



Principles & Criteria Review Workshop

Bonn, 15 & 16 November 2010

Report

31 January 2011

Status: Final

1. Introduction and process for the meeting

The facilitator asked all participants to briefly introduce themselves, their occupation and FSC chamber (for participants list see Annex 2). The agenda (see Annex 1) as well as 12 briefing papers dealing with the issues to be discussed had been circulated prior to the workshop.

The facilitator clarified that the workshop was not a decision making forum but aimed at providing input for the preparation of the final draft by the P&C Review Working Group (P&C Review Working Group). The focus should be on policy level proposals rather than detailed proposals for revised wording. It was agreed to stick to the 12 major issues, though it was recognized that other issues might be brought up in the course of the meeting.

The facilitator also relayed the expectation held by FSC and the P&C Review WG that the participants would, assuming their satisfaction with the final draft, advocate on its behalf among their chamber contacts in order to promote a positive vote in February.

It was agreed to break out in working groups by chamber to discuss the different issues. Agreements of these groups would be brought back to the plenary. If needed, further cross-chamber working groups would be established to re-discuss specific items. The output expected would be: issues, concerns and proposals. The following sections provide an overview of feedback of the break out groups in the sequence in which the issues were discussed during the workshop. Summary conclusions, usually of common agreements, were provided by the facilitator for most of these issues. In some cases issues were re-discussed in the plenary.

For ease of reading the feedback under each section below follows the following sequence: Social Chamber, Economic Chamber, Environmental Chamber, Cross Chamber A, B, C. This does not reflect any order of priority nor the sequence in which the separate break out groups reported back to the plenary. Indeed, the actual sequence of feedback was changed for every topic.



To ensure brevity this report does not provide any summary of the discussed issues. For further information please download to the original briefing papers from the FSC website as hyperlinked in the applicable section below.

2. Economic Viability

Download here: [Briefing paper on Economic Viability](#)

Social Chamber feedback

It was recognized that the economic viability of the forest sector would be in the long term interest of Indigenous Peoples and Local communities. It was pointed out that short term gains from enhanced social benefits must not compromise this long term viability and the capacity of communities for self determination.

Economic Chamber feedback

This subgroup disagreed that added documentation and procedural requirements would not add costs for certificate holders. This would be especially true for small holders. It was proposed to remove criteria that are not a necessary elements of good forest management, for example social management plans. Duplication of requirements should be avoided. It was proposed to carry out pilot tests to quantify and measure the impacts of the revisions and to identify duplications. Regarding the development of Generic Indicators it was pointed out that continuity of working group members would be required. The focus of the criteria should be on outcome and not on how to do things, e.g. no requirements for documentation.

Environmental Chamber feedback

It was expressed that the revised P&C need to be feasible for smallholders. The focus should be on ends rather than means. There was agreement with the raising of the bar of social requirements as reflected in proposed Principle 2 and 4. Clarification was sought on the role of associated formulations, such as the planned Generic Indicators, as well as the P&C Preamble and Glossary.

Regarding the latter, Matthias Fecht (MF) clarified that the explanatory notes would be the basis for the generic indicators. The generic indicators are intended to replace the Certification Body (CB) generic indicators. Their role in relation to national standards was not yet entirely clear. He explained that the process for developing generic indicators would follow FSC-PRO-01-001 V1-0 Procedure for the Development and Approval of Social and Environmental International Standards.

This would require the establishment of a sub-chamber balanced working group and public consultations of the draft Generic Indicators. This would provide FSC members with the opportunity to make sure that the Generic Indicators properly reflect the interpretation provided in the Explanatory Notes. The Explanatory Notes, though not to be subjected to the membership vote on the P&C, would be made available as



background information together with the revised P&C, when submitted for the vote. They will also be made available together with the revised P&C if and once approved.

Conclusion

It was agreed that economic viability was an overarching issue, affected by all other issues to be discussed during the work shop. More clarity on the actual impacts on economic viability should be available after these issues had been discussed. It was therefore agreed to re-discuss bring this up again at the end of the workshop.

