



Forest Stewardship Council®



# Interpretations of the normative framework

CONTROLLED WOOD

11 MARCH 2016



# Table of content

Page 4-17  Standards

Page 18-24  Directives

<b>STANDARDS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>FSC-STD-20-012 EVALUATION OF FSC CONTROLLED WOOD IN FOREST MANAGEMENT ENTERPRISES</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>FSC-STD-30-010 (V2-0) FSC CONTROLLED WOOD STANDARD FOR FOREST MANAGEMENT ENTERPRISES</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>FSC-STD-40-005 (V2-1) FSC STANDARD FOR COMPANY EVALUATION OF FSC CONTROLLED WOOD</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>DIRECTIVES</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>FSC-DIR-40-005 FSC DIRECTIVE ON FSC CONTROLLED WOOD</b>	<b>18</b>

## STANDARDS

### **FSC-STD-20-012 EVALUATION OF FSC CONTROLLED WOOD IN FOREST MANAGEMENT ENTERPRISES**

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-20-012_01 (also published under FSC-STD-30-010 with code INT-STD-30-010_06)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Clause 1.1.
<b>Publication date</b>	10 July 2015
<p><b>1) Is the conversion of plantations that have previously been established on agricultural land back to agricultural land acceptable according to the requirements of FSC-STD-30-010 (Clause 6.1)?</b></p> <p><b>2) Are abandoned (unmanaged) plantations established on agricultural land and destined for conversion back to agricultural land eligible for certification according to FSC-STD-30-010?</b></p> <p>1) Yes. Only conversion of natural and semi-natural forests and other wooded ecosystems such as woodlands and savannahs to plantation or non-forest uses is not allowed according to the standard (with exceptions specified in Clause 6.3).</p> <p>2) No. The certification of abandoned or unmanaged plantations does not meet the intent of the standard, which is designed for application by forest management enterprises (FMEs) at the forest management unit (FMU) level. According to the definitions of FME and FMU, the implementation of the standard involves forest management, which shall not be downgraded to clear cutting of plantations.</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-20-012_02 (also published under FSC-STD-30-010 with code INT-STD-30-010_07)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Clauses 7.2-7.7
<b>Publication date</b>	19 August 2015

**According to Clause 7.4 of FSC-STD-20-012 V1-1, “A non-compliance shall be considered major if, either alone or in combination with further non-compliances of other indicators, it results in, or is likely to result in a fundamental failure to achieve the objectives of the standard in the forest management unit(s) within the scope of the evaluation.”**

**How shall this be interpreted when considering non-compliances with requirements relating to the five Controlled Wood categories (Sections 3-7 of FSC-STD-30-010 V2-0)?**

Non-compliances for requirements relating to the five Controlled Wood categories (Sections 3-7 of FSC-STD-30-010 V2-0) shall always be considered major. As per Clauses 7.6 and 7.7 of FSC-20-012 V1-1, the certification body shall not issue or reissue a certificate if there is a major non-compliance with the requirements of the standard, and the certificate shall be suspended or withdrawn if a major non-compliance is identified after the Controlled Wood certificate has been issued, respectively. The note under Clause 7.6 of the standard does not apply to major non-compliances for Controlled Wood categories.

Minor non-compliances are only possible in instances where requirements for Sections 1 and 2 of FSC-STD-30-010 V2-0 are not implemented correctly, and the status of the material as “FSC Controlled Wood” is not affected.

