

November 2000

Comparative Matrix of Forest Certification Schemes

Principal Indicators Matrix: International Forest Certification Schemes

Governing body of certification scheme	Date of last update (1)	Status of analysis (2)	Operational	Geographical coverage	Affiliations		Scheme accommodates all relevant forest types
					Fully endorsed national/sub national schemes (3)	Affiliated national/sub national schemes (3)	
Forest Stewardship Council A.C.	02/10/2000	Amended draft	Yes	World-wide	FSC Regional Standards in United Kingdom, Sweden, Bolivia, Canada - Maritimes, Belgium, Germany	FSC Regional Standards in Canada - Great Lakes/St. Lawrence, British Columbia, Boreal; United States - Northeast, Ozark-Oachita, Southeast, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, Southwest, Pacific Northwest, Rocky Mountains; Mexico; Nicaragua; Colombia; Peru - Timber, Brazil Nuts; Ecuador, Chile; Brazil - Amazon, Plantations; Bolivia - Brazil Nut Standards; Ireland; Belgium; Denmark; Netherlands; Spain; Estonia; Latvia; Russia; Poland; Hungary; Romania; New Zealand; Papua New Guinea; Indonesia; Vietnam; Cameroon; Ghana; Zimbabwe	++
Pan European Forest Certification Scheme (PEFC)	02/10/2000	Amended draft	Yes	Europe	PEFC National Bodies in: Austria, Germany, Finland Norway and Sweden	PEFC National Bodies in: Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Ireland, Latvia, Portugal, Spain and Switzerland	++

Principal Indicators Matrix: National Forest Certification Schemes

Governing body of certification scheme	Date of last update (1)	Status of analysis (2)	Operational	Geographical coverage	Affiliations (3)		Non discriminatory		
					Fully endorsed by:	Working towards full endorsement by:	Scheme accommodates all relevant forest types	Active participation of leading forest owner representatives in development of the scheme	No significant cost variation for certification of forests of differing sizes and ecological types and in different regions
AF&PA Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI)	16/09/2000	Amended draft	Yes	USA (& parts of Canada)			++	++	++
CFV (Consejo Boliviano para la Certificación Forestal Voluntaria)	23/03/2000	Preliminary draft	Yes	Bolivia	FSC		++	?	?
Finnish Forest Certification Council	16/09/2000	Amended draft	Yes	Finland	PEFC		++	++	++
Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific, PNG	16/09/2000	Amended draft	Yes	Papua New Guinea		FSC	++	+	?
Lembaga Ekolabel Indonesia (LEI)	14/04/2000	Amended draft	Yes	Indonesia		FSC	+	+	?
Living Forests	18/01/2000	Preliminary draft	Yes	Norway	PEFC		++	++	?
LRF Skogsagarna	16/09/2000	Amended draft	Yes	Sweden	PEFC		++	++	++
PEFC Austria	23/03/2000	Amended draft	Yes	Austria	PEFC		++	++	++
PEFC Germany	04/10/2000	Amended draft	Yes	Germany	PEFC		++	++	++
PEFC Switzerland and HWK-Zertifizierungsstelle	16/09/2000	Amended draft	Yes	Switzerland		PEFC	++	++	?
Standards Council of Canada	18/01/2000	Preliminary draft	Yes	Canada			++	+	?
Swedish FSC Council	15/02/2000	Preliminary draft	Yes	Sweden	FSC		++	+	?
UK Woodland Assurance Scheme Steering Group	01/09/2000	Amended draft	Yes	United Kingdom	FSC		++	++	na
Associação Brasileira de Normas Técnicas	18/01/2000	Preliminary draft	No	Brazil			++	++	?
CEF (Certification Espanola Forestal)	08/10/2000	Preliminary draft	No	Spain		PEFC	++	++	++
Conselho Da Fileira Florestal Portuguesa	30/09/2000	Amended draft	No	Portugal		PEFC	++	++	?
Council of the National Certification Centre - Czech Republic	14/04/2000	Amended draft	No	Czech Republic		PEFC	++	++	++
German FSC Contact Person	18/01/2000	Preliminary draft	No	Germany	FSC		?	o	?
Ghana Forest Management Certification Systems Project	18/01/2000	Preliminary draft	No	Ghana			o	++	?
National Timber Certification Council, Malaysia	04/10/2000	Amended draft	No	Malaysia			++	++	+
PEFC Council of Latvia	03/10/2000	Amended draft	No	Latvia		PEFC	+	+	++
PEFC Denmark	01/03/2000	Preliminary draft	No	Denmark		PEFC	++	+	?
PEFC France	01/03/2000	Preliminary draft	No	France		PEFC	++	?	?
Sociedad para el Manego Forestal Sostenible, A.C.	18/01/2000	Preliminary draft	No	Mexico		FSC	++	?	?
Woodnet asbl	01/03/2000	Amended draft	No	Belgium		PEFC	++	+	++

