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### ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>Certification Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC</td>
<td>Chain of Custody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>Criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td>Guidelines (related to documents of PEFCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha.</td>
<td>Hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAF</td>
<td>International Accreditation Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMS</td>
<td>Forest management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGD</td>
<td>International Guidelines (related to the document names of PEFCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO</td>
<td>International Organization for Standardization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>Non wood forest products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC</td>
<td>Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFCC</td>
<td>PEFC Council (also referred to as the PEFC Secretariat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC Board</td>
<td>PEFC Council Board of Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC LV</td>
<td>Latvian PEFC System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC LV FMS</td>
<td>PEFC Forest Management Standard for Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC Latvia</td>
<td>Latvian PEFC Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoE</td>
<td>Panel of Experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFM</td>
<td>Sustainable Forest Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Standard (related to documents of PEFCC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Latvian PEFC Certification System

The development of the PEFC Latvia Certification System for Sustainable Forest Certification was first adopted in 2000 by the Association “PEFC Latvijas Padome” (PEFC Latvian Council who is the Latvia PEFC National Governing Body, hereinafter – PEFC Latvia). It was first endorsed by PEFC International in 2001.

In 2009 PEFC Latvia commenced the development process of a new system (PEFC LV) (including the PEFC Forest Management Standard for Latvia, PEFC LV FMS). The PEFC LV was endorsed by PEFC International in March 2011.

In 2013 – 2014, the System passed an extraordinary assessment organized by PEFC International and was assessed as fully compliant with the extraordinary assessment requirements.

PEFC Latvia commenced the 5-year System revision process in May 2014. During the revision process only minor changes in System documentation occurred.

In practice, forests in Latvia occupy 3,020,575 ha or 50 per cent of the total land area. There are 144 thousand private forest owners (physical persons) who own 35 per cent of the forest area and an additional 14 per cent of the forests are owned by legal entities, providing 49 per cent in private ownership. The rest is owned by the state (49 per cent) and municipalities (2 per cent) or public ownership. State forests are managed by the State enterprise AS Latvijas Valsts Meži (LVM). According to the statistics, the total forest area in Latvia is increasing. As at April 2015, total of 1,683,641 ha forests are PEFC certified–while 29 companies are certified to the PEFC Chain of Custody.

1.2 Scope of the assessment

This report forms an independent and objective basis for the decision making process of the PEFC Council (PEFCC). It provides a recommendation to the PEFC Council Board of Directors (PEFCC Board) on the re-endorsement of the revised PEFC LV. The scope of this assessment is to compare the revised Latvian PEFC System against the ‘PEFC Council standard requirements’.

The revised Latvian PEFC certification system consists of nine documents/standards. The following standards are part of the present assessment:

- PEFC LV01 “Terms and Definitions” (fully adopted not available in tender dossier)
- PEFC LV02 “Guidelines for Certification Bodies and Auditors to conduct Forest Management and Chain of Custody certification”
- PEFC LV03 “Guidelines for PEFC notification of the Certification Body”
- PEFC LV04 “Guidelines for Forest Management certification application”
- Document includes requirements for Group Forest Management Certification (PEFC ST 1002:2010)
- PEFC LV05 “Guidelines for PEFC Latvia documentation development and revision”
- PEFC Forest Management Standard for Latvia
- PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products – Requirements (fully adopted, not available in tender dossier)
The ‘PEFCC Standards and Guidelines’ used in the conformity assessment are listed in chapter 1.6 of this report. An overview of PEFC LV is provided in chapter 1.7. Besides the conformity assessment of PEFC LV, other aspects that might affect its functionality, credibility and efficiency were assessed as well.

This conformity assessment report has been structured according to PEFC IGD 1007-03:2012 (version of 22.09.2014) and PEFC Secretariat’s clarification concerning the content of the assessment report (clarification 30.10.2012).

PEFC Latvia fully adopted the international standards of the PEFCC on ‘PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products’ and ‘PEFC ST 2003:2012 Requirements for Certification Bodies operating Certification against the PEFC International Chain of Custody Standard’ therefore, these components were not assessed in this report.

1.3 The methodology applied for this assessment

The applied methodology of assessment was a desk-top study. No field visits were carried out prior to or after the assessment within the framework of this assessment.