## **FSC-STD-30-010 (V2-0) FSC CONTROLLED WOOD STANDARD FOR FOREST MANAGEMENT ENTERPRISES**

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-30-010_01 (also published under FSC-STD-40-005 with code INT-STD-40-005_02)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	FSC-STD-30-010
<b>Publication date</b>	31 January 2012
<p><b>Within a National Initiative “unspecified risk” category, is it possible for a company to classify a smaller district as “low risk”?</b></p> <p>No, unless done at the FMU level through the process described in Annex 3 of FSC-STD-40-005. According to this standard, where national or regional interpretation or guidance relating to Annex 2 has been provided by an FSC accredited National Initiative, this interpretation shall prevail.</p> <p>Other option would be that the Forest Manager got certified according to FSC-STD-30-010.</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-30-010_06 (also published under FSC-STD-20-012 with code INT-STD-20-012_01)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Section A (Scope), Clause 6.1
<b>Publication date</b>	10 July 2015
<p><b>1) Is the conversion of plantations that have previously been established on agricultural land back to agricultural land acceptable according to the requirements of FSC-STD-30-010 (Clause 6.1)?</b></p> <p><b>2) Are abandoned (unmanaged) plantations established on agricultural land and destined for conversion back to agricultural land eligible for certification according to FSC-STD-30-010?</b></p> <p>1) Yes. Only conversion of natural and semi-natural forests and other wooded ecosystems such as woodlands and savannahs to plantation or non-forest uses is not allowed according to the standard (with exceptions specified in Clause 6.3).</p> <p>2) No. The certification of abandoned or unmanaged plantations does not meet the intent of the standard, which is designed for application by forest management enterprises (FMEs) at the forest management unit (FMU) level. According to the definitions of FME and FMU, the implementation of the standard involves forest management, which shall not be downgraded to clear cutting of plantations.</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-30-010_02 V2-0
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Clause 3.2, Intent Box.
<b>Publication date</b>	4 May 2012

**In countries where there is an approved FSC National Standard, how should approved elements in the national standard which could equally pertain to the interpretation and application of Controlled Wood (FSC -STD-30-010 V2-0) be regarded?**

Where elements of an approved national standard can be equally applied to the interpretation and application of Controlled Wood in a given country, these elements shall be applied in relation to the specific category of Controlled Wood; e.g. advice in the national standard on the assessment of legal compliance.

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-30-010_04
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Clause 1 e) (Note)
<b>Publication date</b>	21 August 2013

**How should the nationally developed HCV Framework be applied according to the standard FSC-STD-30-010?**

**The standard FSC-STD-30-010 requires, that the Forest Management Enterprise shall consider guidance that may be provided by FSC International, FSC regional offices, or by FSC accredited national initiatives in relation to interpreting the requirements of FSC-STD-30-010 in a particular national or sub-national context.**

**There is an approved 'High Conservation Values (HCVs) evaluation framework for use in the con-text of implementing FSC Certification to the FSC Principles and Criteria and Controlled Wood standards' developed by FSC Australia. The following questions aim to clarify how to implement the Framework.**

**How shall requirements be interpreted that use the term 'consider' – are all the elements of the Framework mandatory? Or can the FME select which elements they deem to be relevant?**

**Do all of the steps need to be followed for each HCV1-6? Note that some of the steps have been pointed out to be contradictory.**

**Is there any difference in the Framework requirements for SLIMF or plantation forest?**

FME shall use approved HCV Framework and apply all its elements relevant for FME. In case of contradiction these shall be reported to relevant FSC National Partner and PSU.

SLIMF: HCV Framework serves mainly for HCV identification. Annex 2 of FSC-STD-30-010 (5.2) requires HCVs identification, thus HCV Framework shall be used in SLIMF operations.

Plantation: Framework shall also be used for plantations when relevant as per Framework contents.

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-30-010_05 V 2-0
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Clause 4.2
<b>Publication date</b>	19 May 2014
<p><b>Shall the certification body issue a non-compliance against Clause 4.2 and/or 4.5 of FSC-STD-30-010 where a minority of stakeholders do not agree on the dispute resolution process?</b></p> <p>Non-conformity against Clause 4.2 shall be issued in cases where a stakeholder(s) that is one of the main parties in the dispute disagrees with the resolution process. Non-conformity against Clause 4.2 shall not be issued in cases where the stakeholder(s) that disagrees is not one of the main parties to the dispute.</p> <p>The main parties to the dispute are those who are directly involved in the dispute (e.g. complainants/plaintiffs and defendants to which the claim is made against).</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-30-010_07 (also published under FSC-STD-20-012 with code INT-STD-20-012_02)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Sections 3-7
<b>Publication date</b>	19 August 2015
<p><b>According to Clause 7.4 of FSC-STD-20-012 V1-1, “A non-compliance shall be considered major if, either alone or in combination with further non-compliances of other indicators, it results in, or is likely to result in a fundamental failure to achieve the objectives of the standard in the forest management unit(s) within the scope of the evaluation.”</b></p> <p><b>How shall this be interpreted when considering non-compliances with requirements relating to the five Controlled Wood categories (Sections 3-7 of FSC-STD-30-010 V2-0)?</b></p> <p>Non-compliances for requirements relating to the five Controlled Wood categories (Sections 3-7 of FSC-STD-30-010 V2-0) shall always be considered major. As per Clauses 7.6 and 7.7 of FSC-20-012 V1-1, the certification body shall not issue or reissue a certificate if there is a major non-compliance with the requirements of the standard, and the certificate shall be suspended or withdrawn if a major non-compliance is identified after the Controlled Wood certificate has been issued, respectively. The note under Clause 7.6 of the standard does not apply to major non-compliances for Controlled Wood categories.</p> <p>Minor non-compliances are only possible in instances where requirements for Sections 1 and 2 of FSC-STD-30-010 V2-0 are not implemented correctly, and the status of the material as “FSC Controlled Wood’ is not affected.</p>	