Data Symbols : ++ Fully complies with indicator + Partially complies with indicator o Does not comply with indicator

Non discriminatory (4)				Independent and impartial (5)		Accreditation procedures (6)			Consensus building		
No significant cost variation for certification of forests of differing sizes and ecological types and in different regions		Compliance of accreditation bodies with Section 2.1.1 (General Provisions) of ISO Guide 61	Compliance of certification bodies with Section 2.1.1 (General Provisions) of ISO Guide 62	Compliance of certification bodies with ISO Guide 62 Section 2.1.2 (Organisation) and Section 2.2 (Personnel)	Complaints procedure established	Accreditation at national level	Accreditation body fully compliant with ISO Guide 61	Accreditation body affiliated to the International Accreditation Forum	Rules established to ensure no single interest dominates the decision making process	Procedures to ensure all relevant interests are given opportunities to participate in decisions	
+		++	++	++	++	na	++	na	++	++	
++		++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	

y (4)		Independent and impartial (5)		Accreditation (6)			Performance standards (7)		Management standards (8)	Forest policy and regulations (9)		
Compliance of accreditation bodies with Section 2.1.1 (General Provisions) of ISO Guide 61	Compliance of certification bodies with Section 2.1.1 (General Provisions) of ISO Guide 62	Compliance of certification bodies with ISO Guide 62 Section 2.1.2 (Organisation) and Section 2.2 (Personnel)	Complaints procedure established	Accreditation at national level	Accreditation body fully compliant with ISO Guide 61	Accreditation body affiliated to the International Accreditation Forum	Standards setting body committed to developing standards in line with FSC Principles and Criteria	Standards setting body committed to developing standards in line with Intergovernmental Principles and Criteria	Requirement for certification applicants to be certified to ISO14001 or EMAS	Standards setting body committed to ensuring certification standards comply with national forestry policies and regulations	Involvement of relevant regulatory authorities in standards setting process	Rules established to ensure
++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	
na	na	na	na	o	na	na	++	o	+	++	++	
++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	+	++	+	
na	na	na	na	o	na	na	++	o	o	++	++	
+	+	+	+	+	+	?	++	++	+	++	++	
++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	
++	++	++	++	++	++	++	o	++	++	++	++	
++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	+	++	++	
++	++	++	++	++	++	++	+	++	++	++	++	
++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	+	++	++	
++	++	++	++	++	++	++	o	++	++	++	++	
na	na	na	na	o	na	na	++	++	o	++	?	
na	na	na	na	na	na	na	++	++	+	++	++	
o	++	++	++	o	o	o	++	++	o	++	++	
++	++	++	++	++	++	++	o	++	+	++	++	
++	++	++	++	++	++	+	o	++	+	++	++	
++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	+	++	++	
na	na	na	na	o	na	na	++	?	o	?	?	
?	?	?	?	?	?	?	++	++	++	++	++	
+	++	++	++	+	+	+	++	++	?	++	++	
++	++	++	++	++	++	o	+	++	++	++	++	
o	++	++	++	o	o	o	?	?	?	?	++	
++	++	++	++	++	++	++	o	++	++	++	?	
na	na	na	na	o	na	na	++	++	o	++	?	
++	+	+	?	++	++	++	o	++	+	+	++	

