



Conformity Assessment Slovenian Forest Certification Scheme

Final Report
June 10, 2014

Assessor: Robert S. Simpson
GreenWoodGlobal Consulting, Ltd
1107 P Street, NW
Washington, DC 2005
Phone: +1 – 202- 340-1543
simpson@gwgcltd.com

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	4
Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	5
1. Introduction	7
1.1 Scope of the Assessment	7
1.2 Assessment Process	8
1.3 Methodology Adopted	8
1.4 Timetable of the Assessment	9
1.5 Reference Documents and Sources	10
1.6 Personnel	11
2. Recommendation to the PEFC Council Board of Directors	12
3. Summary of Findings	
3.1 Structure of the System	13
3.2 Standard Setting Processes and Procedures	14
3.3 Forest Certification Standards	16
3.4 Group Certification Model	17
3.5 Chain of Custody Standards	19
3.6 Logo Usage	19
3.7 Complaints and Dispute Resolution Procedures	19
3.8 Certification and Accreditation Procedures	19
3.9 Any Other Aspects	20
3.10 Stakeholder Survey	20
4. Structure of the System	21
5. Standard Setting Process	24
6. Forest Management Standard	29
7. Group Certification Model.....	33
8. Chain of Custody Standard	37

9. Implementation of PEFC Logo Usage	37
10. Certification and Accreditation Arrangements	38
11. Complaints and Dispute Resolution Procedures	40
12. Annex 1: PEFC Standard and Scheme Requirements Checklist	
1. Purpose	41
2. Methodology	41
3. Legend	41
Part I: Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Standard Setting	43
(PEFC ST 1001:2010)	
Part II: Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Group Forest	61
Management Group Certification (PEFC ST 1002:2010)	
Part III: Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Sustainable Forest	67
Management (PEFC ST 1003:2010)	
Part IV: Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Certification	90
and Accreditation Procedures (Annex 6)	
Part V: Standard and System Requirement Checklist for System Specific Chain of	100
Custody Standards - Compliance with PEFC 2002:2010	
Part VI: Standard and System Requirements Checklist for Scheme Administration	101
Requirements	
Annex 2: Results of Stakeholder Survey	103
Individual Stakeholder Responses	
Annex 3: Results of International Stakeholder Consultation	109
Annex 4: Panel of Experts Comments	110
Mr. Hannu Valtanen	110
Mr. Hugh Miller.....	115
Mr. Hans Kopp	117

Acknowledgements

The Assessor wishes to thank the following people for their assistance, contributions and support during this project.

- Mr. Michael Berger and Mr. Johan Vlieger of the PEFC Technical Unit
- Mr. Mihael Koprivnakar , PEFC Slovenia
- All respondents to the Working Group survey
- PEFC Panel of Experts:
 - Mr. Hannu Valtanen
 - Mr. Hugh Miller
 - Mr. Hans Kopp

Acronyms and Abbreviations:

BOD	Board of Directors
CAFS	Chamber of Agriculture for Forest Certification
CoC	Chain of Custody
C/O	Care of
FA	The Slovenian Forest Act
FLU	Forest Level Unit
FMU	Forest Management Unit
FMP	Forest Management Plan
FMS	Forest Management Standard
GD	Guidance Document
GZS	Chamber of Commerce and Industry
IAF	International Accreditation Forum
IFC	Institute of Forest Certification
IFC Plan	IFC Plan for Scheme Revision
IGD	Internal Guidance Document
ILO	International Labor Organization
ISO/IEC	International Standards Organization/International Electrotechnical Commission
KGZS	Chamber and Institute for Forest Certification
N/A	Not Applicable
PEFC	Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification

PEFCC	PEFC Council
ReNGP	Resolution of National Forest Program
RU	Regional Unit
SFCS	Slovenian Forest Certification Scheme
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management
SKZGS	State Forest Service
SSP	Standard Setting Procedure
TU	Technical Unit
SLO	Slovenia
WGP	Working Group
ZGS	Slovenian Forest Service
ZOG	Slovenian Forest Act

1. Introduction

1.1 Scope of the Assessment

The scope of this assessment is compare the Slovenia Forest Certification Scheme with the minimum requirements of the PEFC as stated in the PEFC Technical Documents and specified in PEFC IGD 1007:2012. This assessment shall ultimately provide the assessor's recommendation to the PEFC Board of Directors (BOD) as to whether the revised scheme is in conformance with PEFC Technical Documents and whether the scheme should be recommended by the BOD for re-endorsement to the PEFC General Assembly.

It is to be noted that the PEFC BOD approved PEFC IGD 1007:2012 in May, 2012 and that the document came into force in January, 2013. However, the SFCS revision had formally commenced by January 2012 and was approved by the Institute of Forest Certification in May, 2012. During this time the Minimum Requirement Checklist GL 2/2011 was in use by the SFCS working group.

As specified in PEFC IGD 1007:2012, the following actions were taken to assess the conformity of the revised standard to PEFC requirements.

- A general analysis of the structure of the scheme technical documentation.
- Assessment of the standard setting procedures and process against PEFC ST 1001:2010, Standard Setting – Requirements
- Assessment of the forest certification standard(s) against PEFC ST 1003:2010, Sustainable Forest Management - Requirements
- Assessment of the group certification model against PEFC ST 1002:2010, Group Forest Management Certification - Requirements
- Assessment of the CoC standard(s) against PEFC ST 2002:2010, Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products – Requirements (*PEFC Slovenia has adopted in its entirety and without modification the PEFC Chain-of-Custody; PEFC ST 2002:2010 requirements)
- Assessment of the procedures for notification of certification bodies against PEFC GD 1004:2009, Administration of PEFC Scheme, Chapter 5
- Assessment of the procedures for logo licensing against PEFC GD 1004:2009, Administration of PEFC Scheme, Chapter 6 (*Logo usage is only assessed with the initial scheme submission)
- Assessment of the procedures for complaints and dispute resolution against PEFC GD 1004:2009, Administration of PEFC Scheme, Chapter 8
- Assessment of the certification and accreditation procedures, as defined in the PEFC Council Technical Document, Annex 6, Certification and Annex Procedures

- A stakeholder survey to check the basic contents of the development report on the standard setting process.
- Any other aspects which can affect functions, credibility and efficiency of the submitted system.

1.2 Assessment Process

The assessment process was carried out in two phases, each phase comprising several significant steps.

Phase I

- Step 1: Review the scheme documentation as provided by the National Governing Body, PEFC Slovenia, 22.07.2013.
- Step 2: PEFC Slovenia initiated a 60-day public consultation by way of its website to gather comments from other PEFC National Governing Bodies as well as interested international stakeholders.
- Step 3: Develop Working Group stakeholder survey and submit it to WG members.
- Step 4: Scheme documentation (see Chapter 1.4) was assessed for conformance against PEFC GD 1007:2012 by the assessor.
- Step 5: The assessor communicated with PEFC Slovenia asking for several evidentiary documents not included in the initial package of SFCS documentation.
- Step 6: A Draft Report in both Microsoft Word and Adobe PDF was delivered to PEFC Slovenia and PEFC Slovenia providing an overview of the SFCS non-conformities to PEFC requirements on 25.08.2013 for review and comment.

Phase II

- Step 7: Reviewed PEFC Slovenia responses received 29.08.2013
- Step 8: Reviewed surveys from three respondents of the SFCS WG
- Step 9: Reviewed comments from PEFC Slovenia received 18.09.2013
- Step 10: Comments from Panel of Experts

1.3 Methodology Adopted

The following methodology was used by *GreenWoodGlobal Consulting, Ltd* to determine the level of conformity of the revised documents of the SFCS as outlined in **Scope of the Assessment**.

1.3.1 Assessment of Documents

The assessment of the scheme and review of documents provided by SFCS (see Chapter 1.4) was conducted from the office of GreenWoodGlobal Consulting, Ltd. As this was a standard revision procedure by SCFC, a field visit was not required. Most of the technical documentation provided by SFCS was presented in English. However, the majority of supplemental evidentiary and corroborating documentation was not in English. In addition, although this material is made available to the public by PEFC Slovenia (www.pefc.si), the website is in the native language making it difficult for the assessor to determine where to locate appropriate documents. Requests were

then placed to PEFC Slovenia to supply needed documentation and to also provide English translations of the critical components of the documents. This was done.

The documents were assessed by Robert S. Simpson of GreenWoodGlobal Consulting, Ltd. The PEFC IGD 1007:2012 Minimum Requirements Checklists were used to assess conformance of the revised scheme against the minimum requirements for the re-endorsement process as defined by the PEFC.

The results of the assessment were documented in full in the Minimum Requirements Checklist and draft report was elaborated and submitted to PEFC and PEFC Slovenia for review and comment.

1.3.2 Stakeholder Comments and Public Consultation

During the review and assessment of the documentation, the PEFC Secretariat held a 60-day open call for comments on the Slovenian scheme. Specifically, this was directed to PEFC National Governing Bodies and interested international stakeholders as well as other interested parties. This public consultation was held via the PEFC website (www.pefc.org) and available for comment from 08.08.2013 through 23.08.2013. The results of the assessment were assembled into a Draft Report as defined in PEFC GD 1007:2012 and submitted to PEFC Slovenia and the PEFC Secretariat for a two-week review and comment period. No international comments were received by PEFC.

Also, during the SFCS assessment period, the Assessor developed a survey for the SCFS Working Group (WG), responsible for the scheme revision. Names and e-mail addresses were provided by PEFC Slovenia and the survey (See Annex 2) was forwarded to them with instructions to please return all comments by 23.08.2013. Three comments were received.

1.3.3 Panel of Experts Review

The results of the Draft Report of the conformity assessment which were reviewed and documented by the assessor after consideration of comments from PEFC and PEFC Slovenia were reviewed by the Panel of Experts (POE) assigned by PEFC. POE comments were reviewed by the Assessor, and where the Assessor believed them to be significant, were incorporated into the final report. (See Annex IV for POE Comments and Assessor's responses)

1.4 Timetable of Assessment

The following timetable was submitted to the PEFC Secretariat for the assessment process.

Table 1

Timetable for PEFC Slovenia Scheme Assessment		
Date	Action	Elapsed Time
22.07.2013	Begin Phase I: Assessment of Slovenian Standard	
25.08.2013	Submission of Draft Report to PEFC Secretariat and PEFC Slovenia for review and comment	5 weeks

23.08.2013	Survey Comments Due from SFCS WG	
26.08.2013	Draft Report Review and Comment Period of PEFC Secretariat and PEFC Slovenia	2 weeks
08.09.2013	Commence Phase II of Assessment	3 weeks
26.09.2013	Draft Final Report Submitted to PEFC Secretariat And PEFC Slovenia	10 Weeks
	Submission to PEFC Panel of Experts for Review	
	Inclusion of POE Comments Submission of Final Report to PEFC Secretariat	

1.5 Reference Documents and Sources

The following is list of documents provided by PEFC Slovenia to the PEFC Secretariat for conformity assessment to evaluate for re-endorsement of the SFCS.

Normative Documents Provided by PEFC Slovenia:

- PEFC SLO 01-2012 General Presentation of Slovenian Forest Certification Scheme
- PEFC SLO 02-2012 Requirements for Regional, Group and Individual Certification
- PEFC SLO 03-2012 Criteria and Indicators for SFM at Regional Level
- PEFC SLO 04-2012 Criteria and Indicators for SFM at the Group and Individual Level
- PEFC SLO 05-2012 Certification and Accreditation Procedures for Certification Bodies Carrying Out Certification
- PEFC SLO 06-2012 Requirements for Auditors
- PEFC 2002 – 2010 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products
- PEFC 2001 – 2008 Logo Usage Rules - Requirements
- PEFC GL 2 – 2011 PEFC Minimum Requirements Checklist

Descriptive Documents Provided by PEFC Slovenia

- Plan for Modification of Slovenian Scheme
- Standard Setting Procedures
- Scheme Description and Implementation Arrangements

Supporting Documents Provided by PEFC Slovenia

- Institute of Forest Certification Articles of Association
- Forest Act

In addition, documents attesting to proof of process were referenced (i.e. minutes of meetings, public notifications, invitations to participate, public comments, etc.) did not accompany the documents provided by PEFC Slovenia, but were to be available by PEFC Slovenia at www.pefc.si or by request at info@pefc.si.

The following list of technical documents was provided by PEFC and used for the conformity assessment.

Technical Documents Provided by PEFC

- PEFC GD 2001:2008 Structure of PEFC Technical Documents
- PEFC ST 1001:2010 Standard Setting
- PEFC ST 1002:2010 Group Forest Management Certification
- PEFC ST 1003:2010 Sustainable Forest Management
- PEFC ST 2001:2008 PEFC Logo Usage Rules
- PEFC ST 2003:2012 Chain of Custody Certification Body Requirements
- PEFC GD 1004:2009 Administration of PEFC Scheme
- PEFC GD 1007:2012 Endorsement of National Schemes
- Annex 6 PEFC TD Accreditation and Certification Procedures

In addition, the websites of PEFC (www.pefc.org) and PEFC Slovenia (www.pefc.si) functioned as sources of additional information, process and documents relevant to the conformity assessment.

1.6 Personnel

Robert S. Simpson was the sole assessor involved in the project. He completed the PEFC Standard Assessor's Training in Geneva, Switzerland, November 2012. He has been involved with PEFC at some level from 1999 to present. He has served eight years on the PEFC Board of Directors and is intimately familiar with PEFC framework, as well as reviewing dozens of standard assessments submitted to the PEFC Board from standard assessors.

Mr. Mihael Koprivnikar, Acting Director, PEFC Slovenia, was involved as the contact person during the conformity assessment process.

2. Recommendation

Based on the findings of GreenWoodGlobal Consulting, Ltd, and documented in the text and checklists of this report, the Assessor concludes that the Slovenian Forest Certification Scheme is in conformity to PEFC requirements for scheme endorsement following remedies to six minor non-conformities noted by the Assessor.

Therefore GreenWoodGlobal Consulting, Ltd. **recommends** to the PEFC Board of Directors to **re-endorse** the Slovenian Forest Certification Scheme as all identified non-conformities **have been corrected within six months following re-endorsement by the PEFC General Assembly.**

3. Summary of Findings

3.1 Structure of the System

The Slovenian Forest Certification System (SFCS) for sustainable forest management is based upon requirements as defined in the Technical Documents of the PEFC Council. It was initially endorsed by PEFC in 2007. The SFCS takes into account Slovenian national forest legislation governing forest management, ownership structure, the national forest management planning system, the methodology of forestry data collection and processing and other relevant criteria in Slovenia. The SFCS allows regional, group and individual certifications.

PEFC Slovenia functions as the national governing body of SFCS, administered by the Institute for Forest Certification (IFC). The IFC is a not-for profit organization and was instituted to “as a national administrative body having a purpose to promote a sustainable management of forests according to the Programme for the Endorsement of Forests Certification scheme – PEFC. The IFC is recognized as “owning” the Slovenian forest certification standard and shall in accordance with the instructions of the BOD of PEFC, grant the right to use the PEFC logo”. The IFC is recognized as a legal entity with its own Board of Directors. Its Articles of Incorporation require it to act in an open and transparent manner as a public organization.

Some of the duties of the IFC, with respect to the SFCS include:

- Operate as the official representative of PEFC Slovenia
- Support and promote sustainable forest management through the program of PEFC
- Oversee certification and accreditation of certification bodies
- Grant rights for the use of the PEFC logo
- Archive all relevant PEFC Slovenia and SFCS documents
- Oversee SFCS standard setting and standard revision
- Oversee the dispute resolution process

Concerning standard setting activities, the following bodies participated in the revision process of the 2012 SFCS.

- IFC BOD – responsible for planning the five-year revision, public announcements, administration of the process, announcing public consultation and acceptance of the revisions from the SFCS Working Group (WG)
- Acting Director, PEFC Slovenia – responsible for administrating the WG and overseeing the standard setting process

- Working Group (WG) – body of interested stakeholder organization representatives directly participating in the standard revision process. They work under rules of consensus, transparency and are organized so that no single entity can control the process. Following reaching consensus, they submit their revisions to the IFC BOD for formal adoption.

The list of WG participants (see Table 3) demonstrates a balanced representation of for the development of the SFM standard. Results of the stakeholder survey also demonstrated satisfaction with the WG in regard to balanced participation and transparency.

The Assessor finds that **the Structure of the System is in conformity** with PEFC requirements.

3.2 Standard Setting Procedures and Process

The standard revision process was guided by the Statute for the Institute of Forest Certification, Chapters 2.4 and 2.5 and in conformance with PEFC ST 1001:2010 – Standard Setting Requirements as of November 26, 2010. Additionally, the revision was guided by ISO/EC: Guide 59:1994 and ISO/EC Guide 2: 1996. Both the standard setting procedures and the standard setting processes for the revision were reviewed by the Assessor.

The revision process was initially instituted by the IFC as per statute requirements. The process was initiated in November with the first invitations to join the working group being sent on January 3, 2012. This was followed by public announcements of the revision and invitations to join the working group through the newspaper and the website; www.pefc.si. From the initial meeting it was determined that all interested stakeholders would participate. A formal Working Group (WG) was established consisting of five chambers; State and Public Interest, Wood-based Industry, University Faculty, Private Forest Owners, Consumers/General Public, Environmental NGOs, and Other Organizations. The composition was diverse and set so that no single entity could control the process. The Working Group met four times from January through April, in an open and transparent process with consensus as the goal for all decision making. Both minutes and stakeholder surveys attested to this. Following the ending of the public consultation period, the WG convened and through consensus agreed on the final revision which was then forwarded to the IFC as per IFC statute. The IFC approved the revised standard on May 17, 2012.

Standard Setting Procedures

The assessment of the standard setting procedures showed that written procedures for both the IFC and the Working Group are clear and objective. Areas of responsibility, instructions for formal adoption, record keeping, balanced representation of stakeholders, standard setting process, means of reaching consensus, processes and timelines for revisions of standards and other normative documents are adequately defined. The procedures for the WG are clear and adequately covered in the standard. The standard clearly defines WG transparency, balanced representation, outreach to disadvantaged stakeholders, public availability to documents and input, consensus building and dispute resolution.

The Assessor finds that **the Standard Setting Procedures are in conformity** with PEFC ST 1001:2010 requirements with two minor non-conformities remedied by PEFC Slovenia on 06.05.2014.

Minor Non-conformity

Standard and System Requirement Checklist of Standard Setting (PEFC ST 1001:2010)

6.3. The application date shall not exceed a period of one year from the publication of the standard. This is needed for the endorsement of the revised standards/normative documents, introducing the changes, information dissemination and training.

Minor non-conformity: The SCFS reads “The application date should not exceed...”

Remedy: Change “should” to read “shall.”

PEFC SLO Remedied Standard

Standard and System Requirement Checklist of Standard Setting (PEFC ST 1001:2010)

The transition period shall not exceed one year except in a case when a longer period is requested by the implementation of modifications.

Minor Non-conformity

Standard and System Requirements Checklist for Standard Setting (PEFC ST 1001:2010)

4.5 (a) *Upon receipt of the complaint, the standard setting body shall acknowledge receipt to the complainant.*

Minor non-conformity: The SCFS does not address communicating with the complainant about receiving the complaint and the process that will follow.

Remedy: Criteria should be revisited and amended with proper translation to mention that the complainant receives both acknowledgement of the complaint and informed as to the procedures and processes from the IFC following registering of a complaint.

PEFC SLO Remedied Standard

Standard and System Requirements Checklist for Standard Setting (PEFC ST 1001:2010)

6.5 The procedure of complaint includes:

- Record of the complaint,
- Informing the complainant about the receipt procedures of complaint
- Gathering necessary information,
- Discussion and decision on complaint,
- Informing the complainant about the decision.

Standard Setting Processes

The assessment of the standard setting procedures showed overall that processes were in conformance with PEFC requirements. Respondents of the WG survey (Annex 2) demonstrated overall satisfaction with the process and with reaching consensus. However, only three of the twelve WG members responded to the survey. It should also be noted that one respondent seemed somewhat dissatisfied with some parts of group consensus. Additional evidence of conformance to the process is

demonstrated in additional material including minutes of the WF meetings, correspondence, website snapshots, etc.

The Assessor finds that **the Standard Setting Processes are in conformity** to PEFC requirements.

3.3 Forest Certification Standards

The SFCS documentation identifies PEFC SLO 03:2012 as Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management at the Regional Level. It states, "The document is produced on the basis of requirements of sustainable forest management, an international standard of the PEFC Council: Sustainable Forest Management Requirements – PEFC ST 1003:2010." The stated purpose of the document is to provide:

- Definition of minimum requirements of sustainable forest management for the needs of certification, taking into account all ecological, social and productive functions of the forest.
- Definition of key points and areas of sustainable forest management audit for the regional level on the basis of which certification bodies will be able to audit sustainable forest management.

The FMS functions as the national standard and is applicable to all forests in Slovenia seeking PEFC certification. This is justified in the SFCS because of current factors such as forest planning, data collection, and cost-effectiveness for the certification process.

The SCFS relies heavily on the Slovenian Forest Act (Official Gazette of the RS no. 30/1993, 13/1998 Decision of the Const. Court: U-I-53/95, 24/1999, Decision of the Const. Court: U-I-51/95, 56/1999 (31/2000 - cor.), 67/2002, 110/2002), a national forest policy that sets forest management practices for both public and private forests. The SFCS builds upon the Forest Act and is complimentary to it. In addition to the Forest Act, PEFC SLO 03:2012 criteria and indicators also take into account other international and national documents as well.

The Assessor finds that **the Forest Certification Standards are in conformity** with PEFC ST 1003:2012 requirements with two minor non-conformities remedied by PEFC Slovenia on 06.05.2014.

Minor Non-conformity

Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Sustainable Forest Management Checklist (PEFC ST 1003:2012)

5.2.1) Forest management planning shall aim ...

Minor non-conformity: The SCFS does not mention the word "planning" in their standard, only management.

Remedy: PEFC Slovenia acknowledges the missing word and says it is lost in translation. They will revisit both PEFC SLO 03/2012 and PEFC SLO 04/2012 and insert "planning" into the criteria.

PEFC SLO Remedied Standard

Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Sustainable Forest Management Checklist (PEFC ST 1003:2012)

PEFC SLO 03/2012 Criterion 2.1

Forest planning and management must be geared at maintenance and improvement of health and vitality of forest ecosystems (integral forest protection), also by constant systematic monitoring of threats to the forests and their life potential, natural impacts and the influences of human activity on the forest as well as preventive and other protective measures.

PEFC SLO 04/2012 Criterion 2.1

Forest planning and management must be geared at maintenance and improvement of health and vitality of forests, also by constant systematic monitoring of harmful occurrences which must be monitored by forest holder together with the public forest service.