---

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-30-010_03 V2-0
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Section 6
<b>Publication date</b>	8 February 2013

**The use of the present tense (*being converted; take place, etc.*) suggests that FSC accepts conversion that has happened in the past. But until when? What is the cut-off date?**

The cut-off date for FSC certification for controlled wood for forest management enterprises is the date when the organization signs the certification agreement with the CAB as this document includes the general requirement to adhere to all applicable rules and regulations as published by FSC (see FSC-STD-20-001 V3-0 Clause 7.2 c).

## **FSC-STD-40-005 (V2-1) FSC STANDARD FOR COMPANY EVALUATION OF FSC CONTROLLED WOOD**

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_04 (also published under FSC-DIR-40-005 with code INT-DIR-40-005_02)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Applies to all requirements where the CPI is mentioned
<b>Publication date</b>	6 September 2013
<p><b>In 2012 the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) changed from a scale of 0-10 to a scale of 0-100. Shall the new 0-100 CPI scale be implemented in FSC normative documents that currently still reference the previous 0-10 scale system?</b></p> <p>Yes, CPI references in FSC normative documents using the 0-10 scale system shall be converted to the new scale.</p> <p>A reference to a CPI index threshold '5' based on the old scale system becomes a CPI index '50' applying the new scale.</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_06 V 2-1
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Categories 2, 3, 4
<b>Publication date</b>	18 May 2014
<p><b>Can material originating from artificially submerged forests be evaluated according to the standard FSC-STD-40-005?</b></p> <p>Materials harvested from standing "dead" forests that have been e.g. submerged to construct water reservoirs or dams are eligible for evaluation under the FSC Controlled Wood Standard FSC-STD-40-005 V2-1. In this case the district shall be set at the submerged area in question.</p> <p>When evaluating conformance with the standard, special attention shall be given to the requirements of Controlled Wood Categories 2, 3 and 4, which, depending on circumstances, may be particularly challenging to be met.</p> <p>This interpretation supersedes any former interpretations relevant for this question.</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_14 (also published under FSC-DIR-40-005 with code INT-DIR-40-005_10)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	7.1
<b>Publication date</b>	9 July 2014
<p><b>Can timber of unknown origin collected from beaches be evaluated according to the standard FSC-STD-40-005?</b></p> <p>No, timber collected from beaches is not eligible for evaluation under the FSC Controlled Wood Standard FSC-STD-40-005 V2-1.</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_16 V2-1 (also published under FSC-DIR-40-005 with code INT-DIR-40-005_11)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	9.1
<b>Publication date</b>	10 October 2014

**If a certified company sources material that has previously been FSC certified or covered by another company's FSC Controlled Wood verification program but has since been traded by a non-certified company (therefore breaking the Chain of Custody), can this material be considered controlled with-out conducting a full verification program and risk assessment?**

For previously FSC-certified material from a broken Chain of Custody to be considered as FSC Controlled Wood, the company must trace the material back to the certified company that traded it to the non-certified company where the Chain of Custody was broken, and conduct an audit of the supply chain. This audit shall demonstrate with verifiable documentation that the material is identifiable and traceable and has not been mixed with uncontrolled material.

For previously controlled material from a broken Chain of Custody to be considered as FSC Controlled Wood, the district of origin must be determined within/through the company's own Controlled Wood verification program, for which all relevant normative requirements apply. For this purpose, risk assessments performed by other entities (e.g. a supplier with a valid FSC certificate that includes FSC Controlled Wood in its scope that sold FSC Controlled Wood (without a claim) to a non-certified entity) may be used as additional sources of information.

