

# Making Participation of Stakeholders Work within the FSC Certification Process

**Tim Cadman, MA<sup>1</sup>**

Introduction.....	1
Comparative Analysis of Stakeholder Participation in Forest Management Certification. 2	
Canadian Standards Association.....	2
Forest Stewardship Council.....	2
Pan European Forest Certification.....	3
Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI).....	3
Case Study: FSC - Participatory “Schein und Sein”.....	5
Stakeholder Consultation Requirements.....	5
Breakdown in Stakeholder Participation in FSC processes.....	7
Meaningful Participation.....	9
Mechanics of Participation.....	9
Participation Theory.....	9
Inclusion and integration of participants.....	10
Types of Non-Government Stakeholder.....	10
Role of certifiers.....	10
Recommendations for certifiers.....	11
Hypothetical model for a certification process that includes stakeholders.....	12
Conclusions.....	13
Annex One: How Might Cross-sectoral Stakeholder Participation in the Certification Process be Measured?.....	13
Annex Two: FSC Principles and criteria for Stakeholder Consultation.....	17
Selected Bibliography and Further Reading.....	19

## Introduction

The Forest Stewardship Council is an international non-profit organization founded in 1993 to support environmentally appropriate socially beneficial, and economically viable management of the world's forests. It

---

<sup>1</sup> Tim Cadman MA is a graduate of Girton College, Cambridge, and a PhD student in Applied Science at Canberra University. He specialises in research into sustainable forest management and certification and labelling. He is a founding member of the international NGO, Native Forest Network (retired), Director of the New South Wales based Colong Foundation for Wilderness Ltd., Advisory Board Member of the Terra Nature Fund and a member of the Forest Stewardship Council (Environmental Chamber) and FSC Australia Contact. Current Research Affiliations: Canberra University's Centre for Environmental Philosophy Planning and Design; Friends of the Earth – Australia (Research Associate). His latest papers can be seen at: <http://www.nfn.org.au/sfm/>. He can be contacted via: [tcadman@certifiedforests.org.au](mailto:tcadman@certifiedforests.org.au)

is an association of Members consisting of a diverse group of representatives from environmental and social groups, the timber trade and the forestry profession, indigenous people's organizations, community forestry groups and forest product certification organizations from around the world. Membership is open to all who are involved in forestry or forest products and share its aims and objectives (FSC, 20/9/99).

This paper presents the case for increased participation of stakeholders<sup>2</sup> within the FSC certification process. The value of the FSC certification is the emphasis it places on involvement of social, environmental and economic interests in the development of management plans, and the role of stakeholders in the development of management standards. Indeed, it is the participatory role of stakeholders in FSC certification that differentiates it from other schemes such as Pan European Forest Certification and the American Forest and Paper Association's Sustainable Forestry Initiative, which are more oriented towards serving the requirements of one sector (i.e. the timber industry) above those of other interests. This is one of the major reasons why the FSC enjoys the support of non-government organizations (NGOs), whilst other schemes do not.

The paper provides some guidelines for certifiers and outlines a new set of principles and criteria for measuring the extent of participation in the forest management process. The intent is to provide landowners, managers, certifiers and community stakeholders with a clear methodology for this important social aspect of SFM.

## **Comparative Analysis of Stakeholder Participation in Forest Management Certification**

The four major market competitors are outlined below. They differ in the extent to which they meet expectations as to what constitutes independent, third party certification, and their level environmental performance (FERN, 2001).

### **Canadian Standards Association**

With the establishment of national standards based on multi-stakeholder input, Canada has become a leader in the certification of sustainable forest management.

The national certification program has been developed by the Canadian Standards Association (CSA) and covers six criteria (key environmental, economic and social values) and more than 80 indicators associated with sustainable forest management. These range from conservation of biological diversity to maintenance and enhancement of forest ecosystem condition to conservation of water and soil.

*(CSA, 2001)*

### **Forest Stewardship Council**

The Forest Stewardship Council is an international non-profit organisation founded in 1993 to support environmentally appropriate, socially beneficial, and economically viable management of the world's forests. It is an association of Members consisting of a diverse group of representatives from environmental and social groups, the timber trade and the forestry profession, indigenous people's organisations, community forestry groups and forest product certification organisations from around the

---

<sup>2</sup> "The stakeholder on any issue represents the parties or individuals that the expert source or sources believe are trying to shape the resolution of the issue(s) in question". Decision Insights, Inc. <http://www.di.usa.com/stakeholders.html> (accessed 25/09/01)

world. Membership is open to all who are involved in forestry or forest products and share its aims and objectives.

(FSC, 20/9/01)

### **Pan European Forest Certification**

The Pan European Forest Certification (PEFC) Council was officially launched in Paris on the 30th of June 1999, following months of intensive development work. The PEFC scheme, a voluntary private sector initiative, will provide assurance to the customers of woodland owners that the products they buy come from independently certified forests managed according to the Pan European Criteria as defined by the resolutions of the Helsinki and Lisbon Ministerial Conferences of 1993 and 1998 on the Protection of Forests in Europe.

The purpose of the PEFC scheme is to promote an internationally credible framework for forest certification schemes and initiatives in European countries, in the first instance, which will facilitate mutual recognition of such schemes. The PEFC Technical Document and Statutes (found on this web page) define the basic requirements of forest certification and set up of institutional arrangements at Pan-European and national and sub-national levels. Timber from certified forests that meet the PEFC criteria and requirements will have access to the PEFC logo.

(PEFC, 12/09/01)

### **Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI)**

The Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) was launched in 1994 by the American Forest & Paper Association (AFPA) which represents 205 American forestry companies and 44 Associate members. SFI is an SFM program encourages responsible environmental practices to be integrated with sound business practices, for the benefit of landowners, shareholders, customers. The program was developed to enable foresters, landowners, loggers and wood and paper producers to operate an economically viable industry and satisfy the public demand for environmental responsibility.

(Government of British Columbia, 2001)

There is debate surrounding the merits of each scheme depending on which stakeholder sector is asked. The forestry industry, excluding companies that are FSC members, is generally hostile to the FSC, and depending on their regional location advocate the CSA, SFI or PEFC schemes (Forests Forever, 1999).

Analysis of the literature shows that of the four, the FSC is considered to include the greatest level of stakeholder involvement; while the SFI pursues a multi-stakeholder approach, the standard does not specify any requirements for publicly available documentation (FERN, 2001).

The two programs differ in their degree of **mandatory public involvement**.

- The FSC standards are developed through a participatory process that requires the active involvement of environmental, business and social sectors within its membership as well as the participation of its members and other stakeholders in openly publicized national or regional standard-setting processes. Beyond standards development, stakeholder

consultation is an integral part of the certification process. While protecting confidential information, FSC certification requires public summaries of certification evaluation reports, the certificate holder's management plan, and the results of periodic monitoring of the certified forest.