3. Engagement

Download here: [Briefing paper on Engagement](#)

Economic Chamber feedback

Concern was expressed regarding the burden of demonstrating engagement and that the proposed requirements would create unrealistic expectations from engaged parties regarding benefits and compensation.

It was proposed to include a reasonableness test to make the criterion feasible and auditable. It was put forward that the wording of proposed criterion 7.6 would need improvement for clarity, e.g. in relation to risk of activities and the meaning of the word transparently. Specific consideration is needed for small holders to make the requirement feasible and in order to manage the cost implications, for example in relation to the need for 'public advertisements'.

Social Chamber feedback

No concerns were raised.

Environmental Chamber feedback

It was stressed that the role of observers should be acknowledged. The differentiation between affected and interested stakeholders was appreciated though the interaction with interested stakeholders would go too far. The specific situation of small holders would have to be acknowledged but at the same time it would be important to keep in mind accumulated effects of groups of small holders. There is a need to balance benefits and costs. The focus of the criterion should be on the ends rather than the means. Clarification would be needed on the meaning of reasonableness test.

Conclusions

There was overall agreement with the need to engage stakeholders, however, further clarification, especially in relation to the responsibilities of small holders would be required.

4. Indigenous Peoples customary rights

Download here: [Briefing paper on Indigenous Peoples Customary Rights](#)



Social Chamber feedback

The conclusions of the P&C Review WG as explained in the applicable briefing paper were approved on the condition that the revised P&C would be converted into auditable indicators in a step wise process.

Economic Chamber feedback

It was agreed that the Economic Chamber would provide its feedback at the end of the workshop.

Environmental Chamber feedback

There was support for the approach proposed in the paper. However, it was stressed that legal verification, according to Principle 1, should not be possible if violating customary rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Conclusion

It was agreed to re-discuss the issue at the end of the workshop.

5. Primacy of Natural Forests

Download here: [The Primacy of Natural Forests?](#)

Social Chamber feedback

The conclusions in the applicable paper were endorsed by this group. It was explained that such a primacy would imply primacy of Principle 6 over other Principles, e.g. a priority of preservation over local livelihoods. FSC would be unable to influence development in forested landscapes. There has to be a recognition of the benefits, that people have in these forests.

Economic Chamber feedback

This group also supported the conclusions of the paper. It was proposed that clarity on HCV criteria must be achieved.

Environmental Chamber feedback

This group did not agree with the conclusions put forward in the paper. It was stated that FSC focus had from the beginning been on natural forest, not understood as primary or pristine forests only. It was expressed that this view was supported by the conversion rules (e.g. 1994 cut-off date), the role of plantations as defined in current P10, and the restoration requirements in the P&C. It was agreed that plantations are part of the FSC system. The final recommendations of the Policy Working Group of the plantations review, which linked the level of impacts, including those on the landscape, to the level conservation efforts required from plantations was stressed.

Concerns were raised in relation to FSCs openness to certify a wide variety of vegetation types, such as oil palm plantations, orchards, Christmas trees, bamboo.



Vegetation types that decrease threat to natural forests would be acceptable. It was also pointed out that an appropriate definition of forest would be needed.

The following statement was presented to the workshop: FSC's key concern is the protection and restoration of natural forest in the context of other natural ecosystems.

Summary conclusion

There is no agreement on what are the objectives of FSC in relation to natural forest. It was agreed that the further discussions during the workshop could shine a light on this question and this issue would be considered again at the end of the workshop.

6. Conversion

Download here: [Briefing Paper on Conversion](#)

Social Chamber feedback

The group supported the conclusions as provided in the paper but a) pointed out that the current rules would severely disadvantage some Indigenous Peoples, e.g. in New Zealand, the Philippines and Indonesia and b) did not agree with the conditions for allowing conversion, such as only allowing limited portions or requiring for conservation benefits.

Economic Chamber feedback

The conclusions in the paper were supported. The proposed option of a ten year rolling cut-off date was supported. Alternatively, it was proposed to keep the current rules, but to allow for off-setting mechanisms in the form of restoration outside the management unit. It was also proposed that social benefits should be included as a condition for allowing conversion. However, clear guidelines would be needed for interpretation by CBs and National Initiatives.