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_11 V2-1 (also published under FSC-DIR-40-005 with code INT-DIR-40-005_07)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Section 11
<b>Publication date</b>	9 July 2014

**In cases where there is an approved national risk assessment, is it acceptable for the certificate holder to use the National Risk Assessment to satisfy the controlled wood requirements for conducting a risk assessment as specified in FSC-STD-40-005 and FSC-DIR-40-005, rather than having to generate its own risk assessment?**

The use of approved National Risk Assessments (NRAs) for sourcing Controlled Wood according to FSC-STD-40-005 is mandatory. Certificate holders have different options for aligning their verification programs with the results of applicable NRAs. Certificate holders may, for example, use NRAs available on FSC's website and/or the Global Forest Registry, or generate or update a new or existing company-developed risk assessment with the risk designation(s) provided in relevant NRAs. These examples are not exhaustive.

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_05 (also published under FSC-DIR-40-005 with code INT-DIR-40-005_03)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Clause 11.1
<b>Publication date</b>	5 February 2014

**Which process shall be implemented if a certified FMU is under suspension in a district that has been designated as low risk for all CW categories either by a National Risk Assessment or by a COC Certificate Holder in their FSC Controlled Wood verification pro-gram when the COC Certificate Holder wants to source from this FMU?**

At the moment of suspension the products sold by the certified FMU\* are losing their FSC status. As the FMU is located in a designated low risk district for CW, the products may still be sourced as “controlled material” under the following conditions:

1. As some or all CW categories may be affected by activities that led to the suspension of the FMU, the COC Certificate Holder shall review and if necessary revise their risk assessment for the area of the suspended FMU.
2. The review/revision of the risk assessment shall be completed by the COC Certificate Holder within a period of two months from the date of suspension of the FMU certificate.
3. The COC Certificate Holder shall submit the reviewed/revise risk assessment to their CB for verification.
4. The reviewed/revise risk assessment shall be verified by the CB no later than one month after the COC Certificate Holder has submitted its reviewed/revise risk assessment, before it can be applied (see FSC-STD-40-005 V2-1 Clause 11.1).
5. As the whole district is considered low risk, the products sourced from the suspended FMU are considered controlled until the verification of the reviewed/revise risk assessment is completed by the relevant CB.
6. The outcome of the review/revision process including verification by the relevant CB will then determine the risk designation for the suspended FMU.
7. Material sourced from the area shall be classified as unspecified risk, if the timelines of review/revision and verification of the risk assessment (2, 4) is not met.

\* according to the standard FSC-STD-01-001 or FSC-STD-30-010

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_18 (also published under FSC-DIR-40-005 with code INT-DIR-40-005_12)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Clause 13.2, Annex 3
<b>Publication date</b>	28 October 2014
<p><b>Shall the outcomes of a company verification program according to Annex 3 be made publicly available?</b></p> <p>No, currently there are no requirements for publishing the outcomes of verification according to Annex 3. The standard does not limit such an opportunity, however.</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_08 V2-1
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Section 14
<b>Publication date</b>	9 July 2014
<p><b>If a company receives a complaint regarding their risk assessment and/or company verification program, does it matter if the complainant identifies the complaint as formal or informal as per the FSC Dispute Resolution Process?</b></p> <p>No, it does not matter. The company is required to deal with all complaints that are received according to the requirements of Section 14 of FSC-STD-40-005, irrespective of the complaint classification by a complainant. Controlled Wood requirements for the handling of complaints by Certificate Holders are not subject to the FSC Dispute Resolution Process and shall be evaluated by the Certificate Holder, according to their own mechanism.</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_09 (also published under FSC-DIR-40-005 with code INT-DIR-40-005_05)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Annex 1
<b>Publication date</b>	9 July 2014
<p><b>With regards to Category 3 (HCV), what is the minimal level of detail for describing the sourcing in the district of origin in the published company risk assessment? If the district of origin includes potentially controversial sources, when the company describes their sourcing in this area, must the description of their sourcing explicitly state that they are not sourcing from controversial FMUs in that district?</b></p> <p>The minimum required information to be included in the publically available results of the risk assessment are provided in ADVICE 40-005-07 of FSC-DIR-40-005, which applies to all CW categories. In case of potentially controversial activities in FMUs located in a low risk district (See ADVICE 40-005-02 of FSC-DIR-40-005), a company should mention the existing FMUs with potential controversial activities in the publically available results of a risk assessment.</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_15 (also published under FSC-DIR-40-005 with code INT-DIR-40-005_04)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Annex 1
<b>Publication date</b>	9 July 2014

**How should companies treat ecoregions that are not within the WWF Global 200 but are listed as ‘critical/endangered’ or ‘threatened’ by WWF? Should this information always be included in risk assessments, under 3.1?**

The standard requires consideration of ‘ecoregionally significant HCVs’ and does not limit the recognition of ecoregions to Global 200 ecoregions. General references provided in the standard direct to WWF sources without limitation to Global 200 ecoregions (FSC-STD-40-005, Annex 1, definition of ecoregion). Therefore, information about threatened ecoregions other than the examples provided in FSC-STD-40-005 and FSC-DIR-40-005 should be taken into account. The company shall not ignore known and available sources of information in addition to the ones listed in normative documents.