1.3.1 First screening of tender documentation

The assessors carried out a first screening of PEFC LV based on the PEFCC system documentation, and documents provided by PEFC Latvia. Based on this screening, an assessment methodology was proposed to PEFCC (as presented in chapter 1.3 of this report). For the elaboration of the proposal, additional information was taken into account, inter alia from the PEFCC tender documents and the PEFCC website.

1.3.2 Assessment of PEFC LV

The procedures for the endorsement of PEFC certification systems are based on ‘Endorsement and Mutual Recognition of National Systems and their Revision’ (PEFC IGD 1007-03:2012). Report versions that are submitted are written in English and submitted in electronic format (Word and PDF) to the PEFC Council, as well as to PEFC Latvia. All reports have been structured according to PEFC IGD 1007-03:2012 and the PEFC Secretariat’s clarification concerning the content of the assessment report (clarification 30.10.2012).

All reporting material and other associated documents resulting from the assessment will become property of the PEFC Council.

1.4 The assessment procedure

The conformity assessment was conducted in accordance with the procedures prescribed by PEFCC.

1.4.1 Preliminary desk-top study

The first stage of the assessment consisted of a preliminary desk-top study, in which an initial conformity assessment of PEFC LV was conducted, and general information was gathered on PEFC certification in Latvia. The initial assessment enabled the identification of missing information, as well as the similarities
and differences between the revised Latvian PEFC certification System and the ‘PEFC Council standard requirements’.

General analysis of the structure of PEFC LV
A first review of the PEFC LV documentation was conducted to investigate if additional documentation was required, such as relevant forestry legislation, national policies, etc. Also an analysis on the general structure of PEFC LV was carried out on the following aspects:
• The components of the system (requirements, principles, criteria, indicators, standards of performance, guidelines, etc.);
• The way the system was developed (standard setting procedures & processes, history);
• Objectives of the system and the procedures concerning monitoring, controlling, etc.
This analysis gave insight into the functionality of the system and provided vital background information to enable a good comparison with the PEFCC international requirements.

Analysis of the contents PEFC LV
Based on the PEFC Technical Documents a comparison was conducted between the PEFCC Standards and Guidelines (an overview of these documents is provided in chapter 1.6 of this report) and the PEFC LV (an overview of these documents is provided in chapter 1.7).

1.4.2 Public consultation period
From the start of the assessment period, the public was invited by PEFC International to provide comments on the PEFC LV documentation. The public consultation period started 19 November 2014, and was completed 18 January 2015. No comments were received during this sixty-day public consultation period.

1.4.3 Stakeholder Survey
The stakeholder survey was sent to relevant participants involved in the revision process of PEFC LV. It concerns the basic content of the development report on the standard setting process, as described in PEFC 1001:2010, Standard Setting – Requirements. PEFC Latvia provided the names, contact information and email addresses of the participants on the 2 February 2016.

The assessors conducted the stakeholder survey between the 7th of March and the 11th of March 2016. All 18 stakeholders received an e-mail, in which they were requested to participate in the survey, with a reminder being sent on 10 March 2016. The stakeholder survey received replies from 6 respondents, of which 1 respondent skipped the last 4 questions.

1.4.4 Preparation of a Draft Report
On basis of the results of the first evaluation, the public comments (public consultation) and the stakeholder survey, a Draft Report was developed. It was structured according to the PEFC Guideline ‘Endorsement and Mutual Recognition of National Systems and their Revision’ (PEFC IGD 1007-03:2012).

PEFC Latvia revised the following standard documents during the elaboration of the Draft Report:
• 3. Guidelines_for_CB_and_Auditors_LV02_prec
• 3. Guidelines_for_CB_and_Auditors_LV02_prec 100316
• 5. Guidelines_for_FM_cert_LV04_100316
• 6. Guidelines_for_document_development_LV05_10.03.16
Extra documentation on the standard setting process was received and incorporated into the Draft Report.

The Draft Report was presented to both PEFC Latvia and the PEFC Council (PEFCC) for comments, which enabled both PEFC Latvia and the assessors to form a clear understanding of the key issues raised during the first evaluation of the conformity assessment. PEFC Latvia was provided the opportunity to clarify or resolve any non-conformity that was identified by the assessors.