- The SFI program and standard were created in consultation with an array of outside parties. It is beginning to function with fuller public involvement and comment through its separate SFB. The broader social and economic goals associated with the standards are addressed via the recognition that the social aspects of sustainable forest management have been addressed in the U.S. and Canada through public law and regulation of the forest industry and labor relations. Companies that are third-party certified are required to issue a summary document of the findings of certification....

### ***Consultation and Public Reporting***

The programs differ in the level and extent of stakeholder consultation and public reporting.

- FSC standards require extensive stakeholder consultation and public reporting as a part of ongoing forest management.
- SFI standards require consultation with local experts on certain forestry practices and AF&PA provides an aggregate annual report based on information from its members based on first-party verification....

### **Recognition of Indigenous Peoples Rights**

- FSC standards have an explicit principle recognizing the rights of indigenous peoples.
- SFI standards do not address this issue, rather relying on existing treaties, laws, and regulations.

(Meridian Institute, 2001)

Non-Government Organizations favour the FSC as they consider that it meets the highest level of requirements for independent, third party certification:

To be credible certification must be independent: no single party should be able to dominate the process. However, in the PEFC, the SFI and the CSA one group (representing economic interests) is able to dominate the process. Certification must be based on well-documented and transparent standard-setting, certification and accreditation procedures. However, the PEFC, the SFI and the CSA standards vary on a country-by-country or case-by-case basis, as do the PEFC's certification procedures. Certification reports, or at least summary reports, must be publicly available. However, only the FSC's certifiers are conscientious in making summary reports available to the public.

Despite calls from governments and others to develop a framework for mutual recognition between different forest certification schemes, this report shows that at present the differences between these four certification schemes appear too great to justify mutual recognition.

In sum, while the PEFC, the CSA and the SFI incorporate a few of the essential elements of a credible forest certification scheme, the FSC delivers on every component. Consequently, we consider the FSC to be the only available framework that meets the basic requirements outlined in this report. With an FSC label the consumer knows what he or she gets. This is not the case with any of the other schemes.

(FERN, 2001)

## **Case Study: FSC - Participatory “Schein und Sein”**

### **Stakeholder Consultation Requirements<sup>3</sup>**

FSC policy states that the main objectives of stakeholder consultation are:

- To solicit comments on any generic or interim certification standard being used by the certification body for an evaluation.
- To identify forest stewardship issues that are considered difficult or controversial in the region concerned.
- To gain an understanding of the opinions of stakeholders, and in particular local stakeholders, as to how they believe these issues should be resolved.
- To gather information about the performance of the forest management enterprise with respect to the Forest Stewardship Standard being used for the evaluation. Such information may include instances of disputes between the forest managers and other stakeholders, examples of non-compliance with Forest Stewardship Standards, and also general opinions (positive and negative) about the standing of the forest management enterprise in the community or region.

Despite this apparent commitment to stakeholder involvement, there is no actual commitment to the development of consensus-based management standards, and the stakeholders are constrained regarding the extent to which they can influence the certifier’s decision-making powers:

The FSC does not require certification bodies to ensure that there is a consensus amongst all stakeholders as to how difficult or controversial issues should be resolved. The FSC also does not require certification bodies to agree with the opinions of stakeholders, or comply with stakeholders’ recommendations as to whether an operation is certifiable or not. The duty of the certification body is to determine whether the specified Forest Stewardship Standard is, or is not, complied with by the client. Consultation does not imply a right to veto a certification decision. A stakeholder who feels that the certification decision is incorrect may make a complaint/appeal to the certification body, and complain to FSC.

This is partly tempered by an expectation that certifiers should demonstrate their commitment to consultation by showing:

- Evidence that an appropriate range of stakeholders were consulted;

---

<sup>3</sup> FSC Guidelines for Certification Bodies, June 1998. The researcher acknowledges (Donovan, 2001) in the preparation of this section.

- Evidence that stakeholders had the opportunity to present their points of view without fear or recriminations;
- Evidence that their opinions with respect to any generic or interim standard were taken into account during the evaluation;
- Information and opinions of stakeholders are presented in the assessment report (and the public summary); and,
- Evidence that the information and opinions of stakeholders were evaluated and used in coming to a certification decision.

There are four phases in the certification process under the FSC: scoping, full assessment, audit and re-assessment and stakeholder consultation is required at all stages:

**Scoping** – A process for determining whether a candidate operation should go forward to a full certification assessment. This process may be publicly known, or may occur on a private basis (see discussion below).

**Full Assessment** – A process to determine whether a candidate operation qualifies for certification. All full assessments are publicly announced.

**Audit** – A process for annually or randomly checking the performance of an operation to audit whether they continue to meet certification standards (annual on-site audits are required; random audits may also occur).

**Re-Assessment** – A process similar in scope and intensity to a full assessment that occurs once every 5 years after initial certification to determine whether a previously certified operation continues to meet certification standards. All comments below on “Full Assessment” below apply to “Re-Assessment”.

(Donovan, 2001).

The FSC-accredited certifier SmartWood demonstrates that various tools are used to facilitate consultation:

- Public pre-assessment and pre-audit notices through radio, email, newspapers and hand delivery;
- Use of a dedicated website for providing status of ongoing certification assessments (all ongoing SmartWood forest assessments are publicly announced on our website, [www.smartwood.org](http://www.smartwood.org));
- Public and private meetings that are general or organized by interest-group or sector (e.g. environmental organizations, labor unions) – whichever provides a secure environment for stakeholders;
- Structured and unstructured private interviews;
- Use of advisory panels which can be topic specific (e.g. environmental or social issues) or general;
- Use of carefully designed questionnaires or surveys during the assessment or auditing phase;
- Contracting of experienced social scientists or community development organizations to conduct independent individual interviews, surveys or for facilitating public meetings; and,
- Subcontracting with local non-profit organizations to ensure thoughtful interaction with local stakeholders.

(Donovan, 2001).

### **Breakdown in Stakeholder Participation in FSC processes**

Included below are several examples that highlight the failure of the FSC and certifiers accredited by the FSC to meaningfully engage a range of stakeholders in the certification process. The following table provides some case studies associated with a breakdown in stakeholder participation. Some of these problems have been and are being addressed. The table is not an exhaustive list, and is intended solely as a pointer to some problems within stakeholder participation processes.