3.4 Group Certification Model

PEFC Slovenia provides a clear and comprehensive set of requirements and guidance which defines how group entities and group participants can meet the appropriate requirements of PEFC SLO 02-2012 "Requirements for Regional, Group and Individual Certification." The normative technical documents clearly defines the three certification methods available to forest owners and describes the roles and responsibilities of the different parties involved in a clear and effective manner. It defines and describes the duties of the Region/Group entities, and the duties and responsibilities of the Region/Group representative. It also does well at setting out group member responsibilities.

Certification for individual forest owners is covered in this document as well. It describes criteria necessary for forest owners in order to be eligible for individual certification and what processes the landowner must undertake to have his/her property properly certified.

PEFC SLO 02-2012 also covers Region/Group procedures for ingress and egress of members, database monitoring, corrective action procedures and group monitoring.

The Assessor finds that **the Group Certification Model is in conformity** with PEFC requirements with two minor non-conformities remedied by PEFC Slovenia on 06.05.2014.

Minor Non-conformity

Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Group Forest Management – Conformity to the PEFC Council Checklist

4.1.4, The forest certification scheme shall define requirements for an annual internal monitoring program that provides sufficient confidence in the conformity of the whole group organization with the sustainable forest management standard.

Minor non-conformity: There is no specific reference to the requirements for an annual internal monitoring program.

Remedy: PEFC Slovenia acknowledges this gap and has already put forward language to remedy the non-conformity. Proposed language reads: Detail rules and sampling must be described in the internal rules of group representative in document "Rules of Sustainable Management

Control for Regional/Group Representative”. The control must provide sufficient conformity of the whole group certification. Forest properties over 1000 ha Must be controlled (sic. audited) at least once during the five year certification period, based on the “Forest Property Sampling Program.”

PEFC SLO Minor Non-Conformity Remedy

Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Group Forest Management – Conformity to the PEFC Council Checklist

PEFC SLO 02:2012 Criterion 3.2.11

It shall establish an appropriate system of annual auditing the sustainable forest management as regards forest owners included in regional certification scheme,

Minor Non-Conformity

Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Group Forest Management – Conformity to the PEFC Council Checklist:

4.2.1h; To operate an annual internal monitoring programme that provides for the evaluation of the participants’ conformity with the certification requirements, and;

PEFC SLO 02/2012 Ch.3.2.1.10: “It shall establish an appropriate system of auditing the sustainable forest management as regards forest owners included in regional certification scheme.”

Minor non-conformity: There is no specific reference to the requirements for an annual internal monitoring program.

Remedy: PEFC Slovenia acknowledges this gap and has already put forward language to remedy the non-conformity. Proposed language reads: Detail rules and sampling must be described in the internal rules of group representative in document “Rules of Sustainable Management Control for Regional/Group Representative”. The control must provide sufficient conformity of the whole group certification. Forest properties over 1000 ha Must be controlled (sic. audited) at least once during the five year certification period, based on the “Forest Property Sampling Program.”

PEFC SLO Minor Non-Conformity Remedy

Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Group Forest Management – Conformity to the PEFC Council Checklist

PEFC SLO 02:2012 Appendix 5

‘Detail rules for annual sampling must be described in internal rules of group representative in document Rules of Sustainable management control for regional/group representative. The control must provide sufficient conformity of the whole group certification. Forest properties over 1000 ha must be controlled at least once during 5 year certification period, based on Sampling Program of Forest Properties.

3.5 Chain of Custody Standards

The SFCS has adopted in its entirety the PEFC ST 2002:2010 and without modification as the Chain of Custody Standard for the SFCS. Therefore, the criteria required for the PEFC Chain of Custody requirements are fulfilled.

The Assessor finds that **the Chain of Custody Standard is in conformity** to PEFC requirements.

3.6 Logo Usage Rules

In an arrangement with PEFC, the Institute of Forest Certification acts as the licensing body for PEFC logo use. Certification Bodies have the responsibility for the logo use and informing PEFC of any unauthorized use. PEFC ST 2001:2008 "PEFC Logo Usage Rules – Requirements" was adopted in its entirety and without modification by the SFCS.

The Assessor finds that **the Logo Usage Rules is in conformity** to PEFC requirements.

3.7 Complaints and Dispute Resolution Procedures

The IFC, through its Articles of Incorporation is responsible for overseeing dispute resolution with regard to PEFC Slovenia. This temporary body is instituted upon receipt of a formal complaint. The IFC procedures set out a clear process for receiving the complaint, instituting the dispute settlement body of impartial persons and the timeline for reaching settlement. The dispute settlement body is made up of five persons and must be independent and impartial. It was noted that the process did not directly mention that upon receipt of the complaint, the complainant would be notified in a timely manner that it had been received by the IFC.

The Assessor finds that **the Complaints and Dispute Resolution Procedures are in conformity** with PEFC requirements.

3.8 Certification and Accreditation Procedures

The SFCS document clearly and completely describes the certification and accreditation processes. All required ISO procedures for certification bodies and auditors are required and the National Accreditation Body has to be a member of the International Accreditation Forum. Clear procedures for notification of certification bodies are in place.

The Assessor finds that **the Certification and Accreditation Procedures is in conformity** with PEFC requirements with one minor non-conformity remedied by PEFC Slovenia on 06.05.2014.

Minor Non-conformity

Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Accreditation Procedures (Annex 6)

19. Does the scheme documentation include requirements for usage of information from external parties as the audit evidence?

Minor non-conformity: PEFC SLO 05/2012 4.1.8, paragraph 4 appears to be a typographical error giving an incomplete sentence.

Remedy: Revisit the criteria and complete the sentence as needed.

“When conducting the audit, information of various stakeholders (such as the Slovenian Forestry Institute, environmental protection organizations and similar bodies).”

PEFC SLO Minor Non-Conformity Remedy

Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Accreditation Procedures (Annex 6)

PEFC SLO 05/2012 4.1.8, paragraph 4

“When conducting the audit, information of various stakeholders is included (such as the Slovenian Forestry Institute, environmental protection organisations and similar bodies).”

3.9 Other Aspects of Importance

Supplemental materials were either presented (e.g. Forest Act) or mentioned in other documents as available at www.pefc.si or info@pefc.si. These included minutes of meeting, invitation notices, public announcements regarding the standard revision and notification of public consultation. Although all but the Forest Act are in Slovenian, translations were provided by PEFC Slovenia to the Assessor.

The Assessor noted the strong reliance of the SFCS upon the Slovenian Forest Statute. In many instances it was noted that criterion was almost identical to Forest Stature. This will require very specialized auditors with very robust knowledge of the Statute. Additionally, because of its dependency on the Statute, any significant revisions of the Statute will require revisiting of the SCFS.

Finally, the Assessor noted the significant amount of interpretation needed for the conformity assessment. Many of the documents normally provided in English for PEFC assessments were not available and had to be translated for the Assessor. In addition, there were multiple grammatical errors throughout the document, sometimes calling into question the spirit and intent of the criterion and calling for the Assessor to ask for clarification. The Assessor strongly recommends that with the next five-year convening of the Working Group, that PEFC Slovenia budget for a professional English translator/editor so that the relevant documents can be readily available in English to the future assessor.

3.10 Stakeholder Survey

A survey was designed and emailed to all members of the working group to gauge their level of satisfaction with the standard setting process. Of the twelve members on the Working Group (WG), three responded within the window of time allotted; 08.08.2013 – 23.08.2013. Although the response was too small for an accurate gauge of the process, the majority of comments were positive about the openness and transparency, the ability to be recognized, and consensus development. (See Annex 2 for responses.)

4. Structure of the System

The forests of Slovenia cover approximately 58% of the country. In terms of forest cover, this places Slovenia third in the European Union, behind Sweden and Finland. Slovenia's forests are actually expanding due to overgrowing of abandoned farmland, meadows and pastures. Privately owned forest land constitutes nearly 78% of the overall forest ownership, the balance belonging to public forest lands. Private forest ownership is small with an average property size of approximately 3 hectares.

Although forest management is considered both a right and duty of private forest owners, it is the ultimate responsibility of the Slovenia Forest Service to manage for all the forests. The Forest Service works closely with landowners to assist them with forest management practices and oversee harvesting and other activities.

The Institute of Forest Certification in Slovenia (IFC) is a not for profit organization established in December 2006 with the registered office at Celovska cesta 135, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia. It was founded by the Chamber of Agriculture and Forestry of Slovenia and the Forest Interest Grouping for Forestry. The ultimate purpose of the organization is promoting sustainable forest management in conformance to the requirements established by the PEFC Council and through an agreement with PEFC grants the right to use the PEFC logo. It functions as the national governing body; PEFC Slovenia.

The IFC performs the following activities.

- supports and promotes sustainable management of forests through the Programme for the Endorsement of Forests Certification scheme – PEFC,
- operates as the official representative of PEFC for Slovenia,
- harmonises and develops programmes for forest certifications for Slovenia according to the PEFC system,
- harmonises and develops systems for developing a supervision over the origin of wood for Slovenia that shall be in accordance with the requirements of PEFC,
- endeavours to obtain a consent in the process of developing measures and indicators for a sustainable management of forests,
- defines common elements and demands that must be complied with by the Slovene certification scheme
- oversees Programme for the Endorsement of Forests Certification scheme for Slovenia – PEFC,
- analysis of various measures in the process for the development of measure for certification and publishes results,
- in accordance with the instructions of PEFC, grants rights to use PEFC logo,

- maintains records on issued PEFC certificates,
- participates in defining common elements and demands that must be met by the certification programme should they wish to participate and use the trademark PEFC,
- evaluates the adequacy of participating certification programmes with the requirements of the Programme for the Endorsement of Forests Certification scheme – PEFC,
- participates in the harmonisation process of the regulations of the Programme for the Endorsement of Forests Certification scheme – PEFC,
- strengthens and improves the positive image of forests and wood as a recyclable raw material,
- encourages forest owners and all other interested parties to participate in the work of the Institute for Forest Certification in Slovenia,
- mediates information to the founders and to the public,
- performs public relations activities,
- educates forest owners according to the Programme for Forest Certification,
- performs other tasks related to the activities of PEFC.

The organization is led by a five-member Board of Directors. Four of the members are named by the two founding organizations and the fifth member is from the “service users.” This representative is elected through a process overseen by the Board in which five user-groups of the Slovenia PEFC logo can put forward their candidates on a ballot. The user-groups then vote on their representative. The candidate with the greatest amount of votes is declared the new Board member.

Members serve for a period of four years. The Board elects its own president and operates under the statutes set forth in the Articles of Association. Among its duties the Board is responsible for appointing a Director of the Institute, granting PEFC logo usage, instituting the standard revision process, approving the revised standard, overseeing chain of custody requirements and overseeing the complaints and dispute resolution process.

The Board has the authority to appoint three “non-obligatory bodies.” These are:

- Dispute Settlement Body (See Chapter 11)
- Committee for the development and analyses of measure and indicators for sustainable management of forests (See Chapter 5)
- Committee for the development of methods and procedures and for analysing the execution of the following supervision over the wood origin in the whole production chain. (See Chapter 8)

These are independent bodies working as committees to address the issues related to their charge. The bodies are temporary and are instituted when needed and dismissed when their objectives have been met.

The Board appoints a Director who is responsible for the day-to-day running of the organization, budget development, work plans, etc. In addition to these duties the Director provides administrative support to the “Non-obligatory Committees when convened. These duties include:

- Overseeing planning and preparations for scheme development and revisions
- Developing invitations and determining stakeholder bodies to contact
- Developing public notices for invitations and consultations
- Announcements for public consultations and management of records
- Ensuring that PEFC requirements are being met while committees are convened
- Logistics and administrative support for the committees while convened
- Dismissing working groups and committees upon completion of the objectives

The Assessor finds that **the Structure of the System is in conformity** with PEFC requirements.

5. Standard Setting Process

The general procedures applied by the Working Group (WG) are documented in PEFC SLO Plan for Modification of Slovenian Scheme for Forest Certification, PEFC SLO Working Group Procedures for Slovenian PEFC Scheme and PEFC SLO Standard Setting Procedures. More detailed analysis can also be located in Annex 1 – PEFC Standard and Scheme Requirements Checklist. In addition, website snapshots, invitations to stakeholders, public announcement of the revision process, minutes of meetings and other correspondence were reviewed for this report and can be found at www.pefc.si or requesting them through info@pefc.si. It is noted that they are written in the native language and translations will need to be requested.

PEFCC requires that the standard setting process be assessed on two dimensions. First, a conformity assessment of the standard setting procedures is made against the SFCS document Procedures for the Revision of the National Scheme and Working Group Procedures for the Slovenian PEFC Scheme as defined in PEFC ST 1001:2010. In addition, a conformity assessment of the standard setting processes is undertaken of the earlier mentioned documents accompanied with evidentiary documentation of process such as minutes of meetings, public announcements of the revision, invitations to stakeholders, notice of public consultation period, etc. as defined in PEFC ST 1001:2010.

Please refer to Chapter 4 for the general summary of the organizations and the structures and responsibilities of the involved parties of PEFC Slovenia. The following material provides a more detailed analysis of the standard setting procedures and processes, noting core findings and identifying non-conformities.

Forest Management Standard Setting Processes

Table 2 below outlines the actions taken during the revision process, dates, party(s) responsible for carrying out the actions and records containing the results of the process.

Procedures for the Revision of the Slovenian Forest Certification Scheme				
Date	Action Taken	Responsibility		Record
11.2011	Plan for SFCS Revision	BOD	Director	Plan for the Modification of Slovenian Scheme for Forest Certification
01.2012	Public announcement of scheme revision in national newspaper	BOD	Director	Newspaper Zelena dezela
03.01.2012	Invitation to stakeholders to join the WG	BOD	Director	E-mail invitations
10.01.2012	WG Meeting	Director		Minutes of Meeting
23.03.2012	WG Meeting	Director		Minutes of Meeting
04.04.2012	WG Meeting	Director		Minutes of Meeting

23.04.2012	WG Meeting	Director		Minutes of Meeting
17.05.2012	Meeting of IFC to accept revised standard	BOD	Director	Minutes of Meeting
13.06.2012	Public announcement for consultation on revised standard	BOD	Director	www.pefc.si , emails, published in 3 newspapers
17.08.2012	Public consultation closed			No comments received
	Pilot Study			Not Needed Due to Minor Changes in the Standard
13.12.2012	Meeting of IFC Council to approve SFCS for international endorsement	BOD		Minutes of Meeting

There were no significant areas of change with regard to the standard. PEFC BOD considered changes made to the standard as minimal and therefore no pilot testing was required.

The revision planning process began in November 2011. The plan was implemented beginning January, 2012 and was carried out in accordance with the IFC Articles of Association, Chapters 2.4 and 2.5 and in accordance with PRFC ST 1001:2010.

On January 3, 2012 invitations were mailed to all stakeholders identified in the November planning process. In addition, public notice of the scheme revision process was given the national newspaper Zelena dezela. Also in January, notice was posted on the PEFC Slovenia website www.pefc.si. The public announcement included the following.

- Information on goals and content of work and steps for the scheme revision
- Time frame of the revision and final approval of the standard
- Information to stakeholders about their participation
- Invitation to stakeholders to appoint a representative for the WG
- Point of contact and where to find publicly available documentation based on PEFC ST 1001:2010

The revision process was implemented through a “non-obligatory committee” instituted by authority of the IFC Board of Directors and as directed in the IFC Articles of Association. This committee is referred to in scheme documentation as the Working Group (WG). The WG is a temporary body formed to address the standard revision and upon completion of their charge the committee is adjourned. The SFCS WG was formed from those participants who attended the first standard revision meeting held January 10, 2012. During the initial meeting it was determined that due to the reasonable size of the interested stakeholder groups attending, it was possible for all parties to become members of the WG. In an effort to keep the WG balanced so that no single entity could control the process, the WG was divided into five interests. These interests and description of the representative stakeholder groups are in Table 3.

Table 3

Slovenian Forest Certification Scheme Working Group Members	
State and Public Interest	
Organization	Background
ZGS	Former Director of Slovenian Forest Service
ZGS	Current Director of Slovenian Forest Service
ZGS	Director of Forestry Technical Unit, Slovenian Forest Service
SKZGS	Responsible for FSC Certification of State Forests
Wood-based Industry	
GZS	Lobbyist for forest industry, former state secretary
KGZ	Head of timber trade at forest cooperative Zadruga Skofja Loka
University Faculty	
(University Not Acknowledged)	Lobbyist of development of forest-based industry
(University Not Acknowledged)	Faculty for forestry and renewable resources
Private Forest Owners	
CAFS	Head of Forest Certification at the Chamber of Agriculture (CAFS)
CAFS	Auditor for internal control of members in CAFS
Private individual	Private Forest Owner
Consumers/General Public	
Private Individual	Expert general public/consumer interests
Environmental NGO	
Private individual	Expert on sustainable management and renewable energy
Other Organizations	
Private individual	Expert in general interest of the public with regard to sustainable Management (UNESCO perspective)

Additional efforts were made by the IFC to personally reach out to NGOs such as the Slovene Birdlife organization and the Slovene Union of Forest Workers and told if they could not participate that they would have opportunity for input during the public consultation period.

At the initial meeting the WG was made aware of its operating rules and procedures. Specifically, the WG was informed that it must act according to the principles of openness and transparency and that

- Working versions of the documentation are made available to all WG members,
- All members must have the ability to add their comments and proposals to the working versions of the documents,
- Comments and views of all WG members must be discussed in an open and transparent way and discussed.

The WG was also informed that they would be operating under a consensus basis. The WG opted not to elect a chairman as they felt it was unnecessary if working under consensus. They did elect Mihael Koprivnikar, Acting Director IFC, to perform the duties of Secretariat.

A total of four meetings were held with the WG. Process can be confirmed with supplemental evidence provided. Meeting minutes and stakeholder surveys indicate that the meetings were held in conformance to PEFC 1001:2010 requirements.

At the WG meeting of April 23, 2012, consensus was reached by the WG on the standard and it was forwarded to the IFC Board to put forward for public comment. A 60-day public comment period was announced on the PEFC Slovenia website, through emails, letters to the press and published in 3 newspapers. At the end of the period (August 17, 2012) no comments had been received. This made reconvening the WG unnecessary and the IFC moved forward with approving the draft standard as presented by the WG. On December 13, 2012, the IFC approved the final version for submittal for international endorsement.

The Assessor finds that **the Standard Setting Procedures are in conformity** with PEFC ST 1001:2010 requirements with two minor non-conformities remedied by PEFC Slovenia on 06.05.2014.

Minor Non-conformity

Standard and System Requirement Checklist of Standard Setting (PEFC ST 1001:2010)

6.3. The application date shall not exceed a period of one year from the publication of the standard. This is needed for the endorsement of the revised standards/normative documents, introducing the changes, information dissemination and training.

Minor non-conformity: The SCFS reads “The application date should not exceed...”

Remedy: Change “should” to read “shall.”

PEFC SLO Remedied Standard

Standard and System Requirement Checklist of Standard Setting (PEFC ST 1001:2010)

The transition period shall not exceed one year except in a case when a longer period is requested by the implementation of modifications.

Minor Non-conformity

Standard and System Requirements Checklist for Standard Setting (PEFC ST 1001:2010)

4.5 (a) *Upon receipt of the complaint, the standard setting body shall acknowledge receipt to the complainant.*

Minor non-conformity: The SFCS does not address communicating with the complainant about receiving the complaint and the process that will follow.

Remedy: Criteria should be revisited and amended with proper translation to mention that the complainant receives both acknowledgement of the complaint and informed as to the procedures and processes from the IFC following registering of a complaint.

PEFC SLO Remedied Standard

Standard and System Requirement Checklist of Standard Setting (PEFC ST 1001:2010)

The transition period shall not exceed one year except in a case when a longer period is requested by the implementation of modifications.

The Assessor finds that **the Standard Setting Processes are in conformity** to PEFC requirements.

6. Forest Management Standard

Slovenia is a small country with significant forest coverage; approximately 58%. Over 75% of this forest land is owned by approximately 314,000 private individuals with average property size of roughly 3 hectares. The Slovenian Forest Service has the ultimate responsibility for the overall health and sustainability for Slovenia's forests. Although recent surveys show that most Slovenian's do not own forest land for economic purposes, markets are still important to them.

The SFCS documentation identifies PEFC SLO 03:2012 as Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management at the Regional Level. It states, "The document is produced on the basis of requirements of sustainable forest management, an international standard of the PEFC Council: Sustainable Forest Management Requirements – PEFC ST 1003:2010." The stated purpose of the document is to provide:

- Definition of minimum requirements of sustainable forest management for the needs of certification, taking into account all ecological, social and productive functions of the forest.
- Definition of key points and areas of sustainable forest management audit for the regional level on the basis of which certification bodies will be able to audit sustainable forest management.

The Forest Management Standard (FMS) functions as the national standard and is applicable to all forests in Slovenia seeking PEFC certification. This is justified in the SFCS because of current factors such as forest planning, data collection, and cost-effectiveness for the certification process.

The SFCS is created with four major goals.

- Monitoring and continual improvement of sustainable forest management
- Promotion of wood as a renewable raw material
- Establishment of a market instrument for sales of wood and wood products made of sustainably produced raw material
- Ensuring customers that wood labeled with the PEFC logo was acquired from an area where the principles of sustainable forest management apply

The SCFS relies heavily on the Slovenian Forest Act (Official Gazette of the RS no. 30/1993, 13/1998 Decision of the Const. Court: U-I-53/95, 24/1999, Decision of the Const. Court: U-I-51/95, 56/1999 (31/2000 - cor.), 67/2002, 110/2002), a national forest policy that sets forest management practices for both public and private forests. The SFCS builds upon the Forest Act and is complimentary to it. In addition to the Forest Act, PEFC SLO 03:2012 criteria and indicators also take into account other international and national documents as well. Some of these include (but are not limited to):

- Pan-European Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management (Lisbon Resolution L2/1, Third Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe, Lisbon 1998),

- Pan-European Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management (Lisbon Resolution L2/2, Third Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe, Lisbon 1998),
- Rules on the Protection of Forests (Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, No. 92/00) Regulation on the Forest Management and Silviculture Plans (Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia No. 5/98)
- Safety and Health in Forestry Work, ILO 1998, (official translation into the Slovenian language, 2003)

Chart 1. ILO Conventions Ratified by Slovenia

Slovenia Ratification Status of ILO Conventions		
Code	Convention	Date of Ratification
ILO No 29	Forced Labor, 1930	1992
ILO No 87	Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize, 1948	1992
ILO No 98	Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining, 1949	1992
ILO No 100	Equal Remuneration, 1951	1992
ILO No 105	Abolition of Forced Labor, 1957	1997
ILO No 111	Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) 1958	1992
ILO No 138	Minimum Age for Admission to Employment, 1973	1992
ILO 182	Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999	2001

PEFC SLO 03:2012 Forest Management Standard comprises a series of increasingly focused requirements going from a defined criterion, through sub-criteria to descriptive indicators and/or quantitative indicators. Table 4 below defines these components.

