**Appendix B. Selected Issue Specific Comparison FSC and SFI**

2010 FSC-US and 2015 SFI Indicators Regarding Clearcuts (for plantation/even age management)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Max (acres) Opening With no Retention | Max average Opening Size with No Retention | Max Opening with 20-30% Retention | Max Average Opening With 20-30% Retention | Adjacent Stands | Overarching Focus |
| FSC | 2-80 depending on region and forest type[[1]](#footnote-1) | 2-40 | 20, 40, 60, 80, or undefined depending on region and forest type[[2]](#footnote-2) | 20-100 depending on region and forest type[[3]](#footnote-3) | At least 10 feet, 50% edge canopy closure, or advanced successional (except southern pine plantations which can be early successional) | Harvests are designed to resemble components of natural disturbance and maintain habitat needs of wildlife species |
| SFI | None | 120 | None | None | At least 3yrs and 5 feet tall | Planting or regeneration rapid site “green up” |

2010 FSC-US and 2015 SFI Riparian Buffer Indicators

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Minimum Numerical Harvesting Buffer for Perennial Streams | Water Quality Objectives | Habitat | Prescriptions | Overarching Focus |
| FSC | Rockies – 50ft  Ozark, Mississippi –75ft  Appalachia –80ft  Pacific Coast –100ft[[4]](#footnote-4)  Southwest—50ft  (None in Southeast, Lake States, and Northeast apart from legal requirements and BMPs) | Temperature  Sedimentation  Min chemicals  Shade  Natural cycles | Recruit woody debris & litter  Timing and volume of water flows  Fish passage  Feeding, cover, travel, and breeding  Maintains aquatic and upland plant and animal habitat | Written plan before harvest  Minimize soil disturbance  No harvest in buffer  Filter strips  Protect bank  Minimize floodplain disturbance  Minimize roads and crossings  Temporary crossings restored  No logging on steep slope  Restrict grazing | Enhance or restore aquatic and upland habitat, similar to natural systems |
| SFI | None, but must comply with legal requirements and voluntary state BMPs | Protect | Identify and protect | Map, Water body protection plans, Identify non-forested wetland, Minimize impact of roads and skids | Protect and implement BMPs |

2010 FSC-US and 2015 SFI Indicators Regarding Forest Conversion and Plantations

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Restrictions on Conversion to Plantation or Non-forest | Restrictions on Plantation Management | Restoration of Plantations | Rotation/ Harvesting |
| FSC | Leads to long term conservation benefit  Restore to national conditions  No conversion after 1994 | Thinning minimizes damage to residual trees.  Native species preferred, and in some cases required (e.g. no use of exotic species in SE US)  Distribution of plantations maintains natural mosaic  Openings without retention limited to 40 acre average and 80 acre maximum (except in Pacific Coast where retention is required in all openings)  Average for all openings with and without retention does not exceed 100 acres  Openings larger than 80 acres only when justified by credible scientific analysis and retention resembling natural disturbance | 10-25% on private land  100% of public land on forest soils | Maintains late successional habitat.  Retains habitat diversity |
| SFI | None | None specific to plantations  120 average opening? | None | Promote habitat diversity |

2010 FSC-US and 2013 SFI Indicators Regarding GMOs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Use GMOs |
| FSC | Prohibited |
| SFI | Prohibited |

2010 FSC-US and 2015 SFI Indicators Regarding Protected Areas

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Identification | Habitats | Protection | Documentation |
| FSC | Gap analysis, identify and establish representative sample areas, survey for listed, candidate, G1-G3, S1-S3, and N1DN3 species or assume presence, report findings | All | Permanent protection of representative sample, conservation zones support viable populations | Document road building for minimized impact, public review of HCVF areas with maps and description, comments incorporated into plan |
| SFI | Program to locate G1-G2 species through credible system, use NatureServe or equivalent | Special sites and sites with special conservation value including vernal pools of ecological significance, and sites with species at risk | Protect/manage | Map and catalogue special sites |

2010 FSC-US and 2015 SFI Indicators Regarding At-risk Species

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Identification | Protection | Restoration |
| FSC | Survey for all listed, candidate, (G1-G3, S1-S3, and N1DN3) species or assume presence, report findings  Habitats delineated on maps | Permanent protection of representative sample, conservation zones support viable populations  Hunting, fishing, trapping controlled | Public forest designed to meet recovery goals |
| SFI | Plans to locate G1 and G2 species though credible system, Natureserve or equivalent  Determine viability | Program to protect known sites with viable threatened and endangered species (all excellent/good viability, some fair, not all poor), Participate in local or regional conservation planning | None |

2010 FSC-US and 2015 SFI Indicators Regarding Old Growth

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Identification | Protection | Restoration |
| FSC | Old growth is normally mapped as HCVF | Only restoration management on public land  Maintains structure, composition and processes  Legacy trees not harvested  Buffered as necessary | A portion of forest restored where old growth would naturally occur |
| SFI |  | Support and participate in programs for old growth conservation in region | None |