? Insufficient data to assess compliance with indicator

na Indicator not appropriate to certification scheme

process (10)		Transparency (11)		Repeatability (12)		Adaptive (13)		Product labelling (14)	
All relevant interests involved in the decision making process	Presence of clear definition of "consensus"	Rules developed governing the provision of information to the public on certification scheme	Procedures developed to ensure ready public access to information on the certification process	Compliance of accreditation bodies with ISO Guide 61 Sections 2.1.4 (Quality system), 2.1.5 (Conditions for granting and suspending accreditation), and 3 (Requirements for assessment)	Compliance of certification bodies with ISO Guide 62 Sections 2.1.4 (Quality system), and 3 (Requirements for certification/registration)	Procedures developed for regular monitoring and re-assessment of certifiers	On-going training programmes provided for accreditation body and standards body personnel	Chain of custody auditing procedures developed for product labelling	Rules developed governing product claims
+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++

Consensus building process (10)				Transparency (11)			Repeatability (12)		Adaptive (13)		
Rules established to ensure no single interest dominates the decision making process	Procedures established to ensure all relevant interests are given opportunities to participate and influence decisions	All relevant interests involved in the decision making process	Presence of clear definition of "consensus"	Rules developed governing the provision of information to the public on certification scheme	Procedures to ensure ready public access to information on the certification process	Certification standards published and readily available	Compliance of accreditation bodies with ISO Guide 61 Sections 2.1.4 (Quality system), 2.1.5 (Conditions for granting and suspending accreditation), and 3 (Requirements for assessment)	Compliance of certification bodies with ISO Guide 62 Sections 2.1.4 (Quality system), and 3 (Requirements for certification/ registration)	Procedures developed to ensure the periodic review and revision of certification standards	Procedures developed for regular monitoring and re-assessment of certifiers	On-going training programmes provided for accreditation body and standards body personnel
++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
++	++	+	++	na	na	++	na	na	++	na	?
++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	+	+
++	+	+	++	na	na	+	na	na	++	na	o
++	++	++	o	+	+	++	+	+	?	?	++
++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	?
++	++	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
++	++	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
++	++	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
++	++	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
++	++	o	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	?
++	++	o	++	na	na	++	na	na	++	na	?
++	++	++	++	na	na	++	na	na	++	na	na
++	++	++	++	?	?	++	o	++	++	?	?
++	++	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	?
++	++	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	?	++	?
++	++	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	+
++	?	?	++	na	na	++	na	na	+	na	?
++	++	++	++	?	?	++	?	?	?	?	?
+	++	++	+	+	+	++	+	++	+	+	++
++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
?	?	+	?	++	+	?	o	+	?	?	?
++	++	o	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	?
++	++	?	++	na	na	++	na	na	?	na	?
++	++	++	?	+	+	?	++	+	+	+	?



THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMPARATIVE MATRIX OF FOREST CERTIFICATION SCHEMES

OBJECTIVITY, INDEPENDENCE AND PARTICIPATION

The publication of CEPI's comparative matrix of forest management certification schemes has generated a considerable amount of interest. The matrix was developed as an information tool designed to provide a means of comparing schemes against the commonly accepted credibility principles and does not aim in any way to provide judgement of different schemes. Inevitably questions have arisen over the objectivity of the work undertaken. In the interests of transparency, details of the information-gathering and analytical process are summarised below.

General process

The matrix has taken over one year to prepare. It has been compiled directly from information derived from a questionnaire survey of around 50 certification schemes operating at both international and national level.

Questionnaires were initially issued in the Spring of 1999. The questionnaire was re-issued in February 2000 and again in July 2000 to those certification schemes still failing to respond and to newly initiated schemes. All those surveyed were given ample time to respond and were advised of the date on which the matrix would be published.

Conception of the questionnaire and the matrix

The work to develop the questionnaire and database, and to analyse data was carried out by *Rupert Oliver*¹, an independent forest industry consultant based in the UK.

CEPI has encouraged stakeholder review and comment throughout the development of the project. In September 1999 a consultation process was initiated with the aim of increasing involvement of environmental and producer interests. Both the Confederation of European Forest Owners (CEPF) and WWF International were invited to comment on the project. All available information and results were made available to both groups at that time. So far comments have been received from CEPF, while WWF International have only indicated their intention to respond.

In addition, the structure of the questionnaire, and the draft of the matrix were subject to review by Stephen Bass, Director of the International Institute of Environment and Development (IIED). Stephen Bass is a highly regarded independent expert on forest certification. He is co-author of the Forest Certification Handbook and numerous other papers on certification. He was also contracted by the World Bank/WWF Forest Alliance in 1999 to undertake a review of forest certification schemes worldwide.

