

CALIBRATION WEBINAR

Forest Management Evaluations Standard

FSC-STD-20-007 V4-0

Forest Management Team

16 July 2024

Calibration webinar: FSC-STD-20-007 V4



AGENDA



Topic		Time	Presenter
1	Welcome & Introduction	4 min.	Diana
2	Summary of revision process and roll-out timeline	5 min.	Diana
3	Responses to questions submitted by CBs	45 min.	Lauri/Steve
4	Questions and additional points for discussion	5 min.	All
5	Next steps for roll-out	1 min.	Diana

Introduction

Presenters

Purpose of the session:

- Support the implementation of FSC-STD-20-007 V4 by CBs.
- Clarify questions and topics submitted by CBs through survey.



Diana Franco
Policy Manager,
FSC International



Steve Ball
Senior Expert Strategic
Technologies
FSC International



Lauri Moisander
Consultant,
Luontoa Ltd.

SUMMARY OF REVISION PROCESS



ROLL-OUT TIMELINE

Beginning transition
period

CB meeting
Calibration workshop

End of transition
period



1 July 2023

16 July 2024

10-12 Sept. 2024

31 Oct. 2024

31 Dec. 2024



First calibration
webinar

Cross-walk V3 & V4 published



Second calibration
webinar



RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CBS

Setting the scene

Focus topics for the webinar

INFORMATION SHARING

**AUDIT METHOD
DETERMINATION**

REPORTING AND ‘DAR’

**AUDIT TIME
DETERMINATION**

SAMPLING

RISK ASSESSMENTS

Questions received for the webinar:

INFORMATION SHARING

Requirement to request documents in advance (audit type applicability and roles)

AUDIT TIME DETERMINATION

What are the expectations of FSC for the determination of audit time?

AUDIT METHOD DETERMINATION

What are the expectations of FSC for the determination of the audit method?

What type of eligibility criteria exist for applying remote audit method for parts of an FM evaluation.

When is Table 7 applicable for non-SLIMF MUs?

SAMPLING

Guidance on sampling with real-world examples, especially for mixed SLIMF/no-SLIMF groups and Multiple MU certificates. Clear review of each topic that is changing with the new version of 20-007.

Selecting MUs and sites for evaluation.

REPORTING AND 'DAR'

Technical support on DAR – to date no tool for transferring data from one report to another has been developed, which obstructs the audit planning process

DAR questions which are not part of Table 8 (what is normative?)

RISK ASSESSMENTS

Application of NFSS Risk Assessments in FM evaluations.

Additional information sources



An FAQ document has been developed and published on the revised FSC-STD-20-007. Additional items may be included into the non-normative FAQ upon request. Please visit the FSC-STD-20-007 process page for the FAQ.



A crosswalk file between V3-0 and V4-0 of the FSC-STD-20-007 has been developed and will be shared with CBs this week.



Additional webinars will be outlined by Diana at the end of this webinar and published in the CB Forum.

STRUCTURE

PART I **General requirements**

1. Basic principles
2. **Information access and collection**
3. **Application of NFSS Risk Assessments**
4. **Determination of audit time**
5. **Determination of audit method**
6. Preparation for pre-evaluation
7. Preparation requirements for main evaluation
8. **Selecting MUs and sites for evaluation**

Annex 1 – Eligibility criteria for remote auditing

Annex 5 – CB adaptation of NFSS Risk Assessment

PART II **FM evaluations**

9. Pre-evaluation
10. Main evaluation
11. Surveillance evaluation
12. Re-evaluation
13. Conflicts between laws and regulations

Annex 2 – Examples of documents and records

Annex 3 – Examples of sites for evaluation

PART III **Certification decision**

14. General requirements
15. Non-conformities and corrective action requests
16. Non-conformities in Forest Management Groups

PART IV **Reporting**

17. Evaluation report
18. Public summary

Annex 4 – Content of the evaluation report and public summary

INFORMATION SHARING

Q: Requirement to request documents in advance (audit type applicability and roles)

BACKGROUND

- Clause 2.1 introduces the explicit possibility to share the audit checklist (DAR template) with CHs
 - Possibility to pre-fill contents of the DAR template
 - Envisioned to decrease audit time
- Clause 2.2 has been extended from main evaluations to all evaluations
 - Advance supply of key documents may make the audit more efficient (previously pertained to main evaluations)

The aim of the newly introduced Section 2 has been to make the information sharing prior to the audit mandatory. The DAR has been envisioned to provide a functional platform for enabling this information sharing.

