UK)

Alternatives:

- no time limit but reassessment takes place if and when substantial changes in the certification system are evident. (BE and DK)

Discussion: Valid period of recognition

Not only BE and DK but also NL and UK will assess specific topics whenever there is a reason to do so e.g. changes of the standard, or other elements of the system and notifications of noncompliance of the management of certified forests. In fact certification systems change continuously. Changes may occur in their policy, standards or implementation i.e. the actual audit and awarding certificates. For that reason it is useful to have a full re-assessment after five years. A rewarding side effect is that the re-assessment keeps the certification systems sharp.

4 Concluding remarks

When comparing TPP's of six² EU member states many elements of a common approach are noticeable but there is also considerable room for improving consistency and gaining synergy.

The member states pursue similar formal objectives with their TPP's notably *promoting the use of timber and wood from sustainably managed forests* as well as *increasing the demand for sustainable produced wood*. These objectives become only meaningful when the concept of sustainable managed forests is well articulated. That implies an elaboration of the three pillars of sustainable i.e. ecological responsible, social acceptable and economic viable. Thus, if TPP's want to make a difference in forest management and want to provide sufficient warranty that certification systems live up to their promises the set of TPP criteria should cover a wide range of topics at a sufficient level of detail. At the same time the SFM definition should be flexible enough to be applied in different circumstances (non-discrimination) and meet the requirements of proportionality and transparency.

Accepting certificates and labels of different schemes calls for a transparent assessment and decision procedure. Most, but not all, countries have a stand-alone definition (standard) of SFM. Although all standards are constructed on the three pillars of sustainability they show differences in structure, detail and some of the themes they address. Procedures for assessing compliance of certification systems with TPP procurement requirements have diverging levels of intensity and may result in varying interpretations. These variances are not in the interests of forest management, timber trade and certification systems. A commonly accepted SFM definition by various member states and a joint assessment procedure will resolve these problems. A commonly developed and used SFM definition will also diminish the disadvantage of a country's SFM definition being applied to the entire world without having gone through an international consultation process.

The inclusion of the SFM criteria regarding social communities and indigenous people in the technical specification for timber in a tender procedure is contentious. Some parties argue that these topics are not part of the definition of the subject matter. But the social criteria are an indispensable part of the SFM definition. Including these criteria in the awarding clause, as some people suggest, seems less appropriate as the awarding clause is the phase in the procedure for making specific requirements regarding the performance of the contractor.

The position of FLEGT licensed timber in the TPP's deserves further consultation among member states in order to achieve a common approach. After all, the FLEGT process and the Voluntary Partnership Agreements are an EU initiative.

Also requirements for forest biomass used for energy purposes are still in discussion. An important issue here is the statement in the EU Forest strategy *Develop objective, ambitious and demonstrable EU sustainable forest management criteria that can be applied in different policy contexts regardless of the end use of forest biomass*. Forest biomass for energy use should comply with the same SFM definition as for timber used for construction purposes, pulp and paper or furniture. Criteria regarding the CO₂ balance could be added.

Finally the status of post recycled wood material in the TPP's is a subject with room for improving consistency.

² Germany (DE), Denmark (DK), Luxembourg (LU), Netherlands (NL) United Kingdom (UK). Belgium (BE) Information concerning BE refers solely to Flanders.

///////

Annex I

Matrix I: General topics of TPP

TPP	Flanders/Belgium	Denmark	Germany	Luxembourg	Netherlands	UK
Year established Latest revision	2005 2009	2001 2014	2007 2011	2014	2004 2014	2000 2014
1 Objectives Formally adopted	Promoting the use of timber/wood from sustainably managed forests	Promoting the use of timber/wood from sustainably managed forests	Promoting the use of timber/wood from sustainably managed forests	Promoting good governance and sustainable use of resources	Increasing the demand for legal and sustainable produced wood;	Promoting the use of timber/wood from sustainably managed forests
2 Procurement requirement SFM Minimum content Mass balance accept FLEGT accepted on equal footing - General, or - country wise	V 70% V in discussion	V 70% V in discussion	V 70%, V in discussion	V 70% V V	V 70%, V in discussion	V 70% V V Evaluation after imports from 3 countries during 3 years
3 Application National govern. all agencies Local governments	Mandatory Voluntary	Mandatory Voluntary	Mandatory federal and some states and public funded institutions Voluntary	Mandatory, including publicly funded projects Voluntary	Mandatory Voluntary by 2015 100%	Mandatory Voluntary
4 Product type EUTR categories: <i>Round wood</i> <i>Sawn wood</i> <i>Wood panels</i> <i>Packaging wood</i> <i>Furniture</i> <i>Pulp and paper</i> <i>Biomass for heat and power</i> Post consumer recycled wood	All EUTR categories except: Pulp and paper Biomass Recycled products accepted	All EUTR categories except: Wood for energy Recycled products accepted incl. waste of furniture industry	All EUTR categories except: Pulp and paper Biomass Recycled products preferred.	All EUTR categories n.a.	All EUTR categories except: Biomass n.a.	All EUTR categories Biomass for heat and power Recycled products preferred for product groups with govt. buying standard.
5 Evidence of compliance Cat. A Schemes Cat, B system operational	FSC, PEFC no	FSC, PEFC no	FSC, PEFC no	FSC, PEFC no	FSC, PEFC V	FSC, PEFC V

Matrix II : Requirements for specific elements of certification systems for sustainably produced timber

Requirements for	Flanders/Belgium	Denmark	Germany	Luxembourg	Netherlands	UK
Legal EUTR compliant EUTR plus	no	V	no	no	V V	V
Other	V		no	V		
SFM Specific definition	V	V	no	V	V	V
Direct reference to FSC and/or PEFC			V			
Standard setting	V	V	according to FSC and PEFC	V	V	V
Governance of Certification systems	V	no	no	no	V	no
Umbrella systems	no	V (C 7.1) ¹	no	no	V (PEM) ²	V (NLA 5.1) ³
Certification and certification bodies	V	V	according to FSC and PEFC	V	V	V
Accreditation	V	V	according to FSC and PEFC	V	V	V
Chain of Custody	V	V	according to FSC and PEFC	V	V	V

¹ criterion 7.1 in assessment matrix of 8 July 2014

² Procedure on endorsement of certification systems

³ National Level Application Criterion 5.1

Matrix II a: Criteria for SFM including legality requirements

Theme	United Kingdom (June 2013)	Denmark	Luxembourg	Netherlands (February 2014)	Belgium ⁴
Legal frame work (criteria going beyond EUTR compatibility are marked yellow)					
EUTR reference	"Harvested in accordance with the applicable legislation in the country of harvest". Applicable legislation is the legislation in force in the country of harvest covering the following matters:	Identical to UK Introductory wording and L1, L2, L3, L4 and L5 in substance identical to the EUTR definition of "legally harvested timber".		Identical to UK, plus:	
- Right to harvest	L1. rights to harvest timber within legally gazetted boundaries;		1.1.1 The forest owner/ manager holds the legal use rights to the forest.	C1.1 forest manager holds legal use rights.	1.1: De bosbeheerder leeft het wettelijke kader na dat betrekking heeft op bos en bosbouw in de brede zin en houdt zich aan de hieruit voortvloeiende verplichtingen.
- Payments fees etc.	L2. payments for harvest rights and timber including duties related to timber harvesting;		1.2 All relevant royalties and taxes are paid for	C 1.2 forest manager complies with all obligations to pay taxes and royalties.	Criterion 1.3: De bosbeheerder houdt zich aan alle rechten en plichten die voldoen uit alle overeenkomsten, contracten en regelingen die van toepassing zijn op het bosbedrijf en het bosbeheer
- Environmental & forest legislation	L3. timber harvesting, including environmental and forest legislation including forest management and biodiversity conservation, where directly related to timber harvesting;		1.4 Both the forest management organisation and any contractors comply with local, national and international legal requirements including those relevant to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Forest management • Labour and welfare • Health and safety 		
- Use,- tenure rights	L4. Third parties' legal rights concerning use and tenure that are affected by timber harvesting;		Third parties' tenure rights	minus S9.	1.2: Eigendomsrechten en eventuele zakelijke en persoonlijke rechten op het bos zijn aantoonbaar vastgesteld
- Trade and customs	L5. trade and customs, in so far as the forest sector is concerned. S9. The forest management organisation and any contractors must comply with local and national legal requirements relevant to: labour and welfare; health and safety		1.3 Compliance with CITES is required	C 1.3 international agreements that apply to the FMU are respected	1 De bosbeheerder moet bij het beheer van zijn bos alle internationale bindende overeenkomsten, alle nationale en lokale wetten die van toepassing zijn, respecteren.