Environmental Chamber feedback

This group also agreed with the conclusion that the conversion issue is unresolved and would need more consideration. It was pointed out that the proposed definition of forest would pose problems because it includes plantations and thereby blurs the rules in relation to conversion to plantations. The proposed wording would also not prevent the conversion of other natural ecosystems. However, these could possibly be dealt with in the context of HCV.

A desire was expressed to have a positive impact in areas that have been converted after November 1994 without opening the door for further conversion. There was no agreement to the proposal to allow off-site (outside the Management Unit) conservation benefits as a condition for accepting conversion. Limited exceptions should be possible for Indigenous Peoples and for conversion of degraded areas if this contributed to the protection of other areas. Positive guidance on what FSC is aiming to achieve (outcomes) would be needed.



Cross Chamber A feedback

It was proposed that the rules for permitting conversion should be onerous and difficult. Definitions would be needed for the terms 'forest' and 'other land use'. More work would be needed, e.g. by a separate committee, to re-evaluate the 1994 cut-off date in the context of FSCs mission.

Cross Chamber B feedback

This cross-chamber agreed that there should be no promotion of further conversion. However, the reality of post 1994 conversion would need to be acknowledged. It was agreed that FSC must have an influence on areas converted after November 1994 but that this is currently not possible. It was proposed that FSC investigate options or start pilot projects for conservation compensation off-sets, such as restoration activities or conservation funds. A rolling cut-off date was proposed as one option.

Cross Chamber C feedback

The group concluded that the November 1994 cut-off date requires revision. More flexibility would be needed for Indigenous Peoples in relation to the size thresholds for acceptable conversion as laid down in the proposed wording and current policies (5% threshold). Clearer definitions would be needed for criterion 6.9.

Summary conclusions

There is some flexibility needed in relation to conversion. However, FSC should not get involved in the further promotion of conversion. A solution for the 1994 cut-off date is needed and so are clearer definitions in relation to conversion.

7. Preservation of Natural Forests

Download here: [Briefing Paper on the Preservation of Natural Forests](#)

Social Chamber feedback

The conclusions in the paper were endorsed. It was proposed the HCV 5 and 6 should cover the preservation of social values of the forest.

Economic Chamber feedback

There was agreement with the conclusions of the paper. It was proposed that the paper should explain that forest management could lead to better identification, protection, maintenance and monitoring of HCV. Preservation and protection are not always a suitable option because the result could be non-certified logging without social, environmental and economic benefits. It was felt that logging in some natural/primary forests can be fully compatible with achieving FSCs mission, provided that the P&C are complied with.

Environmental Chamber feedback



There was a general agreement with the conclusions provided in the paper. It was proposed to establish a task force to develop guidance on the interpretation of HCV. It was felt that the HCV concept was poorly implemented in terms of maintaining the values and applying the precautionary principle. For example this would mean no industrial logging in Intact Forest Landscapes (IFLs), especially taking into account the role of primary and intact forests for climate change mitigation and adaptation and the greater conversion pressure. There was uncertainty whether the proposed Criteria 6.1 to 6.3 together with Principle 9 would address these concerns.

Cross Chamber A feedback

Management of primary forest should be possible in line with the requirements of Principle 9. Primary forests are not necessarily precluded from management but should be driven by the maintenance of the high conservation values.

Cross Chamber B feedback

The group agreed that forests are dynamic systems and that therefore preservation might not be a possible option. It would possibly be better to refer to conservation rather than preservation. The HCV concept should provide guidance for preservation/conservation and appropriate management of HCV areas. It was felt that the HCV concept has not been applied to its best effect. FSC has not been sufficiently involved in the development of the HCV toolkit. The HCV toolkit on the other hand is too open for interpretation and more guidance is required, particularly for SLIMFs. It was proposed to carry out a trade-off analysis and that FSC should get involved in the development and endorse the HCV toolkit. The involvement of certified management units in land use planning requires further analysis.

Cross Chamber C feedback

This group agreed with the recommendations in the briefing paper.

Summary conclusion

Management in pristine forests is possible in line with HCV criteria.

8. Restoration

Download here: [Briefing Paper on Restoration](#)

Social Chamber feedback

The group endorsed the position as outlined in the briefing paper. However, the need to identify and maintain social functions and roles, such as water was stressed.