Country	Forest Manager	Certifier	Stakeholder	Issue
Brazil State of Para (Amazon)	CIKEL and JURUA	Scientific Certification Systems	Workers, Local community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No analysis of the social relations between the companies and local communities</li> <li>Local communities did not know the certification was proceeding</li> <li>No appreciation that the union was financed and sponsored by the company, and workers' representation was minimal.</li> <li>The charcoal industry that was supplying JURUA included child labour, and other gross labour injustices.</li> <li>CIKEL was engaging in ongoing violent conflicts whilst the certification process was being undertaken. This was not investigated by SCS. SCS condition for certification was that the company should develop a strategy to protect itself from further conflicts, rather than ending the conflict.</li> </ul>
Canada Province of Ontario	Government of Ontario, Ontario lumber industries	FSC Canada, FSC secretariat, Oaxaca	Non-industry stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Announcement by the Govt of Ontario that they would certify all forests based on input from FSC in Oaxaca, looking towards "mutual recognition", meaning that the Ontario process would become recognised as equivalent to the FSC P&amp;C</li> <li>No consultation leading to this announcement</li> <li>Nearly ended the British Columbia regional initiative, as it looked like the Ontario Govt was working directly with FSC head office, independently of other regional initiatives. This meant that BC Province thought it might try a similar process</li> </ul>
Indonesia Province of Java	Perhutani	Smartwood	Non-industry stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to address: tenure rights; worker entitlements; illegal logging; institutionalised corruption; violence and killings</li> <li>Inadequate social and environmental NGO consultation</li> <li>Failure to comply with FSC P&amp;C</li> <li>Poor methodology based on Smartwood's original 1990 certification standard, i.e. before creation of FSC</li> <li>Collusive decision making with clients</li> <li>Lack of regional standards</li> <li>statements issued implying that the decision to certify was taken before assessments were undertaken</li> </ul>
Ireland	Coillte	SGS Qualifor	ENGOS Social stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two economic chambers in the national initiative was inequitable</li> <li>Lack of access to resources by ENGOS and social stakeholders compounded structural issues</li> <li>SGS failed to state that interim standard would and could be used subsequently</li> <li>Coillte had excessive dominance and controlled the development of standards</li> <li>Interim standards were worse than European standards</li> <li>FSC representatives broke trust and alienated the ENGO and social stakeholders. Going to FSC on a higher level did not help.</li> <li>SGS undertook assessment despite only receiving 14 replies to its initial mail out of 1,000 letters</li> <li>Letter was not clear that the assessment would proceed</li> <li>SGS issued 10 corrective action requests to Coillte, but these were subsequently dropped</li> </ul>
Malaysia		National Timber Certification Council (NTCC)	Social and Environmental NGOs	<p><b>Note:</b> This process is discrete from the FSC, but development of national criteria and indicators under this process has been encouraged by the FSC under its emerging "mutual recognition" philosophy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of transparency, consultation, representation</li> <li>Disregard for Indigenous Peoples' rights.</li> <li>Domination of NTCC by industry</li> <li>C&amp;I contain nothing about Indigenous tenure</li> <li>Lack of financial support to translate and explain issues to local people</li> </ul>

## Meaningful Participation

Certification and labelling (C&L) of forest products is an important market-oriented outcome for participants in the SFM debate. Successful stakeholder participation in forest management is recognised as an essential component of certification schemes. The 1998 International Union of Forestry Research Organizations acknowledged that there is an urgent need to:

obtain consensus on how scientific capability and stakeholder expectations can be brought together in pursuit of ongoing improvement in forest management, and to identify future R&D priorities on sustainability criteria and indicators (IUFRO, 1998)

Internationally, a number of certification and labelling schemes already in place are having a significant impact in the market as consumers shift to environmentally-preferred forest products. Therefore it will be increasingly more important to have measurable C&I of successful participation. Such international trends will inevitably be felt by the forest products industry in Australia, as opportunities for new niche markets will open and the demands of some traditional markets will change.

The use of C&I to reflect stakeholder participation will be an essential tool for measuring the success of the social component of SFM. The extent to which the involvement of forest users in planning for sustainable management can be quantified will become increasingly important for developing systems that meet the needs of all stakeholders.

## Mechanics of Participation

### Participation Theory

Prabhu, Colfer and Dudley Have developed a detailed a series of criteria and indicators (C&I) as well as a whole range of field tests that can be applied for determining human well being and some of the other social aspects of sustainable forest management.

While these have been developed largely for use in tropical/less developed nations, they are of some relevance for assessing community participation in forest management.:

#### C&I Related to the Social Environment

PRINCIPLE (implied): Forest management maintains fair intergenerational access to resources and economic benefits (see additional detail in Section 8.1.3 Additional C&I Pertaining to People's Roles in Sustainable Forest Management )

Criterion and example indicators:

1. Stakeholders'/forest actors' tenure and use rights are secure.
  - 1.1 Tenure/use rights are well defined and upheld.
  - 1.2 Forest-dependent people share in economic benefits of forest utilisation.
  - 1.3 Opportunities exist for local people/forest-dependent people to receive employment and training from forest companies.

PRINCIPLE (implied): Stakeholders, including forest actors, have a voice in forest management (see more detailed discussion in Section 8.1.3 Additional C&I Pertaining to People's Roles in Sustainable Forest Management and related discussion within Section 3.3.5 on page 33)

Criteria and example indicators:

1. Stakeholders/local populations participate in forest management.
  - 1.1 Effective mechanisms exist for two-way communication related to forest management among stakeholders.
  - 1.2 Forest-dependent people and company officials understand each others' plans and interests.
2. Forest-dependent people/stakeholders have the right to help monitor forest utilisation.
  - 2.1 Conflicts are minimal or settled. (Prabhu et al. 1999)

In industrialised nations community participation in forest management differs somewhat. The role and influence of indigenous people and forest dwellers varies. With large urban populations and diminishing rural populations, stakeholders may need to include NGOs from outside a given region, as well as local community representatives.

In addition to the above criteria, it would be useful to quantify the extent of stakeholder participation. The following themes should be expanded on to determine the extent of stakeholder “ownership” of the process:

- the level of participation of stakeholders in SFM processes (e.g. national, regional, local, forest management unit);
- extent of participation (e.g. how many and what meetings stakeholders are invited to attend/not invited);
- Scope of stakeholders (i.e. who is included/not included)

### **Inclusion and integration of participants**

The aim of a good participatory mechanism should be to develop an educated, informed, active and involved stakeholder base to enable effective and cooperative participation in the forest certification process.

Active participation of stakeholders who have a high degree of ownership of a project from the beginning is the most effective way of ensuring support. The target groups are geographically and socially dispersed. The forest certification process is complicated and confusing and mechanisms incorporating the needs of the target audiences should be incorporated into subsequent decision making processes.