⁴ The SFM standard of Flanders was only available in Dutch. The relevant differences with the UK criteria are being presented in the main text in Chapters 2.2 and 3.2.

Theme	United Kingdom	Denmark	Luxembourg	Netherlands ⁵	Belgium
SFM (numbers in brackets refer to the Forest Europe criterion) (subjects not explicitly addressed by UK criteria are marked turquoise)					
Maintenance and appropriate enhancement of forest resources and their contribution to global carbon cycles (1) Conversion	Text of UK requirement 2.7 and DK requirement 4.7 for certification bodies: <i>The certification scheme must include measures which limit and clearly describe and justify the circumstances in which certification may be awarded to a forest, the character of which has been subject to planned and systematic transformation in a concentrated period of time with the consequence of significantly reducing the forest's biodiversity and/or health and vitality of the forest ecosystem; for example, the conversion of natural forest or forest with many of the characteristics of natural forest to industrial forest plantation</i>	3.1.Shall seek to ensure maintenance of forest resources and their contribution to global carbon cycles. In order to do this, the standard must include requirements for: i. safeguarding the quantity and quality of the forest resources in the medium and long term... ii. avoidance of conversion of forests to other types of land use including conversion of primary forests to forest plantations , unless in justified circumstances where conversion: (1) is in compliance with national and regional policy and legislation..... (2) entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; (3) does not have negative impacts on threatened (including vulnerable, rare or endangered) forest ecosystems, culturally and socially significant areas,		C4.3 conversion of forests in the FMU to other types of land use, including timber plantations, shall not occur unless in justified exceptional circumstances C 4.5. Plantations shall not be established through the conversion of natural forests after 1997.	C 4.1 Conversie van bos naar plantage vindt niet plaats, tenzij het gaat om een zeer gelimiteerde proportie van de bosbeheereenheid ; en ii) deze niet plaatsvindt in bossen met hoge beschermingswaarde ; en iii) deze duidelijke, substantiële, additionele en gewaarborgde voordelen op lange termijn oplevert voor de bescherming van de gehele bosbeheereenheid. C 5.5 Plantations through the conversion of natural forests after 1997 are not eligible for certification.

⁵ Some criteria of the present Dutch standard are under consideration to be removed i.e. C 5.5. Initiating fires; C 7.2 Physical infrastructure; C 8.2.d. Budget for forest management; C 8.5 Scientific research and C 9.2 b Group management system. They are not included in this matrix

<p>Unauthorized activities</p> <p>Ecological cycles</p>	<p>S7 c. adequate protection of the forest from unauthorised activities such as illegal logging, mining and encroachment.</p>	<p>important habitats of threatened species or other protected areas; and (4) makes a contribution to long-term conservation, economic and social benefits.</p> <p>3.4 iii. adequate protection of the forest from unauthorised activities such as illegal logging, mining and encroachment.</p>	<p>1.2.1 c adequate protection of the forest from unauthorised activities such as illegal logging, mining and encroachment.</p>	<p>C 6.2. The forest management unit is sufficiently protected against all forms of illegal exploitation, illegal establishment of settlements, illegal land use, illegally initiated fires, and other illegal activities.</p> <p>C 5.3. Important ecological cycles, including carbon and nutrient cycles, which occur in the forest management unit, are at least maintained.</p>	<p>1.4: De bosbeheerder beschermt zijn bezit waar mogelijk tegen illegale kap, niet toegestane verblijfsactiviteiten en andere ongewenste vormen van bosgebruik. C 5.3: In het bosbeheer en bosgebruik worden maatregelen genomen om de ecologische processen binnen het bos te beschermen, te versterken of te herstellen.</p>
<p>Maintenance of forest ecosystems' health and vitality (2)</p> <p>Health and vitality</p> <p>Pest control</p>	<p>S7. Management of the forest must ensure that forest ecosystem health and vitality is maintained. In order to achieve this, the definition of sustainable must include requirements for:</p> <p>S7 a. management planning which aims to maintain or increase the health and vitality of forest ecosystems</p> <p>S7 b. management of natural processes, fires, pests and diseases;</p>	<p>3.4 Shall seek to ensure maintenance of forest ecosystem health and vitality. In order to do this, the standard must include requirements for:</p> <p>3.4 i. management planning which aims to maintain or increase the health and vitality of forest ecosystems</p> <p>3.4 ii. management of natural processes, fires, pests and diseases;</p>	<p>1.2.1 Maintenance of forest ecosystem health and vitality. In order to do this, the standard must include requirements for:</p> <p>a. management planning which aims to maintain or increase the health and vitality of forest ecosystems</p> <p>b. management of natural processes, fires, pests and diseases;</p>	<p>C 5.6. Forest management is geared towards preventing and controlling diseases and pests, inasmuch as they threaten the timber production.</p>	<p>P 4: Bosbeheer zal de ecologische functies van het bos in stand houden door het bewaren of verbeteren van de biologische diversiteit, het natuurlijk milieu, de unieke en kwetsbare ecosystemen en landschappen en door de instandhouding van habitats en populaties van wilde dier- en plantensoorten</p> <p>C 4.1: Bosbeheer en bosgebruik blijven binnen de grenzen van de ecologische draagkracht van het bosbezit.</p>
<p>Maintenance, conservation and appropriate enhancement of protective functions(5)</p>	<p>S5. Management of the forest must ensure that harm to ecosystems is minimised. In order to do this the definition of sustainable must include requirements for:</p>	<p>3.2 Shall seek to ensure maintenance of protection functions of forests. In order to do this the standard must include requirements for:</p>	<p>1.2.3 Management of the forest must ensure that harm to ecosystems is minimised. In order to do this the definition of sustainable must</p>	<p>P 5. The regulation function and quality, health, and vitality of the forest shall be maintained and where possible enhanced.</p>	

Soil	S5 b. Protection of - soil,	3.2 ii. Protection of soil,	include requirements for: b. Protection of - soil,	C 5.1. The soil quality of the forest management unit is maintained and, where necessary, improved, whereby special attention is given to shores, riverbanks, erosion-prone parts and slopes.	
water	- water and - biodiversity;	- water and biodiversity;	- water and - biodiversity;	C 5.2. The water balance and quality of both groundwater and surface water in the forest management unit, as well as downstream (outside of the forest management unit), are maintained and, where necessary, improved.	4.4: De bosbeheerder moet, voor zover hij daartoe de mogelijkheden heeft, met zijn bosbedrijfsvoering bijdragen tot het integraal waterbeheer
Chemicals	S5 c. controlled and appropriate use of chemicals and use of Integrated Pest Management wherever possible; and	3.2 iii. controlled and appropriate use of chemicals and use of Integrated Pest Management wherever possible.	c. controlled and appropriate use of chemicals and use of Integrated Pest Management wherever possible; and	C 5.7. The use of chemicals is only permitted if maximum use of ecological processes and sustainable alternatives proves insufficient. The use of class 1A and 1B pesticides, as drafted by the World Health Organisation, and of chlorinated hydrocarbons is not permitted.	
Waste	S5 d. proper disposal of wastes to minimise any negative impacts.	3.2 iv. Proper disposal of wastes to minimise any negative impacts	d. proper disposal of wastes to minimise any negative impacts.	C 5.8. Non-organic waste and litter are avoided, collected, stored in the designated places and removed in an environmentally responsible manner.	C 4.3: De bosbeheerder ziet erop toe dat bij het beheer bos-vreemde stoffen en producten zo veel mogelijk uit het bos worden geweerd.
Maintenance and encouragement of productive functions of forest	S 6 Management of the forest must ensure that productivity of the forest is maintained. In order to achieve this the	3.3. Shall seek to ensure maintenance of productive functions of forests. In order to achieve this the	1.2.2. Management of the forest must ensure that productivity of the forest is maintained. In	P 6. The production capacity of timber and relevant non-timber forest products shall be	P 3: Het beheer van bossen moet het efficiënte gebruik van de verschillende