2010 FSC-US and 2015 SFI Indicators Regarding Carbon

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Emissions | Management | Reporting |
| FSC | None | Identify and define appropriate measures for maintaining and/or enhancing carbon storage and sequestration | None |
| SFI | None | Management planning and long term resource analysis reviews carbon storage | None |

2010 FSC-US and SFI Indicators Regarding Monitoring

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Protocols | What is Monitored | Evidence Required | Public Access |
| FSC | Written | Regeneration, structure, unanticipated loss, NTFP yield, disturbances, water, habitat, soil, fire, pests, sensitive species, invasives, road system, employment, local jobs, stakeholder responses, differences between expectations Social impact, environmental impact, and representative sample areas assessed |  | Summary upon request |
| SFI | Verifiable system identifies areas for improvement | Water quality BMPs, conformance to other BMPs, evaluation of BMPs, progress toward meeting standard | General evidence of conformity, annual report | Audit summary with evidence |

2010 FSC-US and 2015 SFI Indicators Regarding Public Reporting and Consultation (Private Forests)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Planning | Notification | Review | Appeal | Address Concerns |
| FSC | Opportunities for **people affected** to participate in planning | Notified of effects in time to express concern | Opportunities to review | Accessible appeal process | Attempt resolution through communication/negotiation before legal action |
| SFI | Public involved **on government land** | Appropriate contact  Annual reporting of conformance | Summary audit report | None | Respond to inquiries, address nonconforming practices  Regional Implementation Committee may have process to respond to concerns aimed at standard revision |

2010 FSC-US and SFI Indicators Regarding Education and Training

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Training | Public Education | Landowner Education | Promotion of SFM |
| FSC | Provide adequate training for safety | Contribute to education about forestry and forests | None | None |
| SFI | Appropriate training for SFM, enhanced utilization, and compliance with SFI standard, including contractors  Foster improvement in professionalism | Encourage public and forest community to participate in practice of sustainable forestry; publically report progress  Support and promote outreach, education, and involvement | Educate non-certified landowners about SFM, and species | Support development of educational materials  Participate in other efforts to promote conservation  Periodic promotion such as tours, trails, pubs, support for forestry organizations |

2010 FSC-US and SFI Indicators Regarding Workers Rights

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Right to Organize | Wages | Safety |
| FSC | Freedom to associate and advocate  Develop dispute resolution | Meets or exceeds local norms | Program addresses equipment maintenance, posted safety guidelines, contracts include safety, records kept |
| SFI | Obey law, training on worker rights | Written commitment to comply with social law prevailing wage, Training on wage rules | Written commitment to comply with OSHA  Training on OSHA |

2010 FSC-US and SFI Indicators Regarding Indigenous Rights

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Use Rights | Consultation | Traditional Knowledge |
| FSC | Access and use rights documented, identified on maps | Identify and contact American Indian groups via designated tribal representatives for legal or customary use rights, ensure no impact on rights, protocols jointly developed and signed by tribes in formal consultation, informed written consent, identify special sites and protected areas | Identify knowledge used, fairly compensate for use |
| SFI | Identify and protect culturally important sites | Confer with affected indigenous peoples on public lands | Understand and respect |

**Appendix C. Issue Specific Comparison FSC P&C and PEFC**

2012 FSC P&C and 2010 PEFC Indicators Regarding Forest Conversion and Plantations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Restrictions to conversion to plantation or non-forest | | | | Plantations converted from natural forest qualify for certification when conversion |
| Extent | Benefit | Ecologically important / high conservation value forests | Laws |
| FSC | Affects limited area | Produces significant long-term conservation benefit | Does not damage HCV areas (6.9) | Complies with applicable laws, regulations, and nationally-ratified treaties, conventions and agreements | Occurred before Nov. 1994,  not the fault of the organization seeking certification,  affects limited area, and produces long-term conservation benefits (6.10) |
| PEFC | Affects small proportion of forest type | Long-term conservation, economic and social benefit | Does not damage ecologically significant areas, significant habitat, species, or socially significant areas. | Complies with relevant policy and legislation, land-use planning processes. | After Dec 2010: Only when “justified circumstances” outlined in 5.1.1 are met.  Before Dec 2010: Not specified |

*The PEFC international standards focus on bounding the “justified circumstances” for forest conversion whereas FSC limits the timing and “extent” of conversion. PEFC focuses more on the type of forest being converted rather than the area, and specifies that the benefits of conversion must include economic and social benefits (in addition to long-term conservation benefits). FSC prohibits conversation of forest area with significant cultural or social value.*

2012 FSC P&C and 2010 PEFC Indicators Regarding GMOs

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Use GMOs | **Number** |
| FSC | No – no use at all within the management unit | 10.4 |
| PEFC | No – no use at all within the management unit | 5.4.7 |

*By adding the phrase “within the management unit,” FSC implies that the organization being certified may still use GMOs in areas not being considered for certification. This is a weakening of the old standards which strictly prohibits all use of GMOs, carrying with it the interpretation that organizations using GMOs elsewhere would still not be certified (Criterion 6.8). They have also published external guidance interpreting their policy on GMOs (FSC-POL-30-602 (2000) EN), which does not hold status of an official position (p. 3).*

