

FOREST MANAGEMENT CERTIFICATION

Minnesota's Forests

Maintaining a Careful Balance for People and the Environment

Everyone agrees that protecting the environment is necessary. And when people think about protecting the environment, they often consider the best ways for people to relate to forests. Many people are surprised to learn that managing forests, rather than leaving them alone, often helps the larger environment.

While Minnesota's forests sustain the Mississippi River's flow and the productivity of its surrounding ecosystems, they also sustain the livelihoods of families who are a part of the state's forest products industry. Both functions are very important, and, for generations, Minnesotans have worked to maintain a balance between the needs of each.

When forestry professionals work with the lands entrusted to them, they think about a great deal more than how many millions of cords they can sell. What features of the forest should be enhanced as wildlife habitat? How can forest managers help smaller trees become larger and more robust in the ecosystem? In what ways can a forest, altered and damaged by past generations, again come to enjoy the species mix of trees, plants, and animals that it had a century or more before? What public needs—recreation, the health of local communities dependent on the forests—can the best forest management enhance?

With these challenging questions in mind, public land managers, private forest owners, forest products companies and environmental groups have come together to support Forest Management Certification.

An extensive study completed by the World Wildlife Fund in 2005 found that credible forest management certification systems bring added value to society, the environment, and the economy¹.

The Certification Systems

Two credible forest management certification systems have come to the forefront in the United States, although others continue to develop in response to widespread interest in forest management certification.

These two systems are the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) systems. Minnesota DNR is seeking forest management certification under both systems in 2005.

1

http://www.forestrycenter.org/library/admin/uploadedfiles/Minnesota_Forest_Certification_Website.htm#_Protecting_the_Health

The Forest Stewardship Council

In the days leading up to and following the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio, world attention was focused on the challenges faced by cultures around the globe as demands on their natural resources increased. Poverty, disease, land use change, climate change, and pollution all continue to threaten our resources and the stability of cultures worldwide. The challenges at Rio remain largely unmet. However, the conversations that occurred there contributed to one solution - the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC).

Driven in part by the failure of an intergovernmental process to agree on a global forest compact, and the compelling question-“what is sustainable forestry?”- loggers, foresters, environmentalists, and sociologists came together in the first General Assembly to form the FSC in 1993.

The Forest Stewardship Council was created to change the dialogue about and the practice of sustainable forestry worldwide. This impressive goal has in many ways been achieved, yet there is more work to be done. FSC sets forth principles, criteria, and standards that span economic, social, and environmental concerns. The FSC standards represent the world’s strongest system for guiding forest management toward sustainable outcomes. Like the forestry profession itself, the FSC system includes stakeholders with a diverse array of perspectives on what represents a well-managed and sustainable forest. While the discussion continues, the FSC standards for forest management have now been applied in over 57 countries around the world.

In 1995, FSC-US, located in Washington, D.C., was established as the national “chapter” of FSC.

Its purpose is to coordinate the development of forest management standards throughout the different biogeographic regions of the U.S., to provide public information about certification and FSC, and to work with certification organizations to promote FSC certification in the U.S. FSC-US has a national presence through the work of its Board of Directors, members, staff, and regional standards coordinators.

Minnesota’s forest management certification will be governed by the Lakes States-Central Hardwoods Regional Standard of the FSC. Several professional forest managers from Minnesota were involved in developing that biogeographic regional standard.

The FSC’s international headquarters are located in Bonn, Germany. FSC has contact person and national offices in more than 40 countries, creating a global FSC network. For more information on FSC at the international level, please visit www.fscoax.org.²

The Sustainable Forestry Initiative

SFI® History

The SFI® program was launched in October of 1994 as a commitment by program participants to sustainable forest management under a rigorous system of principles, objectives, and measures of performance. In November of 1998 SFI added a verification program for those

² http://www.fscus.org/about_us/

program participants wishing to confirm conformance to the Standard. Successful independent 3rd-party verification may lead to certification and use of an on-product label.

SFB History

The Sustainable Forestry Board was chartered as an independent body in July of 2000 to oversee development and continuous improvement of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI)[®] Program Standard, associated certification processes and procedures and program quality control mechanisms. In January 2002 the SFB filed Articles of Incorporation to become a separate entity and obtained 501(c)3 nonprofit status. The "new" entity is called the Sustainable Forestry Board, Inc. (SFB).

SFB Membership

The SFB has fifteen members with a balanced array of interests -- one-third representing SFI Program Participants; one-third from the conservation & environmental community; and one-third from the broader forestry community.