<p>(wood and non-wood)(3)</p> <p>Harvest levels</p> <p>NTFP</p> <p>Reduced Impact Logging</p> <p>Forest structure</p>	<p>definition of sustainable must include criteria for:</p> <p>S6 e. harvest levels of timber that do not exceed the long-term production capacity of the forest, based on adequate inventory and growth and yield data</p> <p>S6 c. operations and operational procedures which minimise impacts on the range of forest resources and services;</p>	<p>definition of sustainable must include criteria for:</p> <p>3.3 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>3.3 iii operations and operational procedures which minimise impacts on the range of forest resources and services;</p>	<p>order to achieve this the definition of sustainable must include criteria for:</p> <p>e. harvest levels of timber that do not exceed the long-term production capacity of the forest, based on adequate inventory and</p> <p>c. operations and operational procedures which minimise impacts on the range of forest resources and services; growth and yield data</p>	<p>maintained. To that end the system requires that:</p> <p>C 6.1. The production capacity of each forest type of the forest management unit as a whole is maintained.</p> <p>C 4.6. The exploitation of non-timber forest products, including hunting and fishing, are regulated, monitored and controlled. Insofar as relevant, knowledge of the local population, indigenous peoples, and locally active environmental organisations is utilised in monitoring commercial exploitation.</p> <p>C 5.4. Avoidable damage to the ecosystem is prevented by application of the most suitable and available methods and techniques for logging and road construction under the prevailing conditions.</p>	<p>bosproducten en – diensten stimuleren, teneinde de economische levensvatbaarheid van het bosbezit en een breed scala aan ecologische en maatschappelijke functies te waarborgen.</p> <p>6.3: De bosbeheerder controleert en documenteert de houtwinning, de exploitatie en verkoop van hout en andere bosproducten.</p> <p>C 3.1: De bosbeheerder behandelt zijn bos als een hernieuwbare hulpbron, waarbij hij streeft naar een while striving for multiple use.</p> <p>C 3.4: De bosbeheerder regelt het gebruik en de voortbrengst van non-timber forest products zonder afbreuk te doen aan het behoud van de ecologische of sociale functievervulling door het bos.</p> <p>C 3.2: De bosbeheerder streeft met zijn bosbedrijf naar economische levensvatbaarheid zonder afbreuk te doen aan het behoud van de ecologische of sociale functievervulling door het bos.</p> <p>C 3.3: De bosbeheerder beoogt met zijn bosbeheer een bos dat een gevarieerde structuur bezit, zowel naar soorten als naar</p>
--	--	---	--	---	---

<p>Plantations</p>				<p>C4.4 In case of plantations native species are preferred and a relevant proportion of the plantation shall be allowed to regenerate to natural forest.</p>	<p>leeftijdsverdeling, dat een ongelijkjarige opbouw kent en dat gemengd is samengesteld als borg voor het behoud van de standplaatsproductiviteit.</p> <p>C 5.5: Plantage bos wordt duurzaam beheerd en draagt zoveel mogelijk bij aan het behoud, herstel en verminderde druk op natuurlijk bos in het landschap. Een in de specifieke standaard aangegeven proportie van een plantagebos wordt beheerd overeenkomstig het criterium 5.4, daarnaast voldoet het plantagebos eveneens aan de andere criteria.</p>
<p>Maintenance, conservation and appropriate enhancement of Biological diversity (4)</p> <p>Rare and endangered species</p> <p>Set -aside areas</p>	<p>S8 Management of the forest must ensure that biodiversity is maintained. In order to achieve this the definition of sustainable must include criteria for:</p> <p>a implementation of safeguards to protect rare, threatened and endangered species;</p>	<p>3.5 Shall seek to ensure maintenance and conservation of biological diversity in forest ecosystems. In order to do this the standard must include criteria for:</p> <p>i implementation of safeguards to protect rare, threatened and endangered species;</p> <p>ii the conservation/set-aside of key ecosystems or</p>	<p>1.2.4 Management of the forest must ensure that biodiversity is maintained. In order to achieve this the definition of sustainable must include criteria 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</p>	<p>P 4. Biodiversity shall be maintained and where possible enhanced. To that end the system requires that:</p> <p>C 4.2. Protected and endangered plant and animal species are not exploited for commercial purposes. (C 13.2) Where necessary, measures have been taken for their protection and, where relevant, increase of their population.</p>	<p>P 5: De bosbeheerder houdt bij het beheer van zijn bosbezit rekening met de biologische diversiteit door zorg voor het behoud, de ontwikkeling of het herstel van de ecologische functie van zijn bos.</p> <p>C 5.1: In het bosbeheer en bosgebruik worden maatregelen genomen ter instandhouding van habitats en populaties van wilde dier- en plantensoorten met het oog op de multifunctionaliteit.</p>

<p>HCV</p> <p>GMO's</p> <p>Exotic species</p>	<p>b the conservation/set-aside of key ecosystems or habitats in their natural state; and</p> <p>c the protection of features and species of outstanding or exceptional value.</p>	<p>habitats in their natural state; and</p> <p>iii the protection of features and species of outstanding or exceptional value</p>	<p>in their natural state; and</p> <p>c the protection of features and species of outstanding or exceptional value.</p> <p>1.2.6 Use of genetically modified organisms is not allowed</p>	<p>C 4.1. Objects of high ecological value and representative areas of forest types that occur within the forest management unit are identified, inventoried and protected.</p> <p>C 4.7 GMO's are not used</p>	<p>C 5.4: Representatieve voorbeelden van natuurlijke inheemse bosgemeenschappen, waardevolle bostypen en goed ontwikkelde bosesystemen worden beschermd en beheerd overeenkomstig hun specifieke waarde. Voor bossen met een hoge beschermingswaarde is het voorzorgprincipe van toepassing. In overeenstemming met de schaal van de bosbeheereenheid, worden ten behoeve van deze bossen met een hoge beschermingswaarde delen van de bosbeheereenheid aangewezen, waar geen houtkap, overige exploitatie en minimale verstoring door andere activiteiten plaatsvinden. C 5.2: Beheer streeft naar een bepaald aandeel inheemse boomsoorten. Gebruik van exotische soorten zal zorgvuldig gecontroleerd worden en actief gemonitord om negatieve effecten te voorkomen.</p>
<p>Maintenance of other socio-economic functions and conditions (6)</p> <p>Traditional tenure and use rights</p>	<p>SC. Management of the forest must have full regard for:</p> <p>SC1. identification, documentation and respect of legal, customary and</p>	<p>3.6 Shall seek to ensure maintenance of socio-economic functions and conditions. In order to do this the standard must:</p> <p>i Require that the legal, customary and traditional tenure and use rights of</p>	<p>1.2.5 Management of the forest must have full regard for:</p> <p>a. identification, documentation and respect of legal,</p>	<p>P 2. The interests of directly and indirectly involved stakeholders shall be taken into account.</p> <p>C 2.1. The legal status of the management of the forest management unit</p>	<p>C 2.1: De bosbeheerder erkent de betrokkenheid van alle relevante groepen en personen en houdt rekening met hun standpunten. Eigendom- of gebruiksrechten van de lokale bevolking of inheemse volkeren</p>