¹ Rupert Oliver has been working on environmental issues in the forest sector for 10 years. He was formerly employed by the UK Timber Trade Federation's Forests Forever Campaign. During this time he prepared the Forests Forever Directory of National Forest Policies, and numerous papers on forest certification. He also advised timber trading companies on the development of environmental purchasing procedures. He has been working as a consultant for the last 2 years and is currently Editor of the independent journal "hardwoodmarkets.com", which is widely read by the international timber trade, by environmental groups, and by UN and other international bodies. He has a Masters Degree in Forestry.



Commenting on the CEPI project, Stephen Bass wrote in November 2000 that “With small exceptions, the information obtained from the questionnaires is accurate and reliable, and has been intelligently analysed. However, some schemes have not provided adequate information on standards. This can easily be rectified by reference to published material and websites. Much of the information that is relevant to credibility has been obtained, but needs to be organised as such. Whilst a few other studies have been done and can be integrated, other information can only be obtained from respondents, and a few key further questions might therefore be asked of them. Reverting to respondents with the intention to publish should elicit the necessary improvements.”

Detailed use of the answers collected

On the basis of Stephen Bass' advice, CEPI reformulated the matrix structure to ensure that data presented better reflected the demands of a "credible" forest certification scheme.

Detailed requests for supplementary information were also issued to all questionnaire respondents in advance of publication. The aim was to ensure that all respondents were given an opportunity to fill in gaps in our database. At the same time all respondents were asked to review and comment on the draft analysis of their scheme to be contained in the matrix. All comments received were subsequently incorporated into the published matrix.

To ensure there is no misunderstanding over the current status of data contained in the matrix, entries are clearly identified as follows:

- **"Preliminary draft"** indicating the matrix entry is based only on CEPI's analysis of a questionnaire response;
- **"Amended draft"** indicating a matrix entry is based on CEPI's analysis of a questionnaire response and on further comments received following review by the governing body of the certification scheme;
- **"Confirmed"** indicating a matrix entry is based on CEPI's analysis of a questionnaire, on subsequent review and comments from the certification scheme, and following wider stakeholder comment and peer review.

At the time of the second release of the data, no entries have been "confirmed", and some are still at the "preliminary draft" stage.

In the Explanatory Notes issued with the matrix, CEPI acknowledges that the matrix still needs to be improved and therefore is not a tool for the valid judgement of different certification schemes. A major reason for publication of the matrix as it stands is to stimulate further debate on the criteria for assessing the credibility of different certification schemes, and to encourage emerging schemes to demonstrate greater transparency. The intention is to progressively refine the matrix as more data is made available by certification schemes, as more schemes become operational, and as understanding increases.

Conclusion

With this in mind, CEPI welcomes all comments from any interested party on both the structure and content of the matrix. CEPI is happy to make available the data set from which matrix entries have been drawn and details of the specific analysis undertaken for each scheme. CEPI intends to consult further with the full range of stakeholders when updating the work in the hope of securing support from as wide a range of interests as possible.



Principal Indicators Matrix Explanatory Notes

SCOPE OF THE MATRIX

The matrix has been developed to be applied to:

- **Certification of forest management** defined as “an established and recognised procedure which results in a certificate confirming the quality of forest management in relation to a set of predetermined standards, based on an independent (third party) assessment.” (Baharuddin and Simula, ITTO, December 1997).

and

- **Single issue labelling of forest products** defined as “a process which results in a claim which may be used on-product referring to the quality of forest or forest management at the origin of the raw material (wood, fibre) of which the product is made. Labelling is based on certification of forest management and verification of the chain of custody” (Baharuddin and Simula, ITTO, December 1997). Labelling on this basis is described as “single issue” because it only covers forest management and takes no account of other environmental impacts.

Aim of the matrix

The matrix provides summary data derived from the CEPI database of national and international forest certification schemes. The matrix is designed to allow “at a glance” comparisons of different forest management certification and single issue labelling schemes.

The matrix’ primary function is to provide reliable advice to customers and companies involved in the paper and wood products trade on the status of individual certification schemes and the labels issued under these schemes.