SFI Program Management

While the SFB has responsibility for maintaining and enhancing the SFI Standard and certification procedures,

- Individual companies and landowners are responsible for adoption and implementation of the program with help from staff specialists housed at the American Forest and Paper Association and 34 state implementation committees;
- Only auditing firms that meet certification and training standards set by the American National Standards Institute and the Registrars Accreditation Board may verify conformance to the SFI Standard; and,
- A wide range of committees and organizations provide programmatic input and guidance

Minnesota's third party forest management certification will be governed by the 2005 revision of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard.³

³ <http://www.aboutsfb.org>

Certification Standards Governing Common Forest Management Field Activities

Inventory

FSC Standard	SFI Standard
Principle 4, Criterion 4.4.b	Obj. 1, Performance Measure 1.1
Principle 5, Criterion 5.2.b	Obj. 2, Performance Measure 2.4
	Obj. 3, Performance Measure 3.2

Planning

FSC Standard	SFI Standard
Principle 2, Criterion 2.1.a, 2.2.a, b, and c	Obj. 1, Performance Measure 1.1
Principle 3, Criterion 3.2.a and b	Obj. 2, Performance Measure 2.1
Principle 3, Criterion 3.3.a, b, and c	Obj. 4, Performance Measure 4.1
Principle 5, Criterion 5.1.a	Obj. 5, Performance Measure 5.3
Principle 5, Criterion 5.4	
Principle 5, Criterion 5.6.b, and c	
Principle 6, Criterion 6.3.a.1, 2, and 4	
Principle 6, Criterion 6.6.a, b, c, d, and e	
Principle 6, Criterion 6.10.a, b	
Principle 8, Criterion 8.4	

Appraisal

FSC Standard	SFI Standard
Principle 2, Criterion 2.1.b	Obj. 2, Performance Measure 2.3
Principle 4, Criterion 4.4 a, b, c, d, and e	Obj. 3, Performance Measure 3.2
Principle 6, Criterion 6.1.a, b, and c	Obj. 4, Performance Measure 4.1
Principle 6, Criterion 6.2.c, and e	Obj. 6, Performance Measure 6.1
Principle 6, Criterion 6.3.b.1	Obj. 7, Performance Measure 7.1
Principle 8, Criterion 8.2.d.3	

Prescription Preparation

FSC Standard	SFI Standard
Principle 5, Criterion 5.3.a and b	Obj. 2, Performance Measure 2.1
Principle 5, Criterion 5.5	Obj. 2, Performance Measure 2.3
Principle 5, Criterion 5.6	Obj. 3, Performance Measure 3.1
Principle 6, Criterion 6.1.d	Obj. 3, Performance Measure 3.2
Principle 6, Criterion 6.2.a, b, d	Obj. 4, Performance Measure 4.1
Principle 6, Criterion 6.3.a.3, and 5	Obj. 5, Performance Measure 5.1
Principle 6, Criterion 6.3.b.1, 2, 3, and 4	Obj. 6, Performance Measure 6.1
Principle 6, Criterion 6.3.c. 1, 2, and 3	Obj. 7, Performance Measure 7.1
Principle 6, Criterion 6.5.a, and b	

Principle 6, Criterion 6.6.a and b	
Principle 6, Criterion 6.6.a, b, c, d, and e	

Timber Sales/Permit Supervision

FSC Standard	SFI Standard
Principle 5, Criterion 5.3.a, b, and c	Obj. 2 Performance Measure 2.3
Principle 6, Criterion 6.3.c. 1, 2, and 3	Obj. 3, Performance Measure 3.1
Principle 6, Criterion 6.5.a, and b	Obj. 6, Performance Measure 6.1
Principle 6, Criterion 6.7.a, b, c, and d	Obj. 7, Performance Measure 7.1
Principle 8, Criterion 8.2.d.1	
Principle 8, Criterion 8.3	

Regeneration Surveys

FSC Standard	SFI Standard
	Obj. 2, Performance Measure 2.1
	Obj. 5, Performance Measure 5.1

Reforestation/Planting

FSC Standard	SFI Standard
Principle 5, Criterion 5.5	Obj. 2, Performance Measure 2.5
Principle 6, Criterion 6.6.a, b and c	
Principle 10.1-9	

Contracting

FSC Standard	SFI Standard
Principle 4, Criterion 4.1.a, b, and f	Obj. 10, Performance Measure 10.1
Principle 4, Criterion 4.2.a	
Principle 4, Criterion 4.5	