1.4.5 Preparation of a Final Draft Report

On 12 April 2016, PEFC Latvia sent extra information on the non-conformities stated in the Draft Report, including alterations on the Latvian PEFC standard: PEFC LV02 Guidelines for Certification Bodies and Auditors to conduct Forest Management and Chain of Custody certification, LV03 Guidelines for PEFC notification of the Certification Body and Logo usage.

On 28 April 2016, a conference call was held with the assessors (Mrs. Bea Groenen, Mr. Rens Hartkamp and Mr. Edmond Muller) and PEFC Latvia (Mr. Ansis Actins). Due to a poor connection with Latvia (skype and telephone) the decision was made that Mrs. Bea Groenen and Mr. Ansis Actins plan a separate meeting. On 28 April 2016 they discussed the findings in the Draft Report and the identified non-conformities, which were not resolved by the extra information provided by PEFC Latvia. This information was used in the Final Draft Report. During the call, PEFC Latvia explained and clarified the extra information on the discussions during the standard setting of PEFC LV and the standards’ embedding in the national (forest) legislation.

On 29 April 2016, the assessors received additional documentation including a written response from PEFC Latvia on the non-conformities that were identified during the draft assessment stage. The documentation consisted of translations of relevant parts of legislation and the list of stakeholders that were invited to participate in the standard setting process. The documents also included a revision of PEFC LV05, which was adopted 29 April 2016. This provided information was used in the present Final Draft Report.

1.4.6 Preparation of the Final Report

The conformity assessment was finalized on the basis of the feedback obtained from the PEFC Council’s Panel of Experts (PoE) review on the Final Draft Report. Based on this feedback a Final Report was be elaborated (as presented here). This Final Report was submitted to the PEFC Council in both .pdf and .doc format. The Final Report also includes a summary, clearly stating the assessors’ findings and recommendations regarding the conformity of PEFC LV to the PEFCC requirements.
1.5 **Timetable of the assessment**

The table below indicates the agreed timeline for the conformity assessment work. The timeline was approved by the PEFC Council and PEFC Latvia. The final report will be presented to the PEFC Council the 12th of August 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start of the Assessment</td>
<td>The PEFC Council announced the start of the assessment process. ForestSense, the PEFC Council, and PEFC Latvia agree on dates and deadlines, related to the assessment.</td>
<td>E-mail, including a planning</td>
<td>2 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 Assessment</td>
<td>ForestSense assesses the documentation referred to in the tender dossier and additional documentation submitted by PEFC Latvia prior to the start of the assessment. ForestSense may request PEFC Latvia for additional documentation and evidence. ForestSense undertook a Stakeholder Survey, including an analysis of the responses. ForestSense delivered the Draft Report to the PEFC Council on 21 March 2016.</td>
<td>Draft Report</td>
<td>2 February - 21 March 2016 Delivered to PEFCC 21March Delivered to PEFC Latvia 30 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment period</td>
<td>In reaction on the Draft Report, PEFC Latvia had the opportunity to submit responses, clarifications, comments, and changes to the system documentation. The PEFC Council could also ask for clarifications. ForestSense made an appointment for a conference call with PEFC Latvia to clarify the findings.</td>
<td>The input of PEFC Latvia and the PEFC Council to the Draft Report.</td>
<td>31 March - 12 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 Assessment</td>
<td>ForestSense considers and processes the responses, additional evidence and revised system documentation submitted by PEFC Latvia. The assessment takes into account questions received from the PEFC Council as well. ForestSense delivers the Final Draft Report to the PEFC Council on 4 May 2016.</td>
<td>Final Draft Report</td>
<td>13 April - 4 May 2016 (2 weeks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.6 PEFC Council standards & reference documentations