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_13 V2-1 (also published under FSC-DIR-40-005 with code INT-DIR-40-005_09)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Annex 1
<b>Publication date</b>	9 July 2014

**Can a district of origin cover more than one country? If so, is a separate risk assessment required for each country, given the heterogeneity in assessing risk between two different sets of laws? What about within countries where the sub-national units (states, provinces, etc.) have the independence to create their own resource use and protection laws?**

According to its definition, a ‘district’ is considered to be a generic geographical definition within a country. Subject to the above, various guidance and requirements are provided stating that how a district shall be established depends on the CW category under assessment. In the case of National Risk Assessments (NRAs) it is possible to develop shared NRAs for countries sharing homogenous conditions (e.g. sharing the same ecoregions), according to the procedure FSC-PRO-60-002 V2-0 (FSC Controlled Wood Risk Assessments by FSC accredited National Initiatives, National and Regional offices).

Subject to the specific conditions of each CW category, the division of a country into sub-national units (e.g. states, provinces) will only impact how a district is defined if those divisions result in increased heterogeneity of the level or type of risk that is assessed within them.

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_10 V2-1 (also published under FSC-DIR-40-005 with code INT-DIR-40-005_06)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Annex 1
<b>Publication date</b>	9 July 2014

**Does the concept of ‘minimally disturbed by human economic activity’ in the definition of Intact Forest Landscape include fire suppression?**

Regarding definition of Intact Forest Landscape, firefighting or prevention for the protection of public safety is not considered an economic activity. Fire control in the context of forest management activities is not considered to be an economic activity of minimal disturbance.

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_12 (also published under FSC-DIR-40-005 with code INT-DIR-40-005_08)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Annex 2
<b>Publication date</b>	9 July 2014

**Is a CoC-certified harvesting company that DOES NOT own or manage the forest required to conduct a nature value assessment when conducting a risk assessment according to Annex 2 of FSC-STD-40-005, when a nature value assessment is required by the respective National Forest Stewardship Standard?**

No, a company that is conducting a risk assessment according to Annex 2 of FSC-STD-40-005 (V2-1) is not required to perform a nature value assessment, unless it is required by an approved national guidance as per Annex 2, part A, Clause 2 of FSC-STD-40-005 and/or as per FSC-DIR-40-005-09, Clause 3 (Advice).

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_07 V2-1
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Annex 2, part B, Section 2
<b>Publication date</b>	9 July 2014

**How should a risk assessment be conducted following Clause 2.5 when ILO 169 is not ratified?**

The standard does not refer to the ratification of ILO 169 and a risk assessment shall involve an assessment of evidence of violation of ILO requirements, irrespective of whether they have been ratified by the country in which the risk assessment is made.

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_03
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Annex 2 and 3.
<b>Publication date</b>	4 May 2012
<p><b>Can wood from plantations converted to non-forest use be acceptable according to Category 4 of CW Standard FSC-STD-40-005?</b></p> <p>Yes, wood from plantations converted to non-forest use is acceptable according to Category 4 of FSC-STD-40-005.</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_01 V2-1
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Annex 2, A.3
<b>Publication date</b>	8 December 2011
<p><b>What is the definition of FMU in FSC terms and does this definition count for all references to FMU in FSC Standards, including Controlled Wood?</b></p> <p>Yes, the definition of FMU is the same for all references in FSC Standards, including Controlled Wood.</p> <p>Forest Management Unit (FMU): A clearly defined forest area with mapped boundaries, managed by a single managerial body to a set of explicit objectives which are expressed in a self-contained multi-year management plan.</p> <p>The term 'management plan' is key and taken as equivalent to that which is described in FSC Principle 7.</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_17 V2-1
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Annex 3
<b>Publication date</b>	28 October 2014
<p><b>If a company risk assessment or applicable National Risk Assessment concludes 'unspecified risk' for a district and then field verification at the forest level by a company implementing Annex 3 concludes 'low risk', is it possible to use the outcomes from the field verification as a source of information/evidence in the risk assessment to conclude low risk at the level of the whole district?</b></p> <p>No, the field verification according to Annex 3 allows the verification of risk at the FMU level. The confirmation of low risk at the FMU level cannot be extrapolated to the district level.</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_02 (also published under FSC-STD-30-010 with code INT-STD-30-010_01)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Annex 3
<b>Publication date</b>	31 January 2012