<p>Objects of cultural value</p> <p>Consultation</p> <p>Say in forest management FPIC</p> <p>Public availability</p>	<p>traditional tenure and use rights related to the forest</p>	<p>indigenous peoples and local communities related to forest are identified, documented and respected.</p>	<p>customary and traditional tenure and use rights related to the forest</p>	<p>and claims of the local population, including indigenous peoples, in the property/tenure or use rights regarding the forest management unit or a portion thereof have been inventoried and are respected.</p> <p>C 2.6. Objects of cultural and traditional economic value are identified and inventoried in consultation with the stakeholders and are respected.</p> <p>C 2.2. Effective communication with and consultation and participation of stakeholders take place regarding the management of the forests.</p> <p>C 2.3. The local population and indigenous peoples have a say in forest management on the basis of free and informed consent, and hold the right to grant or withhold permission and, if relevant, receive compensation where their property/use rights are at stake</p> <p>C 2.4. The forest management plan and accompanying maps, relevant monitoring results and information about the forest management measures</p>	<p>worden gerespecteerd, tenzij de lokale bevolking of de inheemse volkeren vrij en geïnformeerd hebben ingestemd met het afzien van dit recht. De lokale bevolking en inheemse volkeren hebben een eerlijke kans op werk in de bosbeheereenheid</p> <p>C 2.2: Bossen of delen van bossen met grote sociale, culturele, landschappelijke, geschiedkundige, religieuze betekenis, waardevolle traditionele behevormen of belangrijke wetenschappelijke of educatieve betekenis worden beschermd en beheerd overeenkomstig hun specifieke waarden en potenties.</p>
--	--	---	--	--	---

<p>Resolving grievance</p> <p>Local employment and processing</p>	<p>SC2. mechanisms for resolving grievances and disputes including those relating to tenure and use rights, to forest management practices and to work conditions; and</p>	<p>ii. require that appropriate mechanisms are in place for resolving grievances and disputes including those relating to tenure and use rights, to forest management practices and to work conditions; and</p>	<p>b. mechanisms for resolving grievances and disputes including those relating to tenure and use rights, to forest management practices and to work conditions; and</p>	<p>to be applied are publicly available, except for strictly confidential business information.</p> <p>C 2.5. Adequate mechanisms are in place for resolving disputes regarding forest management, property/usage rights, work conditions, or social services.</p> <p>C 7.1. Forest management stimulates employment of the local population, including indigenous peoples, as well as the local processing of timber and non-timber forest products.</p>	<p>C 2.2: Er is een klachtenmechanisme in gebruik dat zorgt voor een adequate behandeling en afwikkeling van klachten en conflicten, volgens de vastgelegde procedures</p>
<p>Labour conditions</p> <p>health and safety</p>	<p>SC3.safeguarding the basic labour rights ⁶</p> <p>and health and safety of forest workers</p>	<p>iii. ensure that the basic labour rights of forest workers are safeguarded, including by requirements concerning the following: (1) freedom of association (2) elimination of forced labour; (3) abolition of child labour (4) elimination of discrimination</p> <p>iv require that appropriate safeguards are put in place to protect labour and health and safety of forest workers, including compliance with local and national legal requirements.</p>	<p>SC3.safeguarding the basic labour rights</p> <p>and health and safety of forest workers</p>	<p>C 3.2. Employees have the right to organise and negotiate wages and employment conditions, in accordance with national laws and the core conventions of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).</p> <p>C 3.1. The forest manager must take adequate health and safety measures, at least in compliance with relevant legislation and in accordance with ILO conventions, in order to protect the personnel, including contractors and</p>	<p>C 2.3: De bosbeheerder draagt er zorg voor dat de voorschriften voor gezondheid, milieu, veiligheid, arbeidsinhoud en arbeidsomstandigheden worden nageleefd bij alle activiteiten die onder zijn verantwoordelijkheid en opdracht worden uitgevoerd in het bos in kwestie. Met betrekking tot de arbeidsomstandigheden moeten de rechten van de arbeiders om zich te organiseren en vrijwillig te onderhandelen volgens de Conventies van de Internationale</p>

⁶ This criterion has been elaborated in the Criteria for Evaluating Forest Certification Schemes (Category A evidence). The DK C.3.6 iii and iv reflect the UK elaborated text.

				their employees and, where appropriate, the local and indigenous population.	Arbeidsorganisatie gegarandeerd worden.
Management system				P 8 Sustainable forest management shall be realised through a management system .	
Management cycle	S6 a. management planning and implementation of management activities to avoid significant negative impacts on forest productivity;	3.3.i. management planning and implementation of management activities to avoid significant negative impacts on forest productivity	1.2.2 a. management planning and implementation of management activities to avoid significant negative impacts on forest productivity;	C 8.1. Forest management aims to achieve the goals formulated in the forest management plan and comprises the cycle of inventory and analysis, planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and improvement	C 6.2: De bosbeheerder volgt de effecten van het beheer en gebruik van zijn bosbezit en gebruikt die gegevens voor aanpassingen in het beheer of de tussentijdse herziening van zijn beheerplan.
Environmental social impacts	S5 a. appropriate assessment of impacts and planning to minimise impacts;	3.2 i. Appropriate assessment of impacts and planning to minimise impacts;	1.2.3 a. appropriate assessment of impacts and planning to minimise impacts;	C 8.4. The implementation of the forest management plan and the ecological, social, and economic effects of forest management on the FMU and its surroundings are monitored periodically on the basis of adequate data.	C 2.5 en 4.2: Ingrijpende veranderingen in bosbeheer en bosgebruik worden vooraf getoetst aan een evaluatie van de te verwachten effecten op natuur en landschap en sociaal vlak. Wensen en klachten van lokale bevolking, inheemse volkeren en personeel worden opgenomen in de evaluatie.
Management plan	S6 b. monitoring which is adequate to check compliance with all requirements, together with review and feedback into planning;	3.3.ii monitoring which is adequate to check compliance with all requirements, together with review and feedback into planning;	1.2.2 b. monitoring which is adequate to check compliance with all requirements, together with review and feedback into planning;	C 8.2. There is a forest management plan , consisting of, or dealing with at least: a the condition of the forest b. long-term objectives c. the average annual allowable cut per forest type,	C 6.1: Ten forest manager has articulated his vision on the management and use of the forest in a extensive forest management plan .
Maps				C 8.3. Essential elements for forest management are indicated on maps	
training		3.3 iv Adequate training of all personnel, both employees and contractors	1.2.2 d adequate training of all personnel, both	C 8.6. Forests are managed by professional staff and forest workers. Adequate periodic training secures the level of skills, including	

	S6 d adequate training of all personnel, both employees and contractors		employees and contractors	knowledge of relevant laws and treaties.	
Group management				<p>P 9. Forest management in a group or regional association shall offer sufficient safeguards for sustainable forest management.</p> <p>C 9.1. A group or regional association is under the leadership and supervision of an independent legal entity.</p> <p>C 9.3. A group or regional association complies with the requirements set by the SFM standard of the certification system. In addition, each member of a group or regional association complies with these requirements, inasmuch as they apply to its operations.</p>	