The PEFCC standard, guide and reference documentation used in this assessment were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEFCC Standards</th>
<th>PEFCC international standards – Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEFC ST 1001:2010</td>
<td>Standard Setting – Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC ST 1002:2010</td>
<td>Group Forest Management Certification – Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC ST 1003:2010</td>
<td>Sustainable Forest Management – Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC ST 2002:2013</td>
<td>Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products – Requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC ST 2003:2012</td>
<td>Chain of Custody Certification Body Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEFCC Guides</th>
<th>PEFCC Guides – Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEFC GD 1001:2008</td>
<td>Structure of PEFC Technical Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC GD 1004:2009</td>
<td>Administration of PEFC system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC GD 1007:2012</td>
<td>Endorsement and Mutual Recognition of National Systems and their Revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other PEFCC documents

- PEFC Terms and Definitions, Annex 1
- PEFC Council Technical Document, Annex 6
- Structure of assessment report according to PEFC IGD 1007-03:2012
- Clarification content assessment report according to PEFC Secretariat’s clarification (30.10.2012)
- 4 Standards interpretations and clarification approved by the PEFC Board of Directors
- Handouts from the PEFC Assessors’ Training 2012
- Presentations from the PEFC Assessors’ Training 2015
1.7 PEFC Latvia’s documents & sources

All documents provided by the PEFC Latvia and used during this conformity are listed below.

The Latvian PEFC system (PEFC LV) includes the following standards and guidelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEFC LV Standards</th>
<th>PEFC LV Standards – Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEFC LV01:2015</td>
<td>Terms and Definitions (fully adopted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC LV02:2015</td>
<td>Guidelines for Certification Bodies and Auditors to conduct Forest Management and Chain of Custody certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC LV03:2015</td>
<td>Guidelines for PEFC notification of the Certification Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC LV04:2015</td>
<td>Guidelines for Forest Management certification application (includes requirements for Group Forest Management Certification (PEFC ST 1002:2010))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC LV05:2015</td>
<td>Guidelines for PEFC Latvia documentation development and revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC FMS:2015</td>
<td>PEFC Forest Management Standard for Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidelines for issuance of PEFC Logo use licenses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following revised documents were received during the compilation of the Draft Report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEFC LV Standards</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEFC LV02:2016</td>
<td>3.Guidelines_for_CB_and_Auditors_LV02_prec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.Guidelines_for_CB_and_Auditors_LV02_prec_100316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC LV04:2016</td>
<td>5.Guidelines_for_FM_cert_LV04_100316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC LV05:2016</td>
<td>6.Guidelines_for_document_development_LV05_10.03.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following revised documents were received during the making of the Final draft report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEFC LV Standards</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEFC LV02:2016</td>
<td>3.Guidelines_for_CB_and_Auditors_LV02_prec_11042016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC LV03:2016</td>
<td>4.Guidelines_for_CB_PEFC_notification_LV03_110416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC LV05:2016</td>
<td>6.Guidelines_for_document_development_LV05_29.04.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.PEFC_logo_usage_110416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other documents provided by PEFC Latvia in the tender dossier

System description

PEFC Council Minimum Requirements Checklist

Relevant Latvian Legislation

- Environmental protection law (translated including amendments: 2014)
- Law on forest (translated including amendments: 2007)
- Law on the conservation of species and biotopes (translated including amendments: 2014)
- Law on environmental impact assessment (translated including amendments: 2015)
- Law on specially protected nature territories (translated including amendments: 2014)
Plant protection law (translated including amendments: 2010)
Protection zone law (translated including amendments: 2005)

