The following document summarizes the input received during and immediately following the 2018 Controlled Wood Regional Meetings and provides rationale for the resulting mitigation options for the Central California Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA), along with definition of any identified gaps in the final set of options.

**Please note that any of the proposed mitigation options may be done individually or in collaboration with other certificate holders, or other entities that have similar desired outcomes. Collaboration is encouraged to scale up potential mitigation impact, and FSC US will seek to assist with collaboration when feasible.**

**CENTRAL THEME: Education & Outreach**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original Proposed Options(#5) Influence suppliers that are land managers to implement best management practices that maintain or enhance the biodiversity of mixed conifer stands.(#1) Work with landowners and land managers to increase awareness of the environmental value of Montane meadows, and the importance of maintaining them (particularly riparian areas within them). (#2) Work with landowners and land managers to establish, implement and monitor best management practices for snag, large tree, and hardwood retention. (#7) Produce / distribute educational communications to suppliers / landowners which includes information on management of mixed conifer stands to avoid loss of diversity, montane meadow management, invasive species, and other threats. | Topline Input* Support across the board
* Need to increase awareness of, and promote management that enhances, threatened biodiversity
* ‘Influence’ and ‘work with/to’ may not be auditable
* Many of options similar at the core, and could be combined into something around sharing information intended to influence actions that will conserve biodiversity in the region
* Concern - actions may be more accessible to companies that are very close to the beginning of the supply chain; need some for other companies
* Include an action specifically for getting suppliers who are land managers or purchase directly from the forest to change their behaviors
 |

*Consultation Insights: Input included lots of support for education and outreach general, but notes that any related mitigation options need to be available to Organizations throughout the supply chain. Comments also emphasize that the mitigation options must be actionable and clearly address the mitigation need, without trying to make Controlled Wood into something equivalent to Forest Management certification. The following mitigation includes a mitigation option that merges a number of those originally proposed, but also introduces some flexibility to ensure companies throughout the supply chain are able to use this option within their unique context and characteristics. However, there is also is an option that focuses on those Organizations near the beginning of the supply chain that have a unique opportunity to influence actions on the ground.*

**Proposed Revised Mitigation Options**

**The following is offered as an option that could be scaled for any impact level:**

**Using materials (as described below), and with a desired outcome of engaging landowners within the specified risk area and the Organization’s supply area in conservation of the Sierra Nevada biodiversity, communicate to audiences (as described below) the social benefits and values of biodiversity in the ecoregion associated with mixed conifer forests and the montane meadows embedded within them, threats from poorly implemented forest management (and related loss of values), opportunities for conservation (i.e., management that enhances biodiversity, focusing on both within stand diversity, such as maintenance of snags, large trees and hardwood, and between stand diversity), the role of fire and importance of mimicking disturbance patterns, and with recognition of both even-age and uneven-age management practices, if appropriate for the supply area.**

* **Materials: Developed by, or developed in cooperation with, organizations/individuals with expertise in Sierra Nevada biodiversity conservation, or FSC US, and delivered in a manner that will be the most effective in achieving the desired outcome of engaging landowners in conservation of Sierra Nevada biodiversity, while reflecting the specific context and characteristics of the Organization.**
* **Audiences: Audiences will reflect the specific context and characteristics of the Organization, but communications should be directed toward those audiences where the communications will be most effective in helping to achieve the desired outcome of engaging landowners within the specified risk area and the Organization’s supply area in conservation of Sierra Nevada biodiversity. Depending upon the Organization’s location in the supply chain, communications may be directly with landowners, or through intermediaries such as community members, forest managers or suppliers, or in collaboration with organizations/individuals already working for conservation of Sierra Nevada biodiversity.**

**The following is offered as an option for Organizations with suppliers that are land managers or that purchase directly from the source forest:**

**Develop/adapt a procurement policy that reflects the above communications themes and clearly states the expectation that suppliers will promote conservation of Sierra Nevada biodiversity and will not provide materials from forests where this HCV was threatened as a result of forest management activities that produced the forest materials. This will require providing a description of the potential threats from forest management activities, and of the kinds of activities that would maintain or enhance the Sierra Nevada biodiversity in the supply area.**

**NOTE: Actions to demonstrate policy enforcement and communicate policies on sourcing to suppliers should be audited under the Due Diligence system requirements within the 40-005V3-1 standard section 1.1**

**CENTRAL THEME: Forest Practice Rules**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original Proposed Option(#3) Work to revise the Forest Practice Rules to include explicit minimums for snag and large tree retention within planned harvest units. | Summary of Input* Overall negative input
* Significant concern expressed about FSC shifting from voluntary system to functioning more like a regulator
* A prescriptive forest practice rule might result in actions that are not appropriate for the specific context in which management is being implemented
* Likely a long, difficult effort, without high probability of success
 |