2012 FSC P&C and 2010 PEFC Indicators Regarding Inventory, Monitoring & Evaluation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Protocols | What is monitored | Continuous Improvement? | Public Access |
| FSC | Not specified | Regeneration, structure, unanticipated loss, NTFP yield, disturbances, water, habitat, soil, fire, pests, sensitive species, invasives, road system, employment, local jobs, stakeholder responses, differences between expectations, | Yes | Summary of monitoring, excluding confidential info (8.4) |
| PEFC | Not specified | - Social, environmental and economic impacts (1.2)  - Forest resources (1.3)  - Health: pests, diseases, overgrazing, overstocking, fire, damage from climatic factors, etc. (2.2)  - Exploitation of NTFPs, e.g. hunting and fishing (3.7)  - HCV areas (4.2) | Yes. Feedback into planning process (1.7) | Management plan publicly available (1.6) but results of monitoring not specified. |

*Neither FSC or PEFC is prescriptive regarding the form that the monitoring and evaluation will take. FSC requires results of monitoring to be publicly available while PEFC does not.*

2012 FSC P&C and 2010 PEFC Indicators Regarding Community Benefit

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Benefits | Community Needs | Employment |
| FSC | Enable production of benefits to strengthen and diversify local economy (5.1) | Defines sites crucial to fulfilling community needs as a type of high-conservation value area (9.1) | Provide reasonable opportunities for employment for local communities (4.3) |
| PEFC | Promote long-term health and well-being of communities (6.2) | Protects sites of significance that help to meet basic needs of local communities (6.6) | “consider new opportunities for employment” (6.1) |

*FSC and PEFC both have modest language regarding local employment – under FSC, it should be provided where “reasonable,” and for PEFC it should be a factor to “consider” when making planning decisions. They both provide protection for sites that are crucial or significant for fulfilling community needs in terms of health, subsistence, and cultural importance.*

2012 FSC P&C and 2010 PEFC Indicators Regarding Indigenous Rights

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Laws | Tenure | Consultation | Traditional Knowledge |
| FSC | FPIC  (3.2)  UNDRIP (3.4) | Recognizes and upholds legal and customary rights (3.2) | Engage with indigenous peoples re:   * Delegating control over management activities (3.2) * Identifying significant areas (4.7) * Use of knowledge (4.8)   7.6 Proactively and transparently engage *affected stakeholders* in planning and monitoring; engage *interested stakeholders* on request. | Compensate indigenous peoples for their knowledge (4.8) |
| PEFC | FPIC (6.4)  UNDRIP (6.4) | “Legal, customary and traditional rights related to the forest land shall be clarified, recognized and respected.” (6.3) | “Provide for effective communication and consultation with local people and other stakeholders” (6.7); provide meaningful opportunities for parties to be engaged in forest management decisions (6.4) | Use traditional management systems when economically feasible (4.9); Make best use of local forest-related experience and knowledge (6.9) |

*It is unclear whether there is a legal difference between the terms ‘upheld’ and ‘respected’ in terms of indigenous land rights. If upholding is stronger, FSC holds stronger provisions for indigenous land rights. FSC also goes further in defining the topics that should be discussed in consultation with indigenous peoples, while PEFC leaves it open-ended. Both ways have their strengths and weaknesses; FSC may leave certain topics out, while the lack of clarification for PEFC may result in ‘meaningful engagement’ that fails to cover key points of contention.*

1. This table poorly captures FSC requirements as the FSC-US FMS Appendix C sets out differing standards by region for cutting under even-aged management. In the Ozarks, openings without retention are limited to 2 acres and shelterwood cuts with 20-30% retention are limited to 20acres. In Appalachia harvest openings with no retention are limited to 10 acres. Mississippi region requires retention in cuts larger than 20 acres. In the Pacific Northwest, any opening larger than 6 acres requires 10% basal area retained whereas Guidance in the Southeast suggests that clearcuts up to 80 acres may be allowed where lesser cut would not provide enough timber volume to secure a timber sale. Other regions have other maximums: Appalachia (10), Ozark-Ouachita (2-20), Mississippi (20), Rocky Mountain (even age only for restoration), Northeast and Southwest (Harvests protect native natural regeneration). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Maximum individual openings with retention specified for Ozark-Ouachita (20), Mississippi (40), Pacific Coast (60), and Southeast (80 unless 40 is economically viable) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Average opening does not exceed 100 acres. Pacific Coast limits average openings to 40 acres. By default, there will be a lower average in areas with lower individual cut limits: Ozark-Ouachita (20), Mississippi (40), and Southeast (80) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The FSC-US FMS Appendix E sets factors for assessing buffer width. Appalachia, Pacific Coast, and Mississippi Regions vary based on stream class; Appalachia, Ozark, Mississippi and Rockies Regions vary based on slope. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)