Extra Documentation provided during the making of the draft report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document description</th>
<th>Document name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Committee members with category (English)</td>
<td>Standard revision Technical Committee members + category.doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC Logo izmantošanas ligums</td>
<td>Liguma projekts PEFC Logo 2016.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection zone law (translated including amendments: 2005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitations, minutes and present list of the working group</td>
<td>SKMBT_C25316020910330_minutes_invitations_presentlist.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement and invitation (Latvian)</td>
<td>NR1.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Announcement on website of public consultation:</td>
<td>NR2.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) List of PEFC Latvian standard related documents (Latvian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Email invitation to stakeholder (Latvian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Post office notes with stakeholders name (Latvian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical committee: Minutes from meetings in 20.08.2014 and 08.10.2014. (Latvian)</td>
<td>NR3.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal approval of the standard by Technical committee before public consultation:</td>
<td>NR4.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes from meetings in 12.11.2014 and electronically revise 15.01. – 16.02.2015. (document Nr4) (Latvian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The council of PEFC Latvia established the Technical committee (Latvian)</td>
<td>NR5.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process of revision of the standard was initiated by the PEFC Council of Latvia on May 27th 2014 (Latvian)</td>
<td>NR6.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The approval of the General Assemblee (Latvian)</td>
<td>NR7.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC logo pieteikuma forma</td>
<td>PEFC logo pieteikuma forma.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC logo application form (Latvian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC notification contract 2016 (English)</td>
<td>PEFC notification contract 2016.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles 6,7 and 8 of the bylaws</td>
<td>Statutes.pdf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extra Documentation provided during the making of the Final draft report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document description</th>
<th>Document name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System description: The stakeholder list was completed, due to copy/paste problems a part was missing in the previous version</td>
<td>1.Scheme_Description_2015_28.04.doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on the missing link on the website of the approved standard setting (Latvian)</td>
<td>email_website.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation to VAK (ENGO in Latvia) (Latvian)</td>
<td>Invitation.pdf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minutes of the working group of 27-07-2015 (Approval of the standard) (Latvian) | Minutes_22.07.2015.pdf
---|---
Categorised stakeholders invited to participate | Stakeholder.doc

### Relevant Latvian Legislation (Latvian)

- Forest Law (amendments included until 01.01.2016)
- Forest regeneration regulations, N308, 09.05.2012
- Hunting Law (amendments included until 02.12.2015)
- Hunting Regulations (original document 01.08.2014)
- Nature protection regulation in Forest management (original document 01.01.2013)
- Regulation Forest inventory and circulation of State forest register Information, N88, 05.03.2013
- Regulation on tree felling in Forest, N935, 28.12.2012
- Regulations for establishment and management of genetic Resource Forest stands, N177, 05.04.2013
- Regulations for forest management plans, N67, 06.02.2014
- Regulation of Nature parks, N83, 12.03.1999
- Regulation of protected Landscape areas, N69, 02.03.1999
- Regulation on the General Protection and use of Specially protected nature territories, N264, 30.03.2010

### Relevant Latvian Legislation (English)

- Civil Law (translated including amendments: 2007)
- Civil Procedure Law (translated including amendments: 2012)
- Land survey law (translated including amendments: 2008)
- Fishing regulations N1498, 22.12.2009 (relevant sections)

Translations of the relevant parts of Latvian legislation/regulations can be found in translation.doc delivered 28.04.2016.

Furthermore, the websites from PEFCC (www.pefc.org) and PEFC Latvia (www.pefc.lv) were used as sources of information and for documents/processes relevant for the assessment.

#### 1.8 The assessment team

The following researchers of ForestSense carried out the desk-top study and are responsible for this report:

- Mr. Edmond Muller, MSc (Lead Assessor);
- Mrs. Bea Groenen, BSc and MBA (Assessor procedural requirements and forest management requirements);
- Mr. Rens Hartkamp, PhD (Assessor forest management requirements).

The assessors have cooperated closely on all aspects of the conformity assessment. In this report, they are referred to as ‘the assessors’.
2. RECOMMENDATION

Considering the present assessment results, the assessors recommend to the Board of Directors of PEFCC that the PEFC LV should be re-endorsed.

In relation to the standard-setting process, the assessors identified two (2) minor non-conformities. However, the assessors conclude that the identified non-conformities did not adversely affect the credibility of the standard revision process.
3. SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

3.1 The general structure of PEFC Latvia and the Latvian PEFC System

PEFC Latvia is an independent association of legal entities and represents the National Governing Body and the Logo Licensing Body of the Latvian PEFC Certification System. The highest authority is the General Assembly consisting of all members of PEFC Latvia. The Standardizing Body in charge of forest management standard revision is the General Assembly of PEFC Latvia, which is responsible for the final approval of the forest management standard, elaborated by the Technical Committee.

3.2 The standard setting procedures and process

In total 45 stakeholders were personally invited to take part in the standard setting process (See Annex G), representing a total of twelve (12) organisations (see Annex E). The majority of the invited stakeholders (69%) were non-materiially affected stakeholders with a large emphasis on NGO and civil society (mostly associations).