### **Types of Non-Government Stakeholder**

#### Non-Government Organizations

##### **Local**

This sector is intimately associated with the rights and wrongs of forest management on the ground, and consequently has a wealth of useful knowledge on management. These stakeholders relate to local government and local catchment areas and are a source of knowledge for other NGOs

##### **Regional/sub-national/State**

These groups are seeking to have influence on the State or regional level and interact with State Government and government agencies. They also have national interests in terms of the implication of federal government policies on forests (as do local stakeholders). This sector is based in the capital cities and rural towns. It is comprised of a wide range of groups with a very diverse set of opinions. Group dynamics are lively in this sector and need to be well managed for negotiations amongst parties to succeed.

##### **National**

These groups are driven by a different set of agenda. They are out there talking face to face with government ministers and prime ministers. Some of them are capable of organising huge numbers of people to persuade the politicians of their intent. Compared to other stakeholders they have potentially wider political and social leverage. Their membership base is generally much larger than the other types of stakeholder.

### **Role of certifiers**

The researcher’s investigations into certification worldwide indicates that certifiers often come into a country with a pre-arranged participation methodology. Usually they are hired by a forestry company, and proceed to implement their methodology, largely at several removes from the “stakeholder coalface”.

This kind of approach is not always likely to be successful. Later, as more and more of these processes unfold, some key stakeholders begin to feel disempowered. Most researchers would agree that there has

been some backlash to perceived failings of the FSC for instance in this regard. It is the “dance” that happens long before the actual certification process kicks off that is the most significant period. Many companies and certifiers in good faith get involved in a process that they think will work, then wonder why the process collapses.

Ultimately, the various stakeholders must have a degree of ownership in crafting the process from the outset. Circulating two page forms for people to tick boxes “yes/no/don’t know”, informing them they have 28 days to do so, and the next stage will commence (as is the case with some methodologies) is a recipe for disaster. Stakeholders immediately feel like they are dancing to someone else’s tune.

Participatory research attempts to integrate the researcher into the social milieu where they are active, and encourages them to act as a facilitator for community empowerment. The community itself, rather than the researcher, is encouraged to identify issues and problems and the historical origins of these issues. The intention is to provide an intellectual environment whereby the community can develop its own solutions to the problems it faces, and ultimately transform this situation by its own efforts. The researcher is part of that community, but acts more as an information provider than the controlling agent of any given process (Sohng, 1995).

Participatory research challenges practices that separate the researcher from the researched and promotes the forging of a partnership between researchers and the people under study (Freire, 1970, 1974). Both researcher and participant are actors in the investigative process, influencing the flow, interpreting the content, and sharing options for action. Ideally, this collaborative process is empowering because it (1) brings isolated people together around common problems and needs; (2) validates their experiences as the foundation for understanding and critical reflection; (3) presents the knowledge and experiences of the researchers as additional information upon which to critically reflect, (4), contextualizes what have previously felt like "personal," individual problems or weakness, and (5) links such personal experiences to political realities. The result of this kind of activity is living knowledge that may get translated into action....

Researchers need to take responsibility for developing an informed and critical view of the daily realities surrounding research issues before starting the research project. They need to be knowledgeable about the specific substantive content areas of a research topic, about the cultures and life experiences of those whose lives would be the focus of the research. Researchers need to be aware of how members of a group perceive and speak about their lives. This means they must learn everything that can be found out about the community and its members both historically and sociologically through available records, interviews, observation, and participation in the life of the community...

(Sohng, 1995, <http://www.interweb-tech.com/nsmnet/docs/sohng.htm> - accessed 25/10/01).

A similar approach, if adopted by certifiers, would go a long way towards breaking down current perceptions amongst some disenfranchised stakeholders that that they are acting on more behalf of the timber companies than any other stakeholder.

### **Recommendations for certifiers**

- a) Preliminary assessments: currently, a company hires a certifier who then “consults” with “stakeholders” - instead the certifier must concentrate on developing a process for scoping that is inclusive and driven by stakeholders from the outset. There is too much financial/ethical conflict of interest with the current status quo. NGOs (and various other stakeholders, especially Indigenous people and community interests) are already “unequal partners” from the outset, externalised from a key component in the certification process. If stakeholders are unhappy with a company proceeding with a scoping due to concerns, these concerns should be addressed before the scoping takes place.

- b) Participation processes: a universal participatory methodological framework needs to be adopted by all certifiers, with the stated aim of identifying, including and bringing all stakeholders together to develop a mutually-owned participation process that leads to a consensus of all parties on a certification standard. Certifiers have too much power, acting according to a pre set methodology and justifying this by insisting this process has stood them in good stead elsewhere and that they know best, even if they are new to a region/country.
- c) Management planning processes are required in which stakeholders not certifiers drive the process. The people who are affected for good and bad by forestry activities may have a lot to contribute. The key issue is to integrate these solutions. The role of the certifier is to facilitate, monitor and record this process to ensure all parties have equal access to decision making fora.
- d) Human rights and the social environment: the certifier must pay particular attention to the social environment in which certification is taking place. In countries with a history of human rights abuses, illegal logging, dispossessing local inhabitants of traditional lands etc., it is not appropriate for the certifier to continue with a process that does not seek to fix these problems first; otherwise certification is not socially beneficial – one of the stated aims of forest management under the FSC.

### Hypothetical model for a certification process that includes stakeholders

<b>1.Scoping: Forest Assessment and Stakeholder Consultation</b>
1.1 The certifier is contacted by the organization seeking certification.
1.1.2 The certifier identifies and contacts all relevant stakeholders to ascertain if there are any major impediments to proceeding with a preliminary assessment of the organization seeking certification.
1.1.3 If there are, the certifier’s scoping study is confined to identifying those problems and making them the basis for the recommendations contained in scoping study provided to the organization seeking certification.
1.1.4 If not, the certifier undertakes a full assessment of the landholdings of the organization seeking certification and provides indicative recommendations regarding possible future management issues
1.2 Relevant stakeholders are invited to participate in an assessment of the scoping study to ensure that all environmental, cultural and social values have been taken into account during the scoping process.
<b>2.Management Planning Process</b>
2.1 A management plan is developed by all stakeholders with the assistance of the certifier and other expert sources.
<b>3.Silvicultural and Ecological Considerations</b>
3.1 External advice is sought from silvicultural, ecological and social third party experts as to the merits and problems of the management plan,
3.2 Which if necessary, is emended accordingly subject to stakeholder input.
<b>4.Harvesting and production</b>
4.1 All forest products removed from the site will be processed a mill that
4.2 will be quarantined to ensure “chain of custody” from the logging site.

