



**SFI Standard Review workshop  
Little Rock, AR  
April 2, 2009**

**Welcome and Introductions**

Rick Cantrell, SFI Inc., provided background information on the standards review process and the proposed changes. Jody Erikson, The Keystone Center, provided facilitation and asked participants to provide their concerns and their proposals to address those concerns. The following summary records the key questions and concerns and proposals raised during the workshop.

**Organization and Principles of Revised Draft Standard**

1. Principle 1 – eco system services: **Concern:** This term is not defined. **Proposal:** Define it.
2. Principle 3 – Best Management Practices (BMPs): **Concern:** BMPs differ from state to state. **Proposal:** Use the term “conform to” instead of “adhere”.

**Changes to Forest Management Objectives & Associated Definitions (Objectives 1-7)**

1. Objectives 1-7: **Concern:** There is no requirement for land managers to use certified or qualified logging professionals, even though there is one for procurement. **Proposal:** Be more explicit; add more clarity to Objective 16 that everyone must use certified or qualified logging professionals.
2. Indicator 1.1.4 – the e.g.: **Concern:** The for example (e.g.) regarding long-term drought creates confusion for an auditor if it is a natural occurrence; auditors want to hold participants to the examples. **Proposal:** Remove the e.g. list.
3. Objective 2 – carbon management: **Concern:** This term is not defined and is only in the objectives language and not in the performance measure or indicators. **Proposal:** Define it and map it through the performance measure and indicator.
4. Indicator 2.4.4: **Concern:** How does this work? How do we use the information; how do we manage for this information? **Proposal:** Use “consider” information instead of “monitor” information.
5. Performance Measure 2.5 – varietal seedlings: **Concern:** If this is clonal forestry, then the standard should state this clearly. Some of the processes outlined are not just for cloning. **Proposal:** Remove OR reduce the number of processes listed to genetics and root cuttings.
6. Indicator 4.1.4 – such as list: **Concern:** The use of “and” implies an auditor will look for all of those things. **Proposal:** Remove the list and/or remove the list and define wildlife habitat elements using that list in the glossary OR add “wildlife habitat elements” to the performance measure (4.1) and remove the list from the indicator.
7. Indicator 4.1.4 – pollinator habitat: **Concern:** The term is confusing and vague. **Proposal:** Remove.

8. Objective 5 – clear cut size: **Concern:** This restricts isolated islands in remote areas like Alaska that are only economically feasible if harvested all at one time (costs to set up camps and infrastructure for harvest operation are too great). **Proposal:** Add exemptions for extremely isolated locations where it is not economically feasible to cut smaller areas.
9. Objective 5 – clear cut size: **Concern:** This is the only hard number in the standards that isn't based on science. Some bird species need large contiguous forests and small clear cut areas disadvantage those birds. **Proposal:** Remove.
10. Objective 7- efficient and minimize: **Concern:** These terms are subjective and may lead to leaving materials behind if not economically efficient (e.g. last load not full therefore not hauled to the mill). **Proposal:** Add "landings left clean without waste" OR use original language.

### **Changes to Fiber Sourcing Objectives & Associated Definitions (Objectives 8-13)**

1. Objectives 8-13: **Concern:** These objectives don't apply to agencies because agencies don't do procurement; doesn't apply to non-industrial participants. **Proposal:** --.
2. Indicator 8.1.1 – shall: **Concern:** This typically means supplying a packet of material. It limits SIC outreach because the indicator implies that only the participant can supply information. It is also important that landowners get information before timber sale. **Proposal:** Change to shall "make available".
3. Indicator 8.1.1 – list: **Concern:** Information on some of the elements is hard to find and would be labor/cost intensive. **Proposal:** Add "some of the following" OR add "those things that pertain to activities." **Response:** Some states already have the information and the participant need only refer to the state information.
4. Indicator 8.1.1e: **Concern:** How would this be done? It is vague. **Proposal:** Change to say "encourage landowners to have sustainability plans and harvest based on those plans."
5. Indicator 8.1.2 – American Tree Farm System: **Concern:** Objective is for procurement only and reference to American Tree Farm System needs to be for both procurement and management. **Proposal:** Put this in objective 16 or 17.
6. Indicator 8.1.2 – encourage: **Concern:** it is difficult to audit "encouragement". **Proposal:** Use "shall support" instead of "encourage".
7. Objective 9: **Concern:** This says the same things as objective 16 and should be included for both procurement and land management. **Proposal:** Lump with objective 16.
8. Objective 9 – harvesting professional. **Concern:** This term is not defined. There are too many terms. **Proposal:** Define all the terms (certified logging professional-CLP, qualified logging professional-QLP, qualified resource professional and harvesting professional) and consider using fewer terms.
9. Objective 9/definition of qualified logging professional – on-site responsibility: **Concern:** Does this mean each crew needs a QLP every day, every minute? This definition conflicts with the

white paper language. **Response:** The intent is to have a QLP with on-site responsibility.  
**Proposal:** Use white paper language OR clarify intent.