Table 4

Components of PEFC Slovenian Forest Management Standard		
Component	Number	Definition
Criterion	6	Pan-European Criteria for Sustainable Forest Management
Sub-criterion	38	Individual element or aspect of the criterion; in most cases a guideline adopted from the Pan-European Criteria for Sustainable Forest Management or the National Forest Development Programme.
Descriptive	38	A descriptive parameter used to clearly and objectively describe the

Indicator		contents of the sub-criterion with the aim of evaluating sustainable forest management in relation to a concrete sub-criterion. Four principal aspects of the indicator are described, for better transparency: legal or regulatory framework, institutional framework, economic policy and financial instruments, and informational means.
Quantitative Indicator	63	A numeric parameter for objective and unambiguous evaluation of sustainable forest management which presents the actual state or indicates the development of a concrete aspect.

The Slovenian Forest Service is ultimately responsible for sustainable forest management in Slovenia. The Forest Service, through the Forest Act, is charged with planning, inventory, research and management to name a few of its responsibilities. The Forest Act serves as a significant reference document throughout the SFCS and is frequently cited for conformance to PEFC requirements in GL 2-2011 PEFC Minimum Requirements Checklist, as presented with the SFCS.

Since the 2007 endorsement of the SFCS, PEFC has added several new requirements with regard to forest management. Specifically, PEFC 1003:2010 Sustainable Forest Management Requirements have added requirements regarding forest conversion, use of WHO Type 1A and 1B pesticides, forests of high conservation value, protected and endangered species, core ILO conventions, free, prior and informed consent, and protection from illegal logging.

The Assessor finds that **the Forest Certification Standards are in conformity** with PEFC requirements with one minor non-conformity identified.

Minor Non-conformity

Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Sustainable Forest Management Checklist (PEFC ST 1003:2012)

5.2.1) Forest management planning shall aim ...

Minor non-conformity: The SCFS does not mention the word “planning” in their standard, only management.

Remedy: PEFC Slovenia acknowledges the missing word and says it is lost in translation. They will revisit both PEFC SLO 03/2012 and PEFC SLO 04/2012 and insert “planning” into the criteria.

PEFC SLO Remedied Standard

Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Sustainable Forest Management Checklist (PEFC ST 1003:2012)

PEFC SLO 03/2012 Criterion 2.1

Forest planning and management must be geared at maintenance and improvement of health and vitality of forest ecosystems (integral forest protection), also by constant systematic

monitoring of threats to the forests and their life potential, natural impacts and the influences of human activity on the forest as well as preventive and other protective measures.

7. Group Certification Model

Because of Slovenia's large number of private forest owners (450,000 owners and co-owners) and the relatively small average size of forested ownerships, group certification offers an economic and efficient mechanism for forest owners interested in seeking to certify their sustainable forest management. PEFC Slovenia offers forest owners three different means of voluntary certification; Region, Group and Individual.

PEFC Slovenia offers a comprehensive set of requirements and guidelines to enable certified group entities and the members of these groups to meet the relevant PEFC requirements for group certification. PEFC SLO 02:2012 describes in a clear and precise method the types of group certification available through the SFCS, processes necessary for acquiring group certification, and the roles and responsibilities of the different actors involved with group certification.

PEFC Slovenia defines three types of forest certification available to forest owners.

- Regional
- Group
- Individual

Regional forest certification is defined in PEFC SLO 02:2012 as ... "a certification of forests within delimited geographic boundaries, being applied for by the authorised organisation, and providing for a voluntary participation of individual forest owners and other participating actors."

An organized group as defined in PEFC SL 02:2012 is a group of participants (forest owners) represented by a legal organization/entity for the purpose of implementation of the SFCS. It is the Regional/Group organization which is certified and received the certificate. Certificates are issued to the Regional/Group representative to hold, maintain and have available.

The Regional/Group representative must be a legal entity and registered at the entire level of the region/group being represented. PEFC SLO 02:2012 lists the responsibilities of the Regional/Group representative. These include, but are not limited to:

- Appointing a person to oversee the implementation of the certification
- Prepare all necessary documentation for the certification of SFM of the group
- Select an accredited certification body and contract with that body
- Cooperate with the certification body during audits
- On the group's behalf, undertake to observe the standards of SFM and other requirements as needed as stipulated by the SFCS

- Prepare an appropriate method of annually auditing the group's SFM as well as other requirements of the SFCS
- Maintain and update all required and relevant databases
- Supply group members in good-standing with certificates of participation
- Inform group members of non-conformances noted during audits
- Exclude those members choosing not to bring their properties into conformance and notify the certification body and IFC of such expulsions

PEFC SLO 03:2012 stresses that participation of forest owners in group certification is strictly voluntary. Forest owners are invited to participate through the group representative. The SFCS defines the responsibilities of the forest owner once they have agreed to accept the invitation to join the group. Should they decide to participate, they then sign an accession statement where they commit to manage their forests in conformance to the SFCS forest management standard and comply with the rules of the scheme. Following their signature on the accession statement they then receive detailed documentation regarding forest management requirements. In addition to abiding by the stated SFM practices, forest owners also agree to let representatives of the group organization as well as the contracted accredited certification body onto their property to audit for conformance of the standard.

PEFC SLO 03:2012 clearly states that Regional/group representatives shall issue participants (at the participant's expense) a certificate of participation identifying the forest owner as member of the certified organization. The SFCS states precisely what must be on the certificate.

Region/group representatives must notify the IFC with regard to number of members in a certified area on a quarterly basis.

The SFCS also allows for group participants to voluntarily exit from the group. Owners must inform the Region/group representative in writing as well as the certification body. Group representatives are required to then notify the owners in writing that they are deleted from the database and prohibited from using the PEFC logo.

The SFCS also describes how participants may be expunged from the system due to non-conformance violations. Should members be found in nonconformance and do not remedy this, they may be excluded from the group. Groups are required in the SFCS to impanel a Dispute Settlement Committee should such an issue arise. Should the Committee decide to expel the participant, the IFC must be notified by the certification body within 10 days of the decision. The name of the participant is then shared with other groups notifying them of the expulsion and that the person is not eligible for participation within another group for a period of no less than one year.

The Assessor finds that **the Group Certification Model is in conformity** with PEFC requirements with two minor non-conformities remedied by PEFC Slovenia on 06.05.2014.

Minor Non-conformity

Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Group Forest Management – Conformity to the PEFC Council Checklist

4.1.4, The forest certification scheme shall define requirements for an annual internal monitoring program that provides sufficient confidence in the conformity of the whole group organization with the sustainable forest management standard.

Minor non-conformity: There is no specific reference to the requirements for an annual internal monitoring program.

Remedy: PEFC Slovenia acknowledges this gap and has already put forward language to remedy the non-conformity. Proposed language reads: Detail rules and sampling must be described in the internal rules of group representative in document “Rules of Sustainable Management Control for Regional/Group Representative”. The control must provide sufficient conformity of the whole group certification. Forest properties over 1000 ha Must be controlled (sic. audited) at least once during the five year certification period, based on the “Forest Property Sampling Program.”

PEFC SLO Minor Non-Conformity Remedy

Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Group Forest Management – Conformity to the PEFC Council Checklist

PEFC SLO 02:2012 Criterion 3.2.11

It shall establish an appropriate system of annual auditing the sustainable forest management as regards forest owners included in regional certification scheme,

Minor Non-Conformity

Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Group Forest Management – Conformity to the PEFC Council Checklist:

4.2.1h; To operate an annual internal monitoring programme that provides for the evaluation of the participants' conformity with the certification requirements, and;

PEFC SLO 02/2012 Ch.3.2.1.10: “It shall establish an appropriate system of auditing the sustainable forest management as regards forest owners included in regional certification scheme.”

Minor non-conformity: There is no specific reference to the requirements for an annual internal monitoring program.

Remedy: PEFC Slovenia acknowledges this gap and has already put forward language to remedy the non-conformity. Proposed language reads: Detail rules and sampling must be described in the internal rules of group representative in document “Rules of Sustainable Management Control for Regional/Group Representative”. The control must provide sufficient conformity of the whole group certification. Forest properties over 1000 ha Must be controlled (sic. audited) at least once during the five year certification period, based on the “Forest Property Sampling Program.”

PEFC SLO Minor Non-Conformity Remedy

Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Group Forest Management – Conformity to the PEFC Council Checklist

PEFC SLO 02:2012 Appendix 5

'Detail rules for annual sampling must be described in internal rules of group representative in document Rules of Sustainable management control for regional/group representative. The control must provide sufficient conformity of the whole group certification. Forest properties over 1000 ha must be controlled at least once during 5 year certification period, based on Sampling Program of Forest Properties.

8. Chain of Custody Standard

The SFCS has adopted the PEFC ST 2002:2010 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products in its entirety and without modification.

The document PEFC SLO 01:2012 states *“The chain of custody of Forest Based Products standard PEFC ST 2002:2010 was prepared by the working group of the PEFC Council. The proposal was publicly presented and discussed and was adopted at the PEFC General Assembly on 12 November 2010. **The Slovenian Forest Certification Scheme contains a direct translation of this standard including all amendments and supplements.**”*

The Assessor finds that **the Chain of Custody Standard is in conformity** to PEFC requirements.

9. Implementation of PEFC Logo Usage

Requirements for the use of the PEFC Logo and the issuance of logo using licenses are found in the document PEFC SLO 05/2012 the Institute for Forest Certification is the official manager of the PEFC logo on the basis of contractual arrangement between IFC and PEFC Council. IFC has the right to grant the right to the use of the PEFC logo. In addition, the contract stipulates that the right to use the PEFC logo may be granted by a regional or group representative to group members participating in the process of regional or group certification.

Therefore, IFC is the licensing body in accordance to PEFC GD 1004:2009. The IFC has adopted the PEFC ST 2001:2008 (PEFC Logo Usage Rules – Requirements) in its entirety and without modification as documented in PEFC SLO 01/2012, Page 8, Section 10. With this, the SFCS for the logo use of certified companies is in automatic conformity to PEFC's requirements.

As further evidence of conformity, the SFCS document goes on to define requirement for the notification of certification bodies (PEFC SLO 05/2012 6). The Assessor also found that requirements as set forth in PEFC GD 1004:2009 chapter 6.1 and 6.2 are met by the SFCS.

A detailed analysis can be found in Annex 1, Part VI - Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Certification and Accreditation Procedures (Annex 6).

The Assessor finds that **the Logo Usage Rules is in conformity** to PEFC requirements.

10. Certification and Accreditation Arrangements

Requirements of the SFCS for qualifications of certification bodies and auditors are documented in PEFC SLO 05/2012.

The SFCS requires certification bodies must be legal entities, and must be accredited by the national accreditation body. The accreditation body must be a member of the EA and/or IAF.

Certification bodies wishing to carry out certification through the SFCS must meet ISO 17021 and/or ISO Guide 65 requirements. In addition, requirements for auditors carrying out assessments of SFM or CoC of timber and forest based products must do so in accordance to PEFC SLO 06/2012. Certification bodies must be impartial, independent third parties that have not been involved in standards setting process as governing or decision-making bodies. Certification bodies must demonstrate technical competence with regard to the method of procurement and processing timber and forest based products. Compliance of these and other requirements will be verified by the national accreditation body.

Auditors must have adequate knowledge of the SFCS and have a University degree in forestry or a similar field. They must also fulfill general criteria for quality and environmental management systems auditors as defined in ISO 19011.

The SFCS has adopted the PEFC ST 2002:2010 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products in its entirety and without modification. This automatically includes all requirements for certification bodies and auditors with regard to CoC as required by the PEFC Council.

The Assessor finds that **the Certification and Accreditation Procedures is in conformity** with PEFC requirements with one minor non-conformity remedied by PEFC Slovenia on 06.05.2014.

Minor Non-conformity

Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Accreditation Procedures (Annex 6)

19. Does the scheme documentation include requirements for usage of information from external parties as the audit evidence?

Minor non-conformity: PEFC SLO 05/2012 4.1.8, paragraph 4 appears to be a typographical error giving an incomplete sentence.

Remedy: Revisit the criteria and complete the sentence as needed.

“ When conducting the audit, information of various stakeholders (such as the Slovenian Forestry Institute, environmental protection organizations and similar bodies).”

PEFC SLO Minor Non-Conformity Remedy

Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Accreditation Procedures (Annex 6)

PEFC SLO 05/2012 4.1.8, paragraph 4

“When conducting the audit, information of various stakeholders is included (such as the Slovenian Forestry Institute, environmental protection organisations and similar bodies).”

11. Complaints and Disputes Resolution Procedures

The IFC handles complaint dispute resolution procedures for all complaints going beyond the capability of the accredited certification bodies or PEFC Slovenia (e.g. standard setting disputes, implementation of group and regional certification, interpretation of the Standard, PEFC logo usage and chain of custody grievances.) Articles 36, 37 and 38 of the Statute give authority to the IFC Board of Directors to empanel a temporary body to resolve the complaint.

The dispute settlement body consists of five persons. The panel is independent, impartial and is made up of members of the forestry and environmental community. Once the body is empaneled it elects its own chairman.

To be formally acknowledged and acted upon, complaints must be written and submitted to the IFC office. The complaint must include a description of the reason of the complaint, the position of the involved parties and reports from the certification body (if the complaint stems from a certification issue.) The Secretariat of the IFC makes a written request to members of the committee to convene. The hearing shall take place within 60 days upon receipt of the complaint with a decision to be made within 60 days.

The decision will be made with a simple majority vote. The IFC is responsible for keeping records, administering the protocols of the hearing and informing those parties involved about the decision from the committee. The decision is binding and final.

The Assessor finds that **the Complaints and Dispute Resolution Procedures are in conformity** with PEFC requirements.

Annex 1: PEFC Standard Requirements Checklist

Purpose

The following standard setting checklists are included as part of PEFC GD 1007:2012. They were employed by the Assessor to aid and provide detailed analysis of compliance to the PEFC Council requirements for the SFCS scheme endorsement process.

Methodology

The checklists are in tabular form and divided usually into 3 or 4 columns. The first column on the left documents the standard criteria. The second column from the left denotes either YES or NO and at times N/A if the criteria is not applicable to the SCFS scheme. The final column on the right is the Assessors detailed reference to the SCFS scheme documentation.

SCFS criteria that were found to be in conformity to the PEFC Council International Benchmark Standards are indicated with a black YES. Those criteria found to have a minor non-conformity and do not violate the integrity of the certification system are denoted with a yellow No. In case of a major non-conformity, which violates the integrity of the certification system, and needs addressing immediately, the criteria were marked with a red NO.

References, citations and descriptions of Scheme Documentation

Under the References to Application Documents column the Assessor used the following procedure.

The beginning line of the reference starts with the attribution of the SCFS relevant document and section (e.g. PEFC SLO 03/2012 3.3). When supporting documentation indicated that requirements were met by the SFCS, citations from the standard were copied and followed the document attribution. These citations were placed in quotations and italicized (e.g., "*accredited certification bodies ...*"). In instances when the Assessor captured the findings in his words the citations were not placed in quotations or italicized.

Legend

"Yes/No" Column

Yes – assessment shows conformity with PEFC International Benchmark Standards

No – assessment shows minor non-conformity to the PEFC International Benchmark Standards

No - assessment shows major non-conformity to PEFC International Benchmark Standards

N/A – not applicable

Legend (cont'd)

“Reference to Application Documents” Column

“*Black*” – quotations from the SFCS standard documents

Black – Assessor evaluations or overarching comments



Part I: Standard and System Requirement Checklist for standard setting (PEFC ST 1001:2010)

1 Scope

Part I covers the requirements for standard setting defined in PEFC ST 1001:2010, *Standard Setting – Requirements*.

Any inconsistencies between this text and the original referred to document will be overruled by the content and wording of the technical document.

2 Checklist

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
Standardising Body			
4.1 The standardising body shall have written procedures for standard-setting activities describing:			
a) its status and structure, including a body responsible for consensus building (see 4.4) and for formal adoption of the standard (see 5.11),	Procedures	Yes	<p>Articles of Association of the Institute of Forest Certification (IFC) {hereinafter referred to as Statute in Slovenia} define the IFC structure, function, responsibilities and roles. The five member board is made up of representatives (4) selected by the Chamber of Agriculture and Forestry and by the service users (1). The Board shall elect its own officers.</p> <p>Statute, Article 15 states that IFC is managed by a Board of Directors totaling five individuals; three from Chamber of Agriculture and Forestry, one from a different chamber within the Chamber of Agriculture and Forestry and one elected by his peers representing different service user groups.</p> <p>The IFC Board of Directors reviews the PEFC Slovenia standard and determines the adequacy of the scheme as compared to the guidelines established by PEFC Council. All votes are by simple majority.</p> <p>The IFC Board determines when to convene a Working Group to review and revise the PEFC Slovenia Standard. At minimum, statutes call for the working group to be convened on a five-year basis. Upon establishment of the Working Group, it elects its chairman.</p> <p>The revision was carried out in accordance with the Statute of the IFC, Chapters 2.4 and 2.5. and according to the PEFC ST 1006:2010.</p> <p>Statute Article 39: <i>“The Board of the Institute nominates and dismisses, upon the proposal of the director, and independent committee whose duties include analyzing and developing measures and indicators for the sustainable management of forests. The method of work shall be defined in the committee’s working regulation (sic. Working Group Procedures for Revision of Slovenian PEFC Scheme {WGP}).”</i></p> <p>Statute, Article 41: <i>“The committee must include all groups that have expressed an interest in the development and</i></p>

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
			<p><i>analyses of the measures and indicators of on the sustainable forest management.</i></p> <p>Working Group procedures established by the IFC call for all decisions to be consensus based. In the case of a dissenting vote, negotiations are undertaken until consensus is reached. Consensus is defined in the documents as <i>“General agreement defined as non-existence of conflicting opinions about a proposed solution which is attained in the process of finding solutions and co-ordination opinions of all parties involved.”</i></p> <p>Upon reaching consensus, the Working Group submits the Standard to the IFC Council for approval.</p> <p>Plan for Modification of Slovenian Scheme for Forest Certification (Plan) Chapter 2, Sec. 2.1.11: <i>“IFC council (sic. Board of Directors) responsibility is to adopt the final version of the Scheme for forest certification.”</i></p>
b) the record-keeping procedures,	Procedures	Yes	<p>Working Group procedures stipulate that documentation on the procedures be archived a minimum of five years. Documented procedures include meeting minutes, Working Group correspondence, public notices of the process and public comments received during the consultation process. This information can be found on the PEFC Slovenia website or available upon request at info@pefc.si.</p> <p>Plan 2.1.10: <i>“Documentation regarding scheme implementation process (minutes.) must be available to the public.”</i></p> <p>Plan 2.1.12: <i>“Formally adopted standards and normative documents must be available to the public in a suitable time and manner.”</i></p> <p>WGP Sec 5: <i>“Formally adopted Scheme and documentation regarding the implementation of the process for setting up the scheme is accessible on www.pefc.si.”</i></p> <p>WGP Sec 6: <i>“Documentation of procedures is archived for at least five years and is on request available to the public.”</i></p> <p>Standard Setting Procedures and Records of Standard Setting Process (SSP) states: <i>“Minutes of the meetings, correspondence and articles are available upon request at info@pefc.si or the IFC office, Celovska cesta 135</i></p>

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
			<i>Ljubljana.</i> "
c) the procedures for balanced representation of stakeholders,	Procedures	Yes	<p>The IFC initiates the first communications to the public informing them of the plan for revising the Slovenian scheme. The IFC Statute 41 states that all interested stakeholders shall have an opportunity to participate,</p> <p>The Working Group shall be constituted based upon proposals of candidates from interested stakeholder following public announcement by the IFC. The IFC shall then appoint Working Group members from this pool of candidates. The Standard revision plan stipulates that the ultimate composition of the Working Group shall be balanced. In addition, Working Group Procedures for Revision state that "interests of one stakeholder group must not prevail."</p>
d) the standard-setting process,	Procedures	Yes	<p>Working Group Procedures of Slovenian PEFC Scheme and Standard Setting Procedures and records of the Standard Setting Process adequately describe and define the standard setting process as defined in Statute, the WGP and SSP.</p> <p>General steps for the process call for public announcement of the revision and call for participants, identifying key stakeholders, working group meetings, open public consultation period, review of the comments, WG consensus on the standard, passing the Standard on to the IFC Board for final approval and adoption,</p>
e) the mechanism for reaching consensus, and	Procedures	Yes	<p>Plan Sec. 8, WGP Sec. 3 & 4</p> <p>The mechanisms for reaching consensus for the Working Group can be found in the above documents.</p> <p>Consensus is defined as: "<i>General agreement defined as non-existence of conflicting opinions about a proposed solution which is attained in the process of finding solutions and co-ordination opinions of all parties involved.</i>"</p> <p>In case consensus cannot be reached within the Working Group, the following mechanisms were defined as avenues for reaching consent. discussion and negotiation within the extent of the Working Group with the aim to reach a consensus;</p>

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • direct negotiations between shareholders where their standpoints are further substantiated with the aim of reaching consensus; • the negotiation process <p>The formal approval of the Standard by the general IFC Council is based upon simple majority.</p>
f) revision of standards/normative documents.	Procedures	Yes	<p>The obligation to review the Standard can be found in both the Plan (Ch.2.1, para.2) and SSP (Sec 1. Para.2) call for revisions to be undertaken every five years. The IFC Board of Directors is responsible for formally calling for the revisions and constituting the Working Group.</p> <p>Although neither of the documents carry specific arrangement for extraordinary revisions due to PEFC Council, the IFC Board Statute allows for calling for a extraordinary revision process. Statute Article 7: <i>“participates in the harmonization process of the of the regulations of the PEFC scheme”</i></p>
4.2 The standardising body shall make its standard-setting procedures publicly available and shall regularly review its standard-setting procedures including consideration of comments from stakeholders.	Procedures	Yes	<p>All information related to the standard setting or revision shall be located on PEFC Slovenia’s website (www.pefc.si) or available upon request, either through the Ljubljana office or at info@pefc.si.</p> <p>SSP Ch.1, para. 2 states; <i>“In accordance with the requirements by PEFC and the Statute of the IFC (sic.) a revision of the criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management and procedures...was carried out following the expiry of five years...”</i></p> <p>Publicly available documents include public notices, minutes of meetings, announcements for public consultation and public comments.</p> <p>All related documentation shall be archived for a minimum of five years.</p>

