

Connecting query



What's a book, series, movie or other media that has a forest as a focal point that you have really enjoyed?

3



Meeting Aims

- ❖ Update about 2022 consultation process
- ❖ Overview current mitigation options & issues
- ❖ Drive understanding of key viewpoints on themes
- ❖ Identify additional information & perspectives
- ❖ Clarify the roadmap ahead for this effort



Antitrust statement

As participants in this meeting, we need to be mindful of the constraints of antitrust laws. There shall be no discussions of agreements or concerted actions that may restrain competition. This prohibition includes the exchange of information concerning individual prices, rates, market practices, or any other competitive aspect of an individual company's operation. Each participant is obligated to speak up immediately for the purpose of preventing any discussion falling outside these bounds.



Our agenda

- ❖ Welcome, purpose, agenda
- ❖ Mitigation options & issues overview
- ❖ Sharing key viewpoints for data so far
- ❖ Deep dives on key themes
- ❖ Report back from breakouts
- ❖ Toplines & what to expect going forward



Getting it Done😊

- Engage on what matters most for you
- Respect differences, stay curious
- Identify gaps, contribute ideas, aim for clarity
- Protect the joy!

7



Mitigation options & issues overview

Where have we been?



What happened in 2018?

Through the informed consultation process (webinar, online discussion forum, in-person meetings and a public consultation of outputs) FSC US Controlled Wood stakeholders helped to define the options that certificate holders would have for mitigating risk in the FSC US National Risk Assessment.

- ❖ **Shared criteria** focused options on the most effective and most feasible actions
- ❖ 11 mitigation option themes, with consistent application across risk areas
- ❖ Intent statement for each option linked directly to rationale for risk designation
- ❖ FSC US resolution to complete evaluation of mitigation effectiveness at a landscape scale
- ❖ FSC US commitment to revisit options on a regular basis and adapt as needed

10



What is FSC US's Monitoring Approach?

Three Tiered Framework:

- Tier 1** - Coarse scale eco-region assessment of forests associated with specified risks
- Tier 2** - Wood basket identification and fine scale specified risk assessment
- Tier 3** - Within wood baskets and through partnerships: assess, and monitor effectiveness for most common mitigation options (e.g., education and outreach, procurement policy, and conservation initiatives)

11



FSC US Monitoring Approach – Tier 1

Coarse scale eco-region assessment of forests associated with specified risks

- ❖ Characterize the area
- ❖ Forest area extent and change
- ❖ Protected areas extent and change

Data Sources:

- ❖ Forest Inventory Analysis (FIA)
- ❖ National Land Cover Database
- ❖ Protected Areas Database
- ❖ National Conservation Easements Database

12



FSC US Monitoring Approach – Tier 2

Wood basket identification and fine scale specified risk assessment

- ❖ Identify areas of concentrated sourcing
- ❖ Forest characterization: species, age class, ownership, disturbance
- ❖ Perceptions of status, change and attribution

Data Sources:

- ❖ Certified mill sourcing area
- ❖ Forest Inventory Analysis (FIA)
- ❖ Other specific publicly available datasets (e.g., Databasin)
- ❖ Surveys – previous participants, other potential stakeholders

13



FSC US Monitoring Approach – Tier 3

Assess and monitor effectiveness for most common mitigation options

- ❖ Perceptions of effectiveness
- ❖ Evaluation of landowner reception and response to education materials

Data Sources:

- ❖ Surveys of certificate holders, consultants, partnering NGO
- ❖ Surveys of landowners
- ❖ Direct consultation with conservation organizations & CBs

14



What is the focus for 2022?

Following several years of experience with the US Controlled Wood approach, FSC US is again looking for key input, along with our monitoring and evaluation findings.

Areas of high interest:

- ❖ **Effectiveness and feasibility of the 2018 mitigation options**
- ❖ **Ideas for new types of mitigation options**
- ❖ Additional information that can inform future revision of the US NRA regarding:
 - Potential changes to risk designations / specified risk areas
 - Quantitative and qualitative inputs on monitoring & evaluation

16



How will the 2022 process work?

For the remainder of 2022, and into early 2023, we're seeking:

- ❖ Initial identification of higher priorities and concerns via the webinar
- ❖ More in-depth sharing of experiences and knowledge via the in-person Regional Meetings
- ❖ Ongoing complementary collection of ideas, questions & suggestions via the web site
- ❖ Reactions to proposed changes to the mitigation options

<https://www.engage.us.fsc.org>

17



What have we learned from the monitoring?