**Within a National Initiative “unspecified risk” category, is it possible for a company to classify a smaller district as “low risk”?**

No, unless done at the FMU level through the process described in Annex 3 of FSC-STD-40-005. According to this standard, where national or regional interpretation or guidance relating to Annex 2 has been provided by an FSC accredited National Initiative, this interpretation shall prevail.

Other option would be that the Forest Manager got certified according to FSC-STD-30-010.

<b>Code</b>	INT-STD-40-005_19
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Annex 4
<b>Publication date</b>	2 July 2015

**An FSC Chain of Custody (CoC) certified manufacturer is making furniture (final product) for sale to a large international retailer that does not hold a CoC certificate. According to FSC-STD-40-005 V2-1, Annex 4, Clause 1.4, the CoC certified manufacturer cannot make a Controlled Wood claim on sales documentation for the furniture, since the retailer does not hold a CoC certificate.**

**Is there any claim or statement that the CoC company can make on or off product? Such a claim or statement may be asked for, for example, by retailers with responsible procurement policies or by importers wanting to meet legality legislation.**

No. FSC certificate holders are not allowed to promote Controlled Wood products or to make FSC Controlled Wood claims on sales documents issued to non-FSC certified customers.

## DIRECTIVES

### **FSC-DIR-40-005 FSC DIRECTIVE ON FSC CONTROLLED WOOD**

<b>Code</b>	INT-DIR-40-005_02 (also published under FSC-STD-40-005 with code INT-STD-40-005_04 and under FSC-STD-20-011 with code INT-STD-20-011_07)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	Applies to all requirements where the CPI is mentioned
<b>Publication date</b>	6 September 2013
<p><b>In 2012 the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) changed from a scale of 0-10 to a scale of 0-100. Shall the new 0-100 CPI scale be implemented in FSC normative documents that currently still reference the previous 0-10 scale system?</b></p> <p>Yes, CPI references in FSC normative documents using the 0-10 scale system shall be converted to the new scale.</p> <p>A reference to a CPI index threshold '5' based on the old scale system becomes a CPI index '50' applying the new scale.</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-DIR-40-005_04 (also published under FSC-STD-40-005 with code INT-STD-40-005_15)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	ADVICE-40-005-01
<b>Publication date</b>	9 July 2014
<p><b>How should companies treat ecoregions that are not within the WWF Global 200 but are listed as 'critical/endangered' or 'threatened' by WWF? Should this information always be included in risk assessments, under 3.1?</b></p> <p>The standard requires consideration of 'ecoregionally significant HCVs' and does not limit the recognition of ecoregions to Global 200 ecoregions. General references provided in the standard direct to WWF sources without limitation to Global 200 ecoregions (FSC-STD-40-005, Annex 1, definition of ecoregion). Therefore, information about threatened ecoregions other than the examples provided in FSC-STD-40-005 and FSC-DIR-40-005 should be taken into account. The company shall not ignore known and available sources of information in addition to the ones listed in normative documents.</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-DIR-40-005_06 (also published under FSC-STD-40-005 with code INT-STD-40-005_10)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	ADVICE-40-005-01
<b>Publication date</b>	9 July 2014

**Does the concept of ‘minimally disturbed by human economic activity’ in the definition of Intact Forest Landscape include fire suppression?**

Regarding definition of Intact Forest Landscape, firefighting or prevention for the protection of public safety is not considered an economic activity. Fire control in the context of forest management activities is not considered to be an economic activity of minimal disturbance.

<b>Code</b>	INT-DIR-40-005_11 (also published under FSC-STD-40-005 with code INT-STD-40-005_16)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	ADVICE-40-005-04
<b>Publication date</b>	10 October 2014

**If a certified company sources material that has previously been FSC certified or covered by another company’s FSC Controlled Wood verification program but has since been traded by a non-certified company (therefore breaking the Chain of Custody), can this material be considered controlled with-out conducting a full verification program and risk assessment?**

For previously FSC-certified material from a broken Chain of Custody to be considered as FSC Controlled Wood, the company must trace the material back to the certified company that traded it to the non-certified company where the Chain of Custody was broken, and conduct an audit of the supply chain. This audit shall demonstrate with verifiable documentation that the material is identifiable and traceable and has not been mixed with uncontrolled material.