Economic Chamber feedback

Also, this group agreed on the overall concept as proposed in the paper. It was agreed that where restoration of damage is needed it should take place regardless of who caused it. It should be a management objective if the damage continues to cause negative economic, social and environmental impacts. This should be clarified in the



applicable criteria, especially in relation to the aspired end state and timeframe of responsibilities for repairing damage. Restoration was identified as one example of increased cost with an impact on economic viability, especially in relation to water bodies. It was also pointed out that it is part of the due diligence responsibility of the Organization, when buying piece of land, to assess its liabilities, e.g. for damage repair.

Environmental Chamber feedback

It was agreed that the general direction for restoration must be toward natural ecosystems. The term enhancement could not be used. Restoration also needs to take into consideration functions, composition and structure, adaptation and resilience to climate change, cultural landscapes, timeframes and sequence, scale (stand, management unit, landscape level) and connectivity and corridors. Clarification would be needed on how to apply the concept of restoration to degraded or converted areas. This also applies to areas converted after November 1994 and is therefore also a conversion issue.

Cross Chamber A feedback

This group reached an agreement that where the Organization causes damage it is required to restore.

Cross Chamber B feedback

It was agreed that where restoration is needed it should take place regardless of who caused the problem. The natural ecosystem provides the direction for restoration rather than the endpoint. Problems are related to defining the limits of the obligation of the organization as well as responsibilities in relation to damage cause by external factors, such as climate change and pests. It was proposed FSC investigates or carries out pilots for conversion compensation off-sets.

Cross Chamber C feedback

Damage repair (restoration) should be backdated.

Summary conclusion

There is agreement on the need but not on the limits for restoration.

9. Landscapes and Mosaics

Download here: [Briefing Paper on Landscapes and Mosaics](#)

Social Chamber feedback

It was stated that proposed criterion 6.8 on landscapes and mosaics of stands would still be confusing. It was not clear what a mosaic of species is and how this would apply to plantations. Regarding the requirement to consider landscape values in the region clarification would be needed on what the important values needing to be



managed and protected would be, on who takes the decision and on what would be the hierarchy of importance.

Clarification would also be needed on the role of The Organization in managing non-forest functions. It was also expressed that it would not be possible to have viable forest if all landscape values need to be taken into account. It was stated that this is a planted forest issue requiring sympathetic design. It was recommended that primary importance should be given to the values held by people traditionally connected to the land. This issue is also linked to engagement.

Economic Chamber feedback

Appreciation was expressed for the flexibility provided by the criterion. Concern was raised that not all forests are managed for mosaics. Clarity would be needed on how to determine the appropriate landscape. It would be unclear what the values are and who would determine them and that they would change over time. Clarity would also be needed regarding the required end point of restoration and when restoration rather than maintenance of mosaics would be needed (maintain and/or restore). Concern was raised regarding the cost implications of the criterion.

Environmental Chamber feedback

It was stated that the proposed wording would not consider non-forest landscapes. The intent of the criterion would be to maintain and/or restore landscape values, which include connectivity, aesthetics, resilience and ecosystem services. Also, it would be unclear how to audit the criterion and that it would heavily rely on indicators. Finally it would require small holders to work together and it would be unclear how such collaboration could be co-ordinated.

Plenary Discussion

It was agreed that aesthetics, connectivity, resilience as well ecosystems are all important landscape aspects. It was proposed that aesthetics must be addressed through engagement and that certain groups should be given more weight, in relation to determining landscape values, for example IPs and traditional peoples. It was stated that a small holder perspective would be needed. Also, the requirements must be scale sensitive and relate to the wider landscape.

10. Sustained Yield

Download here: [Briefing Paper on Sustained Yield](#)

Social Chamber feedback

It was pointed out that the proposed criterion would not encompass specific reference to the social circumstances of communities. However, the proposed approach was supported. Management should not lead to progressive degradation of natural forests and disadvantage indigenous or traditional forest communities through creaming. It was felt that sustainable management would provide a sustainable work force. It was



recommended to provide for exceptions in the case of force majeure or external economic downturn beyond the control of the Organization.