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
	Process	Yes	Same as above. Information made available for this report included minutes (and translations of key sections), flash shots of web page screens and public announcements in newspapers. Assessor Note: No public comments were received during the public consultation period.
4.3 The standardising body shall keep records relating to the standard-setting process providing evidence of compliance with the requirements of this document and the standardising body's own procedures. The records shall be kept for a minimum of five years and shall be available to interested parties upon request.	Procedures	Yes	Plan 2.1.12: <i>"Formally adopted standards and normative documents must be available to the public in a suitable time and manner."</i> WGP Sec 5: <i>"Formally adopted Scheme and documentation regarding the implementation of the process for setting up the scheme is accessible on www.pefc.si."</i> WGP Sec 6: <i>"Documentation of procedures is archived for at least five years and is on request available to the public."</i>
	Process	Yes	Same as above. PEFC Slovenia provided access to the documentation through their websites and as also requested in writing. Documentation included minutes, stakeholder invitation letters, lists of invitees, and website announcement.
4.4 The standardising body shall establish a permanent or temporary working group/committee responsible for standard-setting activities.	Procedures	Yes	Statute Article 39: <i>"The Board of the Institute nominates and dismisses, upon the proposal of the director, and independent committee whose duties include analyzing and developing measures and indicators for the sustainable management of forests. The method of work shall be defined in the committee's working regulation (sic. Working Group Procedures for Revision of Slovenian PEFC Scheme</i>
	Process	Yes	Documentation provided supplied the names and email addresses of Working Group members. A survey was developed and sent and members, several of whom responded. Other evidentiary evidence included working group minutes.
4.4 The working group/committee shall:			
a) be accessible to materially and	Procedures	Yes	The Standard Setting Procedures state that minutes are to

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
directly affected stakeholders,			<p>be sent to all working group members and made available to the public. The procedures also state that Working Group members are encouraged to openly communicate about the work taking place in the Working Group to interested and disadvantaged stakeholders.</p> <p>WGP Sec 1. E. <i>“Members are encouraged to openly communicate about the work in working group to interested and disadvantaged stakeholders.”</i></p>
	Process	Yes	The WGP lists a series of minutes and other communications to the public. In addition, responses to the stakeholder survey showed this to be the case.
b) have balanced representation and decision-making by stakeholder categories relevant to the subject matter and geographical scope of the standard where single concerned interests shall not dominate nor be dominated in the process, and	Procedures	Yes	<p>The <u>Plan</u> for Scheme revision requires informing stakeholders of all interest groups. IFC appoints the Working Group from the invitation based on the responses and nominations of candidates from interested stakeholder groups. The Plan for Scheme Revision states that the Working Group must be based upon a balanced composition of stakeholder interest groups. Working Group Procedures states that interests of one stakeholder group must not prevail.</p> <p>The WGP also provides a list of stakeholders along with their representative bodies. This list shows a balanced WG with members coming from diverse backgrounds with appropriate knowledge and skill sets.</p> <p>WGP Sec.1.f: <i>“interests of one stakeholder group must not prevail.”</i></p>
	Process	Yes	Process documentation demonstrates that the WG was a diverse body of representatives. (See Annex 5, Attachment 1) for a list of WG members and their respective affiliations.
c) include stakeholders with expertise relevant to the subject matter of the standard, those that are materially affected by the standard, and those	Procedures	Yes	See 4.4b above
	Process	Yes	See 4.4b above

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
that can influence the implementation of the standard. The materially affected stakeholders shall represent a meaningful segment of the participants.			
4.5 The standardising body shall establish procedures for dealing with any substantive and procedural complaints relating to the standardising activities which are accessible to stakeholders.	Procedures	Yes	<p>The WG works on the basis of consensus. Should consensus not be reached the WGP Sec.4 stipulates that should there be a negative vote, three options are available to the WG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion and negotiation within the extent of the WG with the aim to reach consensus • Direct negotiations between shareholders where their standpoints are further substantiated with the aim to reach consensus • The negotiation process <p>In addition, the IFC has a dispute resolution process which may be instituted should the WG not be able to come to an agreement. Should the complaints be of a procedural regard and coming from outside the WG, the IFC will institute its complaint procedure process.</p>
	Process	N/A	No complaints were received and consensus was reached within the WG.
4.5 Upon receipt of the complaint, the standard-setting body shall:			
a) acknowledge receipt of the complaint to the complainant,	Procedures	Yes	<p>Minor Non-conformity: The SFCS does not address communicating with the complainant about receiving the complaint and the process that will follow.</p> <p><u>PEFC SLO Remedied Standard</u></p> <p>6.5 The procedure of complaint includes:</p> <p>Complaints of a procedural regard are outside the scope of the WG and are taken by the IFC Board.</p> <p>WGP Sec.7 states, "<i>Complaints regarding the procedure is discussed and decided by the IFC (sic.). The procedure includes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Record of the complaint</i> • <i>Informing the complainant about the receipt procedures</i>

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
			<p><i>of complaint</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Gathering necessary information</i> • <i>Discussion and decision of the complaint</i> • <i>Informing the complainant about the procedures and decision.</i>
	Process	N/A	No complaints were received during the revision.
b) gather and verify all necessary information to validate the complaint, impartially and objectively evaluate the subject matter of the complaint, and make a decision upon the complaint, and	Procedures	Yes	See 4.5a above IFC Statute Article 37: “A dispute settlement body consists of five persons. In this body, which has to be independent and impartial, representatives from forestry and environmental groups must be included.”
	Process	N/A	No complaints were received during the revision.
c) formally communicate the decision on the complaint and of the complaint handling process to the complainant.	Procedures	Yes	See 4.5a above
	Process	N/A	
4.6 The standardising body shall establish at least one contact point for enquiries and complaints relating to its standard-setting activities. The contact point shall be made easily available.	Procedures	Yes	IFC Acting Director Mihael Koprivnikar was elected the WG secretary and administrator. All complaints were to be forward to him: C/O Institute of Forest Certification Celovska cesta 135 1000 Ljubljana
Standard-setting process			
5.1 The standardising body shall identify stakeholders relevant to the objectives and	Procedures	Yes	During the planning process the IFC created a list of stakeholders relevant to the standard setting work. All received written invitations to participate in the process. A list of the participating stakeholders was included in the scheme documentation. (See Chapter 5).In addition, several

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
scope of the standard-setting work.			other stakeholder were contacted, but do to other obligations they informed the IFC they could not participate.
	Process	Yes	The assessor requested information regarding the makeup of the WG be translated to English. This was done.
5.2 The standardising body shall identify disadvantaged and key stakeholders. The standardising body shall address the constraints of their participation and proactively seek their participation and contribution in the standard-setting activities.	Procedures	Yes	The WGP calls for inviting disadvantaged stakeholders and that the invitations must be sent in a manner appropriate for their ability to receive them. Invitations must be sent in a manner that they will be received. <i>Plan Ch. 2.1.3: "Invitation to key and disadvantaged stakeholders must be sent (sic.) to them in a way that they are notified."</i>
	Process	Yes	Documentation such as letters and emails are available for review. An email from the Acting Director also provided further information regarding outreach efforts. Returned participant surveys also demonstrate this was satisfactorily undertaken. (See Annex 2)
5.3 The standardising body shall make a public announcement of the start of the standard-setting process and include an invitation for participation in a timely manner on its website and in suitable media as appropriate to afford stakeholders an opportunity for meaningful contributions.	Procedures	Yes	The IFC Board publicly announces the plan for the standard revision as well as a call for stakeholders to participate. This is done through the internet, newspapers and personal invitations.
	Process	Yes	Public notice for informing interested parties about the standard revision, as well as invitation to participate included the following. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invitation to stakeholders to join the WG 3.1.2012 • Newspaper announcement; Zelena dezela – Jan. 2012 • Website announcement; www.pefc.si – Jan. 2012
5.3 The announcement and invitation shall include:			
a) information about the objectives, scope	Procedures	Yes	The WGP calls for the invitation to carry information on the goals and content of the work, time frame of the revision,

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
and the steps of the standard-setting process and its timetable,			<p>information to stakeholders regarding their participation, an invitation to stakeholders to appoint a representative to the Working Group and place of contact and where to find publicly available information.</p> <p>Plan 2.1.3 List of inclusive items for public announcement and invitation.</p>
	Process	Yes	<p>Letter dated 3 January, 2012</p> <p>Screenshot of PEFC Slovenia website dated January 2012</p> <p>Response from stakeholder survey showing satisfaction with components of announcement.</p>
b) information about opportunities for stakeholders to participate in the process,	Procedures	Yes	See 5.3a above
	Process	Yes	See 5.3a above
(c) an invitation to stakeholders to nominate their representative(s) to the working group/committee. The invitation to disadvantaged and key stakeholders shall be made in a manner that ensures that the information reaches intended recipients and in a format that is understandable,	Procedures	Yes	<p>The WGP states that the invitation shall notify stakeholders of their ability to nominate a representative to the Working Group and that the process will reach out to disadvantaged stakeholders in a manner that must reach them.</p> <p>An interest group is allowed to be accompanied by an expert(s).</p> <p>Plan 2.1.3: <i>“Invitation to key and disadvantaged stakeholders must be sent (sic.) to them in a way they are notified.”</i></p> <p>Plan2.1.3 <i>“Public announcement includes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Invitation to stakeholders to appoint a representative in a working group”</i>
	Process	Yes	See Process 5.3 above
d) an invitation to comment on the scope and the standard-setting process, and	Procedures	Yes	Plan 2.1.3: Public announcement includes...” ...an invitation to key stakeholders that includes opportunities to comment on the scope of the standard setting process.

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
	Process	Yes	The invitation and mailings show that this was offered in the invitation.
e) reference to publicly available standard-setting procedures.	Procedures	Yes	<p>The Plan states that the invitation must include a place of contact where one can find publicly available documentation.</p> <p>Plan 2.1.3: <i>“Public announcement includes...”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Place of contact point and publicly available documentation based on PEFC 1001:2010
	Process	Yes	See Process 5.3 above
5.4 The standardising body shall review the standard-setting process based on comments received from the public announcement and establish a working group/committee or adjust the composition of an already existing working group/committee based on received nominations. The acceptance and refusal of nominations shall be justifiable in relation to the requirements for balanced representation of the working group/committee and resources available for the standard-setting.	Procedures	Yes	<p>The WGP states that the process of scheme revision will be based on comments received from the invitation and from the public comment period. Acceptance and/or refusal of candidates will be made upon setting balanced representation for the Working Group.</p> <p>Plan 2.1.4: <i>“IFC will adopt the process of scheme revision based on received comments during the public announcement and invitation. IFC will appoint the working group based on proposals and candidates. Acceptance or refusal of candidature must be based upon a claim for a balanced composition of stakeholder interest groups.”</i></p>
	Process	Yes	Minutes of the first meeting indicate that the WG was able to accommodate all interested parties and that none were turned away.
5.5 The work of the working group/committee shall be organised in an open and transparent manner where:			
a) working drafts shall be available to	Procedures	Yes	WGP 1: <i>“The working body must operate following the principle of openness and transparency whereby:</i>

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
all members of the working group/committee,			<i>1.a: working versions of documents are accessible to all WG members."</i>
	Process	Yes	Meeting minutes and member survey results
b) all members of the working group shall be provided with meaningful opportunities to contribute to the development or revision of the standard and submit comments to the working drafts, and	Procedures	Yes	WGP 1b: <i>"all members must have an opportunity to provide their opinions and contributions for the modification of the scheme and submit comments on a draft document"</i> .
	Process	Yes	Minutes of the meeting made available by PEFC Slovenia and member survey results regarding process.
c) comments and views submitted by any member of the working group/committee shall be considered in an open and transparent way and their resolution and proposed changes shall be recorded.	Procedures	Yes	WGP 1.c: <i>"comments and standpoints of members must be handled in an open and transparent manner and recorded."</i>
	Process	Yes	Minutes of the meeting made available by PEFC Slovenia and member survey results regarding process.
5.6 The standardising body shall organise a public consultation on the enquiry draft and shall ensure that:			
a) the start and the end of the public consultation is announced in a timely manner in suitable media,	Procedures	Yes	Plan 2.1.6: <i>"IFC will organize a public consultation of the scheme. It must be executed in a way that includes;</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Time schedule of the scheme revision process</i> • <i>Invitation to disadvantaged and key stakeholders must be sent in a way that reaches them</i> • <i>Scheme documents available to the public</i> • <i>Public consultation lasts at least 60 days</i> • <i>All comments are objectively proceeded in a working group</i> • <i>Abstract of comments and proposals that is available to the public for instance on the internet."</i>
	Process	Yes	PEFC Slovenia provided evidence of a public announcement released on 13.06.2012 and open for comment until 17.08.2012. The media used included an internet page at www.pefc.si , emails to specific organizations, letters to the press and notices in three newspapers.

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
b) the invitation of disadvantaged and key stakeholders shall be made by means that ensure that the information reaches its recipient and is understandable,	Procedures	Yes	See 5.6a
	Process	Yes	See Process 5.6a
c) the enquiry draft is publicly available and accessible,	Procedures	Yes	See 5.6a
	Process	Yes	See Process 5.6a
d) the public consultation is for at least 60 days,	Procedures	Yes	See 5.6a
	Process	Yes	See Process 5.6a
e) all comments received are considered by the working group/committee in an objective manner,	Procedures	Yes	See 5.6a
	Process	N/A	No public comments were received.
(f) a synopsis of received comments compiled from material issues, including the results of their consideration, is publicly available, for example on a website.	Procedures	Yes	See 5.6a
	Process	N/A	No public comments were received.
5.7 The standardising body shall organise pilot testing of the new standards and the results of the pilot testing shall be considered by the working group/committee.	Procedures	Yes	Plan 2.1.7: <i>"IFC organizes a pilot test of the new Scheme if it deviates significantly from current Scheme. Results of the testing are discussed by Working Group."</i>
	Process	N/A	PEFC Council determined that modifications to the scheme were minor and that a pilot test was not needed.

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
5.8 The decision of the working group to recommend the final draft for formal approval shall be taken on the basis of a consensus.	Procedures	Yes	Plan 2.1.8: <i>“The decision on passing the standard to IFC for the final approval must be done on the basis of consensus.”</i>
	Process	Yes	Minutes indicate consensus was reached at the final meeting before the standard went out for public consultation. Since there were no comments to review, the standard was sent on the IFC Board.
5.8 In order to reach a consensus the working group/committee can utilise the following alternative processes to establish whether there is opposition:			
a) a face-to face meeting where there is a verbal yes/no vote, show of hands for a yes/no vote; a statement on consensus from the Chair where there are no dissenting voices or hands (votes); a formal balloting process, etc.,	Procedures	Yes	WGP 3: <i>“A decision on submitting the scheme to the IFC Board (sic.) for its approval must be adopted on the basis of consensus. The approval of the scheme may be made at the meeting, voted through telephone or email, or in a combination of the communication means mentioned above.”</i>
	Process	Yes	Minutes indicate consensus was reached at the final meeting before the standard went out for public consultation. Since there were no comments to review, the standard was sent to the IFC Board.
b) a telephone conference meeting where there is a verbal yes/no vote,	Procedures	Yes	See 5.8a
	Process	N/A	See 5.8a
c) an e-mail meeting where a request for agreement or objection is provided to members with the members providing a written response (a proxy for a vote), or	Procedures	Yes	See 5.8a
	Process	N/A	See 5.8a
d) combinations thereof.	Procedures	Yes	See 5.8a
	Process	N/A	See 5.8a
5.9 In the case of a negative vote which represents sustained opposition to any important part of the concerned interests surrounding a substantive issue, the issue shall be resolved using the following			

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
mechanism(s):			
a) discussion and negotiation on the disputed issue within the working group/committee in order to find a compromise,	Procedures	Yes	WGP Sec.7 states, "Complaints regarding the procedure is discussed and decided by the IFC (sic.). The procedure includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record of the complaint • Gathering necessary information • Discussion and decision of the complaint • Informing the complainant about the procedures and decision."
	Process	Yes	Minutes of meetings and participant surveys
b) direct negotiation between the stakeholder(s) submitting the objection and stakeholders with different views on the disputed issue in order to find a compromise,	Procedures	Yes	See 5.9a
	Process	Yes	See 5.9a
c) dispute resolution process.	Procedures	Yes	See 5.9a
	Process	N/A	No dispute resolution process was needed.
5.10 Documentation on the implementation of the standard-setting process shall be made publicly available.	Procedures	Yes	Plan 2.1.10: "Documentation regarding scheme implementation process (minutes..etc.) must be available to the public." PEFC Slovenia makes its scheme revision documentation available to the public through www.pefc.si and info@pefc.si . Documentation can also be acquired by sending a request in writing to the IFC central office in Ljubljana.
	Process	Yes	The Records of Procedure show that the following were made available to the public. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Announcement for plans for PEFC Slovenia standard revision • Invitation to stakeholders to join the working group • Newspaper announcements inviting stakeholder participation • Website information regarding the process and invitation to participate • Minutes of meetings

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of IFC to approve the Standard • Sixty-day public consultation period • Meeting of IFC Board to approve English translation • Meeting of IFC Board to approve Slovenian scheme for international endorsement process
5.11 The standardising body shall formally approve the standards/normative documents based on evidence of consensus reached by the working group/committee.	Procedures	Yes	The Standard Setting Procedures and IFC Articles of Association require that the formal approval of the Standard by the IFC is done so only after the draft standard is approved by the Working Group through consensus.
	Process	Yes	Records of Procedure indicate that the vote was held at the final meeting of the WG on 23.04.2012 and that consensus on the Standard was reached. The IFC voted to approve the changes on 17.05.2012 and send it out for public consultation.
5.12 The formally approved standards/normative documents shall be published in a timely manner and made publicly available.	Procedures	Yes	Plan 2.1.12: <i>"Formally adopted standards and normative documents must be available to the public in a suitable time and manner."</i>
	Process	Yes	Documents listed under 5.10 Process (see above) may be found at www.pefc.si or available upon request at info@pefc.si .
Revisions of standards/normative documents			
6.1 The standards/normative documents shall be reviewed and revised at intervals that do not exceed a five-year period. The procedures for the revision of the standards/normative documents shall follow those set out in chapter 5.	Process	Yes	<p>The Slovenian Forest Certification Scheme was first endorsed on 03.08.2007. The five year validity of the scheme gave expiration on 03.08.2012. Initial planning for the revision process began in November 2011. However, due to financial reasons the process had to be delayed and an extension was requested of the PEFC Council. The process began again in January 2012 and was finalized with a meeting of the IFC Board of Directors on 13.12.2012 to approve the standard for the international endorsement process.</p> <p>The revision was carried out in accordance with the Statute of IFC, Chapters 2.4 and 2.5 and in conformance with PEFC ST 1001:2010 as of 26 November 2010.</p>
6.2 The revision shall define the application date and transition	Process		Scheme Description and Implementation Arrangements: Attachment 1 as provided in the Slovenian scheme documentation states that <i>"the transition date shall not</i>

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
date of the revised standards/normative documents.		Yes	<i>exceed one year as defined by PEFC Council.</i> The documentation titled “Planned implementation in 2013 for revised scheme” indicates that processes are designed and underway informing already-certified forest owner of the revisions and time allowed to provide for those changes. It is not said, but inferred that forest owners newly coming into the system will have to manage to the scheme as adopted by the IFC for international endorsement.
6.3 The application date <u>shall</u> not exceed a period of one year from the publication of the standard. This is needed for the endorsement of the revised standards/normative documents, introducing the changes, information dissemination and training.	Process	Yes	<p>Minor Non-conformity: Standard uses “should” instead of “shall” as presented by PEFC.</p> <p>Plan 2.1.2, para. 4. Transition dates <u>should</u> not extend one year except in circumstances when implementation of changes needs longer period.</p> <p>PEFC SLO Remedied Standard:</p> <p>Standard and System Requirement Checklist of Standard Setting (PEFC ST 1001:2010)</p> <p>The transition period <u>shall</u> not exceed one year except in a case when a longer period is requested by the implementation of modifications.</p>
6.4 The transition date shall not exceed a period of one year except in justified exceptional circumstances where the implementation of the revised standards/normative documents requires a longer period.	Process	Yes	<p>Plan 2.1.2 para.4: “Transition dates should not exceed one year except in circumstances when implementation of changes needs longer period.</p> <p>PEFC Slovenia has the following implementation plan in place for 2013.</p> <p>Planned implementation in 2013 for revised scheme</p> <p><i>“1.IFC is informing Institute KON-CERT ¹ and Chamber of Agriculture and Forestry of Slovenia ² of the scheme revision process on a regular basis.</i></p> <p><i>Public announcements, fairs, internet and articles in relevant media will be also in 2013 the main tool for informing general public.</i></p> <p><i>2.Forest owners that have joined regional group or individual certification will be informed on proposed changes and final endorsement by email and relevant media.</i></p> <p><i>As currently valid scheme is being implemented the talks on</i></p>

Question	Assess. basis*	YES /NO *	Reference to application documents
			<i>implementation of the revised scheme with Slovenian Accreditation and certification body did not yet fully started. Process is planned to start in March after main work for accreditation and certification process is finished and first certificates for forest certification will be issued to forest owners."</i>

3 Application documentation

The application for the endorsement and mutual recognition as defined in Chapter 5 of Annex 7 (*Endorsement and Mutual Recognition of National Systems and their Revision*) shall include information which enables the assessment of the applicant system's compliance with the PEFC Council requirements.

The application documentation should identify and make reference to other detailed documentation such as minutes, internal procedures and rules, reports, etc. which do not need to create a part of the application documentation.

Asses. basis* The standard setting is assessed against the PEFC Council requirements in two stages: (i) compliance of written standard setting procedures ("Procedures") and (ii) compliance of the standard setting process itself ("Process").

For "Procedures" the applicant should refer to the part(s) of its standard setting procedures related to the respective PEFC requirement. For "Process" the applicant should either refer to the report/records of the standard setting process forming a part of the submitted application documents, or describe how the PEFC requirement was fulfilled during the standard setting process.

Part II: Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Group FOREST MANAGEMENT CERTIFICATION (PEFC ST 1002:2010)

1 Scope

Part II covers requirements for group forest management certification as defined in PEFC ST 1002:2010, *Group Forest Management Certification – Requirements*.

Any inconsistencies between this text and the original referred to document will be overruled by the content and wording of the technical document.

2 Checklist

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to system documentation
General		
4.1 Does the forest certification scheme provide clear definitions for the following terms in conformity with the definitions of those terms presented in chapter 3 of PEFC ST 1002:2010:		
a) the group organisation,	Yes	PEFC SLO 02/2012: “A group of participants is represented by an organisation for the purpose of implementation of the standard for sustainable forest management.”
b) the group entity,	Yes	PEFC SLO 02/2012: “Group representative: A body representing participants holding a general responsibility for the provision of conformity of sustainable forest management and with regard to other requirements required by the Slovenian Forest Certification Scheme.”
c) the participant,	Yes	PEFC SLO 02/2012: “A forest owner/manager or any other body covered by a group certificate who has the right to forest management in a clearly defined area of forest and who is capable of carrying out the requirements set by sustainable forest management standard on this holding.” (the term “participant” is used as a synonym for “an applicant” or “a member.”)
d) the certified area,	Yes	PEFC SLO 02/2012: “An area of forests and areas of forest trees covered by a regional or group certificate and representing a sum of area in ownership of participants.”
e) the group forest certificate, and	Yes	PEFC SLO 02/2012: “A document certifying that a group organisation (a region of group members) does meet the requirements of sustainable forest management and other applicable requirements of the Forest Certification system.”