A secondary aim is to inform the developing international debate on harmonisation and mutual recognition of the wide variety of forest management certification schemes currently under development around the world.

Users of the matrix should note the comments made below under “Progressive improvement of the matrix”.

Data sources

Data for the second edition of the matrix published in November 2000 is derived from a questionnaire issued to the governing bodies of forest certification schemes during autumn 1999, February and July 2000, and on requests for supplementary information issued in March, July and September 2000.

Copies of the background data from which the matrix has been derived can be obtained from CEPI.



Structure of the matrix

The matrix describes the various certification schemes (listed on the y-axis) against various criteria and indicators to assess their credibility (on the x-axis). The criteria and indicators are based on those agreed by the CEPI Forestry Committee for assessing the credibility of different certification schemes. Further information on the criteria are provided in the notes below.

Forest management certification and labelling schemes are sub-divided into international and national schemes. As the functions of international and national certification bodies vary, it is recognised that not all criteria are equally relevant to each scheme.

National level schemes will involve the development of forestry performance and management standards for forest certification, usually through some sort of consensus building and participatory exercise. National schemes generally do not have responsibility for the development of rules relating to environmental claims and for product labelling procedures. Criteria and indicators relating to “product labelling” are therefore omitted from the national schemes’ matrix.

International certification schemes tend to involve:

- the recognition of national level certification systems, usually through some sort of consensus building and participatory exercise
- the development of rules and procedures for environmental claims and forest products labelling.

International schemes generally are not involved in the detailed development of forestry performance and management standards. Criteria and indicators relating to “Performance standards”, “Management Standards” and “Compatibility with National Forest Policies” are therefore omitted from the international schemes’ matrix.

The development of procedures to assess the professional competence of certifiers (i.e. accreditation) may take place at either national or international level depending on the scheme.

Data summary and representation

Data derived from the questionnaire survey of certification schemes has been analysed against CEPI’s principles. All the governing bodies were subsequently invited to comment on the analysis and to provide supplementary information as required. The current status of CEPI’s analysis of each forest certification scheme is identified in the matrix under column heading “Status of analysis” (see note 2). Data derived from the survey is summarised in the matrix as follows:

++	the certification scheme fully complies with the relevant indicator
+	the certification scheme partially complies with the relevant indicator
o	the certification scheme does not comply with the relevant indicator
?	insufficient data is available from the questionnaire survey to assess compliance with the relevant indicator
na	the indicator is not applicable to a particular certification scheme. For example, certain indicators relating to accreditation of certifiers are not applicable to FSC national groups since FSC undertakes accreditation at international level.

Complete details of the analysis are contained in Documents FOR/135/00 and FOR/136/00 available from CEPI.



Progressive improvement of the matrix

It is recognised that the matrix is not a perfect tool for the valid comparison of different certification schemes. Any user of the matrix should take account of the various shortcomings identified below. A major reason for publication of the matrix as it stands is to stimulate further debate on the criteria for assessing the credibility of different certification schemes, and to encourage emerging schemes to demonstrate greater transparency. The intention is to progressively refine the matrix as more data is made available by certification schemes, as more schemes become operational, and as understanding increases. [CEPI would therefore welcome comments from interested parties on both the structure and content of the matrix.](#)

The matrix provides sound information on the organisational structure of certification schemes, and on the procedures that should determine whether certification is independent, unbiased, transparent, and broadly acceptable to a wide range of interests. However there are a number of important limitations of the matrix, which will be addressed in the future.

- The matrix provides evidence of commitment to different international forestry principles, but provides little information on the actual content of forestry performance standards, and the level at which they are set. Further data gathering and analysis is required to fulfil this need.
- The matrix provides no real indication of a scheme's relative effectiveness and efficiency in actually promoting sustainable forestry management on the ground. This information will only become available through longer term experience of forest certification.
- The matrix is dependent on information supplied by the governing bodies of certification schemes themselves.
- Many schemes are still non-operational and important decisions regarding the standards and procedures have yet to be made.
- Information to assess the economic costs and benefits of certification and commercial viability is currently inadequate. As a result one of CEPI's criteria for credibility, that "forest management certification should be cost effective and commercially viable" has been omitted from the current matrix.