<b>5. Monitoring, assessment, reporting</b>
5.1 In consultation with stakeholders, monitoring for environmental impacts will occur immediately after logging and on an ongoing basis
5.2 In consultation with stakeholders, the strengths/weaknesses of the project will be evaluated and the plan updated where appropriate

**Conclusions**

The process of certification can be complex and fraught with difficulties if not conducted properly. There is mounting evidence that shows that many potential stakeholders are not being properly included in the FSC certification process. The methodologies adopted by the various FSC certifiers vary considerably, both across the different certifiers, and within the same certification organizations, often depending on the countries where they are active. The certifier has an obligation to ensure that participation of stakeholders moves beyond passive consultation and that all relevant stakeholders are involved from the certification process from the outset. Furthermore, the certifier needs to work within a participatory framework that seeks to empower stakeholders and which ensures that any social, economic and environmental injustices are addressed as part of the certification process.

**Annex One: How Might Cross-sectoral Stakeholder Participation in the Certification Process be Measured?**

These differing community and industry demands over resource use and access clearly need to be resolved in order to achieve SFM. Agencies involved in the SFM debate have begun to examine what components should be included in C&I for assessing stakeholder involvement in processes for achieving SFM.

Initial research has focussed on developing countries in the tropical and sub-tropical zones. In order to develop participatory C&I of universal relevance, there is a need to expand on existing research and develop a core set of C&I that can also be applied to developed countries and temperate and boreal forest ecosystems. Any new criteria and indicators developed will need to be capable of moving beyond the existing constraints imposed on the implementation of SFM identified in this research. The existing power relationships between stakeholders will be a major factor influencing the development of C&I establishing effective participation.

The use of C&I to reflect stakeholder participation will be an essential tool for measuring the success of the social component of SFM. The extent to which the involvement of forest users in planning for sustainable management can be quantified will become increasingly important for developing systems that meet the needs of all stakeholders.

<b>Criterion “X”</b>
<b>Participatory framework for cross-sectoral and multi-level involvement in sustainable forest management and planning</b>
The intent of this criterion is to ensure that forest management is carried out within a management systems framework that includes stakeholder participation in developing the forest management performance criteria and operational standards. The management planning framework is to be flexible and adaptable to stakeholder participation at all levels, scales and forest types, and provides for continual improvement in participation based on the key elements outlined in X.1-X.3 below
<b>National Indicator:</b> National-level stakeholders, where relevant, participate based around the elements outlined below.
<b>Regional Indicator:</b> Regional (state and local) stakeholders, where relevant, participate based the

elements below.

**Rationale:** It is widely acknowledged that the role of stakeholders in forest management planning is an essential component of SFM. Such participation is a significant component of the social aspect of forest management.

CRITERION	INDICATORS	GUIDE TO IMPLEMENTATION
<p>X.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The extent to which stakeholder participation in Forest management planning is undertaken in a systematic manner</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Rationale</b> Participation occurs in a manner that is consistent across regions, forest types and tenures, enabling assessment of participation.</p>	<p><b>Indicators</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders/local populations are identified in a consistent manner.</li> <li>Stakeholders are involved in the development of plans.</li> <li>Stakeholders' contributions are incorporated into the management planning processes and operational guidelines.</li> <li>Processes are in place to check that stakeholders have been included and corrective action is taken to incorporate those overlooked.</li> <li>The extent of participation is assessed.</li> </ol> <p><b>Type of evaluation</b> Document-based</p> <p><b>Basis of assessment</b> That methods are in place to fulfil reporting against indicators 1-5</p> <p><b>Sources of information</b> Policy and procedural documentation</p> <p><b>Updating and monitoring</b> Periodic checking for changes in stakeholder sectors and their incorporation into the participatory processes.</p>	<p>Stakeholders are included on all relevant levels by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifying key players;</li> <li>Seeking advice from participants as to who else should be included;</li> <li>Public announcements seeking stakeholder input;</li> <li>Ensuring adequate representation at all relevant fora of all relevant participants;</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources of information</b> Media, community directories, personal interviews.</p>

CRITERION	INDICATORS	GUIDE TO IMPLEMENTATION
<p>X.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The extent to which forest managers develop an educated, informed, active and involved stakeholder base to enable effective and cooperative participation</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Indicators</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders/local populations participate in forest management.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective mechanisms exist for two-way communication related to forest management among</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>The Policy could include a statement on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the core values and beliefs and mission of the manager in relation to pursuing stakeholder participation under the AFS;</li> <li>an awareness of and</li> </ul>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>in the forest certification process</b></p> <p><b>Rationale</b></p> <p>Managers and agencies are able to demonstrate that they have engaged stakeholders in the forest management planning process</p>	<p>stakeholders.</p> <p>1.2 Forest-dependent people and company officials understand each others plans and interests.</p> <p>2. Forest-dependent people/stakeholders have the right to help monitor forest utilisation.</p> <p>2.1 Conflicts are minimal or settled.</p> <p>Responsibility is assigned for establishing, implementing and maintaining a systematic approach to participation in relevant forest management performance criteria and requirements;</p> <p>The organization/owner has capacity to establish, implement and maintain stakeholder participation methodologies;</p> <p>There is a process whereby staff/employees/operators are made aware of their responsibilities and other requirements;</p> <p>There is a process whereby commitment to participatory planning is established, reinforced and communicated to employees/staff/operators</p> <p><b>Type of evaluation</b></p> <p>Document- and field-based</p> <p><b>Basis of assessment</b></p> <p>That a participatory process for developing forest management performance criteria and requirements is in place;</p> <p>That there is ongoing development of awareness, personal commitment, motivation and leadership from top management or owner to systematic management and continuous improvement in environmental performance.</p> <p><b>Sources of information</b></p> <p>Policy statement</p> <p><b>Updating and monitoring</b></p> <p>Periodic checking for changes in legal and other requirements and their incorporation into the participatory</p>	<p>commitment to continual improvement in participatory processes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• compliance with relevant environmental regulations, laws and other criteria to which the manager subscribes;</li> <li>• requirements of and communication with interested parties;</li> <li>• the key objectives and targets of participation in relation to the development of forest management performance criteria and requirements;</li> </ul> <p>Scope of the policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• commensurate with nature, scale of ownership and environmental aspects [define] of the activities of the organization so that it is achievable;</li> <li>• brief and written in plain English or translated where English is a second language;</li> <li>• publicly available;</li> <li>• include a consultative mechanism provided to consider the views of interested parties, where appropriate, to broaden the information and decision making base;</li> <li>• Relevant to all levels of stakeholder participation (national, regional, local, forest management unit)</li> </ul> <p>Interested parties may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• neighbours;</li> <li>• local councils;</li> <li>• regulatory authorities;</li> <li>• unions;</li> <li>• employees;</li> <li>• environmental non-government organizations;</li> <li>• community groups;</li> <li>• Indigenous Peoples' organisations</li> </ul>
--	---	--

	processes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recreational users</li> <li>• Forest users</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources of information</b></p> <p>Forest Management Performance Criteria and Requirements;</p> <p>Academic research on participatory processes</p> <p>All levels of Government, including Regulatory Authorities, Government Agencies and associated web sites and informative material;</p> <p>ISO 14001:1996 Environmental Management Systems – Specification with guidance for use;</p> <p>Other forest certification agencies’ principles, criteria and indicators</p> <p>Organization’s values, beliefs and strategic plans;</p> <p>Industry Associations, Professional Institutions and Groups;</p> <p>Professional services.</p>
--	------------	--