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to system documentation
f) the document confirming participation in group forest certification.	Yes	PEFC SLO 02/2012; <i>“Membership Certificate: A membership certificate is a document certifying the participation in a group certification.”</i> (The document is issued for an individual participant and it refers to a group certificate and it certifies that the participant is included in the extent covered by a group/regional certification.)
4.1.2 In cases where a forest certification scheme allows an individual forest owner to be covered by additional group or individual forest management certifications, the scheme shall ensure that non-conformity by the forest owner identified under one forest management certification scheme is addressed in any other forest management certification scheme that covers the forest owner.	Yes	PEFC SLO 02/2012, Ch. 9, para.2: The certification body notifies the Institute for Forest Certification (IFC) within a period of 10 days with regard to exclusions from the Group. The IFC shall provide the name of the violator to other certification bodies to avoid recertification by another certification body. Upon the withdrawal of a membership in a regional certification, immediate certification through a group or individual method or vice-versa is prevented.
4.1.3 The forest certification scheme shall define requirements for group forest certification which ensure that participants’ conformity with the sustainable forest management standard is centrally administered and is subject to central review and that all participants shall be subject to the internal monitoring programme.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 02/2012, Ch.3.2.1: Tasks of an Authorized Group or Regional Representative</p> <p>Under the scheme the authorized group or regional representative is authorized to perform specific tasks. These include, but are not limited to: tasks of an authorized group or regional representative which centralizes many of the administrative activities such as maintaining and updating databases, owners’ assurances of scheme and sustainable forest adherence, and internal monitoring processes and data management.</p> <p>Ch.3.2.1.6 : <i>“...it shall undertake to observe the standard of sustainable forest management and other requirements of the forest certification scheme.”</i></p> <p>Ch.3.2.1.10: <i>“It shall establish an appropriate system of auditing the sustainable forest management as regards forest owners included in regional certification scheme.”</i></p> <p>Ch.3.2.1.11: <i>“Maintain and update database which include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Members’ assurance of managing in accordance to the Standard</i> • <i>Statements of owners’ to manage in accordance with sub-criteria</i>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to system documentation
		<p><i>of the SFM</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Data bases of the forest owners who have voluntarily acceded to the certification procedure</i> • <i>Documentation regarding the implementation of internal audit and potential prevention and corrective measures.”</i>
<p>4.1.4 The forest certification scheme shall define requirements for an annual internal monitoring programme that provides sufficient confidence in the conformity of the whole group organisation with the sustainable forest management standard.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Minor Non-conformity:</p> <p>PEFC SLO 02/2012 3.2.1 – 10: The tasks of the authorized group representative are quite inclusive and make reference to an internal monitoring system, but there is no specific mention of the system or its design.</p> <p><u>PEFC SLO Minor Non-Conformity Remedy</u></p> <p>PEFC SLO 02:2012 Appendix 5</p> <p>‘Detail rules for annual sampling must be described in internal rules of group representative in document Rules of Sustainable management control for regional/group representative. The control must provide sufficient conformity of the whole group certification. Forest properties over 1000 ha must be controlled at least once during 5 year certification period, based on Sampling Program of Forest Properties.</p>
Functions and responsibilities of the group entity		
<p>4.2.1 The forest certification scheme shall define the following requirements for the function and responsibility of the group entity:</p>		
<p>a) To represent the group organisation in the certification process, including in communications and relationships with the certification body, submission of an application for certification, and contractual relationship with the certification body;</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>PEFC SLO 02/2012, Ch.3.2.1: The Group organization is responsible for initiating the certification process, selecting the certification body, preparing and submitting the contract and the communications with certification body.</p> <p>Ch.3.2.1.3; <i>“It shall prepare all necessary documentation for the certification of sustainable forest management”</i></p> <p>Ch.3.2.1.4; <i>“It shall select the certification body accredited for certification of SFM and establish contact with said body.”</i></p> <p>Ch.3.2.1.5; <i>“It shall submit a request for certification to the certification body and arrange for a contract relation with the certification body.”</i></p>
<p>b) To provide a commitment on behalf of the whole group organisation to comply with the sustainable forest</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>PEFC SLO 02/2012, Ch.3.2.1.6: <i>“On behalf of an organized group, it shall undertake to observe the standards of SFM and other</i></p>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to system documentation
management standard and other applicable requirements of the forest certification scheme;		<i>requirements of the certification scheme.”</i>
c) To establish written procedures for the management of the group organisation;	Yes	PEFC SLO 02/2012, Ch.3.2.1.1 – 20 defines the tasks of the “group entity.” Although there is no formal terminology stating the establishment of written procedures for the management of the group, in its entirety, this chapter functions as this requirement.
d) To keep records of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the group entity and participants’ conformity with the requirements of the sustainable forest management standard, and other applicable requirements of the forest certification scheme, - all participants, including their contact details, identification of their forest property and its/their size(s), - the certified area, - the implementation of an internal monitoring programme, its review and any preventive and/or corrective actions taken; 	Yes	<p>Tasks of the group/regional manager include managing data bases that include documentation from members assuring their adherence to SFM, documentation regarding the implementation of internal auditing and documentation of preventative and corrective action measures participants’ statements of accession, and certificates of participation which provide property-specific data.</p> <p>PEFC SLO 02/2012, Ch.3.2.1.11</p> <p>Ch.3.2.1.11: <i>“Maintain and update database which include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Members’ assurance of managing in accordance to the Standard</i> • <i>Statements of owners’ to manage in accordance with sub-criteria of the SFM</i> • <i>Data bases of the forest owners who have voluntarily acceded to the certification procedure</i> • <i>Certified area</i> • <i>Documentation regarding the implementation of internal audit and potential prevention and corrective measures.”</i>
e) To establish connections with all participants based on a written agreement which shall include	Yes	In order to voluntarily enter the Group, all participants must sign the “ <i>Statement of Accession Into Forest Certification</i> ” agreement. This agreement allows for group representatives to access the property for internal audit purposes. It shall inform the member of any

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to system documentation
<p>the participants' commitment to comply with the sustainable forest management standard. The group entity shall have a written contract or other written agreement with all participants covering the right of the group entity to implement and enforce any corrective or preventive measures, and to initiate the exclusion of any participant from the scope of certification in the event of non-conformity with the sustainable forest management standard;</p>		<p>noncompliance established in the audit of their property and on any required measures for improving the noncompliance. In case the owner does not fulfill the corrective action request, the forest owners must be excluded from the group.</p> <p>Tasks of forest owners participating in the group/regional certification system are as follows:</p> <p>PEFC SLO 02/2012, Ch.3.3.3: <i>“They have to fill in the accession statement confirming their inclusion in the regional certification scheme and undertake to respect guidelines or sustainable forest management.”</i></p>
<p>f) To provide participants with a document confirming participation in the group forest certification;</p>	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 02/2012, Ch. 8, para.2: <i>“A representative of a region or group shall issue a certificate of participation in a regional or group certification to participants taking part in the regional or group certification...”</i></p>
<p>g) To provide all participants with information and guidance required for the effective implementation of the sustainable forest management standard and other applicable requirements of the forest certification scheme;</p>	Yes	<p>Following the participant's signing of the accession statement, the group manager is obliged to provide the participant with “Instructions for Sustainable Forest Management.” Following conferral of the certificate, the group manager forwards participants a more detailed document stating the mentioned guidelines and measures for sustainable forest management.</p> <p>PEFC SLO 02/2012 Ch.6 para.2 <i>“Upon signing of the said statement (accession statement) they shall receive “Instructions for Sustainable Forest Management.” Upon the conferral of the certificate, forest owners shall be awarded a more detailed brochure stating the mentioned guidelines and measure for SFM.”</i></p>
<p>h) To operate an annual internal monitoring programme that</p>	Yes	<p>Minor Non-conformity: There is no specific reference to the requirements for an annual internal monitoring program.</p>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to system documentation
provides for the evaluation of the participants' conformity with the certification requirements, and;		<p>PEFC SLO 02/2012</p> <p>Ch.3.2.1.10: <i>"It shall establish an appropriate system of auditing the sustainable forest management as regards forest owners included in regional certification scheme."</i></p> <p>Ch.3.2.1.11: <i>"Maintain and update database which include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Members' assurance of managing in accordance to the Standard</i> • <i>Statements of owners' to manage in accordance with sub-criteria of the SFM</i> • <i>Data bases of the forest owners who have voluntarily acceded to the certification procedure</i> • <i>Documentation regarding the implementation of internal audit and potential prevention and corrective measures."</i> <p>PEFC SLO Minor Non-Conformity Remedy</p> <p>PEFC SLO 02:2012 Criterion 3.2.11</p> <p>It shall establish an appropriate system of <u>annual</u> auditing the sustainable forest management as regards forest owners included in regional certification scheme,</p>
i) To operate a review of conformity with the sustainable forest management standard, that includes reviewing the results of the internal monitoring programme and the certification body's evaluations and surveillance; corrective and preventive measures if required; and the evaluation of the effectiveness of corrective actions taken.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 02/2012 Ch.3.2.1.20; <i>"It shall carry out a conformity audit with the Slovenian Forest Certification Scheme which includes a revision of the internal audit of certification body, potential correctional and prevention measures and evaluations regarding the efficiency of the implemented measures."</i></p>
Function and responsibilities of participants		
4.3.1 The forest certification scheme shall define the following requirements for the participants:		
a) To provide the group entity with a written agreement, including a commitment on conformity with the	Yes	Participants in the scheme must fill in the accession statement confirming their inclusion in the certification scheme and undertake to comply with the rules of the certification scheme.

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to system documentation
sustainable forest management standard and other applicable requirements of the forest certification scheme;		PEFC SLO 02/2012, Ch.3.3.3: <i>“The have to fill out an accession statement confirming their inclusion in the regional certification scheme and undertake to respect guidelines for SFM.”</i>
b) To comply with the sustainable forest management standard and other applicable requirements of the forest certification scheme;	Yes	See 4.3.1a
c) To provide full co-operation and assistance in responding effectively to all requests from the group entity or certification body for relevant data, documentation or other information; allowing access to the forest and other facilities, whether in connection with formal audits or reviews or otherwise;	Yes	<p>Upon signing the Statement of Accession forest owners agree to commit themselves to comply to the rules of the certification scheme, provide certain data and relevant documents required for audits, allow access to the certification body or group representative and allow use of relevant data.</p> <p>PEFC SLO 02/2012 Ch.3.3.4, <i>“They shall enable an inspection of documents and on-site inspections upon the visit by a certification body or a regional representative carrying out an audit or supervision.”</i></p>
d) To implement relevant corrective and preventive actions established by the group entity.	Yes	<p>Upon signing the Statement of Accession forest owners agree to commit themselves to comply with the rules of the certification scheme. Although there is not specific terminology referencing the participant taking corrective and preventative actions, the Statement of Accession defines the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage my forest in according to the sub-criteria regarding the sustainable forest management that I have been informed about from the attached guidelines. • Resume [sic. Assume] all cost in the case of an extraordinary control caused as a result of information of serious violations of the SFM. (See PEFC SLO 02/2012 Ch. 3.2.12 for group representative responsibility for informing participant of preventative or corrective measures.)

PART III: Standard and System Requirement Checklist for SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT (PEFC ST 1003:2010)

1 Scope

Part III covers requirements for sustainable forest management as defined in PEFC ST 1003:2010, *Sustainable Forest Management – Requirements*.

Any inconsistencies between this text and the original referred to document will be overruled by the content and wording of the technical document.

2 Checklist

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
General requirements for SFM standards		
4.1 The requirements for sustainable forest management defined by regional, national or sub-national forest management standards shall		
a) include management and performance requirements that are applicable at the forest management unit level, or at another level as appropriate, to ensure that the intent of all requirements is achieved at the forest management unit level.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012: Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management at the Regional Level</p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management at the Group and Individual Level</p> <p>Both documents clearly and precisely define requirements for forest management at the regional, certified group and individual forest owner level. Forest management planning is a function of the Slovenian Forest Service. These plans are regional and scale down to FMUs, then to silvicultural plans for private forests and timber stands.</p> <p>This is adequately covered in the Forest Act: I. 1.1, 1.2; II.9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4; 12.1, 13.1.</p> <p>FA II. 9.1: <i>“Forest management plans shall be regional forest management plans and the forest management plans of forest management units.”</i></p> <p><i>“Forest management plans shall also take into account guidelines for managing of the natural and cultural heritage of the forest area, ...water management conditions...guidelines for ensuring other functions of the</i></p>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
		<i>forest...</i>
b) be clear, objective-based and auditable.	Yes	PEFC SLO 03/2012, PEFC SLO 04/2012 state in their Purpose: <i>"Define [sic] key points and areas of sustainable forest management audit for the regionals level on the basis of which certification bodies will be able to audit sustainable forest management."</i>
c) apply to activities of all operators in the defined forest area who have a measurable impact on achieving compliance with the requirements.	Yes	The standard clearly requires that all operators must be knowledgeable regarding sustainable forest management. PEFC SLO 03/2012, 6.2: <i>"Forest managers, forest owners and forest workers must constantly improve their knowledge regarding sustainable forest management."</i>
d) require record-keeping that provides evidence of compliance with the requirements of the forest management standards.	Yes	PEFC SLO 03/2012, 2.4: <i>"Health condition of forests and availability of nutritional substances to and trees must be documented."</i> PEFC SLO 03/2012 2.5: <i>"Any disposals of waste in forests that would threaten growth and fertility...must be recorded and reported."</i> PEFC SLO 03/2012, 3.1 Forestry Planning: <i>"Plans must be periodically revised"</i> FA: II 2.8.2: <i>"The content of forest management plans must be made public."</i> FA: II 2.8.3: <i>"Plans for managing forest are documentary material which must be permanently stored after the expiry of their validity."</i>
Specific requirements for SFM standards		
Criterion 1: Maintenance and appropriate enhancement of forest resources and their contribution to the global carbon cycle		
5.1.1 Forest management planning shall aim to maintain or increase forests and other wooded areas and enhance the quality of the economic, ecological, cultural and social values of forest resources, including soil and water. This shall be done by making full use of related services and tools that	Yes	PEFC SLO 03/2012. 1.1: Forest management planning <i>"...is implemented by means of the use of and coordination of existing tools and institutions at the level of spatial planning and nature protection."</i> PEFC SLO 03/2012. 1.2: <i>"Suitable Silviculture and other measures must be introduced to improve the exploitation of the site potential, both in terms of quantity and quality, and by accumulation of increments in the forests must be increased."</i> PEFC SLO 04/2012 (Identical to above) FA II, 9.4 <i>"Forest management plans shall also take into account guidelines for managing of the natural and cultural heritage in the forest area, the water management conditions and guidelines for ensuring</i>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
support land-use planning and nature conservation.		<i>other functions of the forest which are prepared by competent bodies and organizations.”</i>
5.1.2 Forest management shall comprise the cycle of inventory and planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and shall include an appropriate assessment of the social, environmental and economic impacts of forest management operations. This shall form a basis for a cycle of continuous improvement to minimise or avoid negative impacts.	Yes	PEFC SLO 03/2012 1.1.a5: <i>“Existence of forestry planning which is of a cyclical nature and contains inventory and planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and includes an adequate assessment of social, environmental and economic impacts of sustainable forest management. This represents a basis for the cycle of constant improvement aimed at decreasing or preventing negative impacts.”</i>
5.1.3 Inventory and mapping of forest resources shall be established and maintained, adequate to local and national conditions and in correspondence with the topics described in this document.	Yes	<p>Forest planning and mapping are specific functions of the Slovenian Forest Service. These functions are clearly specified in the Forest Act.</p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 1.1: <i>“Forest areas and functions must be adequately mapped.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 1.1c: This is a quantitative indicator calling for auditors to be cognizant of forest cover maps and mapping methods.</p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 5: <i>“Forests having protective function must be mapped in forest management plans.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 1.1 and 1.1c and 5 (Identical to above)</p> <p>FA: II.2. sec.11.2; III.2.sec.35.1; VII.1.sec50.1: The activities of the Forest Service Shall be <i>... to monitor the state and development of forests...</i> VIII.3.sec.56.1: The activities of the Forest Service shall be <i>...collecting data on the state an development of forests; ...monitoring the biological balance in forests.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012. 1.1.a.5: <i>“Forest management and silvicultural plans must be regularly produced and periodically revised. They must be produced on the basis of legislative requirements and compliant with the forest map and spatial planning.”</i></p>
5.1.4 Management plans or their equivalents, appropriate to the size and use of the forest area, shall be elaborated	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012. 1.1.a.5: <i>“Forest management and silvicultural plans must be regularly produced and periodically revised. They must be produced on the basis of legislative requirements and compliant with the forest map and spatial planning.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012. 3.1: <i>“Forest management must be based on valid</i></p>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
and periodically updated. They shall be based on legislation as well as existing land-use plans, and adequately cover the forest resources.		<p><i>forest management plans, which have to be aligned with other plans and guidelines, especially those related to spatial planning and nature protection. Plans must encourage various forest uses and functions. Plans must be periodically revised. For the purpose of planning, forest resources and the impact of forest management must be periodically monitored. Forest management planning should promote wood and non-wood forest products and services.</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 1.1a5, 3.1 (Identical to above)</p> <p>FA: II.2.sec.9.4: <i>"Forest management plans shall also take into account guidelines for managing of the natural and cultural heritage in the forest area, the water management conditions and guidelines for ensuring other functions of the forest which are prepared by competent bodies and organizations."</i></p>
5.1.5 Management plans or their equivalents shall include at least a description of the current condition of the forest management unit, long-term objectives; and the average annual allowable cut, including its justification and, where relevant, the annually allowable exploitation of non-timber forest products.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 1.1.a.5: Forestry Planning: <i>"...these should contain at least a description of: current condition of the forest at a holding, long-term goals, potential annual cut including its justification, and when necessary, also restrictions regarding picking of non-wood products."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 3.1: <i>"Forest management planning should promote wood and non-wood forest products and services."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 3.5 <i>"Forest management must provide sustainable production and exploitation of non-wood forest products and services, which does not exceed the capacity of forests and does not deteriorate their quality and general condition."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04.2012 1.1a5, 3.1, 3.5 (Identical to above)</p>
5.1.6 A summary of the forest management plan or its equivalent appropriate to the scope and scale of forest management, which contains information about the forest management measures to be applied, is publicly available. The summary may exclude confidential business and personal information and other information made confidential by national legislation or for the protection of cultural sites or sensitive natural resource features.	Yes	<p>FA:II.2. Sec. 8.2: <i>"The content of managing forest plans shall be made public."</i></p> <p>FA:II.2. Sec. 8.3 <i>"Plans for managing forest are documentary material which must be permanently stored after the expiry of their validity."</i></p> <p>The basis for preparing forest management plans in Slovenia is the Forest Act (ZOG - Official Gazette of the RS Nos. 30/93, 67/2002) and the Resolution on National Forest Programme (ReNGP -Official Gazette of the RS no. 14/96). Slovenia is divided into 14 regional units (RU) for which Forest Management Plans (FMP) are prepared in line with the provisions of the Forest Act. The RU is further divided into forest local units (FLU) for which forest management plans are also prepared. The FLUs are divided into sections for which detailed silviculture plans are prepared. The Forest Service prepares the Silviculture plans for private forest owners. These must be in line with the RUs and FLUs. These are made available to the public.</p> <p>Plans for private forest lands are provided by the Forest Service and by</p>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
		law must fall into the scope of the RUs.
5.1.7 Monitoring of forest resources and evaluation of their management shall be periodically performed, and results fed back into the planning process.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 1.1.a5: <i>“Existence of forestry planning which is of a cyclical nature and contains inventory and planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and includes an adequate assessment of social, environmental and economic impacts of sustainable forest management. This represents a basis for the cycle of constant improvement aimed at decreasing or preventing negative impacts.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03.2012 2.1: <i>“Forest management must be geared at maintenance and improvement of health and vitality of forest ecosystems, also by systematic monitoring ...”</i></p> <p>FA:II. sec.11.4: <i>“Forest areas and functions of forests specified and evaluated...in forest management plans of the FMU shall be as expert basis taken into account in spatial planning at the local level.”</i></p>
5.1.8 Responsibilities for sustainable forest management shall be clearly defined and assigned.	Yes	The Forest Act clearly defines the Slovenia Forest Service as the ultimate manager of Slovenia’s forests. This is found throughout the Forest Act. Forest owners are required by the Act to manage within accord of their RMU and to seek Silviculture plans from the Forest Service for the management of their forests. Forest owners are responsible for the management of their property in conformance to the Forest Act and are subject to fines and other penalties for non-conformance to the Act or not reporting instances of forest degradation or abuse.
5.1.9 Forest management practices shall safeguard the quantity and quality of the forest resources in the medium and long term by balancing harvesting and growth rates, and by preferring techniques that minimise direct or indirect damage to forest, soil or water resources.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012. 1.2: <i>“Suitable Silviculture and other measures must be introduced to improve the exploitation of the site potential, both in terms of quantity and quality, and by accumulation of increments in the forests must be increased.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012. 2.2: <i>“Forest management must be geared at maintenance and improvement of health and vitality of forest ecosystems...”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012. 3.2: <i>“In the long term, the forest management should preserve and improve forest funds (i.e. functions)...”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012. 3.3 <i>“As wood production is promoted, more intensive Silviculture works and investments in the implementation of protective measures must be provided to improve the quality and ecologic stability of forest stands.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012. 3.4 <i>“The construction of forest roads and hauling roads and bridges is built in a manner to minimise the danger of erosion on non-protected soil and leaching near water courses...”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012. 3.5 <i>“Forest management must provide sustainable production and exploitation of non-wood forest products and services, which does not exceed the capacity of forests and does not deteriorate their quality and general condition.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012. 5.2. <i>“In forest management, special attention must be paid to preventing erosion on sensitive soil and preventing technique and mechanisation inadequate for the stand. Inappropriate</i></p>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
		<p><i>use of chemicals and other substances as well as other activities having an harmful impact on the quality of water must be prevented.</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012. 1.2, 2.2, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 5.2 (Identical to above)</p>
<p>5.1.10 Appropriate silvicultural measures shall be taken to maintain or reach a level of the growing stock that is economically, ecologically and socially desirable.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012. 1.2: <i>“Suitable Silviculture and other measures must be introduced to improve the exploitation of the site potential, both in terms of quantity and quality, and by accumulation of increments in the forests must be increased.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012.3.2: <i>“...forest management must permanently provide for optimal wood yield from forest without diminishing the biotic diversity of the forest...”</i></p>
<p>5.1.11 Conversion of forests to other types of land use, including conversion of primary forests to forest plantations, shall not occur unless in justified circumstances where the conversion:</p> <p>a) is in compliance with national and regional policy and legislation relevant for land use and forest management and is a result of national or regional land-use planning governed by a governmental or other official authority including consultation with materially and directly interested persons and organisations; and</p> <p>b) entails a small proportion of forest type; and</p> <p>c) does not have negative impacts on threatened (including vulnerable, rare or endangered) forest ecosystems, culturally and socially significant areas, important habitats of</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 1.1: <i>“Clearing of forest for agricultural purposes is only possible in areas with not top-priority ecological functions of forests.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 1.1.a6: <i>“Clearing of the forest with the purpose of land conversion into agricultural or other non-forest land including the conversion of the forest into a plantation of forest trees is not implemented except in justified cases when such conversion is in accordance with the national and regional policy and legislation including carrying out a consultation with materially and directly interested persons and organisations; and:</i></p> <p>b.) <i>it signified a small share of forests types</i></p> <p>c.) <i>has no negative impacts on threatened species (including vulnerable and rare species) forest eco-systems, cultural and social functions and important habitats of threatened species or other protected areas,</i></p> <p>d.) <i>contributes to the long-term preservation of economic and social benefits.</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 1.1, 1.1a6. (Identical to above)</p>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
<p>threatened species or other protected areas; and</p> <p>d) makes a contribution to long-term conservation, economic, and social benefits.</p>		
<p>5.1.12 Conversion of abandoned agricultural and treeless land into forest land shall be taken into consideration, whenever it can add economic, ecological, social and/or cultural value.</p>	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 1.1.a6: <i>“The conversion of abandoned agricultural land into forest land is carried out if economic, ecological, social or cultural functions of the landscape are thus improved.”</i></p>
<p>5.2.1 Forest management planning shall aim to maintain and increase the health and vitality of forest ecosystems and to rehabilitate degraded forest ecosystems, whenever this is possible by silvicultural means.</p>	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 2.1: <i>“Forest management must be geared at the maintenance and improvement of health and vitality of forest ecosystems...”</i></p> <p>FA: III.1. Sec.23.2: <i>“The Forest Service, in cooperation with the forest owner, shall ensure reforestation of burns and forests damaged by any natural cause.”</i></p> <p><u>PEFC SLO Remedied Standard</u></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 Criterion 2.1</p> <p>Forest <u>planning</u> and management must be geared at maintenance and improvement of health and vitality of forest ecosystems (integral forest protection), also by constant systematic...</p>
Criterion 2: Maintenance of forest ecosystem health and vitality		
<p>5.2.2 Health and vitality of forests shall be periodically monitored, especially key biotic and abiotic factors that potentially affect health and vitality of forest ecosystems, such as pests, diseases, overgrazing and overstocking, fire, and damage caused by climatic factors, air pollutants or by forest management operations.</p>	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 2.1: <i>“Forest management must be geared at the maintenance and improvement of health and vitality of forest ecosystems...also by constant systematic monitoring of threats to the forests and their life potential, natural impacts and influences human activity on the forest as well as preventative and other protective measures.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 2.1 (Identical to above)</p> <p>The Slovenian Forest Service is tasked by legislation of monitor the health of Slovenia’s forests.</p> <p>FA VII 1. Sec. 50: <i>“The activities of the public forest service shall be:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>to monitor the state and development of forests</i> - <i>protection of the forests”</i> <p>There is a large quantity of guidance in the Forest Act demonstrating that forest owners are required by law to carry out measures to reduce</p>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
		forest damage by over grazing, insects, pathogens and fire. They are to report all such incidences to the Forest Service who in turn is legislated to monitor these occurrences.
5.2.3 The monitoring and maintaining of health and vitality of forest ecosystems shall take into consideration the effects of naturally occurring fire, pests and other disturbances.	Yes	PEFC SLO 03/2012 2.1, 2.2 (See 5.2.2) PEFC SLO 04/2012 2.1, 2.2 (See 5.2.2) All of Slovenia's forest land is managed by the Slovenia Forest Service. The Forest Service is mandated by law (Forest Act) to manage Slovenia's forests in a "close to nature" manner. Forest management plans are adaptive and correspond to conditions monitored by the Forest Service. (FA II.1 Sec. 7.3 " <i>The programme of development of the forests of Slovenia shall be adopted and supplemented in accordance with changes in the forests and with the changing conditions of management.</i> ")
5.2.4 Forest management plans or their equivalents shall specify ways and means to minimise the risk of degradation of and damages to forest ecosystems. Forest management planning shall make use of those policy instruments set up to support these activities.	Yes	FA: III.1.sec 17 – 25: The Forest Act is specific on the activities allowed by forest owners within their Silviculture plans; a subset of the larger RMU plan. These actions include methods of harvest, forest openings due to harvest, collection of seed, reforestation, conversion of forests, grazing, fencing, forest road construction and wildlife management.
5.2.5 Forest management practices shall make best use of natural structures and processes and use preventive biological measures wherever and as far as economically feasible to maintain and enhance the health and vitality of forests. Adequate genetic, species and structural diversity shall be encouraged and/or maintained to enhance the stability, vitality and resistance capacity of the forests to adverse	Yes	PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.1: " <i>...forest management must be geared at sustainable maintenance, conservation and enhancement of biotic diversity on the ecosystem, species, genetic, and where appropriate, landscape level.</i> " PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.5: " <i>Natural forest regeneration must strive for maximum share of natural regeneration of stands in a manner most similar to natural processes...</i> " PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.7: " <i>Forest management must systematically preserve and not remove suitable quantity and distribution of standing, fallen dead trees and holloh(w) trees which ensures the preservation of favourable conservation status of plant and animal species in forests.</i> " PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.8: " <i>Forest management must promote tree structure suitable for the site as well as species diversity. Where applicable, the diversity of horizontal and vertical structures, such as uneven age structure and mixed stands, are stimulated by means of</i>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
environmental factors and strengthen natural regulation mechanisms.		<p><i>forest management plans.</i>"</p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.9: <i>"In forest management it is necessary, if possible, to strive for preservation and promotion of tree diversity at the landscape level."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 4.5, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9 (Identical to above)</p>
5.2.6 Lighting of fires shall be avoided and is only permitted if it is necessary for the achievement of the management goals of the forest management unit.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 7.2: <i>"Suitable protection against prohibited activities, such as ...burning of forests...must be ensured."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 7.2 (Identical to above)</p>
5.2.7 Appropriate forest management practices such as reforestation and afforestation with tree species and provenances that are suited to the site conditions or the use of tending, harvesting and transport techniques that minimise tree and/or soil damages shall be applied. The spillage of oil during forest management operations or the indiscriminate disposal of waste on forest land shall be strictly avoided. Non-organic waste and litter shall be avoided, collected, stored in designated areas and removed in an environmentally-responsible manner.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 2.5: <i>"... residues of fuels and lubricants must not be left."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 3.4: <i>"The construction of forest roads and bridges is built in a manner to minimize the danger of erosion on non-protected soil and leaching near water courses."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.4: <i>"For the needs of artificial regeneration of forests and reforestation whereby a preference is given to domestic species and local provenances, a constant supervisory care with quality reproductive material of different types and provenances must be provided."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.5: <i>"Natural forest regeneration must strive for maximum share of natural regeneration of stands in a manner most similar to natural processes..."</i></p> <p>Assessors Note: Quantitative Indicator 2.1.d states that "mechanical damage to trees is a direct indicator of the quality of sustainability of management."</p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 2.4, 3.4, 4.4 ,4.5, (Identical to the above)</p>
5.2.8 The use of pesticides shall be minimised and appropriate silvicultural alternatives and other biological measures preferred.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 2.3: <i>"The use of pesticides another chemical substances in the forest is prohibited unless exceptionally for controlling the gradation of harmful insects and for protection against game. The use of chemical substances must be limited to a minimum, taking into account the alternative Silviculture and other biological measures."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 2.3 (Identical to above)</p>
5.2.9 The WHO Type 1A and 1B pesticides and other highly toxic	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 2.3: (See 5.2.8 above)</p> <p>PEFC SLO 04.2012 2.3: (Identical to above)</p>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
pesticides shall be prohibited, except where no other viable alternative is available.		
5.2.10 Pesticides, such as chlorinated hydrocarbons whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use, and any pesticides banned by international agreement, shall be prohibited.	Yes	PEFC SLO 03/2012 2.3: (See 5.2.8 above) PEFC SLO 04.2012 2.3: (Identical to above)
5.2.11 The use of pesticides shall follow the instructions given by the pesticide producer and be implemented with proper equipment and training.	Yes	PEFC SLO 03/2012 2.3 (See 5.2.8 above) PEFC SLO 04.2012 2.3: (Identical to above)
5.2.12 Where fertilisers are used, they shall be applied in a controlled manner and with due consideration for the environment.	Yes	PEFC SLO 03.2012 2.3: <i>"If fertilizers are used, this must be done under supervision, in an ecologically acceptable manner."</i> PEFC SLO 04.2012 2.3: (Identical to above)
Criterion 3: Maintenance and encouragement of productive functions of forests (wood and non-wood)		
5.3.1 Forest management planning shall aim to maintain the capability of forests to produce a range of wood and non-wood forest products and services on a sustainable basis.	Yes	PEFC SLO 03/2012 3.1: "Plans must include various forest uses and functions." PEFC SLO 03/2012 3.2: <i>"Planning and forest management must permanently provide for optimal wood yield without diminishing biodiversity". "In the long term, the forest management should preserve and improve forest funds and promote new products and services."</i> <i>"...planning should be an adequate economic performance which, when planned, should take into account the available market studies, new markets sales potentials, and economic activities related to products and services provided by forests."</i> PEFC SLO 04/2012 3.1: (Identical to above)
5.3.2 Forest management planning shall aim to achieve sound economic performance taking into	Yes	PEFC SLO 03/2012 3.2: (See 5.3.1) PEFC SLO 04.2012 3.1: (See 5.3.1)