According to PEFC Latvia, lack of interest to participate in the Technical committee can be explained by the fact that almost every forestry activity (planning, operations, nature protection, social aspects, etc.) in Latvia is strictly regulated by legislation and the fact that many stakeholders already participate in continuously ongoing legislation revision working groups.

The assessors did not find any non-conformities related to the procedures of standard setting.

Two (2) minor non-conformity were found related to the process of standard setting.

1) One non-conformity is related to the announcement and invitation for commenting on the standard: no explicit text found to comment on the scope and the standard-setting process of the Latvian PEFC standard.

2) The other non-conformity relates to the ‘balanced’ composition of the Technical Committee: Commercial stakeholder organisations, such as forest owners and forest related industry or associations of commercial actors dominate the Technical Committee in numbers. Nine (9) out of twelve (12) stakeholder organisations are organisations with a commercial interest, which may not entirely comply with the requirement of a ‘balanced’ composition to many. One of the predefined categories “consumer/customer” (defined by PEFC Latvia) was not represented. Also no representatives were present from recreational associations, youth and women organizations, research institutes, hunters and worker representative organizations (Annex E). Nevertheless evidence was found that PEFC Latvia did honor all applicants to participate in the Technical Committee. Secondly, they have put a lot of emphasis on inviting non-commercial stakeholders to participate. Therefore the assessors consider it a minor non-conformity.
3.3 The Sustainable Forest Management Certification Standard

The criteria on Sustainable Forest Management are stated in PEFC LV FMS ‘PEFC Forest Management Standard for Latvia’. This document was approved by PEFC Latvia on 18 August 2015. The Guidelines for Forest Management certification application were approved by PEFC Latvia on 10 March 2015.

The standard has been written exclusively for the PEFC certification of forests in Latvia. It includes public forests, as well as many small privately owned forest holdings.

The assessors did not find any non-conformities related to PEFC LV FMS. The assessors conclude that PEFC LV conforms to PEFC ST 1003:2010.

3.4 Group certification model

Group certification is referred to as the Owner Group Forest Management certification. Forest owners or managers can join and apply for certification as a group. In Owner Group Forest Management certification in Latvia, all participants of the group decide, achieve, and ensure conformity with the PEFC Forest Management Standard for Latvia.

Currently, there are no valid group forest management certificates in Latvia.

The assessors did not find any non-conformities related to PEFC LV04. The assessors conclude that PEFC LV conforms to PEFC ST 1002:2010.

3.5 Chain of custody standard(s)

The PEFC Council's International standard PEFC ST 2002:2013 ‘Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products’, was fully adopted by PEFC Latvia without any modifications on 24 May 2013. Besides, PEFC ST 2003:2012 (Certification Body Requirements – Chain of Custody) standard defining requirements for certification bodies carrying out PEFC chain of custody certification was also fully adopted by PEFC Latvia on 16 July 2012.

3.6 Logo Usage

The procedures on PEFC Logo Usage Licensing are stated in three documents:
- Guidelines for issuance of PEFC Logo use licenses (in accordance with the PEFC Logo usage rules – requirements, PEFC ST 2001:2008);
- Application form of the PEFC logo license: PEFC logo pieteikuma forma.pdf (in Latvian);

The assessors did not find any non-conformity and conclude that the procedures comply with the PEFCC requirements.

3.7 Certification and accreditation procedures on forest management

The assessors did not find any non-conformities and conclude that the standards PEFC LV02: “Guidelines for Certification Bodies and Auditors to conduct Forest Management and Chain of Custody certification”
and PEFC LV03: “Guidelines for PEFC notification of the Certification Body” comply with PEFCC requirements.

3.8 Complaints and dispute resolution procedures

An overall complaints and dispute procedure is available in chapter 8 within Standard LV05 “Guidelines for PEFC Latvia documentation development and revision”. References to this chapter are made in the guidelines of logo usage, PEFC LV02: “Guidelines for Certification Bodies and Auditors to conduct Forest Management and Chain of Custody certification” and PEFC LV03: “Guidelines for PEFC notification of the Certification Body”.

The PEFC logo-contract (in Latvian) states that “potential differences and disputes between parties should be solved through mutual negotiation. If a dispute cannot be solved through negotiations, it is dealt with by the procedure stipulated by Latvian Republic Law”.