Year 1 data collection focused on establishing baselines for future comparison, but some additional insights were gained regarding **implementation of mitigation options**:

At a national scale:

- ❖ Education & Outreach options were selected most often
- ❖ Most Education & Outreach efforts met the requirements and intent, but opportunity to ensure more consistently high-quality materials / delivery
- ❖ Landowners unlikely to change behaviour following a single touchpoint
- ❖ Procurement Policies & Conservation Initiatives were the next two most frequently selected
- ❖ Most CW sourcing occurred in the Southeast and Appalachian regions

18



What have we learned from the monitoring?

At a Southeast Region scale:

- ❖ 71% of 252 mitigation options reported were Education & Outreach
- ❖ Of CH respondents:
 - 84% sourcing from Late Success. Bottomland Hardwoods risk area
 - 82% sourcing from Native Longleaf Systems risk areas
 - 64% sourcing from Conversion risk area
 - 52% sourcing from Southern Appalachians risk area

19



What have we learned from the monitoring?

At a Southeast Region scale:

❖ Of CH respondents:

- 34% sourcing from Patch-nosed Salamander risk area
- 34% sourcing from Florida Panhandle risk area
- 28% sourcing from Cape Fear Arch risk area
- 26% sourcing from Dusky Gopher Frog risk area
- 14% sourcing from Central Florida risk area
- 10% sourcing from Houston Toad risk area

❖ A majority of CH engaged a consultant as, or worked without a partner, and a few partnered with an NGO

20



What have we learned from the monitoring?

At a Mississippi Alluvial Valley Region scale:

- ❖ 85% of 26 mitigation options reported were Education & Outreach
- ❖ Other mitigation options reported were Procurement Policy & Implement Management Activities
- ❖ 100% of CH respondents sourcing from Late Successional Bottomland Hardwoods risk areas

21



What have we learned from the monitoring?

Insights were also gained regarding **potential future improvements**:

At a national scale:

- ❖ FSC US efforts to help develop partnerships could make conservation initiative options more feasible and effective
- ❖ Redesigned mitigation options could improve potential for monitoring & evaluation to detect impacts from mitigation activities
- ❖ Additional data sources are needed for individual specified risk areas
- ❖ Improved outreach to stakeholders needed to improve assessment of perceptions on ecological conditions and mitigation effectiveness

22





What did we hear via the webinar & website?


- ❖ All potential topics are important to discuss, but effectiveness of mitigation options and potential inaccuracies in the NRA are priorities
- ❖ Overall, the mitigation options were generally felt to be feasible
- ❖ Of the top three most implemented mitigation options, greatest concern about effectiveness for Education & Outreach, least for Procurement Policy
- ❖ Also that Education & Outreach is working as well as could be expected
- ❖ More support and information from FSC US is desired
- ❖ Potential need to restructure mitigation options; different approach for conversion
- ❖ Improved outputs needed (compared with 2018)
- ❖ Importance of NGO partnerships

23









Coming soon...

Following the Regional Meetings and if mitigation option changes are identified, FSC US will:

- ❖ Continue to monitor the online discussion forum
- ❖ Develop a set of proposed edits, and share through a short public consultation
- ❖ Revise as needed and then consult with FSC International on whether to complete changes immediately, or delay until the NRA is revised
- ❖ Keep US stakeholders informed about when changes will occur

Coming soon...

The NRA is due for revision by March 2024, but timing will likely be affected by other processes:

- ❖ Revision of the NRA Framework (FSC-PRO-60-002a) is ongoing, and may affect how risk designations are determined
- ❖ Revision of the Controlled Wood Standard (FSC-STD-40-005) will be initiated in 2024 (potential changes are unknown)

31



NRA Framework Revision

Major Changes Proposed!

- ❖ Introduction of an analytical template
- ❖ Reforms to when Control Measures and verifiers are required
- ❖ Mapping requirement

Opportunities to engage & influence

- ❖ Willingness to share experiences in risk assessment and mitigation?
- ❖ Best practices for mitigation measures? Examples?
- ❖ Willingness to pilot the analytical template?
- ❖ Extended consultation window for US CW process participants

32



Many thanks & hope to see you all soon!