CRITERION	INDICATORS	GUIDE TO IMPLEMENTATION
<p>X.3</p> <p><b>Encourages forest managers and or/relavant agencies to:</b></p> <p>a) <b>facilitate, monitor and record participation to ensure all parties have equal access to and ownership of the decision making fora;</b></p> <p>b) <b>commit to openness transparency and access to information to enable stakeholders to participate at all levels and in all fora where decisions regarding forest policy, management and operational guidelines are developed.</b></p> <p><b>Rationale</b></p> <p>Forest managers/agencies provide stakeholders with the opportunity to have input into the forest</p>	<p><b>Indicators</b></p> <p>1. Materials collected and generated during all stages of planning are made available to all participants.</p> <p>2. Participatory processes foster increased levels of community participation in landscape mapping and planning, with all stakeholders able to participate on an equitable basis;</p> <p>2.1 participatory planning contributes to the social, cultural and long-term economic wellbeing of the community, especially local and Indigenous communities and traditional owners;</p> <p>3. stakeholders have open access to all relevant information and data, including from industry and Government agencies.</p> <p>4. evidence of Social, environmental, economic and heritage impact assessment;</p> <p>5. Evidence that stakeholders have</p>	<p>Adequate resourcing is required to identify, inform and enable all relevant local, regional, national and sectoral stakeholders to participate in the certification process, in particular Traditional owners, from the outset.</p>

management planning processes	<p>been included in all fora associated with forest policy, management and operational guidelines.</p> <p><b>Type of evaluation</b> Document- and field-based</p> <p><b>Basis of assessment</b> A survey undertaken will determine who should participate, and key persons not captured by the survey will also be contacted. It is essential that the selected group of stakeholders represents as full a range of views as possible;</p> <p>All "levels" of participants must be able to claim ownership of the process; no grouping with a legitimate and representative mandate can be alienated if the process is to succeed</p>	
-------------------------------	---	--

## Annex Two: FSC Principles and criteria for Stakeholder Consultation

The following excerpts from a “real time” FSC standard are taken from the Regional Certification Standards for British Columbia (Draft 2 May 22, 2001). It should be noted that the principle of consultation is incorporated throughout the BC Regional standard where appropriate, and is clearly a fundamental component of the standards setting process.

Indicators of Control: Protocol Agreement

- 3.1.2 The manager has negotiated a protocol agreement with relevant First Nation(s) which, at a minimum, contains the following:
- a) the purpose of the protocol agreement as preferred by the First Nation(s), including a description of their choice for exercising control, either through development of a **joint management agreement** as set out under Indicators 3.1.5 or through a consultative approach as set out under Indicators 3.1.6 and 3.1.7;...

Indicators of Control: Consultation

- 3.1.6 Unless the First Nation(s) choose to exercise control through a joint management agreement as set out in Verifier 3.1.2(a), the management plan is developed in consultation with the First Nation(s) communities.
- 3.1.6(i) The First Nation(s) are satisfied the schedule of consultation is sufficient to provide them with effective input into the development and monitoring of the plan.
  - 3.1.6(ii) The First Nation(s) are satisfied their input has been appropriately recorded (e.g., in writing, maps, videos).
  - 3.1.6(iii) The First Nation(s) input is incorporated in the management plan as required.
- 3.1.7 Financial, technical or logistical capacity-building support, in proportion to the scale and intensity of operations, is available to the First Nation(s) where required to assist with consultation...

4.4 Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups directly affected by management operations.

- 4.4.1 The manager establishes and maintains a consultation process to meaningfully address the interests of **directly affected persons**.
  - 4.4.1(i) Directly affected persons who wish to participate are involved in the consultation process, either directly or through representatives.
  - 4.4.1(ii) Directly affected persons who wish to participate and the manager agree to the scope of the consultation.
  - 4.4.1(iii) Directly affected persons who wish to participate agree to the process by which they are consulted.
  - 4.4.1(iv) Where the manager carries out consultation through a public advisory group, participants agree to the terms of reference for the process, including:
    - a) purpose;
    - b) decision-making methodology;
    - c) facilitation and technical support;
    - d) timelines;
    - e) roles, responsibilities and obligations of participants;
    - f) provision for reasonable participant assistance where required to allow directly affected persons to participate; and,
    - g) accountability for decisions.
  - 4.4.1(v) Directly affected persons are provided with information used in making management decisions, with reasonable technical or expert interpretation as required, in a manner that allows them to understand potential impacts on their interests from management activities.
  - 4.4.1(vi) Steps sufficient to address the interests of directly affected persons are developed and agreed to through the consultation process.
- 4.4.2 Where the manager and directly affected persons fail to reach agreement through the consultation process, a mutually agreed-to dispute resolution process is utilized as set out under Criterion 2.3.
- 4.4.3 Consistent with the results of consultation, the manager takes steps sufficient to protect the interests of directly affected persons.
  - 4.4.3(i) If directly affected persons request it, they are kept informed of actions taken to address their interests.
- 4.4.4 When it is evident from consultation that further evaluation of social impacts is needed, the manager works with directly affected persons to further evaluate the impacts and ways to address them...
- 8.1.1(ii) In a manner determined through consultation, First Nations and directly affected persons participate in the design, implementation and evaluation of monitoring programs and the processes that incorporate the results of monitoring.

## Selected Bibliography and Further Reading

American Forest and Paper Association, "Sustainable Forestry Principles and Implementation Guidelines" (Washington, 1996)

Amitstead, P., Tolhurst, T., "1998 Timber Market Survey, Pricing and Market Trends", State Forests Marketing Division, 1998

B&Q, "The B&Q World of Timber", leaflet, (1996)

Bayerisches Staatsministerium fuer Ernaehrung Landwirtschaft und Forsten, "Zertifizierung in Deutschland"

[[http://www.forst.bayern.de/docskonzept\\_pefc\\_deu.html](http://www.forst.bayern.de/docskonzept_pefc_deu.html)] (accessed 10/9/99)

Bayerisches Staatsministerium fuer Ernaehrung Landwirtschaft und Forsten, "Rahmen für eine Pan-Europäische Zertifizierung von Wäldern Gemeinsame Elemente und Anforderungen", Technisches Dokument 10.