The establishment of the appeal committee is regulated by the bylaws of PEFC Latvia.

The assessors did not find non-conformities and conclude that the procedures comply with the PEFCC requirements.

3.9 Any other aspects affecting functionality, credibility and efficiency of PEFC LV

The assessors did not find any other aspects that affect the functionality, credibility or efficiency of PEFC LV, apart from the aspects (non-conformities) described above.
4. GENERAL STRUCTURE OF PEFC LATVIA AND THE PEFC LV

4.1 General structure of PEFC LATVIA

Association “PEFC Latvijas Padome” (hereafter PEFC Latvia) was founded in 1999.

PEFC Latvia represents the National Governing Body and the Logo Licensing Body of the Latvian Forest Certification System and is the PEFC Council member.

The PEFC Latvia General Assembly, the PEFC Latvia Council, PEFC Latvia secretariat, Technical Committee and Person authorised by the PEFC Latvia Council all had roles during the Standard Setting Process. An Arbitration Commission shall be established by the PEFC Latvia Council to deal with any substantive and/or procedural complaints regarding the standard setting process or other disputes.

PEFC Latvia General Assembly
The PEFC Latvia General Assembly is the standardizing body, which is responsible for the approval of the ‘PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia’. The General Assembly is competent to pass decisions provided two thirds of the Association members are present. A decision of the General Assembly is passed provided no less than two thirds of the voters have voted in the affirmative. Each PEFC Latvia member has one vote.

PEFC Latvia Council
The PEFC Latvia Council (Council) responsibilities within the Standard setting and/or revision process shall be:
- review of documents,
- establishment of Technical Committee, including acceptance or refusal of nominated representatives,
- authorisation of the person responsible for elaboration of preparatory/working draft,
- approval of a proposal for the development or revision of the Forest Management Standard and other PEFC LV documentation.

The Council is responsible for the approval of PEFC Latvia’s documentation (except Standard, which is responsibility of General Assembly). PEFC Latvia’s documentation as well as any changes to such is approved by an open vote at the Council. The Council is competent to pass decisions provided two thirds of the Council members are present. A decision is passed provided no less than two thirds of the voters have voted in the affirmative. There are 4 council members, including chairmen, 1 board member and also a national secretary.

PEFC Latvia secretariat
The PEFC Latvia secretariat (Secretariat) shall be responsible, inter alia, for the implementation of the document procedures and other rules relating to the development of the Standard and/or other PEFC Latvia documentation. For this purpose, the secretariat arranges all contacts between the Technical Committee, authorised person and the Council. In particular, the secretariat shall be responsible for:
- preparation of the proposals
- identification of stakeholders,
- public announcement of the start of the Standard development process and invitation to stakeholders,
- publication of the approved documentation and Standard setting procedures.
- record keeping of nominated members of the Technical Committee and records relating to the Standard setting process.
- communicating decision of the Council on accepted members of the Technical Committee and making their members contacts publicly available,
- administration of the Technical Committee activities unless the Technical Committee provides it itself,
- administration of members and public consultations,
- pilot testing,
- establishing contact point for enquires and complaints relating the standard setting activities,
- administration of disputes and complaints.

**Technical Committee**

The Technical Committee shall be established by the Council on the basis of nominations received. The Technical Committee composition shall provide for balanced representation and decision-making by stakeholder categories relevant to subject matter and scope of the Standard, where single concerned interest shall not dominate nor should be dominated in the process.

The Technical Committee shall include stakeholders with expertise relevant to the subject matter of the specific Standard, those who are materially affected by the Standard and those that can influence the implementation of the Standard. The Technical Committee shall include representatives nominated by:

a) PEFC Latvia members,
b) PEFC Latvia Council,
c) PEFC Latvia secretariat,
d) other stakeholder groups.

The Technical Committee is established on a temporary basis for the period of Standard development or revision.

The materially affected stakeholders shall represent a meaningful segment of the members. The members of the Technical Committees are accessible to the materially and directly affected stakeholders through the publicly available contact information on PEFC Latvia web page. The Technical Committee members vote for a committee chairman who leads the discussions and authorizes correctness and completeness of implementation of adopted decisions into documents. Administration of the Technical Committee activities is provided by the national secretary or by the person authorised by the Council.