Economic Chamber feedback

There was agreement with the concept proposed in the briefing paper. Recognizing that ecosystem functions are covered in Principle 6 it was proposed to revise the criterion as follows: 'The harvest rates and yields of products and other services from the management unit shall maintain the ability of the management unit to continue providing those products and services'.

Environmental Chamber feedback

It was expressed that the paper would confuse the issue of sustainability with sustained yield. The conclusions of the paper were not supported. There was some preference for the current wording of Criterion 5.6 over the proposed wording but support for adding environmental services as an additional item.

Plenary discussion

In the subsequent plenary discussions the following points were raised. It was expressed that the current criterion 5.6 would be more simple and easier to measure. The wording of the proposed criterion should be shortened. It was stressed that sustained yield defines one of the corner stones of FSC certification. It was explained that in many situations it would not be clear what permanence in the sense of harvesting levels would mean also certain changes in species composition age classes etc. would be required. In response to this it was stated that permanence would not prevent adaptation and that a long term focus would be needed in the criterion. It was requested that the reference to the 'ability of the management unit' be removed.

It was felt that the proposed criterion would bear the risk of allowing for continuous shortening of rotation periods. In response to this it was argued that this should be prevented by the requirements under Principle 6. It was expressed that stable yields would also be beneficial for a stable work force.

11. Regeneration Practices

Download here: [Briefing Paper on Regeneration Practices](#)

Social Chamber feedback

There was agreement regarding the proposed preference for local genotypes for regeneration under the condition that the social, environmental and commercial requirements of communities would be recognized. Clarity would be needed in relation to proposed criterion 10.1 vs. 10.3. There was also agreement with a cautious approach to the use of alien species.

Economic Chamber feedback

It was pointed out that the proposed criteria would not address semi-natural forest situations. The use of the term alien species was questioned. It was proposed to use 'exotic' or 'not-native' instead. It was proposed to delete the 1st sentence of proposed criterion 10.3, which gives preference to native species and local genotypes. It was also pointed out that use of alien species could have advantages over local species in the context of climate change. It was proposed to reduce the number of explanatory notes. It was explained that if exotic tree species be used good forest management could be secured for example by consideration to invasiveness, adaptation to climate change, natural reserves, corridors, biodiversity conservation. It was expressed that Principle 10 should be revised to better reflect forest management.

Environmental Chamber feedback

It was stressed that a broader evaluation of the potentials of native species and the impacts of alien species would be needed and that scale issues needed addressing. It was proposed to stress words that would encourage the use of native species and restoration to more natural conditions.

Plenary Discussion

The following points were raised in the subsequent plenary discussions. Principle 10 seemed to have the same content as current Principle 10 on plantation. The only difference would be that the term plantation had been removed. On the one hand the principle would include too many criteria while on the other hand some activities, e.g. harvesting would not be addressed.

Summary conclusions

Regarding regeneration the conclusion was drawn that it is appropriate to use alien species and to require reasonable justification for their use.

12. Biodiversity Conservation

Download here: [Briefing Paper on Biodiversity Conservation](#)

Social Chamber feedback

It was proposed that proposed Criterion 6.4 should require the establishment of conservation areas and/or connectivity rather than both. The proposed wording would not capture areas outside the conservation areas, e.g. bird dispersal sites. Criterion 6.5 could create conflicts with traditional practices, for example grazing.

Economic Chamber feedback

There was a general agreement with proposed Criterion 6.4. It was proposed to reformulate the 1st sentence to refer to 'effective measures to protect (...).' It was expressed that conservation would not guarantee survival of all species and that there should be no obligation to prove the survival of all species. It was proposed that if there is evidence that species are not conserved mitigation measures should be implemented. There was agreement with proposed Criterion 6.5. However, it would



result in additional costs in some countries. It was proposed to use the word 'create' instead of 'restore'.

Environmental Chamber feedback

Concern was expressed regarding the proposal to require the 'protection of survival and viability' in Criterion 6.4 rather than protection of the species more specifically. It was proposed that impact mitigation should also be proportionate to scale intensity and risk. Concern was expressed that the previous phrase 'protected in their natural state' was not used anymore. The referred (ICUN) definitions of rare and threatened would not cover imperilled species. Regarding proposed criterion 6.4 concern was expressed because of the change of words from 'protect' to 'conserve'.