AUDIT TIME DETERMINATION

AUDIT TIME DETERMINATION

Q: What are the expectations of FSC for the determination of audit time?

BACKGROUND

Clause 4.1. The certification body shall maintain a procedure for calculating audit times needed to execute and complete effective audits considering, but not limited to, the activities below:

- Opening and closing meetings
- Document review
- Interviews
- Stakeholder consultation
- Travel time during audit
- Collect and verify information
- Evaluation of open NCs
- Analysing and compiling audit findings

Clause 4.2. Based on this procedure, the certification body shall record and justify the audit time in person days for each evaluation in the evaluation report.

AUDIT TIME DETERMINATION

Q: What are the expectations of FSC for the determination of audit time?

DISCUSSION

FSC has no explicit expectations regarding the appropriate determination of audit time by certification bodies.

- ▶ ADVICE-20-007-19 Forest Management Auditing Time – deemed not to be an appropriate approach.
- ▶ FSC understands that each CB have their own processes and procedures for determining the audit time necessary to successfully carrying out an evaluation.
- ▶ These processes are now required to be transparent and captured in the evaluation report and the public summary.

AUDIT METHOD DETERMINATION



AUDIT METHOD DETERMINATION

Q: What are the expectations of FSC for the determination of the audit method?

Q: What type of eligibility criteria exist for applying remote audit method for parts of an FM evaluation.

Q: When is Table 7 applicable for non-SLIMF MUs?

BACKGROUND

- Pandemic response – derogations and remote auditing procedures were forced upon FSC
- Revision included – Review of ISEAL guidance on remote auditing, ASI study on remote audit performance, CB and CH experiences, and results of public consultations and field testing
- Prescriptive and preventive vs. Flexibility and proactive measures
- SLIMF/CF and non-SLIMF – very different approaches throughout the revision process, and the final approach was developed after extensive iteration and feedback from stakeholders

AUDIT METHOD DETERMINATION

SLIMF AND COMMUNITY FORESTS

PRESCRIPTIVE – LAYS OUT A ‘DEFAULT AUDIT METHOD’

- FSC-STD-20-007 V3-0: SLIMF MUs possible to be remotely evaluated for conformity under specific circumstances
- FSC-STD-20-007 V4-0: Prescribed intensity and frequency of on-site audits – additional factors may influence this intensity and frequency
 - Single SLIMF / Community MU
 - SLIMF <100 members / Community < 50,000 ha
 - SLIMF >100 members / Community > 50,000 ha

Organization Type	Default audit method
Organizations <u>not</u> managing SLIMF or community forests	The certification body shall conduct an annual on-site audit of the relevant aspects for all types of evaluations. NOTE: Certain aspects of the evaluation (e.g., document review, stakeholder interviews, analysis of maps or satellite imagery, etc.) may be verified remotely provided that the eligibility criteria specified in Annex 1 are met.
Organizations managing a single SLIMF or a single community forest	The certification body shall conduct on-site audits at the main evaluation and in one surveillance evaluation during the five-year-period of validity of certification. The remaining surveillance evaluations shall be conducted remotely, unless: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there are outstanding corrective actions to be evaluated which may require on-site verification; or • complaints requiring on-site verification; or • The Organization requests an on-site audit; or • the certification body provides justification that an on-site audit is necessary to obtain objective evidence to verify conformity related to any aspect of the evaluation.
Organizations managing forest management groups or sub-groups of SLIMF and/or community forests	The certification body shall conduct on-site audits at the main evaluation, during the first surveillance evaluation, and at least one additional surveillance evaluation during the five-year-period of validity of certification. For Organizations managing forest management groups or subgroups with MUs that qualify as community forests of <50,000 ha, or with less than 100 MUs that qualify as SLIMF, the remaining surveillance evaluations shall be conducted remotely, unless: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there are outstanding corrective actions to be evaluated which may require on-site verification; or • complaints requiring on-site verification; or • The Organization requests an on-site audit; or • the certification body provides justification that an on-site audit is necessary to obtain objective evidence to verify conformity related to any aspect of the evaluation. For Organizations managing forest management groups or subgroups with MUs that qualify as community forests of ≥50,000 ha, or with 100 or more MUs that qualify as SLIMF, the remaining surveillance evaluations may be conducted remotely, unless: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there are outstanding corrective actions to be evaluated which may require on-site verification; or