For previously controlled material from a broken Chain of Custody to be considered as FSC Controlled Wood, the district of origin must be determined within/through the company’s own Controlled Wood verification program, for which all relevant normative requirements apply. For this purpose, risk assessments performed by other entities (e.g. a supplier with a valid FSC certificate that includes FSC Controlled Wood in its scope that sold FSC Controlled Wood (without a claim) to a non-certified entity) may be used as additional sources of information.

<b>Code</b>	INT-DIR-40-005_12 (also published under FSC-STD-40-005 with code INT-STD-40-005_18)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	ADVICE-40-005-07
<b>Publication date</b>	28 October 2014

**Shall the outcomes of a company verification program according to Annex 3 be made publicly available?**

No, currently there are no requirements for publishing the outcomes of verification according to Annex 3. The standard does not limit such an opportunity, however.

<b>Code</b>	INT-DIR-40-005_05 (also published under FSC-STD-40-005 with code INT-STD-40-005_09)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	ADVICE 40-005-07, ADVICE 40-005-02
<b>Publication date</b>	9 July 2014

**With regards to Category 3 (HCV), what is the minimal level of detail for describing the sourcing in the district of origin in the published company risk assessment? If the district of origin includes potentially controversial sources, when the company describes their sourcing in this area, must the description of their sourcing explicitly state that they are not sourcing from controversial FMUs in that district?**

The minimum required information to be included in the publically available results of the risk assessment are provided in ADVICE 40-005-07 of FSC-DIR-40-005, which applies to all CW categories. In case of potentially controversial activities in FMUs located in a low risk district (See ADVICE 40-005-02 of FSC-DIR-40-005), a company should mention the existing FMUs with potential controversial activities in the publically available results of a risk assessment.

<b>Code</b>	INT-DIR-40-005_03 (also published under FSC-STD-40-005 with code INT-STD-40-005_05)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	ADVICE-40-005-07
<b>Publication date</b>	5 February 2014

**Which process shall be implemented if a certified FMU is under suspension in a district that has been designated as low risk for all CW categories either by a National Risk Assessment or by a COC Certificate Holder in their FSC Controlled Wood verification pro-gram when the COC Certificate Holder wants to source from this FMU?**

At the moment of suspension the products sold by the certified FMU\* are losing their FSC status. As the FMU is located in a designated low risk district for CW, the products may still be sourced as “controlled material” under the following conditions:

1. As some or all CW categories may be affected by activities that led to the suspension of the FMU, the COC Certificate Holder shall review and if necessary revise their risk assessment for the area of the suspended FMU.
2. The review/revision of the risk assessment shall be completed by the COC Certificate Holder within a period of two months from the date of suspension of the FMU certificate.
3. The COC Certificate Holder shall submit the reviewed/revise risk assessment to their CB for verification.
4. The reviewed/revise risk assessment shall be verified by the CB no later than one month after the COC Certificate Holder has submitted its reviewed/revise risk assessment, before it can be applied (see FSC-STD-40-005 V2-1 Clause 11.1).
5. As the whole district is considered low risk, the products sourced from the suspended FMU are considered controlled until the verification of the reviewed/revise risk assessment is completed by the relevant CB.
6. The outcome of the review/revision process including verification by the relevant CB will then determine the risk designation for the suspended FMU.
7. Material sourced from the area shall be classified as unspecified risk, if the timelines of review/revision and verification of the risk assessment (2, 4) is not met.