[[http://www.forst.bayern.de/docs/konzept\\_pefc\\_rahmen.html](http://www.forst.bayern.de/docs/konzept_pefc_rahmen.html)] (accessed 10/9/99)

Commonwealth of Australia, "FORTECH Final Report to the Standing Committee on Forestry. Review of Sustainable Forest Management, Certification and Labelling, Forestry Technical Services Ltd in association with Price Waterhouse and the Timber Merchants' Association of Victoria", Canberra, 1997 (Canberra, 1997), pp.

Cadman, T., "What is sustainable forest management?" and "Timber certification: will it deliver sustainable forest management?" contained in Grant, Karen, (ed.), pp. 93-96, 100-102

Cadman, T., "Forests, Stakeholders and Sustainability: Appearance and Reality", prepared for Neil Gunningham and Associates, December 1999

Cadman, T., "Sustainability Certification: Practice and Potential in Australian Farm Forestry: Literature Review", prepared for Neil Gunningham and Associates, September 1999

Camp, Orville, "The Forest Farmer's Handbook: A Guide to Natural Selection Forest Management" (Oregon, 1992)

Conservation Council of Western Australia, "Plantations Policy Adopted 27 April 2000"

Counsell, S., "Trickery Or Truth? An Examination Of The Effectiveness Of The Forest Stewardship Council", Rainforest Foundation, (London, 1999)

Decision Insights, Inc. <http://www.diiusa.com/stakeholders.html> (accessed 25/09/01)

Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), "BMZ/GTZ Forest Certification Project" leaflet (Undated)

Dillon, R., Commissioner, "Helping us hear the earth - An indigenous perspective on forest certification and Forest product labelling", Aboriginal And Torres Strait Islander Commission, October 2000, contained in: *Forest Certification: Recognising Society's Signals*, Conference Proceedings

Dudley, N., Gilmour, D., Jeanrenaud, J-P., "Forests for Life: A WWF/IUCN policy book", World Wide Fund for Nature, IUCN (Godalming, 1996)

Elliott, C., "WWF Guide to Forest Certification", WWF International, (Godalming, 1996)

Environmental News Service, "UK Woodland Assurance Scheme Launched", media release, 7 June, 1999

FERN, "Presentation of the Pan European Forest Certification Scheme", EU Forest Watch, December 1998)

FERN, Behind the logo: An environmental and social assessment of forest certification schemes (Utrecht, 2001)

Finnish Forest Industries Federation, "Increased credibility for Finnish Forest Certification Approach through European co-operation", Media release, 25/08/98

Forest Stewardship Council, "NGO fury over Isoroy certificates", FSC Notes, Issue 5 - April/May 1997

Food and Agriculture Organization, Non-Wood News: An information bulletin on Non-Wood Forest Products, Issues 1-6, 1993-1999  
Forest Stewardship Council, "Principles and Criteria for Forest Management", FSC Document No. 1.2.1996. (FSC, 1996)

Forest Stewardship Council, "FSC Applicant certification bodies", Document 5.3.2 September, 1999. [[http://www.fscoax.org/html/certified\\_forest.htm](http://www.fscoax.org/html/certified_forest.htm)] (accessed 21/9/99)

Forest Stewardship Council, FSC Notes, Issues 1-9, 1995-1999

Forest Stewardship Council, “Improvements in Forest Management Due to certification” FSC, 24 May, 1999

Forest Stewardship Council, “Who we are?” [[http://www.fscoax.org/html/what\\_is\\_FSC.htm](http://www.fscoax.org/html/what_is_FSC.htm)] (accessed 20/9/99)

Forest Stewardship Council “Draft Minutes of the Forest Stewardship Council General Assembly” Oaxaca, Mexico, 24 - 25 June 1999 [[http://www.fscoax.org/html/assembly\\_general/fscgamin.htm](http://www.fscoax.org/html/assembly_general/fscgamin.htm)] (accessed 22/9/99)

Forest Stewardship Council, “Group Certification: FSC Guidelines For Certification Bodies” Doc. 3.6.1, 31 July 1998 [<http://www.fscoax.org/html/groupp.html>] (accessed 21/9/99).

Forbes, V., “Forest Certification And Auditing Sustainable Forestry - The Way Forward?”, National Trust (undated).

Forests Forever, “Progress In Timber Certification World-Wide Summary: April 1999” [<http://www.forestsforever.org.uk/forestcertification.html>] (accessed 6/9/99)

Forests Forever, “Progress In Timber Certification World-Wide Summary: April 1999” [<http://www.forestsforever.org.uk/forestcertification.html>] (accessed 6/9/99)

FSC-BC Standards Team, Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Regional Certification Standards for British Columbia (Draft 2, May 22, 2001)

FSC Germany, “Leitfaden für Waldbesitzer und Forstbetriebe” [<http://www.fsc-deutschland.de/>] (accessed 17/9/99)

FSC Germany, “Für 1999 Durchbruch des FSC-Gütesiegels erwartet” [<http://www.fsc-deutschland.de/or1mit.htm>] (accessed 15/9/99)

Fungi Perfecti, “Mycova (SM) Helping the Ecosystem through Mushroom Cultivation” [<http://www.fungi.com/remed.html>] (accessed 24/9/99)

Gladman, D., “Sourcing Timber for the 2000 Olympic Games”, Draft, Greenpeace (Sydney, 1995)

Grant, Karen (ed.), “Europe’s Forests: A Campaign Guide”, ASEED, (Findhorn, 1999)

Greger, E. “The Value of Certification to the Stakeholder - the Institutional Investor Perspective”, GMO Renewable Resources, October 2000, contained in: *Forest Certification: Recognising Society’s Signals*, Conference Proceedings Greenpeace Germany, “Der Wald hat ein Problem. Wir haben eine Lösung” [[http://www.greenpeace.de/GP\\_DOK\\_30/HINTERGR/C13HI20.HTM](http://www.greenpeace.de/GP_DOK_30/HINTERGR/C13HI20.HTM)] (accessed 9/9/99).

Greenpeace Germany, “Spezial: Oekologische Siegel: Eine Chance fuer den Wald” [[http://www.greenpeace.de/GP\\_SYSTEM/11L9SH5D.HTM](http://www.greenpeace.de/GP_SYSTEM/11L9SH5D.HTM)] (accessed 8/9/99)

Greenpeace, “Clearcut Free? Just did it. The Vernon Model of responsible forestry: Canada’s first eco-certified forest”, Canada (undated)

Hansen, E., Punches, J., “Developing markets for certified forest products: A case study of the Collins Pine Company”, in Forest Products Journal, January 1999, pp. 30-35

Harper P., Metz, T., Hrubes, R. J., “An analysis of the Possible regional Economic Benefits of Small Scale Sustainable Forestry”, Institute for Sustainable Forestry (Willits, 1995)

Hammond, Herb, “Seeing the Forest Among the Trees: The case for Wholistic Forest Use”, (British Columbia, 1991)

Hendricks, R., “The Institutionalization of National level Criteria and Indicators in the United States”, USDA, 1998

Holzabsatzfond, “Pan European Forest Certification Memorandum” [[http://www.faf.de/paneuro\\_e.htm](http://www.faf.de/paneuro_e.htm)] (accessed 20/9/99)

Kanowski, Peter, Sinclair, Darren, Blair, Freeman, “International Approaches to Forest Management Certification and Labelling of Forest Products: A Review”, Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Australia, October 1999.