AUDIT METHOD DETERMINATION



SLIMF AND COMMUNITY FORESTS

	Non-SLIMF/-CF	SLIMF / Community > 50,000 ha / > 100 members	SLIMF / Community < 50,000 ha / <100 members	Single SLIMF / Community MU
Main evaluation	On-site	On-site	On-site	On-site
1 st surveillance	On-site	On-site	On-site	1/4 Shall be on-site 3/4 Shall be remote*
2 nd surveillance		1/3 Shall be on-site 2/3 May be remote*	1/3 Shall be on-site 2/3 Shall be remote*	
3 rd surveillance				
4 th surveillance				
Re-evaluation	On-site	On-site	On-site	On-site

* Unless there is anything necessitating an on-site audit

Parts of any evaluation may be conducted remotely following specific eligibility criteria.

The selection of audit method is always required to be reported on in the DAR

AUDIT METHOD DETERMINATION

NON-SLIMF

FLEXIBILITY THROUGH PARTIAL REMOTE AUDITING POSSIBILITY

- Non-SLIMF MUs always require an on-site audit
- The Annex 1 (Table 7) provides a generic list of eligibility criteria that CBs should utilize when selecting an appropriate audit method that includes any form of remote auditing
- Necessary to understand:
 - What type of evidence of conformity may be evaluated remotely (availability of accurate imagery of forestry, technological and cultural appropriateness of videoconferencing, etc.)
- CBs shall describe and justify the most appropriate audit method selected for each evaluation

ANNEX 1 ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR APPLYING REMOTE AUDIT METHOD FOR PARTS OF AN FM EVALUATION OF ORGANIZATIONS NOT QUALIFYING AS SLIMF OR COMMUNITY FORESTS

Below are considerations the certification body shall take into account when considering the remote audit method for parts of an FM evaluation of Organizations not qualifying as either SLIMF or community forests. The list of criteria assumes a risk-based approach to efficient audit planning and requires the certification body to evaluate possibilities to apply remote audit techniques in applicable circumstances. The considerations guide the certification body to evaluate critical aspects that affect the ability to conduct an evaluation of conformity, but the certification body may use additional considerations when evaluating which parts of a particular evaluation need to be conducted on-site.

1. If the criteria in Table 7 below are met, then the respective aspect may be audited remotely at the discretion of the certification body.

Table 7. Eligibility criteria for applying remote audit method for parts of an FM evaluation of organizations not qualifying as SLIMF or community forests.

Topic	Criteria	Criteria met
Document review	It is possible to access information securely and confidentially from The Organization remotely (e.g., inventory data, maps, shape files, satellite imagery). The Organization is able to share securely and confidentially real-time (immediately while the audit is taking place) documents and systems remotely with the certification body.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non-conformities	There are no open non-conformities requiring on-site evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Workers Interviews	The Organization and the auditors have communication tools and technologies that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• sufficient for videoconference;• accessible to all relevant workers included in the scope of the audit without having to use The Organization's facilities and accessible throughout the full range of The Organization's MUs included in the scope of the audit.	<input type="checkbox"/>

SAMPLING

Q: Guidance on sampling with real-world examples, especially for mixed SLIMF/no-SLIMF groups and Multiple MU certificates. Clear review of each topic that is changing with the new version of 20-007.

Q: Selecting MUs and sites for evaluation – especially changes related to multiple MU sampling.