\* according to the standard FSC-STD-01-001 or FSC-STD-30-010

<b>Code</b>	INT-DIR-40-005_01
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	ADVICE-40-005-07
<b>Publication date</b>	16 July 2010
<p><b>In the previous FSC-ADV-40-016, section C.1 stated that risk assessments must be made available in one of FSC's official languages. However, ADVICE-40-005-07 in FSC-DIR-40-005 the requirement to use one of FSC's official languages is not included. Can you confirm that an official FSC language is not required anymore for risk assessment public summaries?</b></p> <p>Yes, based on the current directive, risk assessment public summaries do not need to be posted in the FSC database in an official FSC language (English or Spanish).</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-DIR-40-005_13
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	ADVICE-40-005-09
<b>Publication date</b>	2 March 2015
<p><b>ADVICE-40-005-09 indicates that “Companies will have a period of up to 12 months after the approval date to align their controlled wood verification programs to the approved risk designation by a National Initiative.” In many cases, this means a company risk assessment that designated low risk now needs to be aligned with a National Risk Assessment that designates unspecified risk. In these cases, does the certificate holder need to implement field verification according to Annex 3 of FSC-STD-40-005 V2-1 for areas of unspecified risk prior to the one-year transition date?</b></p> <p>Yes. When risk designations by an FSC Network Partner are approved, the certificate holder shall update its risk assessment to the outcomes of the NRA. Field verification according to Annex 3 of FSC-STD-40-005 V2-1 shall be implemented for areas of unspecified risk after the risk assessment is updated and shall be completed prior to the one-year transition date (12 months after the date of the approval of the NRA).</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-DIR-40-005_08 (also published under FSC-STD-40-005 with code INT-STD-40-005_12)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	ADVICE-40-005-09, Clause 3 (Advice)
<b>Publication date</b>	9 July 2014
<p><b>Is a CoC-certified harvesting company that DOES NOT own or manage the forest required to conduct a nature value assessment when conducting a risk assessment according to Annex 2 of FSC-STD-40-005, when a nature value assessment is required by the respective National Forest Stewardship Standard?</b></p> <p>No, a company that is conducting a risk assessment according to Annex 2 of FSC-STD-40-005 (V2-1) is not required to perform a nature value assessment, unless it is required by an approved national guidance as per Annex 2, part A, Clause 2 of FSC-STD-40-005 and/or as per FSC-DIR-40-005-09, Clause 3 (Advice).</p>	

<b>Code</b>	INT-DIR-40-005_10 (also published under FSC-STD-40-005 with code INT-STD-40-005_14)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	ADVICE-40-005-17
<b>Publication date</b>	9 July 2014

**Can timber of unknown origin collected from beaches be evaluated according to the standard FSC-STD-40-005?**

No, timber collected from beaches is not eligible for evaluation under the FSC Controlled Wood Standard FSC-STD-40-005 V2-1.

<b>Code</b>	INT-DIR-40-005_09 (also published under FSC-STD-40-005 with code INT-STD-40-005_13)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	ADVICE-40-005-18
<b>Publication date</b>	9 July 2014

**Can a district of origin cover more than one country? If so, is a separate risk assessment required for each country, given the heterogeneity in assessing risk between two different sets of laws? What about within countries where the sub-national units (states, provinces, etc.) have the independence to create their own resource use and protection laws?**

According to its definition, a 'district' is considered to be a generic geographical definition within a country. Subject to the above, various guidance and requirements are provided stating that how a district shall be established depends on the CW category under assessment. In the case of National Risk Assessments (NRAs) it is possible to develop shared NRAs for countries sharing homogenous conditions (e.g. sharing the same ecoregions), according to the procedure FSC-PRO-60-002 V2-0 (FSC Controlled Wood Risk Assessments by FSC accredited National Initiatives, National and Regional offices).

Subject to the specific conditions of each CW category, the division of a country into sub-national units (e.g. states, provinces) will only impact how a district is defined if those divisions result in increased heterogeneity of the level or type of risk that is assessed within them.

<b>Code</b>	INT-DIR-40-005_07 (also published under FSC-STD-40-005 with code INT-STD-40-005_11)
<b>Requirement (s)</b>	ADVICE-40-005-19
<b>Publication date</b>	9 July 2014

**In cases where there is an approved national risk assessment, is it acceptable for the certificate holder to use the National Risk Assessment to satisfy the controlled wood requirements for conducting a risk assessment as specified in FSC-STD-40-005 and FSC-DIR-40-005, rather than having to generate its own risk assessment?**

The use of approved National Risk Assessments (NRAs) for sourcing Controlled Wood according to FSC-STD-40-005 is mandatory. Certificate holders have different options for aligning their verification programs with the results of applicable NRAs. Certificate holders may, for example, use NRAs available on FSC's website and/or the Global Forest Registry, or generate or update a new or existing company-developed risk assessment with the risk designation(s) provided in relevant NRAs. These examples are not exhaustive.



Forest Stewardship Council®

---

**ic.fsc.org**

FSC International Center GmbH  
Charles-de-Gaulle-Straße 5 · 53113 Bonn · Germany



All Rights Reserved FSC® International 2016 FSC®F000100