Matrix II b: General requirements for certification systems

Theme	United Kingdom	Denmark	Luxembourg	Netherlands	Belgium ⁷
A Standard					
<p>Standard development and applicability</p> <p>Consistent with internationally accepted requirements</p> <p>Applicable on various local conditions</p>	<p>S 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>The standard-setting process must be consistent with the requirements of ISO Guide 59: Code of Good Practice for Standardisation or the ISEAL Code of Good Practice for Setting Social and Environmental Standards or equivalent.</p>	<p>2 The forest must have been managed in accordance with a standard that meets the requirements set out below in criteria 2.1-2.4</p> <p>2.4 The standard must be consistent with the requirements of <i>ISO/EC Guide 59;1994 'Code of Good Practice for Standardisation'</i> or the <i>ISEAL 'Code of Good Practice for Setting Social and Environmental Standards'</i></p> <p>3. The standard 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, and shall as a minimum seek to ensure the following:</p>	<p>1.1 The development process of the standard fulfils the requirements established in the <i>ISEAL 'Code of Good Practice for Setting Social and Environmental Standards'</i>, the <i>ISO Guide 59 'Code of Good Practice for Standardisation'</i> or equivalent requirements.</p>	<p>C 1.1. The development process of the standard fulfils the requirements established in the <i>ISEAL 'Code of Good Practice for Setting Social and Environmental Standards'</i>, the <i>ISO Guide 59 'Code of Good Practice for Standardisation'</i> or equivalent requirements. The development process and application of the standard at least fulfil the following criteria: 1.2. through 1.10.; 2.1. and 2.2.; 3.3. through 3.6. of this assessment table.</p> <p>C 1.8. A national standard which is part of an international certification system with a generic standard or which is based on a generic standard of an umbrella organisation, must refer to the relevant generic standard and be accepted by the relevant international system or organisation.</p> <p>C 1.9. The standard and the procedures for establishing compliance are sufficiently flexible to be applied under changing local conditions and to forest management units of any size, either as a part of a group or regional association or otherwise.</p>	<p>3 The forest certification scheme must guarantee that forest management is based on internationally accepted principles and criteria</p> <p>3 De standaard - opmaak gebeurt volgens ISO -guide 59: Code of good practice for Standardisation of equivalent.</p> <p>3) Het boscertificeringssysteem is institutioneel en politiek aangepast aan de plaatselijke omstandigheden</p> <p>4.1 Het boscertificeringssysteem mag niet discriminerend zijn voor bepaalde bostypes of bepaalde categorieën bosbeheerders waar ook ter wereld.</p>

^{7 7} The SFM standard of Flanders was only available in Dutch. The relevant differences with the UK criteria are being presented in the main text in Chapters 2.2 and 3.2.

<p>Standard character</p> <p>performance based</p> <p>objective verifiable</p>	<p>S 2. The definition must be performance-based, meaning that measurable outputs must be included and cover all the issues set out in S5 to S9.</p>	<p>2.1 Principally identical to UK</p>		<p>C 1.10. The standard contains both process and performance criteria and consists, where appropriate, of measurable, unambiguous parameters with guidelines for interpretation.</p>	<p>3) The SFM certification system must be based on objective and verifiable criteria.</p>
<p>Standard setting</p> <p>Balanced representation</p> <p>Public consultation</p> <p>Justification for handling comments</p> <p>Publication</p>	<p>S 3 The process of defining sustainable must seek to ensure balanced representation and input from the economic, environmental and social interest categories.</p>	<p>2.2 The standard setting process must be open to the participation of all stakeholders and seek to ensure balanced representation and input from the economic, environmental and social interest categories.</p>	<p>1.2 Identical to UK</p>	<p>C 1.2. The standard development body comprises the relevant interested groups that serve the economic, social and environmental interests without undue dominance of one interest.</p> <p>C 1.4. The development of the standard takes place with input of the relevant stakeholders. Potential limitations for certain groups such as indigenous peoples and small forest owners to contribute directly are taken into account.</p> <p>C 1.5. The standard development procedure provides for public input during a reasonable period of time.</p> <p>C 1.6. With the development of the standard, the standard setting organisation takes into account any comments submitted in writing and communicated verbally. The organisation maintains reports of the development process of the standard including the received input and how it is dealt with. A summary of it is published and is freely available.</p> <p>C 1.7. The standard setting organisation publishes the standard as soon as it has been established.</p>	<p>3 Binnen het proces van de standaard-opmaak dient een (uit)gebalanceerde vertegenwoordiging en input van belangengroepen (economisch, ecologische en sociaal) gegarandeerd worden.</p> <p>3 The forest certification scheme must be completely transparent for both stakeholders and the public.</p>

<p>Decision making</p> <p>No-single interest</p>	<p>S 4 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>2.3 The standard setting process must seek to ensure that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the standard is established by consensus of the parties represented, 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>1.3 Identical to UK</p>	<p>C1.3 Decisions of the standard development body are made, if possible, by consensus. If consensus is not reached, qualified majority voting applies.</p>	<p>3 The standard-setting and decision-making process adopted ensures:</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 economic, environmental or social interest category
<p>B Governance of certification systems</p>					
<p>System manager</p> <p>Legal entity</p> <p>Distribution of responsibilities</p> <p>Monitoring</p>				<p>C 2.1. The system manager is a legally registered organisation with statutes, contact address, telephone, e-mail, and website.</p> <p>C 2.2. The distribution of the responsibilities, authorities, and tasks among the entities, comprising an organisational and/or functional part of the certification system, and the procedures to be followed are clear and publicly available. The certification system comprises at least rules for the following functions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> standard development certification accreditation supervision of proper performance of tasks and compliance with the rules objection and appeal handling design and use of logos and labels <p>C 3.1. The decision-making and advisory bodies comprise the relevant interested groups</p>	<p>4.1 Het certificeringssysteem wordt beheerd door een legale entiteit.</p> <p>3) Het boscertificeringssysteem moet geloofwaardig zijn in de ogen van de gebruiker, de boseigenaar en de milieubeweging en het moet transparant zijn zowel voor het publiek als voor de betrokkenen.</p> <p>4.1 Het boscertificeringssysteem bevat minstens regels voor de volgende functies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standaardopmaak Certificatie Accreditatie Controle van een degelijke uitvoering van taken en overeenstemming met de regels

<p>Decision making</p>				<p>without undue dominance of one interest.</p> <p>C 3.2. Decisions of decision-making and advisory bodies are made, if possible, by consensus. If consensus is not reached, majority voting applies.</p>	<p>- Bezwaar en beroepbehandeling - Ontwerp en beheer van logos en labels. 4.1 Beslissingsorganen zullen de belangen van de diverse betrokkenen reflecteren en een gebalanceerde vertegenwoordiging van economische, ecologische en sociale belangengroepen inhouden. Het zal adequate procedures bevatten voor bezwaar en beroep aangaande de gemaakte beslissingen en het functioneren van de beslissingsorganen. Beslissingen worden, indien mogelijk, genomen door consensus.</p>
<p>Provision for objections and appeal</p> <p>Justification of complaint</p> <p>Reasonable period</p>				<p>C 3.3. Objection and appeal procedures are publicly available and clearly indicate the entity a stakeholder must turn to in the event of an objection or appeal against the operation of a particular entity or against a decision made by a particular entity.</p> <p>C 3.4. The objection and appeal procedures require that the submitter or a representative substantiates the objection or appeal with arguments and relevant documentation.</p> <p>C 3.5. Objection and appeal procedures contain clear and reasonable deadlines for</p>	

<p>Independent forum</p>				<p>handling of the objection or appeal.</p> <p>C 3.6. A forum of independent persons, which adequately represent legal and domain knowledge, handles appeal cases. Decisions are taken by majority voting.</p>	
<p>C Certification bodies and procedures</p>					
<p>Certification bodies</p> <p>Competence/ accredited</p>	<p>2.1 Certification must be undertaken by a body whose organisation, systems and procedures conform to applicable ISO guidance, or publicly available equivalent.</p> <p>2.2 Certification is undertaken by a-body which is accredited to evaluate against forest management standards</p>	<p>4.1 Identical to UK</p> <p>4.2 Identical to UK</p>	<p>2.1 Identical to UK</p>	<p>P 4. Certification bodies shall be independent and shall be competent to assess sustainable forest management and the chain of custody system. To that end the system requires that:</p> <p>C 4.1. The certification bodies are accredited on the basis of the requirements and guidelines in ISO 17021⁸ 'Conformity Assessment - Requirements for Bodies Providing Audit and Certification of Management Systems' and/or ISO Guide 65 (EN 45011) 'General Requirements for Bodies Operating Product Certification Systems' and preferably on the basis of specific supplemental requirements for performance of conformity assessments according to the standards for sustainable forest management and the chain of custody.</p>	<p>4.1Het certificeringsorganisme voldoet aan de ISO richtlijnen zoals ISO 62, 65, 66 of equivalent..</p> <p>4.1 Certification is undertaken by a body which is accredited to evaluate against forest management standards.</p>

⁸ ISO 17021 has replaced ISO Guide 62 (EN 45012) and ISO Guide 66.