*Consultation Insights: The topline input indicates a negative perspective on this proposed option, and individual comments in worksheets did not provide any strong support (across perspective). The Shared Criteria require consideration of effectiveness and feasibility, neither of which are support by the input received, therefore this option is not included in the revised set of mitigation options.*

**CENTRAL THEME: Conservation Planning**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original Proposed Option(#4) Participate in and support collaborative working groups and planning within the region that promote forest management that maintains and enhances the biodiversity of the region. | Topline Input* Limited comments with neutral tone
* This kind of work is already happening
* If kept, need to adapt to include consideration of forest resiliency, particularly as it relates to fire.
* Must improve auditability
 |

*Consultation Insights: There were fewer comments shared during the Regional Meeting on this mitigation option than on some of the others, however the + / - / ^ responses written in the worksheets show general support with limited opposition. Clarification requests focused on the need to better define what was meant by ‘support.’ As this option is generally aligned with the Shared Criteria, it is adapted and included in the revised set of mitigation options.*

**Proposed Revised Mitigation Option**

**The following is offered as an option that could be scaled for any impact level:**

**Engage in and/or provide monetary or in-kind resources to conservation planning processes and the implementation of plans that include goals, objectives and/or actions that are intended to achieve conservation Sierra Nevada biodiversity within the specified risk area and the Organization’s supply area. This may include: federal, state and/or local resource planning and plans; planning and plans for Sierra Nevada mixed-conifer forest or montane meadow dependent species; regional planning and plans directly for Sierra Nevada biodiversity itself; and/or broad-spectrum regional conservation planning and plans that include Sierra Nevada biodiversity conservation.**

**CENTRAL THEME: Forester Training**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original Proposed Option(#6) Conduct training for foresters to cover topics such as management of mixed conifer stands to avoid loss of diversity, montane meadow management, invasive species, and other threats. | Topline Input* Limited comments, but mostly positive
* Only applicable to landowners
* Need to be sure to not mix FM requirements with CW mitigation of risk
 |

*Consultation Insights: There were few comments provided on this mitigation option during the Regional Meeting, but the written responses on the worksheets indicate strong support from certificate holders and their suppliers, and no opposition from other participants. This idea represents a limited opportunity for Organizations that are closest to the beginning of the supply chain. Comments associated with other mitigation options were used to adapt this mitigation option to improve auditability and clarity, and to add a little flexibility.*

**Proposed Revised Mitigation Option**

**The following is offered as an option for Organizations with foresters on staff or on contract who have direct contact with landowners/land managers and/or who are on-site at the forest material origin prior to harvest:**

**Ensure foresters receive training or the equivalent, with periodic refreshers that include any new information, on Sierra Nevada biodiversity, particularly mixed-conifer forest and montane meadows, threats from poorly implemented forest management activities, management techniques that will conserve biodiversity, and provision of public values. The training or equivalent shall be: a) developed by, or developed in cooperation with, organizations/individuals with expertise in Sierra Nevada biodiversity, or FSC US; and b) result in foresters having knowledge on these subjects to the extent that they are able to communicate the same content to the landowners and land managers with whom they are working.**

**CENTRAL THEME: Research**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Participant Proposed OptionFurther research and clarification on the actual risk from forest management activities should be conducted. | Topline Input* Indication of support from other participants in the regional meeting
 |

*Consultation Insights: Additional knowledge regarding the positive and negative impact on the Sierra Nevada biodiversity could improve conservation of the biodiversity and reduce threats from forest management activities. However, based upon input on other similar mitigation option ideas, there is a concern that research on its own will likely not effectively mitigate the identified risk, therefore it needs to be linked to another action.*

**Proposed Revised Mitigation Option**

**The following is offered as a two-part option for ‘high impact’ organizations:**

1. **Engage with and/or provide monetary or in-kind resources to an entity or alliance that is currently conducting, or has the capacity to initiate, research on clarifying positive and negative impacts of forest management activities on Sierra Nevada biodiversity and/or improving management practices for conservation of Sierra Nevada biodiversity within the specified risk area and the Organization’s supply area; and**
2. **Use the results of the research to improve implementation of another mitigation option.**

**GAPS IN THE SET OF MITIGATON OPTIONS**

FSC US Staff evaluation of this set of mitigation options, through the lens of the shared criteria, did not identify any significant gaps, with the possible exception of the requirement for 'auditability.' We will be looking to your comments for suggestions on how to address this potential gap, as well as for identification of any other gaps and suggestions for their resolution. Additionally, we will be meeting with Certification Bodies during the consultation and expect that they will also provide input on improvements in auditability.