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
account any available market studies and possibilities for new markets and economic activities in connection with all relevant goods and services of forests.		
5.3.3 Forest management plans or their equivalents shall take into account the different uses or functions of the managed forest area. Forest management planning shall make use of those policy instruments set up to support the production of commercial and non-commercial forest goods and services.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 3.1: <i>"...Plans must encourage various forest uses and functions."</i> <i>"Forest management planning should promote wood and non-wood forest products and services."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 1.1.a5: <i>"Existence of forestry planning ...contains inventory and planning implementation, monitoring, and evaluation and includes an adequate assessment of social, environmental and economic impacts of sustainable forest management. "Forest management plans [sic] ...must be produced on the basis of legislative requirements..."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 3.5: <i>"Forest management must provide sustainable production and exploitation of non-wood forest products and services."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 1.1.a5, 3.1, 3.5 (Identical to above)</p>
5.3.4 Forest management practices shall maintain and improve the forest resources and encourage a diversified output of goods and services over the long term.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 1.2: <i>"Suitable silviculture and other measures must be introduced to improve the exploitation of site potential, both in terms of quantity and quality, and my accumulation of increment in forest must be increased."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 3.2: <i>"...forest management must permanently provide for optimal wood yield from forest without diminishing the biotic diversity of the forest..."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 3.5: <i>"Forest management must provide sustainable production and exploitation non-wood forest products and services..."</i> <i>"The sustainable exploitation of non-wood forest products must be promoted, including in the form of ancillary activities with the framework of the forest holding."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.1: <i>"Planning and forest management must be geared at sustainable maintenance, conservation and enhancement of biotic diversity on the ecosystem, species, genetic, and where appropriate, landscape level."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04.2012 1.2, 3.2, 3.5, 2.1 (Identical to above)</p>
5.3.5 Regeneration, tending and harvesting operations shall be carried out in time, and in a way that does not reduce the productive capacity of the site, for example by avoiding damage to retained	Yes	<p>Forest management activities in Slovenia are managed by the Forest Service and in accordance with the management plan.</p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 1.2, 3.2, 3.5, (See 5.3.4 above)</p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.5: <i>"Natural regeneration must strive for maximum share of natural regeneration of stands in a manner most similar to natural processes."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.6: <i>"Forest management must provide the</i></p>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
stands and trees as well as to the forest soil, and by using appropriate systems.		<p><i>conservation of favourable condition of forest and forest habitat types...</i> "Care and gathering is carried out in a manner no causing any permanent damage to ecosystems."</p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 5.1: "...Forest management must aim to maintain and enhance protective function, notably in terms of soil erosion and different effects of water, such as floods and landslides."</p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 5.2: "...In forest management, special attention must be paid to preventing erosion on sensitive soil and preventing technique and mechanisation inadequate in the stand. In appropriate use of chemicals and other substances as well as other activities having a harmful impact on the quality of water must be prevented".</p> <p>PEFC 04/2012 1.2, 3.2, 3.5, 4.5, 4.6, 5.1, 5.2 (Identical to above)</p>
5.3.6 Harvesting levels of both wood and non-wood forest products shall not exceed a rate that can be sustained in the long term, and optimum use shall be made of the harvested forest products, with due regard to nutrient off-take.	Yes	See 5.3.4 and 5.3.5 above
5.3.7 Where it is the responsibility of the forest owner/manager and included in forest management, the exploitation of non-timber forest products, including hunting and fishing, shall be regulated, monitored and controlled.	N/A	<p>Wildlife management is the sole responsibility of the Forest Service and other appropriate Slovenian agencies as mandated by law.</p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 3.5: "Forest management must provide sustainable production and exploitation non-wood forest products and services..."</p> <p>"The sustainable exploitation of non-wood forest products must be promoted, including in the form of ancillary activities with the framework of the forest holding."</p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 3.5 (Identical to above)</p>
5.3.8 Adequate infrastructure such as roads, skid tracks or bridges shall be planned, established and maintained to ensure efficient delivery of goods and services while minimising negative impacts on the environment.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 3.4 "In order to ensure efficient forest management, the network of forest traffic routes must be suitably planned, set up and maintained, providing adequate permanent production and exploitation of forest resources as well as the functioning of forest for generally useful functions with negative impacts of the network on the environment minimised." "The construction of forest roads and hauling roads and bridges is built in a manner to minimise the leaching near water courses. An adequate drainage of forest routes is arranged."</p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 3.4 (Identical to above)</p>
Criterion 4: Maintenance, conservation and appropriate enhancement of biological diversity in forest ecosystems		

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
<p>5.4.1 Forest management planning shall aim to maintain, conserve and enhance biodiversity on ecosystem, species and genetic levels and, where appropriate, diversity at landscape level.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.1: <i>“Planning and forest management must be geared at sustainable maintenance, conservation and enhancement of biotic diversity on the ecosystem, species, genetic and where appropriate, landscape level.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 4.1: (Identical to above)</p>
<p>5.4.2 Forest management planning, inventory and mapping of forest resources shall identify, protect and/or conserve ecologically important forest areas containing significant concentrations of:</p> <p>a) protected, rare, sensitive or representative forest ecosystems such as riparian areas and wetland biotopes;</p> <p>b) areas containing endemic species and habitats of threatened species, as defined in recognised reference lists;</p> <p>c) endangered or protected genetic <i>in situ</i> resources;</p> <p>and taking into account</p> <p>d) globally, regionally and nationally significant large landscape areas with natural distribution and abundance of naturally occurring species.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 1.1: <i>“Forest management ...is implemented by means of the use and coordination of existing tools and institutions at the level of spatial planning and nature protection.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.1: <i>“Planning and forest management must be geared at sustainable maintenance, conservation and enhancement of biotic diversity on the ecosystem, species, genetic and where appropriate, landscape level.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.2: <i>“When planning and managing forests, the ecologically significant, typical, rare and sensitive forest biotopes, habitat types and species must be reserved, especially in the framework of the network of special areas of conservation (the so-called NATURA 2000 areas and ecologically significant areas – ESA)</i></p> <p><i>A special attention is dedicated to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wetlands and riparian areas • areas containing endemic species and habitats of threatened species, as defined in recognized reference lists, • endangered or protected genetic and in-site resources and • globally, regionally or nationally significant landscape areas with great biodiversity” <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.3: <i>“Forest management planning must provide for protection and conservation of rare and threatened animal and plant species. Protected and threatened animal and plant species must not be used for commercial purposes. When necessary, measures are adopted for their protection or spreading of threatened species.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 1.1,4.1, 4.2, 4.3 (Identical to above)</p>
<p>5.4.3 Protected and endangered plant and</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.3: <i>“Forest management planning must provide for protection and conservation of rare and threatened animal and plant</i></p>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
<p>animal species shall not be exploited for commercial purposes. Where necessary, measures shall be taken for their protection and, where relevant, to increase their population.</p>		<p><i>species. Protected and threatened animal and plant species must not be used for commercial purposes. When necessary, measures are adopted for their protection or spreading of threatened species.</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 4.3 (Identical to above)</p>
<p>5.4.4 Forest management shall ensure successful regeneration through natural regeneration or, where not appropriate, planting that is adequate to ensure the quantity and quality of the forest resources.</p>	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.4: <i>“For the needs of artificial regeneration of forests and reforestation whereby a preference is given to domestic species and local provenances, a constant supervisory care with quality reproductive material of different types and provenances must be provided.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.5: <i>“Natural regeneration must strive for maximum share of natural regeneration of stands in a manner most similar to natural processes.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 4.4, 4.5 (Identical to above)</p>
<p>5.4.5 For reforestation and afforestation, origins of native species and local provenances that are well-adapted to site conditions shall be preferred, where appropriate. Only those introduced species, provenances or varieties shall be used whose impacts on the ecosystem and on the genetic integrity of native species and local provenances have been evaluated, and if negative impacts can be avoided or minimised.</p>	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.4: <i>“For the needs of artificial regeneration of forests and reforestation whereby a preference is given to domestic species and local provenances, a constant supervisory care with quality reproductive material of different types and provenances must be provided. Planting and sowing foreign tree species and tree species not adaptable to the site (non-appropriate provenances) is prohibited unless it is prescribed in the forests-management or silvicultural plan. The areas of existing see stands must be increased and new ones determined.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 4.4 (Identical to above)</p>
<p>5.4.6 Afforestation and reforestation activities that contribute to the improvement and restoration of ecological connectivity shall be promoted.</p>	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 (See 5.4.4 above)</p>
<p>5.4.7 Genetically-modified trees shall not</p>	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.4: <i>“Genetically modified trees are not introduced into the forest.”</i></p>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
be used.		PEFC SLO 04.2012 4.4 (Identical to above)
5.4.8 Forest management practices shall, where appropriate, promote a diversity of both horizontal and vertical structures such as uneven-aged stands and the diversity of species such as mixed stands. Where appropriate, the practices shall also aim to maintain and restore landscape diversity.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.8: <i>“Forest management must promote tree structure suitable for the site as well as species diversity and mixed stands. Where applicable, the diversity of horizontal and vertical structures, such as uneven age structure and mixed stands, are stimulated by means of forest management plans. Traditional management systems which have created special ecosystems (such as coppicing) are promoted at suitable sites when economically adequate.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 4.5 (Identical to above)</p>
5.4.9 Traditional management systems that have created valuable ecosystems, such as coppice, on appropriate sites shall be supported, when economically feasible.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.8 (See 5.4.8 above)</p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 4.5 (See 5.4.8 above)</p>
5.4.10 Tending and harvesting operations shall be conducted in a way that does not cause lasting damage to ecosystems. Wherever possible, practical measures shall be taken to improve or maintain biological diversity.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.6: <i>“Forest management must provide the conservation of favourable condition of forest and forest habitat types...” “Care and gathering is carried out in a manner no causing any permanent damage to ecosystems.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 4.5 (See 5.4.8)</p> <p>The Forest Service is responsible for the management and oversight of forest harvesting operations. The Forest Act covers many aspects of this. (FA: III.1.Sec 17 – 25 and 2.sec 27 – 36)</p>
5.4.11 Infrastructure shall be planned and constructed in a way that minimises damage to ecosystems, especially to rare, sensitive or representative ecosystems and genetic reserves, and that takes threatened or other key species – in particular their migration patterns – into consideration.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 3.4 <i>“In order to ensure efficient forest management, the network of forest traffic routes must be suitably planned, set up and maintained, providing adequate permanent production and exploitation of forest resources as well as the functioning of forest for generally useful functions with negative impacts of the network on the environment minimised. A special attention is dedicated to the planning of forest roads in the area of ecosystems with rare vulnerable species and endangered genetic sources. The construction of forest roads and hauling roads and bridges is built in a manner to minimise the leaching near water courses. An adequate drainage of forest routes is arranged.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 3.4 (Identical to above)</p>
5.4.12 With due regard to management objectives,	Yes	Grazing of livestock in the forest is covered in the Forest Act. Particularly, FA III.2. Sec.32.1 – 2 prohibits pasturing of livestock in the