IIED, “Forestry and Land Use”, [<http://www.iied.org/landuse/index.html>] (accessed 24/9/99)

IIED, “General Information about IIED”, [<http://www.iied.org/info/about.html>] (accessed 24/9/99)

Das Institut für Marktökologie (IMO) “Das Institut für Marktökologie (IMO) ist FSC akkreditiert” [<http://www.IMO.CH>] (accessed 12/9/99)

Institute for Sustainable Forestry, "Pacific Certified Ecological Forest Products", *Forestry News*, Summer 1993, Vol. II No.1, pp. 1-2

Institute for Sustainable Forestry, "Good Wood. A Guide to Purchasing Ecological Forest Products", leaflet (undated)

Kiekens, J.-P., "Certification: international trends and trade implications", *Sustainable Forestry and Certification Watch*, [<http://www.sfcw.org>] (undated, accessed 3/8/99)

Lammerts van Beuren, Erik M., Blom, Esther M., "Hierarchical Framework for the formulation of Sustainable Forest Management Standards", Tropenbos Foundation, Leiden, 1997

Leahy, M., "Forest Product Certification: Promoting Sustainable Forestry Through The Market", Audubon Society, (September 1998) [[http://www.audubon.org/campaign/fh/forest\\_product\\_certification.htm](http://www.audubon.org/campaign/fh/forest_product_certification.htm)] (accessed 20/9/99)

Lloyd, S., "Non-timber Forest products", contained in Grant, Karen (ed.), "Europe's Forests: A Campaign Guide", ASEED, (Findhorn, 1999), pp. 96-97

Mater, C., Rogers, J., Metz, T., "Market Assessment of Certified Sustainably Harvested Forest Products", Institute for Sustainable Forestry (Willits, 1995)

Media Release, "Timber Certification and Labelling, Australian Conservation Groups' Position", (Undated)

Michon, G. and de Foresta, "Agroforests: an original agro-forestry model from smallholder farmers for environmental conservation and sustainable development" in *Traditional Technology for Environmental Conservation and Sustainable Development in the Asian-Pacific Region*, Tsukuba Science City, Japan, 11-14 December, 1995

Ministry of Agriculture, Rural development and Fisheries of Portugal, "Pan European Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management", contained in: General Declaration and resolutions Adopted, Third Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe, (Lisbon, 1998) pp. 47-64

National Association of Forest Industries, "Sustainable Forest Management and Certification: An Issues Paper" (Canberra, 1996)

National Forest Inventory (1988), "Australia's State of the Forests Report 1998" Bureau of Rural Sciences, Canberra

National Wildlife Federation, "Forest Certification Project", (information leaflet, 1997)

National Wildlife Federation, "National Wildlife Federation And Smartwood Program Announce First Forest Certification In New England Region", Media Release 23/1/97

Naturland Verband, "Erfolgsbilanz für die Ökologische Waldnutzung: Naturland zertifiziert jetzt 11.000 Hektar Wald" media release 1/7/98, [[http://www.naturland.de/prme\\_nlv.htm](http://www.naturland.de/prme_nlv.htm)] (accessed 14/9/99)

Pennanen, J., "A model for natural forest management", Greenpeace, (Painorauma, 1996)

Pilarski, M. (ed.), "Restoration Forestry: An International Guide To Sustainable Forestry Practices" (Washington, 1994)

Rogue Institute, "Landowner Stewardship", [<http://rogueinstitute.org/archive/rie7.html#LandownerStewardship>] (accessed 26/9/99)

Romeijn, P., "Green Gold: On Variations of Truth in Plantation Forestry", Treemail Publications (Amsterdam, 1999)

Scientific Certification Systems, "SCS Forest Conservation Programme", [<http://www.scs1.com/forests.html>] (accessed 11/9/99)

SGS Forestry, "The QUALIFOR Programme – An Outline", QUALIFOR Summary Document (Oxford, Undated)

Simula, A-L, "Finnish Forest Certification System (Ffcs) And Its Compatibility With International Certification Systems" MTK/Forestry Group (April 1999)

Simula, A-L, "Viewpoint of Finnish Small-scale Family Forest Owners on SFM", MTK/Forestry Group (Helsinki, 1998)

SKAL, "Certification programme for sustainable forest management!" [<http://www.Skal.com>] (accessed 12/9/99)

SmartWood, "Certified Forestry", Information Pack, 1998

Das Institut fuer Marktsokoologie (IMO)

SmartWood, "Smartwood List of Certified Operations", (New York, January, 1998)

SmartWood, "Generic Guidelines for Assessing Forest Management"  
[<http://www.smartwood.org/guidelines/forest-plantation.html>] (accessed 7/9/99)

Scrase, H., "Certification of forest products for small businesses: improving access – Issues and options"  
Draft Report, 1999

Sohng, Sue, "Participatory research and Community Organizing", A working paper presented at The New Social Movement and Community Organizing Conference, University of Washington, Seattle, WA. November 1-3, 1995 [<http://www.interweb-tech.com/nsmnet/docs/sohng.htm>] (accessed 22/10/01)

Silva Forest Foundation, "The Silva Forest Foundation Certification Program: Ecosystem-Based Certification" [<http://www.silvafor.org/certif/about.htm>] (accessed 23/9/99)

The Swedish FSC Working Group, "Draft Swedish Guidelines for Forest Certification", Secretariat, June, 1997.

Soil Association, "Woodmark Certification Scheme"  
[<http://www.soilassociation.org/SA/SAweb.nsf/FLDocuments/Forestry>] (accessed 24/9/99)

Upton, C., Bass, S., "The Forest Conservation Handbook", Earthscan, (London, 1995)

van der Maesen, L., Assessing the Sustainability of Native Forest Management Karri and Jarrah Forests in Western Australia, reprint, October 1999

Wilkinson, Graham, [<http://www.itto.or.jp/newsletter/v11n2/10.html>] (accessed 25/09/01)

World Rainforest Movement, "Will the FSC Certify Aracruz Celulose's plantations?", Bulletin 26, September, 1999

World Wide Fund for Nature, "A WWF guide to Forest Certification", (Godalming, 1995)

World Wide Fund for Nature, "Forests for Life: Timber Certification in Australia and New Zealand" , 2nd edition (Sydney, 1996)