

## Appendix to “FSC at Risk”

### Recommended action to strengthen FSC’s credibility

To review FSC’s progress on Greenpeace’s recommendations, please visit: [www.greenpeace.org/international/FSC-at-risk](http://www.greenpeace.org/international/FSC-at-risk)

Key FSC decision making processes related to issues	Contact point(s)
<p>1) <b>High Conservation Values (HCVs) and Intact Forest Landscapes (IFLs):</b> Indicators for protecting IFLs and habitat for species at risk must be developed as part of the International Generic Indicators (IGIs) process and in HCV Guidance (HCV identification due early 2013 and HCV Management in process).</p> <p>FSC decision making processes related to this issue:</p> <p>i) The IGI process is a FSC chamber balanced working group that includes FSC National Organisation members and other FSC staff as technical advisors, who are tasked to develop indicators for the FSC’s new Principles and Criteria international standard. In addition, this process is attempting to clarify and correct any uncertainties, conflicting or lack of information within the new P&amp;C.</p> <p><a href="http://igi.fsc.org">http://igi.fsc.org</a></p> <p>ii) In addition, FSC has for many years been promising to publish HCV guidance to ensure a correct and more consistent understanding, identification and conservation of HCVs. It has established an HCV Expert group that has provided input and expertise for FSC HCV guidance, which is to entail two parts: HCV identification and management guidelines.</p>	<p>i) Send a message to your FSC member representative involved in the International Generic Indicators process</p> <p><a href="http://igi.fsc.org/">http://igi.fsc.org/</a></p> <p>ii) Send a message that the HCV guidance (both parts) needs to ensure maintenance of IFLs and be published as soon as possible to:</p> <p>Kim Carstensen FSC International Executive Director</p> <p>Michael Conroy FSC International Board Chairman</p> <p>Hans Joachim Droste Head of FSC International Policies &amp; Standards Unit</p>
<p>2) <b>High risk regions:</b> Social conflict, human rights and legal issues must be urgently addressed through the development of safeguards for certification in “high-risk” forest regions. This will address issues such as lack of governance, stakeholder engagement, and transparency, and also needs to be complimented by FSC’s due diligence requirements and verification of compliance with FSC’s Policy for Association (PfA).</p> <p>FSC decision making processes related to this issue:</p> <p>In 2011, FSC consulted the membership on this issue via a discussion paper on options for how FSC best precede with addressing certification in “sensitive / high risk” regions. In the latter half of 2012, FSC’s Policy Standards Committee (PSC) recommended a chamber balance working group be formed to carry out a policy process on this.</p> <p>The international FSC board has rejected the preconditions and safeguards policy process recommended by PSC, bringing into question how seriously they view this problem.</p> <p>In addition, FSC needs to strengthen its due diligence and compliance verification requirements linked with its Policy for Association.</p>	<p>Send a message that FSC urgently needs to have safeguards on how it operates in high risk regions and that FSC must strengthen its due diligence requirements linked to PfA compliance to:</p> <p>Kim Carstensen FSC International Executive Director</p> <p>Michael Conroy FSC International Board Chairman</p> <p>Hans Joachim Droste Head of FSC International Policies &amp; Standards Unit</p> <p>Until this happens companies must take a precautionary approach to sourcing any FSC products from high risk regions by taking additional due diligence measures to ensure it is not procuring controversial certified wood or violating the PfA.</p>

<p>3) <b>Controlled Wood:</b> FSC must update the Global Forest Controlled Wood (CW) risk register, urgently finalise the National Risk assessments to the new proposed requirements and, where no national risk assessments exist, require FSC-field assessments. Moreover, FSC needs to promote the move to full certification. It is not enough to prevent companies from using controlled wood in perpetuity and benefitting from the use of the FSC logo without having to certify its entire supply.</p> <p>In order to move forest and plantation management companies to full FSC certification, FSC needs to phase out the FSC Mixed label altogether. To compliment this demand, FSC should urgently implement the Modular Approach Programme (MAP) system and prioritise support for community and smallholders to achieve FSC full certification.</p> <p>Key FSC decision making processes related to this issue:</p> <p>Currently, there is a chamber balance working group tasked with making revisions to the Controlled Wood standard. Also, another chamber balance working group completed its task in producing a modular approach draft standard that needs FSC's Policy and Standards unit to send out the draft standard for public consultation so it could be finalised.</p> <p><a href="http://ic.fsc.org/controlled-wood.308.htm">http://ic.fsc.org/controlled-wood.308.htm</a></p>	<p>Send feedback to your Controlled Wood technical committee chamber representatives:</p> <p>Economic chamber:</p> <p>Anders Hildeman Stewart Begg Kevin O'Grady</p> <p>Social Chamber:</p> <p>Martha Nuñez Dwi Rahmad Muhtaman Peter Wood</p> <p>Environmental Chamber:</p> <p>Judy Rodrigues Sean Cadman Miguel Armando Pacheco Ganoza</p> <p>Also send a message to:</p> <p>Kim Carstensen FSC International Executive Director</p> <p>Michael Conroy FSC International Board Chairman</p> <p>Hans Joachim Droste Head of FSC International Policies &amp; Standards Unit</p> <p>Lastly, companies are encouraged to send any relevant data to FSC so that its Global Forest Risk Registry is accurate and supports a consistent approach to risk assessment by companies procuring Controlled Wood until the new standard revisions are finalised and implemented.</p>
<p>4) <b>Performance on the ground:</b> FSC must ensure the Principles and Criteria are implemented with integrity. The IGLs must address aspects currently lacking clarity, including sustainable yield (Criterion 5.2), maintenance and restoration of natural forest (Criterion 6.6), a minimum 10% requirement for forest reserves (Criterion 6.5), as well as the HCV aspects above (1). Secondly, ASI must deliver much improved Certification Body performance by requiring that ASI produce an action plan that will ensure improved CB performance in the future and more consistent application of FSC standards and policies on the ground.</p> <p>FSC has disassociated itself from ASI (it is no longer an owner of ASI) and is in the midst of establishing a Quality Assurance Unit to strengthen its ability to demand and support consistent high standard certification body performance.</p>	<p>Send a message to your FSC member representative involved in the IGI process on the key issues needing strengthening and clarification:</p> <p><a href="http://igi.fsc.org">http://igi.fsc.org</a></p> <p>Send a message of concern and call for an ASI action plan on improved CB performance to:</p> <p>Kim Carstensen FSC International Executive Director</p> <p>Michael Conroy FSC International Board Chairman</p> <p>Gunters Laguns Managing Director of Accreditation International Services (ASI)</p>