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Schemes

■ Certification schemes
  1. performance-based
  2. environmental services
  3. environmental management systems
  4. hybrids

■ Labeling schemes
Performance-based systems

1 Market-oriented certification
   - voluntary, independent
   - often linked with labeling

2 Mandatory verification/certification
   - enforcement of regulatory requirements
   - forest management and chain-of-custody

3 Verification of specific forest management requirements
   - community-based/joint forest management
   - monitoring & evaluation of development projects
Other Types of Certification

Certification of environmental services
- baseline and project impacts
- carbon, water, erosion control, etc.

Certification of environmental management systems (EMS)
- ISO 14001/14004 standard
- capacity of organization

Hybrids
- EMS + performance standards
Labeling schemes

1. Forest management labels
2. LCA-based ecolabels
IPF Recommendations on C&L

- open access and non-discrimination in respect of all types of forest, forest owners, managers and operators
- credibility
- non-deceptiveness
- cost-effectiveness
- participation that seeks to involve all the interested parties, including local communities
IPF Recommendations on C&L II

- sustainable forest management
- transparency
- the only agreed set of criteria
- the IPF recommendations are general and need further elaboration to provide guidance for the development of certification schemes
WWF/WB Alliance Requirements

- institutionally and politically adapted to local conditions
- goal-oriented and effective
- acceptable to involved parties
- based on performance standards, defined nationally, internationally compatible
WWF/WB Alliance Requirements II

- objective and measurable criteria
- reliable and independent assessment
- credible to major stakeholders
- free from conflict of interest
WWF/WB Alliance Requirements III

- cost effective
- transparent
- equitable access to all countries
it appears that no existing scheme is likely to meet all the WWF/WB Alliance requirements

there are trade-offs between criteria
Existing Market-oriented Certification and Labeling Schemes

**Forest certification**
- Performance based
  - FSC
  - PEFC
  - National schemes
- Environmental management systems
  - ISO 14001/14004
  - EMAS

**Labeling**
- Forest management labeling schemes
  - FSC
  - PEFC
  - Keurhout
- LCA-based ecolabeling schemes
  - EU
  - National schemes
  - Private schemes

Chain-of-Custody verification
Market-Oriented Forest Certification Standards

- **International**
  - FSC

- **Regional**
  - PEFC

- **National schemes**
  - Brazil
    - # # CERFLOR
  - Canada
    - # CSA
  - Finland
    - # FFCS
  - Germany
    - ## GFCC

# operational
## expected to start next year

© Indufor Oy 1999
Market-Oriented Forest Certification Schemes II

- Ghana  
- Indonesia  
- Malaysia  
- Norway  
- Sweden  
- UK  
- USA

Certification is reported to be under development in more than 25 countries.

#   operational  
## # # expected to start next year

© Indufor Oy 1999
Review of Existing Schemes

- goals: improved/sustainable forest management; market communication
- not all cover chain-of-custody
- standard framework: international / regional sets of C&I for SFM
- criteria cover performance and management system elements
- full or partial compatibility with ISO 14001/14004
Review of Existing Schemes II

- multi-stakeholder and broad-based processes
- consultation and communication for transparency
- emphasis on consensus in decision making
- independent audits
- group certification for small holdings
- mutual recognition a common goal of national schemes
Conclusions

- undefined common terminology
- no conclusive agreement on minimum requirements for forest certification systems
- obstacle for on-going development work in a large number of countries
- comparative analysis on schemes needed
Conclusions II

- mutual recognition as a general goal
- schemes with different “grades” may be required
- more proactive role of the industry