Summary of CEPI criteria for forest certification schemes

- Certification should be non discriminatory between types of forests and forest owners.
- Certification bodies should be independent and impartial with no commercial interests in the object to be certified, and be adequately staffed with qualified and experienced personnel.
- Certification bodies should be accredited at national level, through internationally accepted methods of assessment and selection.
- Certification should include assessment against performance standards which are compatible with internationally recognised principles and criteria of sustainable forest management.
- Certification should include assessment against internationally recognised management system standards.
- Certification standards should be compatible with national forestry policies and regulations.
- Certification standards and institutional frameworks should be developed through a participatory consensus building process providing equal opportunities for all interests to become involved. No single interest should be allowed to dominate the process.
- Certification should be transparent so that all interests can identify and comprehend standards and institutional frameworks. There should be clear procedures and documentation.
- Certification should be repeatable, so that assessment by a range of certification bodies would produce the same results.
- Certification standards and procedures should be adaptive and regularly revised, so that they may respond to new knowledge of the forest and changing political, social, economic and environmental demands.
- Forest management certification should be cost effective and commercially viable. This entails minimising the costs of certification and the costs of locally appropriate sustainable forest management.
- If the scheme aims to provide a single issue on-product claim of good forest management, this should be based on an independent third party audit of the chain of custody, using transparent and watertight procedures, from a certified forest area or region to the point of sale.



Notes

- 1 Identifies the date when summary information in the matrix was last amended following receipt of new information.
- 2 Identifies the current status of a matrix entry as follows:
 - “Preliminary draft”: indicates matrix entry is based on CEPI’s analysis of a questionnaire response;
 - “Amended draft” indicates a matrix entry is based on CEPI’s analysis of a questionnaire response and on further comments received following review by the governing body of the certification scheme;
 - “Confirmed” indicates a matrix entry is based on CEPI’s analysis of a questionnaire, on subsequent review and comments from the certification scheme, and following wider stakeholder comment and peer review.
- 3 The Affiliations section of the matrix describes the links between national and international forest certification schemes. National schemes may, for marketing purposes, seek recognition under one or more international certification schemes. At present, two international schemes may endorse national frameworks: the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and the Pan European Forest Certification Scheme (PEFC). The matrix identifies:
 - national schemes that are fully endorsed by an international scheme. These include FSC National Working Groups that have published FSC-endorsed National Standards; and PEFC National Bodies that have developed PEFC-endorsed certification schemes.
 - national schemes that are working towards full endorsement by an international scheme. These include FSC-recognised National Working Groups yet to finalise standards; and national certification bodies that are members of PEFC but have yet to finalise a PEFC-endorsed certification scheme.
- 4 CEPI’s criterion 1 for credibility states that [“Certification should be non discriminatory between types of forests and forest owners.”](#) A certification scheme should provide equitable access to all forest owners within the geographical scope of the scheme. For international schemes, there should be equitable access to all countries. Compliance with this criterion is assessed using the following indicators:
 - the scheme has developed procedures to allow certification of all forest types (plantations, natural forest, semi-natural forest) and ownerships (private, state, community) relevant to its geographical area;
 - certification procedures have been developed to ensure that the cost of certifying small and large forest owners is more-or-less equivalent;
 - (national schemes only) representatives of all relevant forest owner groups (private industrial, private non industrial, community/indigenous people, state) have been actively involved in the standard setting process;
 - accreditation bodies comply with Section 2.1.1 of ISO Guide 61 (General requirements for assessment and accreditation of certification/registration bodies). Section 2.1.1 establishes the requirement that accreditation bodies should be administered in a non discriminatory manner;
 - certification bodies are required to comply with Section 2.1.1 of ISO Guide 62 (General requirements for bodies operating assessment and certification/registration of quality systems). Section 2.1.1 establishes the requirement that certification bodies should be administered in a non discriminatory manner.