Regarding proposed Criterion 6.5 it was pointed out that the presumption is that actions must be implemented inside the management unit. The question was posed how legal certainty could be guaranteed outside the management unit. It was pointed out that it would be ecologically impossible to restore some habitats. Control plots must be provided on the management unit. Action outside the management unit would require a landscape analysis. There would be a risk that increased flexibility for actions outside the management unit would open the door for simply buying out of obligations.

Cross Chamber A feedback

Concerns were expressed in relation to using 'conserve' rather than 'protect'. It was pointed out that according to proposed criterion 6.4 protection RTEs would have to be evaluated through the required measures. It was proposed that there should be limited flexibility for allowing representative samples of ecosystems outside the management unit under criterion 6.5.

Cross Chamber B feedback

Here it was agreed that it would not be possible to measure or monitor biodiversity that is every component, fully.

Cross Chamber C feedback

It was pointed out that 'key' habitats would require protection. Regarding proposed criterion 6.5 it was pointed out that representative ecosystems could not be preserved or restored if none are present in the MU. The conclusions of the economic chamber were supported. It was emphasized that it would not be possible to assure survival of all RTE's in the management unit because of external factors.

13. Forest Carbon

Download here: [Briefing Paper on Forest Carbon](#)

Social Chamber feedback



There was support for the proposed addition of a criterion for organizations voluntarily engaging in carbon trading. It was recognized that carbon stocks are an indicator for management and the P&C provide a good benchmark for carbon management.

Economic Chamber feedback

There was agreement that deep peat should not be included as an example of HCVs. It was explained that managing forests well is a way of maintaining carbon and preventing carbon loss. Carbon sequestration should be recognized as an environmental service.

Environmental Chamber feedback

It was argued that FSC has to be able to demonstrate its impacts on carbon. Carbon and climate are important values of forest management. Carbon should therefore be incorporated into the HCV concept. Specific carbon conservation measures, identification of sources of carbon loss and measures to address these would then be required to demonstrate maintenance and enhancement of carbon stocks as a HCV. Estimates would be needed for the purpose of FSC certification as a general management objective rather than for carbon-trading.

Cross Chamber A feedback

It was agreed that carbon management and enhancement must be a management objective. Forest/timber inventories and yields could serve as a surrogate for carbon stocks. It was pointed out that measures would be available for maintaining and enhancing carbon stocks, for example reduced impact logging, reduction of fire risks, conservation areas, appropriate silvicultural measures and peat management. Concerns were raised regarding the consequences of losing carbon, the costs and feasibility of monitoring carbon stocks, the costs of the required additional mitigation measures, and consequences for SLIMFs.

Cross Chamber B feedback

It was agreed that carbon must be addressed. Well managed forests contribute to carbon sequestration. Addressing carbon would be beneficial for FSC but would add costs for managers. Concerns were expressed in relation to the difficulties of measuring carbon stocks, for example in relation to non-tree vegetation, and demonstrating the outcomes. It was proposed to address carbon in the explanatory notes to Principle 6 in the context of the assessment of sustainability. Estimate reporting should be possible at the group level where applicable or even the landscape level.

Cross Chamber C feedback

It was pointed out that a single measurement of carbon stocks would not be useful, if not followed by monitoring of developments. It was stressed that carbon storage must be addressed as an environmental value.

Summary Conclusions



There is agreement that forests and plantations have a part to play in mitigating climate change and FSC certified forests and plantations shall play a role in this. However, the cost-benefit for Organizations is still very unclear and there are concerns about the credibility of current carbon measuring methodologies

14. Scale, Intensity and Risk

Scale, Intensity and Risk was brought up a number of times during the above discussions. It was requested that guidance would be needed on this concept, especially for large scale operations. It was stated that the Policy Working Group of the Plantations Review had agreed on an impact approach, requiring stronger efforts in cases of higher impacts, this approach would not be adequately addressed in the revised P&C.