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
measures shall be taken to balance the pressure of animal populations and grazing on forest regeneration and growth as well as on biodiversity.		<p>forest unless specifically permitted in the region management plan.</p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 2.2: "Pasture in forests which is not provided in the silviculture plan is prohibited. In area where pasture is allowed the maximum allowed animal load per hectare is taken into account."</p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.5: "<i>Cases of intensive grazing of game that is disturbing natural regeneration are communicated to the state forestry service.</i>"</p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 (Identical to above)</p>
5.4.13 Standing and fallen dead wood, hollow trees, old groves and special rare tree species shall be left in quantities and distribution necessary to safeguard biological diversity, taking into account the potential effect on the health and stability of forests and on surrounding ecosystems.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.7: "<i>Forest management must systematically preserve and not remove suitable quantity and distribution of standing, fallen dead trees and holloh(w) trees which ensures the preservation of favourable conservation status of plant and animal species in forests.</i>"</p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 4.5 (Identical to above)</p>
Criterion 5: Maintenance and appropriate enhancement of protective functions in forest management (notably soil and water)		
5.5.1 Forest management planning shall aim to maintain and enhance protective functions of forests for society, such as protection of infrastructure, protection from soil erosion, protection of water resources and from adverse impacts of water such as floods or avalanches.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 5.1: "<i>...Forest management must aim to maintain and enhance protective function, notably in terms of soil erosion and different effects of water, such as floods and landslides.</i>"</p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 5.2: "<i>...In forest management, special attention must be paid to preventing erosion on sensitive soil and preventing technique and mechanisation inadequate in the stand. In appropriate use of chemicals and other substances as well as other activities having a harmful impact on the quality of water must be prevented.</i>"</p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 5.1, 5.2 (Identical to above)</p>
5.5.2 Areas that fulfil specific and recognised protective functions for society shall be registered and mapped, and forest management plans or their equivalents shall take these areas into account.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 5.1: "<i>Forests having protective function must be mapped in forest management plans. Forest management must aim to maintain and enhance protective function, notably in terms of soil erosion and different effects of water, such as floods and landslides.</i>"</p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 5.1 (Identical to above)</p>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
<p>5.5.3 Special care shall be given to silvicultural operations on sensitive soils and erosion-prone areas as well as in areas where operations might lead to excessive erosion of soil into watercourses. Inappropriate techniques such as deep soil tillage and use of unsuitable machinery shall be avoided in such areas. Special measures shall be taken to minimise the pressure of animal populations.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 4.6: "Forest management must provide the conservation of favourable condition of forest and forest habitat types..." "Care and gathering is carried out in a manner no causing any permanent damage to ecosystems."</p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 5.1: "...Forest management must aim to maintain and enhance protective function, notably in terms of soil erosion and different effects of water, such as floods and landslides."</p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 5.2: "...In forest management, special attention must be paid to preventing erosion on sensitive soil and preventing technique and mechanisation inadequate in the stand. In appropriate use of chemicals and other substances as well as other activities having a harmful impact on the quality of water must be prevented."</p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 4.5, 5.1, 5.2 (Identical to above)</p>
<p>5.5.4 Special care shall be given to forest management practices in forest areas with water protection functions to avoid adverse effects on the quality and quantity of water resources. Inappropriate use of chemicals or other harmful substances or inappropriate silvicultural practices influencing water quality in a harmful way shall be avoided.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 (See 5.5.1 above)</p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 (See 5.5.1 above)</p>
<p>5.5.5 Construction of roads, bridges and other infrastructure shall be carried out in a manner that minimises bare soil exposure, avoids the introduction of soil into watercourses and preserves the natural level and function of water courses and river beds. Proper road drainage facilities shall be installed and maintained.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 3.4: <i>A special attention is dedicated to the planning of forest roads in the area of ecosystems with rare vulnerable species and endangered genetic sources. The construction of forest roads and hauling roads and bridges is built in a manner to minimise the leaching near water courses. An adequate drainage of forest routes is arranged.</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 5.1: "...Forest management must aim to maintain and enhance protective function, notably in terms of soil erosion and different effects of water, such as floods and landslides."</p> <p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 5.2: "...In forest management, special attention must be paid to preventing erosion on sensitive soil and preventing technique and mechanisation inadequate in the stand. In appropriate use of chemicals and other substances as well as other activities having a harmful impact on the quality of water must be prevented."</p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 3.4, 5.1, 5.2 (Identical to above.)</p>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
Criterion 6: Maintenance of other socio-economic functions and conditions		
<p>5.6.1 Forest management planning shall aim to respect the multiple functions of forests to society, give due regard to the role of forestry in rural development, and especially consider new opportunities for employment in connection with the socio-economic functions of forests.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 6.1: <i>“When managing forests, the multi-purpose role of forest and their general social significance must be considered, as well as striving for the recognition of the role of forestry by other sectors, in particular those that are responsible for environment and nature protection, spatial planning and rural development.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 03.2012 6.2: <i>“When directing forest management, in compliance with the concept of multi-purpose management, special attention must be paid to the role of forestry in the rural development, in particular in the field of employment in connection with other socio-economic functions of the forest.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 6.1 (Identical to above)</p>
<p>5.6.2 Forest management shall promote the long-term health and well-being of communities within or adjacent to the forest management area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 6.1: <i>“Forest management should promote the long-term vitality of welfare of farms and settlements in the forest landscape.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 6.1 (Identical to above)</p>
<p>5.6.3 Property rights and land tenure arrangements shall be clearly defined, documented and established for the relevant forest area. Likewise, legal, customary and traditional rights related to the forest land shall be clarified, recognised and respected.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 6.2: <i>“Rights to ownership, lease and easement must be clearly determined and taken into account in management.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 6.1 (Identical to above)</p>
<p>5.6.4 Forest management activities shall be conducted in recognition of the established framework of legal, customary and traditional rights such as outlined in ILO 169 and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which shall not be infringed upon without the free, prior and informed consent of the</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 6.6: <i>“Work in forests must be in compliance with fundamental international conventions by the International Labor Organization.”</i></p> <p>(See Chart 1, Chapter 6 for Slovenia ILO ratifications.)</p> <p>Forest planning and forest management activities are the responsibility of the Slovenia Forest Service as mandated by law. The Forest Act mandates that the public shall be informed of upcoming forest planning sessions. FA II.2 Sec.14.2 states that “Forest owners and interested public must be suitably informed about the start, duration and timing of the public debate.” Following public input, the Forest Service must address the comments put forth during the public</p>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
<p>holders of the rights, including the provision of compensation where applicable. Where the extent of rights is not yet resolved or is in dispute there are processes for just and fair resolution. In such cases forest managers shall, in the interim, provide meaningful opportunities for parties to be engaged in forest management decisions whilst respecting the processes and roles and responsibilities laid out in the policies and laws where the certification takes place.</p>		<p>consultation period.</p> <p>Slovenia has not ratified ILO 169 as there are no recognized indigenous tribes or peoples living within the nation's boundaries.</p>
<p>5.6.5 Adequate public access to forests for the purpose of recreation shall be provided taking into account respect for ownership rights and the rights of others, the effects on forest resources and ecosystems, as well as compatibility with other functions of the forest.</p>	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 6.5: <i>"Free access and movement of forest visitors for the purpose of recreation and other similar activities must be enabled, whereby ownership and other rights, impact of recreation and other similar activities on the forest ecosystem as well as compatibility of such activities with other forest functions must be taken into account. Management and visits in forest with particularly emphasised social functions are adapted to such functions so as not to have a negative impact to forest resources and soil"</i></p> <p>Public access to the forest by non-owners for activities as picking mushrooms, herbal plants, fruits, hiking and other recreational uses are defined in Forest Act I. Sec 3.9.</p>
<p>5.6.6 Sites with recognised specific historical, cultural or spiritual significance and areas fundamental to meeting the basic needs of local communities (e.g. health, subsistence) shall be protected or managed in a way that takes due regard of the significance of the site.</p>	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 6.10: <i>"In areas of recognised cultural, historical or other spiritual significance, forest must be managed to protect and maintain them as suitable to their significance."</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 6.8 (Identical to above)</p>
<p>5.6.7 Forest management operations shall take into account all socio-economic</p>	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 6.5 (See 5.6.5 above)</p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 6.4 (See 5.6.5 above)</p>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
<p>functions, especially the recreational function and aesthetic values of forests by maintaining for example varied forest structures, and by encouraging attractive trees, groves and other features such as colours, flowers and fruits. This shall be done, however, in a way and to an extent that does not lead to serious negative effects on forest resources, and forest land.</p>		
<p>5.6.8 Forest managers, contractors, employees and forest owners shall be provided with sufficient information and encouraged to keep up-to-date through continuous training in relation to sustainable forest management as a precondition for all management planning and practices described in this standard.</p>	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 6.6: <i>“Forest managers, forest owners and forest workers must constantly improve their knowledge regarding sustainable forest management.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 6.5 (Identical to above)</p>
<p>5.6.9 Forest management practices shall make the best use of local forest-related experience and knowledge, such as those of local communities, forest owners, NGOs and local people.</p>	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 6.6: <i>“The existing traditional know-how present in local communities should be used in work in the forest by forest owners, non-governmental organisations and local people.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 6.5 (Identical to above)</p>
<p>5.6.10 Forest management shall provide for effective communication and consultation with local people and other stakeholders relating to sustainable forest management and shall provide appropriate</p>	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2013 6.9: <i>“Forest owners, local communities, non-governmental organisations, local population and other interested publics must be drawn to participate in planning and directing forest management, their opinions must be taken into account as appropriate.”</i></p> <p>Forest planning and forest management activities are the responsibility of the Slovenia Forest Service as mandated by law. The Forest Act mandates that the public shall be informed of upcoming forest planning sessions. FA II.2 Sec.14.2 states that “Forest owners and he</p>

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
mechanisms for resolving complaints and disputes relating to forest management between forest operators and local people.		interested public must be suitably informed about the start, duration and timing of the public debate.” Following public input, the Forest Service must address the comments put forth during the public consultation period.
5.6.11 Forestry work shall be planned, organised and performed in a manner that enables health and accident risks to be identified and all reasonable measures to be applied to protect workers from work-related risks. Workers shall be informed about the risks involved with their work and about preventive measures.	Yes	PEFC SLO 03/2013 6.7: <i>“Forest workers and forest owners must work in safe working conditions; for this purpose training for safe work in forest must be ensured. Providers of services in forest must observe requirements for occupational health and safety. Requirement of the Rules of Minimum Conditions for Providers of Services in Forests must be taken into account.”</i> PEFC SLO 04/2013 6.6 (Identical to above)
5.6.12 Working conditions shall be safe, and guidance and training in safe working practices shall be provided to all those assigned to a task in forest operations.	Yes	PEFC SLO 03/2012 6.7 (See 5.6.11) PEFC SLO 04/2012 6.6 (Identical as above)
5.6.13 Forest management shall comply with fundamental ILO conventions.	Yes	PEFC SLO 03/2012 6.6: <i>“Work in forests must be in compliance with fundamental international conventions by the International Labor Organization.”</i>
5.6.14 Forest management shall be based inter-alia on the results of scientific research. Forest management shall contribute to research activities and data collection needed for sustainable forest management or support relevant research activities carried out by other organisations, as appropriate.	Yes	Forest research in Slovenia is clearly defined in the Forest Act. FA: IX. 1. Sec. 72.1 – 3; states <i>“Research activities in forestry and wildlife management shall be performed by research organisations and other legal and natural persons who meet the condition of regulations on research activities.”</i> FA IX. 2. Sec. 73 1 – 2 states the Forestry Institute of Slovenia shall carry out research activities in fields of forests, forestry, fauna and game management.

Question	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
Criterion 7: Maintenance and appropriate enhancement of protective functions in forest management (notably soil and water)		
5.7.1 Forest management shall comply with legislation applicable to forest management issues including forest management practices; nature and environmental protection; protected and endangered species; property, tenure and land-use rights for indigenous people; health, labour and safety issues; and the payment of royalties and taxes.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 7.1: <i>“Forest management must be carried out in compliance with applicable legislation which includes aspects of implementing adequate forestry practices, nature protection including the protection of protected animal and plant species, observance of ownership rights, health and safety at work and payment of fees and taxes.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 7.1 (Identical to above)</p>
5.7.2 Forest management shall provide for adequate protection of the forest from unauthorised activities such as illegal logging, illegal land use, illegally initiated fires, and other illegal activities.	Yes	<p>PEFC SLO 03/2012 7.2: <i>“Suitable protection against prohibited activities, such as illegal felling, illegal forest use, illegal burning of forests and other activities must be ensured.”</i></p> <p>PEFC SLO 04/2012 7.2 (Identical to above)</p>

* If the answer to any question is no, the application documentation shall indicate for each element why and what alternative measures have been taken to address the element in question.

PART IV: Standard and System Requirement Checklist for certification and accreditation procedures (Annex 6)

1 Scope

This document covers requirements for certification and accreditation procedures given in Annex 6 to the PEFC Council Technical Document (*Certification and accreditation procedures*).

Any inconsistencies between this text and the original referred to document will be overruled by the content and wording of the technical document.

2 Checklist

No.	Question	Reference to PEFC Council PROCEDURES	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
Certification Bodies				
1.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification shall be carried out by impartial, independent third parties that cannot be involved in the standard setting process as governing or decision making body, or in the forest management and are independent of the certified entity?	Annex 6, 3.1	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012, Ch.1 para.2: <i>“Certification procedures may only be carried out by an independent and impartial certification body that has not participated in the processed of setting up procedures for standards certification and accreditation or a body being included in the forest management system.”</i>

No.	Question	Reference to PEFC Council PROCEDURES	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
2.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification body for forest management certification or chain of custody certification against a scheme specific chain of custody standard shall fulfil requirements defined in ISO 17021 or ISO Guide 65?	Annex 6, 3.1	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012, 3.1.1a: "A certification body carries out forest management certification or chain of custody of forest based products certification under the scheme of specific standard must comply with standards determined in ISO 17021 if certification is carried out as management system...or ISO Guide 65 if a certification is carried out as a product certification."
3.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification body chain of custody certification against Annex 4 shall fulfil requirements defined in ISO Guide 65?	Annex 6, 3.1	Yes	<u>Chain of Custody</u> PEFC Slovenia has adopted PEFC ST 2002:2010 (<i>Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products - Requirements</i>) in its entirety without modification.
4.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification bodies carrying out forest certification shall have the technical competence in forest management on its economic, social and environmental	Annex 6, 3.1	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 3.3, calls for certification bodies carrying out forest certification must be technically competent and professionally qualified for carrying out the assessment with regard to economic, social and environmental impacts regarding the criteria of the SFM.

No.	Question	Reference to PEFC Council PROCEDURES	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
	impacts, and on the forest certification criteria?			
5.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification bodies carrying out C-o-C certifications shall have technical competence in forest based products procurement and processing and material flows in different stages of processing and trading?	Annex 6, 3.1	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 3.1.3 “A certification body carrying out certification of chain of custody of timber and forest based products must be technically qualified with regard to the method of procurement and processing of timber and forest based products at various stages of processing and trading.”
6.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification bodies shall have a good understanding of the national PEFC system against which they carry out forest management or C-o-C certifications?	Annex 6, 3.1	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 3.1.4: “When carrying out assessments, a certification body must provide for good comprehension of a national PEFC Certification Scheme...”

No.	Question	Reference to PEFC Council PROCEDURES	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
7.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification bodies have the responsibility to use competent auditors and who have adequate technical know-how on the certification process and issues related to forest management or chain of custody certification?	Annex 6, 3.2	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 06/2012 3 – 3.4: Scheme documentation requires that certification bodies use auditors with demonstrated competence in SFM and Chain of Custody. In addition they are required to hold a university degree and not less than five-years work experience in the area of timber flow in the production chain.
8.	Does the scheme documentation require that the auditors must fulfil the general criteria of ISO 19011 for Quality Management Systems auditors or for Environmental Management Systems auditors?	Annex 6, 3.2	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 06/2012 3: Scheme documentation states that auditors must have appropriate knowledge and skills as described in ISO 19011.
9.	Does the scheme documentation include additional qualification requirements for auditors carrying out forest management or chain of	Annex 6, 3.2	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 06/2012 3.1 – 3.3: Additional qualifications are called for in the scheme documentation including University degrees with not less than five-years working experience an practical experience in fields relating to forest economics, natural resources management, forest certification systems and chain of custody implementation.

No.	Question	Reference to PEFC Council PROCEDURES	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
	custody audits? [*1]			
Certification procedures				
10.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification bodies shall have established internal procedures for forest management and/or chain of custody certification?	Annex 6, 4	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 4, 4a – c: The chapter states that each certification body must have adequate internal written procedures for certification prepared in accordance with the PEFC Slovenia Forest Certification Scheme. They must be aligned with ISO 17021 and ISO Guide 65.
11.	Does the scheme documentation require that applied certification procedures for forest management certification or chain of custody certification against a scheme specific chain of custody standard shall fulfil or be compatible with the requirements defined in ISO 17021 or ISO Guide 65?	Annex 6, 4	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 4, 4a – c: The chapter states that each certification body must have adequate internal written procedures for certification prepared in accordance with the PEFC Slovenia Forest Certification Scheme. They must be aligned with ISO 17021 and ISO Guide 65.
12.	Does the scheme documentation require that applied certification procedures for	Annex 6, 4		<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 3.1.1b requires that applied certification procedures CoC certification against Annex shall must comply with ISO Guide 65.

No.	Question	Reference to PEFC Council PROCEDURES	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
	chain of custody certification against Annex 4 shall fulfil or be compatible with the requirements defined in ISO Guide 65?		Yes	
13.	Does the scheme documentation require that applied auditing procedures shall fulfil or be compatible with the requirements of ISO 19011?	Annex 6, 4	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 4: "Assessment procedures must comply with requirements of the Standard: ISO 19011"
14.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification body shall inform the relevant PEFC National Governing Body about all issued forest management and chain of custody certificates and changes concerning the validity and scope of these certificates?	Annex 6, 4	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 4.1: "A certification body is obliged to notify in writing the IFC with the period of 14 days after every issue or withdrawal of a certificate."
15.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification body shall carry out	Annex 6, 4	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 4.1.11: The IFC is the official manager of the PEFC logo on the basis of a contract signed with PEFC Council. PEFC Slovenia has adopted in its entirety and without modification PEFC ST:2001:2008 (PEFC Logo Usage Rules –

No.	Question	Reference to PEFC Council PROCEDURES	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
	controls of PEFC logo usage if the certified entity is a PEFC logo user?			Requirements)
16.	Does a maximum period for surveillance audits defined by the scheme documentation not exceed more than one year?	Annex 6, 4	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 4.1.4: "Surveillance audits must be done for the time of validity of certificate each year," or in other words, annually."
17	Does a maximum period for assessment audit not exceed five years for both forest management and chain of custody certifications?	Annex 6, 4	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 4.1.4: "Recertification audits must be done before expiration of the certificates after five years."
18	Does the scheme documentation include requirements for public availability of certification report summaries?	Annex 6, 4	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 4.1.5: " <i>The summary of the audit report must be made available to the public by the auditor when requested.</i> " <u>Chain of Custody</u> PEFC Slovenia has adopted PEFC ST 2002:2010 (<i>Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products - Requirements</i>) in its entirety without modification.
19	Does the scheme documentation include requirements for usage of information from external parties as the	Annex 6, 4	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> Minor Non-conformity PEFC SLO 05/2012 4.1.8 : Assessor's note. This is printed as an incomplete sentence and should be corrected in order to

No.	Question	Reference to PEFC Council PROCEDURES	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
	audit evidence?			specifically define the requirement. PEFC SLO Minor Non-Conformity Remedy PEFC SLO 05/2012 4.1.8, paragraph 4 “When conducting the audit, information of various stakeholders is included (such as the Slovenian Forestry Institute, environmental protection organisations and similar bodies).”
20.	Does the scheme documentation include additional requirements for certification procedures? [¹]	Annex 6, 4	N/A	<u>Forest Management</u> Not required. <u>Chain of Custody</u> PEFC Slovenia has adopted PEFC ST 2002:2010 (<i>Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products - Requirements</i>) in its entirety without modification.
Accreditation procedures				
21.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification bodies carrying out forest management and/or chain of custody certification shall be accredited by a national accreditation body?	Annex 6, 5	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 3.1: “ <i>Certification body that conducts audits in accordance with Slovenian Forest Certification Scheme must be accredited by the National Accreditation body.</i> ”
22.	Does the scheme documentation require that an accredited certificate shall bear an accreditation symbol of the relevant accreditation body?	Annex 6, 5	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 3.2, 4.1.7: Chapter 3.2 states that every PEFC issued certificate bear the name of the accreditation body that has issued the accreditation and the relevant accreditation number.
23.	Does the	Annex 6, 5		<u>Forest Management</u>

No.	Question	Reference to PEFC Council PROCEDURES	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
	scheme documentation require that the accreditation shall be issued by an accreditation body which is a part of the International Accreditation Forum (IAF) umbrella or a member of IAF's special recognition regional groups and which implement procedures described in ISO 17011 and other documents recognised by the above mentioned organisations?		Yes	PEFC SLO 05/2012 3.1, 5: Accreditation bodies must be members of the EA and/or the IAF or a member of IAF's special group handling the accreditation of regional groups, and carry out procedures described in the standard ISO/IEC 17011.
24.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification body undertake forest management or/and chain of custody certification against a scheme specific chain of custody standard as "accredited certification" based on ISO 17021 or ISO Guide 65 and	Annex 6, 5	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 5: "A certification body...must be accredited in line with the standards: ISO 17021 and ISO Guide 65."

No.	Question	Reference to PEFC Council PROCEDURES	YES / NO*	Reference to scheme documentation
	the relevant forest management or chain of custody standard(s) shall be covered by the accreditation scope?			
25.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification body undertake chain of custody certification against Annex 4 as “accredited certification” based on ISO Guide 65?	Annex 6, 5	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 5: “A certification body carrying out an audit regarding the chain of custody of timber and forest based products in line with the document: <i>Instructions for conducting chain of custody of timber and forest based products – PEFC ST 2002:2010 must be accredited pursuant to the standard: ISO Guide 65.</i> ”
26.	Does the scheme documentation include a mechanism for PEFC notification of certification bodies?	Annex 6, 6	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 6: “A certification body carrying out and audit regarding the chain of custody... in line with PEFC ST 2002:2010 must have relevant notification issued by the National PEFC Governing Body in an individual country.”
27.	Are the procedures for PEFC notification of certification bodies non-discriminatory?	Annex 6, 6	Yes	<u>Forest Management</u> PEFC SLO 05/2012 6: “Conditions for the PEFC Notification must not be discriminatory to the certification bodies or create trade barriers.”

* If the answer to any question is no, the application documentation shall indicate for each element why and what alternative measures have been taken to address the element in question.

[*1] This is not an obligatory requirement

Part V: Standard and System Requirement Checklist for system specific Chain of custody standards – COMPLIANCE WITH PEFC ST PEFC 2002:2010

1 Scope

Part V is used for the assessment of scheme specific chain of custody standards against PEFC ST 2002:2010 (*Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products - Requirements*).

Any inconsistencies between this text and the original referred to document will be overruled by the content and wording of the technical document.

2 Checklist

The SFCS has adopted the PEFC ST 2002:2010 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products in its entirety and without modification.

“The document PEFC SLO 01:2012 states “The chain of custody of Forest Based Products standard PEFC ST 2002:2010 was prepared by the working group of the PEFC Council. The proposal was publicly presented and discussed and was adopted at the PEFC General Assembly on 12 November 2010. The Slovenian Forest Certification Scheme contains a direct translation of this standard including all amendments and supplements.”

Part VI: Standard and System Requirement Checklist for scheme administration requirements

1 Scope

Part VI is used for the assessment of requirements for the administration of PEFC schemes outlined in PEFC 1004:2009, *Administration of PEFC scheme*.

Any inconsistencies between this text and the original referred to document will be overruled by the content and wording of the standard or the guide.

The compliance with these requirements is only evaluated in the first PEFC assessment of a scheme or on specific request by the PEFC Secretariat.