- 5 CEPI's criterion 2 for credibility states that "Certification bodies should be independent and impartial with no commercial interests in the object to be certified, and be adequately staffed with qualified and experienced personnel." Compliance with this criterion is assessed using the following indicators:
- independent certification bodies operating under the scheme are required to comply with Sections 2.1.2 (Organisation) and 2.2 (Personnel) of ISO Guide 62. These sections of the Guide establish detailed requirements for the organisational structure and staffing of independent certification bodies designed to ensure their impartiality and professionalism;
 - the certification scheme has developed a complaints procedure, a measure which should guard against incompetence, or arbitrary and dictatorial decision making.
- 6 CEPI's Criterion 3 for credibility states that "Certification bodies should be accredited at national level, through internationally accepted methods of assessment and selection." Accreditation is the process of assessing the independence and professional competence of certification bodies. National level accreditation is preferred to ensure that certifiers are familiar with forestry management issues relevant to a particular country. Compliance with this criterion is assessed using the following indicators: the presence of accreditation procedures developed at national level;
- full compliance of the accreditation body with ISO Guide 61, which sets out internationally recognised principles for the assessment and accreditation of certification bodies;
 - affiliation of the accreditation body to the International Accreditation Forum. The Forum is an international discussion group established with the aim of ensuring the free flow of information on accreditation to improve practice and encourage harmonisation.
- 7 CEPI's criterion 4 for credibility is that "Certification should include assessment against performance standards which are compatible with internationally recognised principles and criteria of sustainable forest management". Performance standards specify the results that a forestry organisation must achieve in order to be certified (for example, a forestry organisation may have to demonstrate that it has left a 50m buffer zone around rivers; or that clearcuts can exceed no more than 50 hectares in size). As forest certification standards are generally developed at national level, the criterion is not applied to international schemes.

An indication of compliance with the criterion is provided in the matrix by a certification scheme's commitment to develop performance standards in line with one or more sets of internationally recognised Forestry Principles and Criteria. "Internationally recognised" performance standards include all those developed at inter-governmental level for specific regions of the world as follows:

- Pan European (Helsinki) Process
- Montreal Process (non-European boreal and temperate forests)
- International Tropical Timber Organisation (ITTO) Guidelines
- African Timber Organisation
- Tarapoto Process (Amazonian forests)
- Dry-Zone Africa (outcome of FAO/UNEP Expert meeting)
- Near East (outcome of FAO/UNEP Expert meeting)
- Central America (outcome of FAO/UNEP Expert meeting)



“Internationally recognised” performance standards also include the “Forest Stewardship Council Principles and Criteria of Good Forest Management” developed by non-governmental organisations.

Note that the matrix only reports on commitment to these standards, and does not provide any assessment of the actual scope of performance standards, or the level at which they have been set.

- 8 The section indicates whether the scheme meets CEPI’s criterion for management standards. Management standards are defined as the management processes which an organisation must adopt in order to be certified (for example, a forestry organisation may have to demonstrate that it has an environmental policy and has developed procedures to ensure implementation). As forest certification standards are generally developed at national level, this criterion is not applied to international schemes.

CEPI’s criterion 5 for credibility is that “[Certification should include assessment against internationally recognised management system standards](#)”. Compliance with this indicator may be determined from the matrix if certification applicants are required to undergo registration to either ISO14001 or EMAS under the forest management certification scheme. ISO14001 is the “Environmental management systems – Specification with guidance for use” published by the International Organisation for Standardisation. EMAS is the European Eco-Management and Audit Scheme.

- 9 CEPI’s criterion 6 for credibility is that “[Certification standards should be compatible with national forestry policies and regulations](#)”. Certification standards which conflict with national forest laws cannot be implemented. As forest certification standards are generally developed at national level, this criterion is not applied to international schemes. Compliance is assessed using the following indicators:

- the standards-setting body is committed to developing certification standards which comply with national forestry policies and regulations;
- the relevant regulatory authorities are involved in the standards-setting process.

- 10 CEPI’s criterion 7 for credibility is that “[Certification standards and institutional frameworks should be developed through a participatory consensus building process providing equal opportunities for all interests to become involved. No single interest should be allowed to dominate the process.](#)” Compliance is assessed using the following indicators:

- the presence of clear rules to ensure that no single interest dominates the decision making process;
- the presence of procedures to ensure all relevant interests are given opportunities to participate and influence decisions. These procedures will usually include formal committee structures, and procedures to ensure all interest groups are given the opportunity to attend and influence general meetings;
- the actual participation of all relevant interests in the decision-making process. Participation includes the major associations representing all relevant forest ownerships, forest users, industrial sectors, environmental and social groups. No significant group has purposefully and publicly excluded itself from the certification scheme;
- the presence of a clear and well understood definition of what constitutes “consensus”.