<p>Procedure for assessment Assessment system</p>	<p>2.3 The requirements for certification audits must include assessment of systems and documentation toDEther with verification of outcomes in the forest adequate to ensure that both system and performance requirements in the standard are being met.</p>	<p>4.3 Identical to UK</p>	<p>Identical to UK except UK 2.7</p>	<p>C 4.2. The certification contains an assessment of system documents, site visits, and sufficient consultation of external stakeholders.</p>	<p>4.1 certification audits must include assessment of systems and documentation together with field visits.</p>
<p>Group certification</p>	<p>2.4 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>4.4 Identical to UK</p>		<p>C 4.3. In case of group or regional certification an adequate sample of group members must be audited</p>	<p>4.1 Consultatie van de betrokkenen maakt deel uit van het certificeringsproces</p>
<p>Public available</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>4.5 Identical to UK</p>		<p>C 4.4. The certification agency makes the following items public in addition to the requirements in ISO 17021 and ISO Guide 65:</p>	<p>4.1 A summary of the results of the certification audit is publicly available to interested parties.</p>
<p>Provision for complaints</p>	<p>2.6 There is an accessible and functioning mechanism for dealing with complaints and disputes which is open to any interested party.</p>	<p>4.6 Identical to UK</p>		<p>a) summaries of assessment reports b) list of the granted certificates</p>	<p>4.1 There is a mechanism for dealing with complaints and disputes</p>
<p>Limiting factors for certification e.g. conversion</p>	<p>2.7 The certification scheme must include measures which limit</p>	<p>4.7 Identical to UK</p>			

	and clearly describe and justify the circumstances in which certification may be awarded to a forest, the character of which has been subject to planned and systematic transformation in a concentrated period of time with the consequence of significantly reducing the forest's biodiversity and/or health and vitality of the forest ecosystem; for example, the conversion of natural forest or forest with many of the characteristics of natural forest to industrial forest plantation				
D Accreditation agencies and procedures					
Accreditation body					
Requirements ISO 17011	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 accreditation bodies accrediting conformity assessment bodies</i> or equivalent.	5.1 Identical to UK	Identical to UK	P 5. The accreditation agencies that grant the accreditations for certification of sustainable forest management and/or the chain of custody shall be competent and independent, national or international organisations that are preferably member of the IAF. To that end the system requires that: C 5.1. Accreditation must be granted by a national or international organisation that fulfils requirements as included in ISO 17011 <i>General Requirements for Assessment</i>	5 Accreditation system is ISO 17011:2004

Peer review				<i>and Accreditation of Certification Bodies'.</i> C 5.2. The accreditation body takes part in a peer review process with sister organisations, preferably within the framework of the IAF.	
-------------	--	--	--	--	--

Matrix II c: General requirements for Chain of Custody (CoC) Logo's and Labels

Theme	United Kingdom	Denmark	Luxembourg	Netherlands	Belgium ⁹
<p>CoC</p> <p>Third party assessment</p> <p>Certified CoC from origin to final certified product</p> <p>Operator requirements</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>6.1 Assessment of chain of custody must be undertaken by a certification body operating in accordance with <i>ISO/IEC 17065:2012 Conformity assessment – Requirements for bodies certifying products, processes and services</i> or equivalent and accredited by an accreditation body operating in accordance with ISO 17011:2004 Conformity assessment – General requirements for accreditation bodies accrediting conformity assessment bodies or equivalent.</p> <p>6.2 Identical to UK 4.2</p>	<p>Identical to UK</p>	<p>P 1. A Chain of Custody (CoC) must be in place from the forest unit of origin to the final point of sale, which provides a link between the certified material in the product or product line and certified forest units. To that end the system requires that</p> <p>C 1.1 Each individual organisation in the CoC possesses an operational CoC system.</p> <p>C 1.2 The management system of each organisation in the CoC provides sufficient guarantees that the requirements of the CoC standard are being met.</p> <p>C 1.3 Each individual organisation in the CoC registers quantities and the names and certificate</p>	<p>6.1 Het boscertificeringssysteem garandeert traceerbaarheid van de gecertificeerde producten door een handelsketensysteem (CoC). Het ultieme bewijs van het gebruik van hout of hout producten uit duurzaam beheerde bossen is een bewijs van handelsketensysteem (CoC) van de gehele handelsketen. Dit impliceert het bezit van een CoC of een gelijkwaardig bewijs (zoals projectcertificering) van de laatste in het handelsketensysteem .</p>

⁹ The SFM standard of Flanders was only available in Dutch. The relevant differences with the UK criteria are being presented in the main text in Chapters 2.2 and 3.2.

<p>Assurance of legal sources</p>	<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>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>6.3 If mixing of certified and uncertified material in a product or productline is allowed, the uncertified material must be covered by a verifiable system which is designed to ensure that it is from legal sources Guidance: Certified material may be either from certified sustainably produced timber, cf. criteria 1 to 3 or from recycled timber, cf. criteria 6.6.)</p>		<p>numbers of the organisations from which it purchases timber and to which it sells timber.</p> <p>C 1.4 If the system allows for mixing of SFM-certified and non-SFM-certified material, the non- SFM certified material is covered by a verifiable system to ensure that it is from non-disputed, at least legal sources. This applies to new-, including pre-consumer recycled material, and post-consumer recycled material</p>	<p>6.1 In het geval van het mixen van gecertificeerd materiaal met niet-gecertificeerd materiaal in een product of productielijn zijn er voldoende waarborgen in het systeem aanwezig opdat controversieel hout zou geweerd worden</p>
<p>Administrative separation</p>				<p>C1.5 SFM-certified timber, including timber products, timber from other verified legal sources and timber from non-verified (legal) sources are administratively separated. Timber from non-verified (legal) sources is also physically separated from the other two sources.</p>	
<p>Physical separation of timber from non-verified sources</p>					<p>6.3 De evaluatie van de COC gebeurt door een organisme dat werkt in overeenstemming met ISO 65 of equivalent en</p>
<p>Certification body competence</p>					

		<p>6.4 If mixing of material from certified forests, recycled material and legally harvested timber is allowed there must be a controlled and verifiable system in place, which is designed to ensure that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the minimum content of material from certified forests or recycled material is at least 70%, or 2. the share of material sold as certified from a given production line does not exceed the share of certified material used for the production. 			<p>geaccrediteerd is in overeenstemming met ISO 61.</p>
<p>Clear and accurate Claims</p> <p>Mass balance</p>	<p>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>	<p>6.5 Identical to UK</p>	<p>Identical to UK</p>	<p>C 3.3 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> <p>C1.6 If the system allows for mixing of SFM-certified and non-SFM-certified material, (one of) the following</p>	<p>7 Het boscertificeringssysteem moet leiden tot een label op of bij het product waardoor het product uit verantwoord beheerde bossen op een betrouwbare manier kan onderscheiden worden van andere producten.</p>

				C 3.2. The logo is copyrighted and is a registered trademark.	
Group certification				P 2. If Group certification of the CoC is allowed, the standard must require that the group as whole must comply with the same requirements which are posed on individual companies.	Indien groeps-certificering van de COC is toegelaten, dan moet de standaard vereisen dat de groep in zijn geheel aan dezelfde vereisten moet voldoen als deze gesteld voor de individuele bedrijven. Tot dat doel vereist het systeem dat: 1 Een groep is een juridische entiteit, dewelke verantwoordelijk is voor de groep in zijn geheel 2 De groep heeft een beheerssysteem dat voldoende waarborgt dat zal voldaan worden aan 3 3. De groep functioneert volgens het principe dat 'relevante internationale, nationale en regionale/lokale wetgeving en regels gerespecteerd zullen worden'. Eveneens voldoet elk groepslid aan deze vereisten, tot zover als deze betrekking hebben op zijn activiteiten. 4 De groepsbeheerder heeft een operationeel registratiesysteem dat a. de namen en adressen van de groepsleden bevat b. verklaringen van elk groepslid inzake het voldoen aan de certificeringsvereisten van de COC.