The WG explained that the concept of scale, intensity and risk had been an integral part of the P&C since their first approval. The concept had been made more explicit by including the term risk. If guidance was needed this would have to be subject to an independent process and could not be tackled by the P&C Review WG at this point in time.

It was proposed that a general statement of the applicability of Scale Intensity and Risk for all principles and criteria be included in the preamble only.

15. Closing discussions

As previously agreed, the issues Primacy of Natural Forests, Indigenous Peoples Customary Rights and Economic viability were re-discussed.

Primacy of natural forest

Taking the discussions at the workshop into account the environmental chamber participants provided a revised version of their previous statement: 'FSCs key environmental concern is the protection and restoration of natural forest in the context of other natural ecosystems.'

Indigenous Peoples

The United Nations 'definition' was raised as an issue, but no definitive further conclusions were drawn.

Economic Viability

The situation regarding the perceived increase in costs was still unclear, only in a few cases the Workshop had identified real cost factors, e.g. forest carbon and biodiversity conservation. This attributed to the fact that only 12 issues had been discussed. It was agreed that Clara Helstad and Sophia Ryder would provide the WG with an analysis of which new criteria result in increased costs. However, it was agreed that the benefits should also be taken into account.



Additional issues related to the P&C Review

It was proposed that the P&C Review WG should focus on the positive impacts of forest management rather than developing safeguards for addressing negative impacts. For a positive vote on the P&C assurance would be needed that the explanatory note would serve as the basis for the planned generic indicators and clarification would be needed on the status of the explanatory notes and generic indicators. Generally, the P&C should reflect a push towards natural conditions.

It was requested that the workshop participants be consulted before the final draft is published for a vote. It was requested that the P&C Review would double check whether specific criteria are really needed and that duplications, especially between Principle 10 and Principle 1 to 9, be removed. The number of criteria under Principle 1 should be removed. Progress would be needed in relation to the November 1994 cut-off date. The P&C need to provide flexibility in relation to regional differences. Some concern was raised regarding the focus on ILO in Principle 2.

P&C Review WG conclusions

Based on the feedback provided during the workshop The P&C Review WG members concluded that management in pristine forests should not be fundamentally prohibited. The requirements should focus on outcomes and results rather than documentation. There was satisfaction in relation to the agreements reached on forest carbon. Generally, it seemed that the level of agreement of members with the revised P&C had increased. A consistency check of the whole document would be needed. The Workshop had provided feedback that would help improve the wording.



Annex 1 to Principles and Criteria Review Workshop

Principles & Criteria Review Workshop

Bonn, 15 & 16 November 2010

Location and Timings

Monday 15 November 2010, 09.00 – 18.00 @ FSC IC Offices, Bonn

Tuesday 16 November, 08.30 – 17.00 @ Hilton Hotel, Bonn

Introduction

On 3 September 2008, the FSC Board of Directors announced the P&C review and thereafter approved TORs for the P&C Review & Revision Group as follows:

The objective of this comprehensive review and revision is to analyze all issues identified in the past regarding the FSC Principles and Criteria and to propose, when necessary, revisions to the Principles and Criteria needed to solve the identified issues. The review and revision covers the entire Principles and Criteria including their introduction and glossary of terms.

Since then, the P&C Review Group has engaged in two complete cycles of communication with Members comprising:

- Draft 2-0 of the revised P&C was published for stakeholder comments from 03 July 2009 to 04 September 2009
- The Working Group convened once in Bonn and conducted 12 phone conferences to consider 280 of pages of stakeholder comments feedback from the Advisory Group, 5 Indigenous Peoples meetings and the Forest Carbon Working Group in order to develop Draft 3-0.
- Draft 3-0 was published for stakeholder comments from 11 March to 10 May 2010.
- The Working Group convened in June 2010 to consider 550 pages of stakeholder comments on Draft 3-0, including comments from two social chamber meetings as well as an NI meeting as well input provided by the Forest Carbon Working Group.

The P&C Review Working Group is tasked with putting revised Principles & Criteria out to a membership vote in February 2011. Prior to so doing, the Group would like to conduct a further, limited, consultation exercise with those who have demonstrated their interest in the review.