BACKGROUND

- Alignment with the FSC-STD-30-005 V2-0 (incl. concept of **‘active/inactive’ MU**, forestry contractors)
- Streamlining the requirements and content of the FSC-STD-20-007
- Emphasis on **sets of ‘like’ MUs** – sub-sampling to focus on uniform forest areas

PERTINENT CHANGES

Multiple MU certification

- Minimum sample size for re-evaluation to follow that of the main evaluation
- Focus on sets of 'like' MUs when selecting the minimum sample size – the more variation in MUs, the higher the minimum sample size

Group certification

- Introduction of the 'active/inactive' MU concept to the set of 'like' MUs concept
- Clarified sampling rules and clear tables illustrating the applicable formulas
- RMU concept clarified
- Forestry contractors included in the scope of FM Groups now incorporated into the FM evaluations sampling

REPORTING AND 'DAR'

REPORTING AND 'DAR'

Q: DAR questions which are not part of Table 8 (what is normative?)

Q: Technical support on DAR – to date no tool for transferring data from one report to another has been developed, which obstructs the audit planning process

BACKGROUND

- Table 8 in Annex 4 provides the minimum reporting requirements in a condensed format (heading). These requirements are further developed in the fields in the DAR.
- According to clause 17.1, FSC may introduce changes to reporting requirements in accordance with FSC-PRO-01-001.
- Discussions are underway with our contractor to assess a timeline by which we could have a data transfer tool.

RISK ASSESSMENTS

Q: Application of NFSS Risk Assessments in FM evaluations.

BACKGROUND

- The FSC-PRO-60-010 has been developed to allow for a country-/region specific risk assessment to be conducted for the FSS – either a sub-set of requirements or all requirements are provided with a risk designation

Low risk | **Undesignated risk** | **Specified risk**

- FSC-STD-20-007 now further allows the country-/region specific risk assessments to be deployed for the purpose of conducting efficient conformity assessments; AND
- To adapt the risk designations at the level of individual Organizations

RISK ASSESSMENTS

WITHOUT AN FSS RISK ASSESSMENT



- No change
- Section 3 is redundant
- Prescribed list of minimum Criteria to be evaluated during Surveillance evaluations (Section 11)
- Full set of FSS requirements to be evaluated during re-evaluation

WITH AN FSS RISK ASSESSMENT



- CBs to prioritize FSS RA risk designations in evaluations
- Potential suggestions for assurance techniques proposed by FSS RA
- Improved understanding of factors influencing risk of non-conformity at the national level
- Focus of evaluations on specified risk requirements rather than prescribed list of requirements (Section 11)
- Low risk requirements are not evaluated against conformity outside of main evaluation (if no substantiated claims or other risks of NC are detected)

EXAMPLES ON ADAPTING THE RISK DESIGNATIONS

DOWNGRADE OF RISK DESIGNATION AT THE LEVEL OF AN ORGANIZATION

- No observed NCs over a period of time and demonstrated ability to control and mitigate a specific risk better than average
- Downgrades of risk designations are needed to be captured in evaluation reports and **public summaries**

UPGRADE OF RISK DESIGNATION AT THE LEVEL OF AN ORGANIZATION

- Poor control mechanisms or management system insufficiencies increasing risks related to conformance
- Substantiated complaints/disputes/other valid concerns raised against the performance of the Organization
- Upgrades of risk designations are captured in the evaluation reports (but not in public summaries)



QUESTIONS AND ADDITIONAL POINTS FOR DISCUSSION

NEXT STEPS FOR ROLL- OUT

Next steps

- Calibration workshop during CB meeting, 10–12 September in Bonn.
- Second calibration webinar on Thursday, October 31st from 14:00 to 15:00 CET.

**Contribute to the agenda for both events by submitting questions and topics via the following form.
This survey will also be shared via the CB forum:**

- ▶ <https://forms.office.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=22lOEmXva0mWqV1WvsHskQUpSLPPCHVDtISU0zWld71UOUM4RFg5T0pTTVJNMkw2R1JTUIQ5V1c0Ty4u>

FAQ and cross-walk are available at :

- ▶ [Revision of the Forest Management Evaluations Standard \(FSC-STD-20-007\) and associated addenda | FSC Connect](#)

Email for questions: forestmanagement@fsc.org

Thank you



Forest Stewardship Council®

FSC® International Center



Adenauerallee 134, 53113 Bonn, Germany

T +49 (0) 228 367 66-0

F +49 (0) 228 367 66-65

FSC International Center © All rights reserved

FSC® F000100

www.fsc.org