<p>Recycled material</p> <p>Pre-consumer</p> <p>Post-consumer</p>	<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>6.6 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"> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial by-products from wood processing industries, but excluding primary wood processing industries (as primary wood processing industries are considered industries processing raw wood) <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Post-consumer recycled wood and wood fibre <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Drift wood 	<p>Identical to UK</p>		<p>6.5 Indien gerecycleerd materiaal wordt gebruikt, dan moet er een verifieerbaar operationeel systeem zijn om te verzekeren dat gerecycleerde materialen afkomstig zijn van de volgende categorieën:</p> <p>Pre-consumer recycled hout en houtvezel of industriële afgeleide producten maar uitgezonderd van co-producten van de zagerij</p> <p>Post-consumer recycled hout en houtvezel</p>
--	---	--	------------------------	--	--

Matrix III: Assessment of certification systems

Theme	United Kingdom	Denmark	Luxembourg	Netherlands	Flanders/Belgium
Assessment by: independent committee	V CPET		no UK assessment is being followed	V TPAC	
Government Agency		V The Nature Agency			V Agency for Nature and Forests
Conclusion of assessment is binding for government	no	no	no	no	no
Object of assessment: - Standard - Normative documents - Policy documents	V V V	V partly partly		V V V	V V V
Check actual performance through: - public internet forum - (public) reports - audit reports - direct communication	V V V V	no	n.a	V V V V	No V V V
- field visits	possible but not yet			possible but not yet	?
Scoring system - decisive compliance level	V General criteria ¹⁰	V General criteria ¹¹	n.a	V Principles	V Principles
Procedure in place for receiving feed back from certification system	V	no formal procedures	n.a	V	no formal procedures
Objection and appeal procedure in place	V (binding verdict?)	no formal procedures	n.a	V	no formal procedures
For Certification system and other stakeholders	V	n.a.	n.a.	V	n.a.
Validity period of recognition (years)	5	until subst. changes in certification system	until subst. changes in certification system	5	no limited period

¹⁰ The General criteria are in fact the same level as Principles with the Netherlands

¹¹ The General criteria are in fact the same level as Principles with the Netherlands

Annex II Other TPP comparisons and a selection of relevant documents:

Comparison of EU Public Timber Procurement Policies, ProForest 2007, UK

Comparability and acceptance of forest certification systems, ITTO February 2008, Japan

Controlling illegal Logging: Using Public Procurement Policy, Duncan Brack Associate Fellow Chatham House August 2014 England

Developments and Progress in Timber Procurement Policies as tools to promote sustainable management of tropical forests, ITTO 2010, Japan

Development of Luxembourg's public procurement policy for timber, ProForest 2013, UK

EUTR European Timber Regulation 995/2010, Brussels Belgium

EU Forest strategy 9385/14, April 2014 Brussels Belgium

Forest Europe C & I, http://www.foresteuropa.org/sfm_criteria/criteria

Promotion of public procurement of legal and sustainable timber, Fact sheet on status in selected EU countries, Danish Ministry of Environment, Nature Agency August 2013 Denmark

TPP documents available on the official websites of responsible ministries in the countries (BE, DE, DK, LU, NL and UK) which have contributed to this document " Comparison of timber Procurement Policies"

Annex III Example of a possible common definition (P&C) for legal and sustainably produced timber

This example of a possible common definition is derived from a comparison between the BE, DK, LU, NL and the UK criteria. They are being organized along the structure of the Forest Europe criteria. The UK criteria are being used as reference framework while differences between one of the other countries and the UK criteria are marked **turquoise** and presented as items to be discussed. The example is developed by the author. Time has not allowed for discussion or approval in the group of government officials involved in the exchange of experience and lessons learnt on timber procurement.

I Definition of legally harvested timber

II Definition of sustainable

Definition of legal

"Harvested in accordance with the applicable legislation in the country of harvest". This definition is the same as in Article 2 of the EUTR.

Scope of requirement		Considerations
Legal	Applicable legislation is the legislation in force in the country of harvest covering the following matters:	Observation: Management rights are more comprehensive than just harvesting rights. SFM is more than timber harvesting.
Right to harvest	L1. rights to harvest timber within legally gazetted boundaries;	Discussion: L1 may imply that the legal status of FMU has been verified but not necessarily. Necessity/desirability to add a criterion: <i>forest manager holds legal use rights.</i>
Payments and duties	L2. payments for harvest rights and timber including duties related to timber harvesting;	SFM is more than timber harvesting. Discussion: Necessity/desirability to add a criterion: <i>forest manager complies with all obligations related to forest management to pay taxes and royalties.</i>
Environmental and forest legislation	L3. timber harvesting, including environmental and forest legislation including forest management and biodiversity conservation, where directly related to timber harvesting;	EUTR/UK do not refer to international agreements (see C6.6 under definition of sustainable) International Agreements pertain in particular to the CBD, the CITES, ILO agreements and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Discussion: relevance and feasibility of adding a criterion: <i>international agreements that apply to the FMU are respected.</i>
Use and tenure legal rights	L4. Third parties' legal rights concerning use and tenure that are affected by timber harvesting;	Discussion: to what extent are FPIC meant to be covered by criterion L4, and to what extent does the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, by referring to <i>their lands</i> , provide sufficient legal basis to require consultation of IP on the management of the forests?
Trade and customs	L5. trade and customs, in so far as the forest sector is concerned.	

To meet the TPP definition of 'sustainable' sources, timber and wood products must:
 (1) meet the legality requirements listed above, and
 (2) come from a forest which is managed in accordance with a definition of sustainable that meets the requirements set out below:

II Definition of sustainable

Type of requirement	Example of a possible common text	Considerations
SFM		<p>Discussion: Do we strive for a broad SFM definition or a definition that limits sustainability to sustainable yield of timber and the effects of timber harvesting on the sustainability of the ecosystem and its services? For example the latter would not include criteria on the harvest of NTFP's, or specific measures to promote the protection of biodiversity from other interventions than harvesting.</p>
<p>Maintenance and appropriate enhancement of forest resources and their contribution to global carbon cycles (1) Conversion</p> <p>Unauthorized activities Ecological cycles</p>	<p>P1 Management of the forest must ensure that forest resources and their contribution to global carbon cycles is maintained. In order to achieve this the definition of sustainable must include <i>equivalent</i> criteria for: C 1.1 no conversion of forests in the FMU to other types of land use, including timber plantations, other than a very limited part in justified exceptional circumstances Text of UK requirement 2.7 for certification bodies. <i>The certification scheme must include measures which limit and clearly describe and justify the circumstances in which certification may be awarded to a forest, the character of which has been subject to planned and systematic transformation in a concentrated period of time with the consequence of significantly reducing the forest's biodiversity and/or health and vitality of the forest ecosystem; for example, the conversion of natural forest or forest with many of the characteristics of natural forest to industrial forest plantation</i> C1.2 adequate protection of the forest from unauthorised activities such as illegal logging, mining and encroachment.</p> <p>C 1.3 important ecological cycles, including carbon and nutrient cycles, which occur in the forest management unit, are at least maintained.</p>	<p>Discussion: C1.1. and C1.2 affect all aspects of the ecosystem and the related social aspects, not just productivity. They could be placed elsewhere e.g. under Health and vitality. Discussion: UK addresses conversion and plantations in requirement 2.7 for certification bodies. That means that conversion is not an explicit factor in the definition of SFM. However the logic of principles P2 and P3 supposes that conversion should not happen. So the choice is to tackle the conversion issue explicitly in the definition or in the requirements for the certification system. The choice has effect on the acceptance of SFM standards and category B evidence.</p> <p>The NL TPP contains a criterion: <i>Plantations shall not be established through the conversion of natural forests after 1997.</i> In fact this is not a SFM criterion but another element to consider for certification. Therefore it is more appropriate as a criterion to be taken into account by CB's. Discussion: Is a criterion on ecological cycles feasible, can it be measured and monitored?</p>

<p>Maintenance of forest ecosystems' health and vitality (2)</p> <p>Health and vitality Pest control</p>	<p>P2 Management of the forest must ensure forest ecosystem health and vitality is maintained. In order to achieve this the definition of sustainable must include equivalent criteria for:</p> <p>C2.1 the health and vitality of forest ecosystems is maintained or increased C2.2 management is led by natural processes, and geared to prevent and control fires, pests and diseases;</p>	<p>Discussion: Is a separate criterion 2.1 on health and vitality desirable or is that aspect sufficiently covered by C 2.2?</p>
<p>Maintenance, conservation and appropriate enhancement of protective functions(5)</p> <p>Soil Water Chemicals Waste</p>	<p>P3 Management of the forest must ensure that the protection functions of the forest are maintained. In order to achieve this the definition of sustainable must include criteria for:</p> <p>C3.1 protection of the soil quality, with special attention for shores, riverbanks and erosion-prone parts. C3.2 maintenance of the water quality in the FMU, as well as downstream C3.3 permission of the use of chemicals only if sustainable alternatives prove insufficient C3.4 proper disposal of wastes to minimise any negative impacts.</p>	<p>Discussion: An alternative text could be: <i>In order to do this the definition of sustainable must include equivalent criteria for:</i> In that case criteria must be formulated as a state or condition e.g. <i>the soil quality is protected etc.,</i></p> <p>Discussion: It is recommended to include in C 3.3 the turquoise text to reflect strong reluctance to use chemicals. Should exclusion of WHO class 1A and 1B chemicals be mentioned?</p>
<p>Maintenance and encouragement of productive functions of forest (wood and non-wood)(3)</p> <p>Harvest levels Reduced Impact Plantations</p>	<p>P4 Management of the forest must ensure that productivity of the forest is maintained. In order to achieve this the definition of sustainable must include criteria for:</p> <p>C4.1 harvest levels of timber and NTFP's that do not exceed the long-term production capacity of the forest, based on adequate inventory and growth and yield data C4.2 management planning, operations and operational procedures which minimise impacts on the range of forest resources and services; C4.3 In plantations native species are preferred and a relevant proportion of the plantation shall be allowed to regenerate to natural forest.</p>	<p>Discussion: Should NTFP's be mentioned explicitly?</p> <p>Discussion: Justification for C4.3 Certain certification standards have separate criteria for plantations. If and when TPP criteria are applied to timber from plantations some specific requirements are useful.</p>
<p>Maintenance, conservation and appropriate enhancement of Biological diversity (4)</p> <p>Rare and endangered species Set -aside areas HCV GMO's</p>	<p>P5 Management of the forest must ensure that biodiversity is maintained. In order to achieve this the definition of sustainable must include criteria for:</p> <p>C5.1 implementation of safeguards to protect rare, threatened and endangered species; C5.2 the conservation/set-aside of key ecosystems or habitats in their natural state; and C5.3 the protection of features and species of outstanding or exceptional value. C5.4 GMO's are not used</p>	<p>Discussion: Should prohibition of GMO's be included?</p>

<p>Maintenance of other socio-economic functions and conditions (6) Traditional tenure and use rights Objects of cultural value Public availability</p> <p>Consultation</p> <p>Say in forest management FPIC</p> <p>Resolving grievance</p> <p>Local employment and processing Labour conditions health and safety</p>	<p>P6. Management of the forest must have full regard for identification, documentation and respect of legal, customary and traditional tenure and use rights related to the forest including objects of cultural, traditional and economic value. In order to achieve this, the definition of the social component of sustainable must include criteria for:</p> <p>C6.1 The forest management plan and accompanying maps and measures to be applied are publicly available, except for strictly confidential business information</p> <p>C6.2 Effective communication and consultation of stakeholders regarding management of the forests</p> <p>C6.3 The (local population) and indigenous peoples have a say in forest management on the basis of free and prior informed consent, and hold the right to grant or withhold permission and, if relevant, receive compensation where their property/use r</p> <p>C6.4 mechanisms for resolving grievances and disputes including those relating to tenure and use rights, to forest management practices and to work conditions; and</p> <p>C6.5 Forest management stimulates employment of the local population, and local processing of timber and non-timber forest products.</p> <p>C6.6 The basic labour rights, including right to organise and negotiate wages, are respected and management takes adequate measures regarding health and safety of forest workers</p>	<p>Discussion: should respect for objects of cultural, and traditional values be mentioned explicitly?</p> <p>Discussion: Meaningful consultation is not possible without <i>public availability</i> of essential information.</p> <p>Discussion: Is effective communication and consultation implicit in the requirement for FPIC (C6.3). If so C 6.2 may be redundant.</p> <p>Discussion: does the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, by referring to <i>their lands</i>, provide a legal basis to require consultation of IP on the management of the forests?</p> <p>Discussion: Is a criterion on stimulation of local employment desirable?</p> <p>Discussion: Are <i>right to organise and negotiate wages</i> being considered as basic labour rights? <i>Forest workers</i> may imply the employees of contractors, but not local population. Discussion Can forest manager be held responsible for health of local population?</p>
<p>Management system</p> <p>Environmental social impacts Management cycle</p> <p>Management plan</p> <p>Maps</p> <p>training</p>	<p>P7 Sustainable forest management shall be realised through a management system. In order to achieve this the definition of sustainable must include criteria for:</p> <p>C7.1 appropriate assessment of impacts and planning to minimise impacts;</p> <p>C7.2 applying a management cycle of inventory and analysis, planning, implementation, monitoring compliance with all requirements, evaluation, and improvement</p> <p>C7.3 a forest management plan, dealing with at least:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • current condition of the FMU • long-term objectives • the average annual allowable cut per forest type <p>C7.4 essential elements for forest management are indicated on maps on a scale relevant to the element</p>	<p>Discussion: It suggested that all typical management aspects should be covered under one Principle (P4). Indeed this principle is on the performance of forest managers and not on the sustainability of the forests and their related social systems. As such this principle and its criteria are of a different nature than the preceding three principles.</p> <p>Discussion: A management plan is essential for SFM. In standards of various certification systems a management plan is being required. Do we need a separate criterion?</p> <p>Discussion: Maps are indispensable for sustainable</p>

	C7.5 adequate training of all personnel, both employees and contractors; and	forest management. Do we need a separate criterion?
Legislation on labour, welfare health	C7.8 The forest management organisation and any contractors must comply with local and national legal requirements relevant to: Labour and welfare; and Health and safety	This criterion is copied from the UK criterion S9. Discussion: In fact, legislation should be covered under the definition of legal. (see discussion on L3)

////////