The Review Group would like to consult workshop members on twelve issues:

1. Scope of the P&C / The Primacy of Natural Forests?
2. Restoration
3. Sustained Yield
4. Biodiversity Conservation



5. Mosaics & Landscape Values
6. Conversion
7. Carbon
8. Economic Viability
9. Stakeholder Engagement
10. Regeneration practices
11. Indigenous Peoples Rights
12. Preservation of Natural Forests

These are challenging topics to reach consensus on, but with the help of member feedback to date the P&C Review Group has amended its proposals and wishes to explore the results with the workshop participants prior to finalizing its submission for the membership vote.

Purpose

So, the purpose of the workshop is to enable the P&C Working Group to tap into the collective wisdom of those who have been most active and engaged in the P&C review in considering proposals and options in relation to twelve specific issues.

Objectives

By the end of the workshop we will have:

- Provided workshop participants with opportunities to develop a Chamber view on each of the issues
- Invited the P&C Review Group to outline their proposal for each issue
- Evaluated the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal, against specific Chamber requirements
- Captured the opinions of workshop participants on how the P&C Review Group proposals could be improved

NB. To be explicit, the workshop is a consultative forum, not decision making.

Methodology

We have 12 issues to review in 2 workshop days, i.e., 14 hours! The key thing will be to invest discussion time only where it is needed. A methodology has been worked out that will, hopefully, allow just this. A detailed presentation of the method will be made at the meeting, rather than try to describe it here.

In terms of content, it is anticipated:

- Not all issues will require detailed discussion at the workshop. Enough concerns will have been addressed in the issue paper to allow us to move on quickly, perhaps just highlighting a few more concerns for the P&C Review Group to consider
- Some individual issues will require further discussion, which is best conducted in small groups – either mixed chamber or chamber specific



- Some issues can be discussed in parallel, e.g., three small, mixed chamber, groups tackle three different issues

Again, a proposal will be made at the beginning of the meeting about which issues could be dealt with 'in parallel'. This will be for the group's consideration and sign off.

Post Workshop

The P&C Review Group will take the feedback into their last meeting, which is the three days immediately following the workshop.

Rodger O'Connell
Workshop Facilitator



Annex 2 to Principles and Criteria Review Workshop

P&C Review Workshop
List of Attendees

Name	Organization	Country
Environmental North		
Bill Barclay	Rainforest Action Network	US
Anders Lindhe	WWF	Sweden
Grant Rosoman	Greenpeace New Zealand	New Zealand
Christoph Thies	Greenpeace International	Germany
Environmental South		
Zhu Chunquan	Individual/WWF China	China
Blanca Beatriz Aragón	Individual	Guatemala
Steven Germishuizen	Individual	South Africa
Economic North		
Brett Gilmore	PanPac/NZFOA	New Zealand
Sophia Ryder	IKEA	Sweden
Shawn Wasel	Alberta-Pacific Forest Industries Inc	Canada
Clara Helstad	Sodra	Sweden
Economic South		
Alan Rigolo	Amata/IPEF	Brazil
Kevin Grace	Global Forestry Services Inc.	Malaysia
Tom van Loon	Industrie Forestière de Ouessou (IFO)	Dem Rep Congo
Esteban Carabelli	Asociación Forestal Argentina/Alto Parana	Argentina
Social North		
George Asher	Individual	New Zealand
Paul Opanga	Building and Woodworkers International	South Africa
Social South		
Maria Tysiachniouk	Individual	Russia
Aisyah E. Sileuw	Individual	Indonesia
Edin Montufar	Individual	Guatemala
National Initiatives		
Gary Dodge	FSC-US	US
CBs		
Kevin Jones	Soil Association	UK



P&C Review Working Group

Name	Organization	Chamber	Country
Timothy Synnott	Estudios Forestales Synnott A.C.	Economic South	Mexico
Al Thorne	Tembec	Economic North	Canada
Bastiaan Louman	Individual	Environmental South	Costa Rica
John Palmer	Individual	Environmental North	UK
Ben Vickers	Individual	Social North	UK

Facilitation

Rodger O'Connell: rodger@levelheaded.org

Staff support

Cecila Gervasi: c.gervasi@fsc.org

Matthias Fecht: m.fecht@fsc.org