- 11 CEPI's criterion 8 for credibility is that "Certification should be transparent so that all interests can identify and comprehend standards and institutional frameworks. There should be clear procedures and documentation." Compliance is assessed using the following indicators:
- the presence of clear rules governing the provision of public information relating to certification bodies and other institutions. This may be indicated by accreditation and certification bodies respective compliance with ISO Guide 61 and ISO Guide 62. Section 2.1.7 of each guide sets out rules for the maintenance and provision of public information by accreditation and certification bodies;
 - the presence of procedures to ensure ready public access to information on the certification process. This may also be indicated by accreditation and certification bodies' respective compliance with ISO Guide 61 and ISO Guide 62, Section 2.1.7. The presence of procedures may also be demonstrated by well-publicised contact points, the ready availability of public information on the certification scheme through publications and/or a comprehensive internet site;
 - (national schemes only) the ready availability of published forest certification standards.
- 12 CEPI's criterion 9 for credibility is that "Certification should be repeatable, so that assessment by a range of certification bodies would produce the same results." Compliance is assessed using the following indicators:
- compliance of accreditation bodies with ISO Guide 61 sections 2.1.4, 2.1.5 and 3. These sections respectively set out detailed procedures for accreditation bodies' Quality system, Conditions for granting and suspending accreditation, and Requirements for assessment. Compliance should ensure consistent application of accreditation procedures.
 - compliance of certification bodies with ISO Guide 62 sections 2.1.4 Quality system, and 3 Requirements for certification/registration. Compliance should ensure consistent application of certification procedures.
- 13 CEPI's criterion 10 for credibility is that "Certification standards and procedures should be adaptive and regularly revised, so that they may respond to new knowledge of the forest and changing political, social, economic and environmental demands." Compliance is assessed using the following indicators:
- the existence of procedures to ensure the periodic review and revision of certification standards;
 - the existence of procedures for the regular monitoring and re-accreditation of certifiers;
 - the existence of an on-going training programme for accreditation body and standards body personnel.
- 14 CEPI's criterion 11 for credibility is that "If the scheme aims to provide a single issue on-product claim of good forest management, this should be based on an independent third party audit of the chain of custody, using transparent and watertight procedures, from a certified forest area or region to the point of sale." Since product labelling procedures are usually developed at international level, this criterion is applied to international schemes only. Compliance is assessed using the following indicators:
- the existence of chain of custody auditing procedures;
 - the existence of clear guidance regarding product claims.



About CEPI

The Confederation of European Paper Industries (CEPI) is a Brussels-based non-profit making organisation which is both the forum for and voice of the European pulp and paper industry. It represents 18 member countries (13 European Union Member States plus Norway and Switzerland with three Associate Members, Hungary, the Czech and Slovak Republics) and through its member countries, some 1,000 pulp-, paper and board-producing companies across Europe, from small and medium-sized enterprises to multinationals.

CEPI represents the interests of the European pulp and paper industry to the European Union (EU) institutions through its four Standing Committees — the Environment, Forest, Recycling and Association Directors' Committee (ADC) and through working groups covering research, food contact, electronic data interchange (EDI), trade, statistics, communications and starch.

CEPI monitors and analyses EU legislation and initiatives taken at EU level in the fields of industrial, environmental, energy, forestry, recycling and fiscal policies.

It provides a forum for its members to exchange information and to act on emerging issues, to define common positions and to make expert and constructive contributions to the industry consultation process required by the European Treaties.

CEPI possesses a wide source of information on the pulp and paper industry in Europe, and, through its members, can provide information on the industry in individual Member States. It provides technical assistance to legislators, and can identify independent experts to answer specific questions. By working proactively, CEPI is able to better inform interested parties about the pulp and paper industry and issues of concern to the industry.

Prepared by Rupert Oliver, Independent Consultant, on behalf of CEPI - November 2000



250 Avenue Louise
Box 80
B-1050 Brussels
Belgium

Tel +32 2 627 49 11
Fax +32 2 646 81 37
mail@cepi.org

www.cepi.org
www.paperonline.org