2 Checklist

No.	Question	Reference to PEFC GD 1004:2009	YES / NO*	Reference to application documents
PEFC Notification of certification bodies				
1.	Are procedures for the notification of certification bodies in place, which comply with chapter 5 of PEFC GD 1004:2009, <i>Administration of PEFC scheme</i> ?	Chapter 5		<p>PEFC Slovenia, through the IFC has adopted PEFC ST 2001:2008 (PEFC Logo Usage Rules) in its entirety and without modification. IFC shall grant the right to use PEFC logo. The notifying body is IFC.</p> <p>The requirements for certification bodies with regard to staff qualifications and competence, applicable ISO guidelines, accreditation and auditing procedures can be found in Checklist IV above.</p> <p>PEFC SLO 05/2012 Ch.3 covers requirements for certification bodies accreditation requirements as well as requirements for accreditation bodies wishing to operate in Slovenia.</p> <p>PEFC SLO 05/2012 Ch.6 covers notification requirements including processes for ensuring independency of certification bodies and a statement saying that PEFC notification must not be discriminatory to the certification bodies or create trade barriers.</p>
PEFC Logo usage licensing				

No.	Question	Reference to PEFC GD 1004:2009	YES / NO*	Reference to application documents
2.	Are procedures for the issuance of PEFC Logo usage licenses in place, which comply with chapter 6 of PEFC GD 1004:2009, <i>Administration of PEFC scheme</i> ?	Chapter 6	Yes	<p>PEFC Slovenia, through the IFC has adopted PEFC ST 2001:2008 (PEFC Logo Usage Rules) in its entirety and without modification. IFC through a contractual arrangement with PEFC Council is authorized to issue PEFC logo licenses.</p> <p>Authorized certification bodies may terminate the license should the license holder be found to not be in conformance with the license agreement. PEFC Slovenia will be notified by the certification body within 10 days of the revocation (PEFC SLO 05/2012 4.1.11)</p>
Complaints and dispute procedures				
3.	Are complaint and dispute procedures go usage licenses in place, which comply with chapter 6 of PEFC GD 1004:2009, <i>Administration of PEFC scheme</i> ?		Yes	<p>Complaint and dispute resolution procedures are handled through the IFC. The IFC has a contractual arrangement with PEFC Council and is authorized to issue logo usage licenses. IFC has adopted PEFC ST 2001:2008 (PEFC Logo Usage Rules) in its entirety and without modification. The dispute resolution process is covered in the IFC Statute; Articles 36 – 38. The procedure includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record of the complaint • Gathering necessary information • Discussion and decision of the complaint • Informing the complainant about the procedures and decision. <p>In addition, PEFC SLO 05/2012 4.1.10 requires that certification bodies have written dispute settlement processes.</p>

Annex 2: Working Group Survey Responses

During the assessment process, the Assessor forwarded participant survey forms to each member of the Working Group. The surveys were emailed to the participants on 08.08.2013 and asked for a return date of 23.08.2013 to allow the Assessor time to assimilate the reports into the First Draft Report. Of the 12 members participating in the Working Group, three responded. No surveys were returned after the closing date. Please find these surveys attached.

Response 1

PEFC Slovenia: Revised Standard Assessment

Standard Working Group: Stakeholder Survey

1. When were you invited to participate in the revision process of the Forest Certification System of PEFC Slovenia?

I have been invited to the PEFC revision process meetings in January 2012.

2. In your view, were all interested parties given the possibility to participate and contribute to the scheme development and revision?

Yes, I believe, that all parties could participate. I have seen the list of invited organizations, and it was very broad. All members of the group were repeatedly and on several occasions asked to invite more parties. All meetings were advertised on the Web, over e-mail and also conventional means of communication.

3. In your opinion, did the organizers provide you the relevant material to participate in the scheme development and revision?

All materials were available online (webpage). I had some questions and have been debating on them with people leading the workgroup. I have also consulted my colleague, who has worked on FSC standard, on several occasions, to see if what we have been told and were doing is in lines of normal procedure. I found all relevant material readily available on the Slovenian PEFC site. All additional sources were available in English on the international PEFC site.

4. Was the development and revision process well planned and structured?

The development and revision process was understandable and well structured. It was also explained by group leader on several occasions. Also schematics and textual descriptions were found on PEFC Slovenia webpage.

5. Do you believe your views were appropriately considered during the development and revision process?

Yes.

6. Do you believe a consensus was reached in the development of the certification criteria?

There was a lot of concern going out for small private forest owners, especially for the concern of their financial wellbeing (small fee for joining PEFC). I believe, that this approach is OK in the beginning, but in long term I believe, that at least 1 full time professional has to work on PEFC standard, and be funded directly from PEFC scheme fees. The problem in our country is the fact that people are overstressed and work on several things at a time. Because of that the quality of work done is not very high.

7. In your view, did the participating stakeholders represent the range of interests in forest management in your country? If not, in your opinion, which other interest groups should have participated?

I think that the participating stakeholders represent the entire range of forest management in Slovenia. After all we are a small country, and the forestry sector is not really that diverse.

8. Do you believe any aspects of the scheme deserve further consideration?

I think PEFC certification is a move in the right direction. Finally something has been done on trying to get private owners in the country to adopt good practices of forest operations (for instance oil spills), and good practices of forest management and planning. I also believe, that controlling the financial flow (receipts for cutting etc.) is very beneficial for the country as a whole.

I hope, that PEFC will enforce vigorous and regular audits of owners, and make sure that all certification rules are being respected. Because there is a lot of work to be done I believe that new people have to be employed to ensure good functioning of PEFC standard in Slovenia.

Response 2

PEFC Slovenia: Revised Standard Assessment

Standard Working Group: Stakeholder Survey

9. When were you invited to participate in the revision process of the Forest Certification System of PEFC Slovenia?

I was invited to participate at the launch (January 2012) Working Group on Reconstruction Slovenian scheme for the PEFC forest certification, as a representative of NGO in the field of consumer protection.

10. In your view, were all interested parties given the possibility to participate and contribute to the scheme development and revision?

Yes

11. In your opinion, did the organizers provide you the relevant material to participate in the scheme development and revision?

Yes

12. Was the development and revision process well planned and structured?

In my opinion YES

13. Do you believe your views were appropriately considered during the development and revision process?

Yes

14. Do you believe a consensus was reached in the development of the certification criteria?

In my opinion YES

15. In your view, did the participating stakeholders represent the range of interests in forest management in your country? If not, in your opinion, which other interest groups should have participated?

Yes

16. Do you believe any aspects of the scheme deserve further consideration?

Yes, I believe.

Response 3

PEFC Slovenia: Revised Standard Assessment

Standard Working Group: Stakeholder Survey

1. When were you invited to participate in the revision process of the Forest Certification System of PEFC Slovenia?
2. July 2012

3. In your view, were all interested parties given the possibility to participate and contribute to the scheme development and revision? yes

4. In your opinion, did the organizers provide you the relevant material to participate in the scheme development and revision? yes

5. Was the development and revision process well planned and structured? Yes/no

6. Do you believe your views were appropriately considered during the development and revision process? no

7. Do you believe a consensus was reached in the development of the certification criteria? no

8. In your view, did the participating stakeholders represent the range of interests in forest management in your country? If not, in your opinion, which other interest groups should have participated? No., too much administration and regulation system (too complicate). We need simply (effortless) system – Origin/made in Slovenia – all other is unnecessary!

9. Do you believe any aspects of the scheme deserve further consideration? Yes. They need to be simplified. The system must be understood for the simple people. Foresters have to provide (to worry) about administration (bureaucracy).

Annex 3: Comments from International Consultation

PEFCC announced public international consultation for the Slovenian Forest Certification Scheme running from 14.05.2013 – 13.07.2013. During that time no responses were submitted.

Annex 4: Panel of Experts Comments

Assessment of “Conformity Assessment Slovenian Forest Certification Scheme (Green Wood Global CONSULTING LTD) – Final Draft Report. October 10, 2013” - Panel of Experts review: Mr. Hannu Valtanen

Report chapter / page	PoE member	Consultant’s report statement	PoE member comment	Consultants Remarks
General comment	HVa		The aim of the certification is to standardize certain operations in order to get these operations being done routinely in the same way again and again. I feel that reports which deal with certification shall be done in the same way, i.e. by using same phrases routinely again and again. This makes reading easier and helps finding conclusions etc. This report fulfil this requirement only partly.	
General comment	HVa	Content of the report	A comprehensive report, but I would like to see the content of the report being better structured: recommendations only in the chapter of “Recommendations”, all relevant findings of the assessment in the parts of “Summary of Findings” and “Findings” etc. It would be easier to read, if consultant’s conclusions and recommendations had always same terminology and same appearance.	The Consultant has restructured and reformatted the report as recommended. The Consultant has adopted this recommendation and has made an effort to use the same terminology throughout the document.
p. 5	HVa	Acronyms and Abbreviations	at least, the following acronyms / abbreviations are used in the report and not included in the list: TBD, PEFC IGD, BOD, SFCS, PEFC GD, PEFC TU, MNC, ZGS, SKZGS, CAFS, WGP, SSP, C/O, KONCERT, ZOG, ReNGP, FLU, ISO, EA, IAF, ISO/IEC	The additional abbreviations/acronyms were added to the report.
1.3.2., p.8	HVa	“No international comments were	Any reasons, why? Is it common, not to receive international comments?	PEFCC provided no reason as to why There were no comments submitted

		received by PEFC.”		for the international consultation. In a conversation with a member of the staff Technical Unit, it is a topic worth discussing at the next TU meeting. The Consultant is not in a place to speculate why there were no comments.
1.3.2., p.8	HVa	”Three comments were received.”	There is no information from whom those comments came from. – Not even in the annex II.	The Consultant did not receive permission from the respondents to publish their names in a public document.
1.4., p. 9	HVa	list of documents	It would be useful to separate the documents used in two sets: 1. Slovenian documents, 2. PEFC International documents.	Done
2., p. 10	HVa	Content of the chapter	I would prefer very short chapter of ”Recommendation”, like: ”Based on the results of this conformity assessment Green Wood Global Consulting recommends the PEFC BoD to re-endorse the Slovenian scheme on the condition that the identified minor non-conformities shall be corrected within 6 months after re-endorsement.” ... and then some minor clarifications on translation etc. problems. The rest of the chapter should be transferred to ”Findings” part of the report.	The Consultant has restructured and reformatted the report as recommended.
3., pp. 12-16	HVa	Content of the chapter	The title is ”summary” and the content should correspond to it. It contains many details which could be placed in the ”real” report where the findings are explained in more detailed. This chapter does not summarize the findings of this conformity assessment.	The Consultant has restructured and reformatted the report as recommended.
3.1., p.12	HVa	Content of the chapter	There should be a summary of the structure of the Slovenian system and consultant’s conclusion, whether the structure and the content conform to the requirements of PEFC!	The Consultant has restructured and reformatted the report as recommended.
3.2., p.13	HVa	Content of the chapter and ”(See Chapter 2 for minor non-conformities.)”	There should be a summary of the standard setting procedures of the Slovenian system and consultant’s conclusion, whether the procedures of the system conform to the requirements of PEFC plus the list of (minor) non-conformities including consultant’s recommendation how to improve the system. –Chapter 2 is for recommendation to the BoD of PEFC, not to introduce non-conformities. Chapter 3 introduces the findings of the	The Consultant has restructured and reformatted the report as recommended.

			assessment, like found non-conformities.	
3.3. p.14	HVa	Content of the chapter and "(See Chapter 2 for minor non-conformities.)"	There should be a summary of the content of the standard of the Slovenian system and consultant's conclusion, whether the standard of the system conforms to the requirements of PEFC plus the list of (minor) non-conformities including consultant's recommendation how to improve it.. –Chapter 2 is for recommendation to the BoD of PEFC, not to introduce non-conformities. Chapter 3 introduces the findings of the assessment, like found non-conformities.	The Consultant has restructured and reformatted the report as recommended.
3.4., p.14-15	HVa	Content of the chapter and "(See Chapter 2 for minor non-conformities.)"	There should be a summary of the group certification model of the Slovenian system and consultant's conclusion, whether the system conforms to the requirements of PEFC (which the chapter has!!) plus the list of (minor) non-conformities including consultant's recommendation how to improve it.. –Chapter 2 is for recommendation to the BoD of PEFC, not to introduce non-conformities. Chapter 3 introduces the findings of the assessment, like found non-conformities.	The Consultant has restructured and reformatted the report as recommended.
3.5., p.15	HVa	Content of the chapter	This is a good chapter in "Summary of Findings" – short and includes consultant's conclusion –"conforms with PEFC requirements"!	
3.6., p. 15	HVa	Therefore logo usage by certified companies is being fully met and therefore the SFCS is in Conformity.	I propose that consultant's conclusions in each of the summary chapters have the same wording and appearance as much as possible.	The Consultant has restructured and reformatted the report as recommended.
3.6., p.15	HVa	In addition, the requirements and obligations of certification bodies are being fully met and therefore the SFCS is in Conformity.	The heading of chapter 3.6. is "Logo Usage Rules". This conclusion deals with certification bodies! Does PEFC set requirements, obligations or both for certification bodies?	The Consultant corrected the wording.
3.7., p.15	HVa	This resulted in a Minor Non-Conformity. It is recommended that the MNC be remedied within 6 months of the re-endorsement.	It is unclear whether this MNC had been introduced already in chapter 2? Or is this a new additional MNC to those already introduced. In chapter 3, this is the only MNC with consultant's proposal for a time limit. Is there any reason for that? Or should the	In the Chapter 2: Recommendations, the Consultant recommends all MNCs are corrected within six months of the standard re-endorsement.

			same time limit be set for all MNCs? (there is a time limit for all NMCs in chapter 2!)	
3.8., p.15	HVa	The SFCS documents fully meet PEFC requirements.	“requirements”! I propose that consultant’s conclusions in each of the summary chapters have the same wording and appearance as much as possible.	The Consultant has restructured and reformatted the report as recommended.
6., p.25	HVa	The Assessor found the SFCS to be in Conformity with these requirements (See Chapter 12, PEFC IGD 1007-01-2012 Standard and System Requirement Checklist, for a more thorough review.) (See Chapter 2 for minor non-conformities findings)	Chapters 4-5, 7, 10 and 11 do not have consultant’s conclusions, but chapter 6 (plus 8&9) has; why? Minor non-conformities must be presented here, not in the chapter of recommendation!	The Consultant has restructured and reformatted the report as recommended.
7., p.27	HVa	(See Chapter 2 for minor non-conformities findings)	Minor non-conformities must be presented here, not in the chapter of recommendation!	The Consultant has restructured and reformatted the report as recommended.
8., p.28	HVa	The Assessor determines that the requirements for PEFC ST 2002:2010 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products are in full Conformity.	Chapters 4-5, 7, 10 and 11 do not have consultant’s conclusions, but chapter 8 (and 6&9) has; why?	The Consultant has restructured and reformatted the report as recommended.
9., p.28	HVa	With this, the SFCS for the logo use of certified companies is in automatic conformity to PEFC’s requirements.	Chapters 4-5, 7, 10 and 11 do not have consultant’s conclusions, but chapter 9 (and 6&8) has; why?	The Consultant has restructured and reformatted the report as recommended.
9., p.28	HVa	As further evidence of conformity, the SCFS document goes on to define requirement for the notification of certification bodies (PEFC SLO 05/2012 6). The Assessor also found that requirements as set forth in PEFC GD 1004:2009 chapter 6.1 and 6.2 are met by the	This deals with notification of certification bodies, but the chapter’s heading is “Implementation of PEFC Logo Usage” Does the last sentence mean the same as “conforms”?	The Consultant has made the Correction. The Consultant has restructured and reformatted the report as recommended.

		SFCS.		
10., p.29	HVa	The SFCS has adopted the PEFC ST 2002:2010 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products in its entirety and without modification. This automatically includes all requirements for certification bodies and auditors with regard to CoC as required by the PEFC Council.	This is the same as “Conforms”?	The Consultant has restructured and reformatted the report as recommended.
Annex 1, p.31	HVa	These citations were placed in quotations and italicized (e.g., “accredited certification bodies ...”). In instances when the Assessor captured the findings in his words the citations were not placed in quotations or italicized.	In many parts of the annex text is in quotations but not italicized! What does this indicate? I found at least the following: Part I. 4.2. p.37, 4.4.b p.39, 4.5.a p.40, 5.3.e p.43, 5.7. p.46, 5.8. p.46, 5.12. p.48, 6.4. p.49, Part II. 4.1.a p.51, 4.1.3. p.52-53, 4.2.1.d p.54, 4.2.1.h p.56, Part III. 5.1.6 p.61, 5.1.7. p.62, 5.1.11. p.63, 5.1.12. p.64, 5.3.1. p.67, 5.3.5. p.68-69, 5.4.1. p.69-70, 3.4.10. p.72, 5.4.12. p.72-73, 5.5.3. p.73-74, 5.6.4. p.75 Part IV 5. p.82, 6. p.82, 16. p.82, 24. p.88, 25. p.89, 26. p.89	Corrected
Annex 1, Part III	HVa	Content of the column “Reference to scheme documentation”	There are several places, where the consultant refers to “PEFC documentation” instead of “PEFC SLO documentation”. It is unclear for me whether these are correctly or incorrectly referenced. I found at least the following where PEFC documentation were referred: 5.3.5. p.69, 5.4.4. p.71, 5.4.6. p.71, 5.4.7. p.71, 5.4.8. p.71-72, 5.4.9. p.72, 5.4.10. p.72, 5.4.11. p.72, 5.4.12. p.72-73, 5.4.13. p.73, 5.5.3. p.73, 5.6.12. p.78	Corrected
Annex I, Part IV, 19. p. 86-87 (and 2. p.11)	HVa	Minor Non-conformity PEFC SLO 05/2012 4.1.8 : Assessor’s note. This	It would be good to have the incomplete sentence referred here in the annex.	Added

		is printed as an incomplete sentence and should be corrected in order to specifically define the requirement.	
--	--	---	--

Assessment of “Conformity Assessment Slovenian Forest Certification Scheme (Green Wood Global CONSULTING LTD) – Final Draft Report. October 10, 2013” - Panel of Experts review: Mr. Hugh G. Miller

Report chapter / page	PoE member	Consultant’s report statement	PoE member comment	Consultant’s Remarks
pp 10 & 11	HGM	“PEFC Slovenia acknowledges this gap....”	It is not clear from the quote that follows that that a requirement for an annual audit has now been inserted. The only period mentioned is “once during the five year certification period”. The answer may lie in the “Rules of Sustainable Management Control for Regional/Group Representatives”, but it is not explicit. Some rewording required to make it clear that the non-conformity has been corrected. However, on p 86 (see below) under 16 there is the statement “Surveillance audits must be done ...annually”. Is there a contradiction here or am I getting confused?	This was unclear to the Consultant as well. It does appear that the intention is that of an annual internal audit, but poor translation calls this into question. The Consultant has labelled this as a minor non-conformity and recommends this wording be readdressed in a manner that makes it definitive that there are annual internal audits with documented procedures.
p 14	HGM	Second last para, last line states “It also does well at setting out group members responsibilities as	“also” and “as well”, the last two words can be removed.	

		well”		
p 17	HGM	Seventh Bullet point “Programme for the Endorsement”	Seems to need a verb as in all the other bullet points, e.g. manages, oversees, promulgates or whatever.	Corrected
p 19 Table 2	HGM	Date at top of first column “11.2012”	Date should read “11.2011”	Corrected
p 20 Table 2	HGM	Date in third row of first column “13.16.1012”	Date should read “13.06.2012”	Corrected
p 22	HGM	In third para, third last line “This made the reconvening of the WG <u>moot</u> and the IFC moved forward...”	“moot” means debateable, perhaps “unnecessary” would be better.	Corrected
p 24 Table 4	HGM	The heading for Table 4 is not immediately understandable	Perhaps recast as something like “PEFC SLO 03:2012 Forest Management Standard comprises a series of increasingly focussed requirements going from a defined criterion, through sub-criteria to descriptive indicators and/or quantitative indicators”.	Corrected
p 51 Item c)	HGM	Mistype, first line states “...owner/manager <u>ao</u> any other body...”	Should read “or”	Corrected
p 85 Item 15	HGM	Fifth column, third line “..the PEFC <u>log</u> on the..”	“log” should read “logo”	Corrected
p 86 Item 16	HGM	PEFC SLO 05/2012 4.1.4. “Surveillance audits must be done for the time of validity of the certificate each year”, or in other words annually”	See comments at top re. Recommendation 3 on pp 10 and 11. There seems to be a contradiction?	See earlier comment

POE – Professor Dr. Hans Kopp

Conformity Assessment of the Slovenian Forest Certification Scheme

Draft Final Report Dated 10 October, 2013 by GreenWoodGlobal Consulting, Ltd.

(Consultant's remarks are in **RED**)

The assessment is based on a desk study (evaluation of the relevant documents and a questionnaire with a modest response rate, 3 out of 12). It is a robust study, well structured and a good reflection of Slovenian forestry, which had and still has a good reputation in Europe, especially in the field of forest sciences. I fully agree with the recommendation of the assessment for re-endorsement towards PEFC's BoD and the minor non-conformities identified which have to be corrected.

The certification scheme is rather closely tied to the current national forest law. In several chapters (paragraphs) it is even identical and one wonders in how far the scheme goes beyond binding legislation. This is due to the fact that the forest law is indeed very detailed and specific (at least in theory). A lot depends on its implementation (into practice). So auditing is very important in this case. It is also due to the fact, that Slovenia has adopted several chapters from PEFC without modification clearly interpreted by the assessment. So it fully conforms with PEFC (f.e., CoC, logo usage rules etc.).

I understand, that it is not the task of the assessment, to improve the English language, especially with the quotations. Several times it is of extremely poor quality, difficult to read and understand with the danger of leading to misunderstandings. I must ask therefore whether or not at least some recommendation from the assessor towards PEFC Slovenia should be added for the next revision process. Otherwise the chance and opportunity for urgent improvement will fail. (I offer to PEFC Slovenia to get together with them during the G.A. in K.L., Malaysia, for an hour or 2). **The Assessor has recommended that during the planning phase of the next revision of the Slovenian scheme, funds be included for a professional English translator/editor. Their services should be used not only for the Standard, but for key elements of evidentiary documentation such as minutes, newspaper articles, public invitations, etc.**

Some minor suggestions we added:

ILO Conventions are mentioned (p.24), but what about the others. (f.e. WA, CBD and other international law such as NATURA 2000 etc.). **The SFCS provides a very comprehensive list of other organizations. The Assessor states that the list mentioned in the report does not mention all organizations, just a small representation.**

The public consultation period should be at least 60 days, not just 60 days (pp.7 and 8). **Noted**

Is the very often missing article (a, an, the) a result of "American English" or the use of a sort of telegram style? I do not favor this. **Noted**

Several misprints have to be corrected: **Changes made to the conformity assessment report prior to addressing the misprints changed the page numbering. The Assessor did his best to locate the errors and correct them.**

p. 12, 1st line, ... this places , Sl. ...third in the E.U.

p.12, last but one chapter, ... delete one with

p. 13, second chapter, ... the working group through ...

p.13, 3rd line from the bottom, delete ... 3 of the ...

p.14, centre, to set forest management (not sets)

p.20, centre , ... was given in the nat. ...

p. 21, Table 3, Consumers, Expert general public

p.21, last but one line, ...discussed in an open (not and)

p. 22, 2nd. line , They did elect...

p.33, Art. 15, delete ... of Agriculture ... once

p.36, centre, ... stakeholders ...(not shareholders)! (also: p. 39, 4.5)

p.38, 4.4, ... and sent to members ... (not and)

p. 41, 5.2, Procedures call for... delete either way or manner

p. 43, 5.4, 2.1.4 the working group (not grop)

p. 46, 5.8. ... was sent to the IFC Board

p. 50, 1. ... for informing the general public.

p. 57, last but one chapter, ...there is no specific (not: not)

p. 64, Crit. 2, ... by legislation to monitor... (not: of)

p. 78, last but one line, ...fauna and game

p. 94, 3, ... is in line of normal

p.94,4, explained by the group leader

Göttingen, 19.10.13

Prof. Dr. Hans Köpp, PoE