10. Indicator 9.1.1 – programs: **Concern:** Do not know what this means. **Proposal:** Add a for example, like American Logging Council AND/OR define CLP.
11. Indicator 9.1.1: **Concerns:** Some states do not have certified or qualified professionals.  
**Proposal:** Use “or” instead of “and”.
12. Indicator 9.1.1: **Concerns:** It is a burden to use CLP and QLP. **Response:** The intent is to encourage the use of CLP not require it. **Proposal:** Clarify intent.
13. Indicator 10.1.1 – suppliers: **Concern:** This is a new/undefined term. **Proposal:** Use “wood producer” instead of “suppliers”.
14. Indicator 10.1.1: **Concern:** Participants cannot keep track of whose certification expires when.  
**Proposal:** Add “will try to use” instead of “will use”. **Response:** The intent is to have a program that sets use of QLPs as a goal and outlines where there may be exceptions—new supplier, land clearer, etc.
15. Performance Measure 10.2 – improve: **Concern:** Compliance is over 90% and it is very hard to improve once over 90%. **Proposal:** Add “or maintain” OR remove.
16. Objective 10 – sustainable forestry: **Concern:** This objective is focused on protecting water quality, BMPs for water quality, and not sustainable forestry. **Proposal:** Define “sustainable forestry” in objective 8 OR use “do not compromise state recommended BMPs” instead.
17. Indicator 12.1.3 & 4 – direct suppliers: **Concern:** Vague term. **Proposal:** Define the term.

### **Changes to Forest Management and Fiber Sourcing Objectives & Associated Definitions (Objectives 14-20)**

1. Indicator 14.1.4 – government processes: **Concern:** This term is not defined; very loose interpretation could impose additional requirements. **Response:** Intent was to recognize there are areas (e.g. state parks, Canada Crown lands, etc.) protected by the government that are managed and can be managed but also protected. **Proposal:** Clarify intent AND/OR define OR remove.
2. Indicator 14.1.4 – respect. **Concern:** This term is vague. **Proposal:** Clarify.
3. Objective 15 – to improve: **Concern:** This implies the participant must make it better. This is hard to know in the short term. This doesn’t match the language in the principle. **Proposal:** Use “support” instead of “improve”.
4. Indicator 15.2.1 – SIC: **Concern:** SICs are not involved in research. **Proposal:** Remove “SIC”.
5. Performance Measure 15.2 – shall: **Concern:** What is appropriate? What works? **Proposal:** Use “consider” instead of “use”.

6. Objective 16 – contractors: **Concern:** This is a confusing term; there are many different contractors. **Proposal:** Define the term OR add “appropriate” contractors. **Response:** The intent was the participant would define which contractors would need necessary training.
7. Indicator 16.2.1d – protect wildlife habitat: **Concern:** This indicator seems specific to listed species, then the last phrase opens it up to all/any wildlife habitat. **Proposal:** --.
8. Performance Measure 17.1: **Concern:** Left out universities and extensions. **Proposal:** Add “universities and extensions”.
9. Performance Measure 19.1 – report: **Concern:** What kind of report? **Proposal:** Add “summary” report.

### **Changes to the Audit Procedures and Auditor Qualifications Changes**

1. 3 year cycle: **Concern:** It will be a huge cost increase for data, staff, etc. For a company with a 30 year rotation (short term rotation), this would be an increase of certification audits to 10 per 30 year rotation rather than 6. **Response:** It is a new ISO requirement. SFI Inc. is seeking an exemption or delay in implementing this change with the accreditation bodies (ANAB and SCC).
2. Continuous certification: **Concern:** No continuous certification will be a huge cost increase. **Response:** Participants and auditors should talk about what is possible under current ISO rules. There may be ways of accomplishing this same thing.

### **Other Issues/Parking Lot**

1. Auditor attendance at standards review meetings: **Concern:** They need to have an opportunity to understand the intent behind the new word changes. **Response:** There have been auditors and certification bodies at other meetings. There will be a webinar for auditors to discuss changes to the standard. SFI Inc. will also release a transition plan for moving from the current standards to implementation of the new standards.
2. SIC’s need to build relationship with universities (forestry schools, purchasing departments and decision makers), particularly because universities are looking to be more green and some have used FSC even though there are little or no FSC participants in the area and that are more SFI participants. (e.g. University of Mississippi new release stating their preference for FSC)
3. SIC’s need to build on its relationship with American Tree farm System

### **Next Steps**

- Summary of each workshop will be posted
- Public comment period ended on March 2, 2009
- Completion of the 7 workshops (final workshop on April 16)
- Review of the comments and workshop summaries
- Final Standard released at the SFI Annual Conference in September 2009
- Program participants are encouraged to discuss changes in the Audit Procedures and Qualifications with their respective certification bodies and provide additional feedback to SFI Inc. staff on the impacts of these changes on their operations