**Person authorised by the PEFC Latvia Council**

The person authorised by the Council is generally an expert in the respective field of the Standard's subject matter. His/her role is mainly to elaborate a preparatory/working draft of documents, supply it to the Technical Committee and to participate in the process of consideration of comments. The Council can also nominate an external expert (physical person or legal entity) for this position that can either be or not to be a member of the Technical Committee. In this case the authorised person is a Technical Committee member and he/she can be voted for a position to chair the committee.

**Arbitral Commission**

The Arbitral Commission shall be established on a temporary basis by the Council based on information received from the Secretariat. It deals with any substantive and/or procedural complaints regarding the standard setting process.
4.2 General structure of PEFC LV

PEFC Latvia has developed a structured national PEFC certification system (referred to as PEFC LV). The revised PEFC LV consists of nine updated standards:

1. **PEFC LV01 “Terms and Definitions”** (fully adopted PEFC International Normative Document „PEFC Terms and Definitions“, Annex 1 fully adopted by PEFC Latvia)

2. **PEFC LV02 “Guidelines for Certification Bodies and Auditors to conduct Forest Management and Chain of Custody certification”** (Contains the requirements for Certification Bodies and Auditors to perform PEFC Forest Management and PEFC Chain of Custody certification in Latvia. This document specifies the minimum requirements for Certification Bodies notification in the Association “PEFC Latvijas Padome” to perform the certification in accordance with:
   - PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia;

3. **PEFC LV03 “Guidelines for PEFC notification of the Certification Body”** (Defines the requirements for the PEFC notification of the Certification Body for Forest Management and/or Chain of Custody certification in Latvia. It includes procedures for notification of certification bodies (PEFC GD 1004:2009, Administration of PEFC scheme, chapter 5).)

4. **PEFC LV04 “Guidelines for Forest Management certification application”** (Specifies the minimum requirements for forest owners or managers, or forest owner group entities and group participants for Forest Management certification in accordance with PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia and define the certification applicant/certificate holder rights and obligations. It includes requirements for Group Forest Management Certification (PEFC ST 1002:2010))

5. **PEFC LV05 “Guidelines for PEFC Latvia documentation development and revision”** (Describes the requirements for PEFC Latvia in the development and revision of the System documentation. It includes requirements for standard setting procedures and process (PEFC ST 1001:2010, Standard Setting - Requirements) and procedures for complaints and dispute resolution (PEFC GD 1004:2009, Administration of PEFC Scheme, chapter 8).)

6. **PEFC Forest Management Standard for Latvia** (Specifies the framework and requirements for the sustainability assessment of forest management and confirms the conformity of management practices with the PEFC certifications system’ requirements.
   Following the Standard’s criteria and indicators the forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager determines and confirms compliance with the Standard. The conformity assessment is done by an independent Certification Body accredited as provided by the PEFC regulations.
   It includes requirements for Sustainable Forest Management (PEFC ST 1003:2010).)

7. **PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products – Requirements** (fully adopted by PEFC Latvia)

8. **PEFC ST 2003:2012 Requirements for Certification Bodies operating Certification against the PEFC International Chain of Custody Standard** (fully adopted by PEFC Latvia)
9. Guidelines for issuance of PEFC Logo use licenses (sets out the rules for the issuance of PEFC logo use licenses, by PEFC Latvia to ensure legally compliant use of the PEFC Logo in accordance with the PEFC Logo usage rules – requirements, PEFC ST 2001:2008 and procedures for logo licensing (PEFC GD 1004:2009, Administration of PEFC scheme, chapter 6).)

An overview of all PEFC Latvia’s related documentation is provided in the table of Chapter 1.7.

Certification can be implemented as ‘Certification individual forest holdings’ or a ‘Forest owner group certification.’

Furthermore, PEFC LV has incorporated national forest legislation in its standards. Translations of the most important legislation were given to the assessors. However a clear overview about the requirements of the standards which are covered by national law and were not included in the national forest management standard were not given in a separate document or as an Annex to document PEFC LV FMS: 2015.

During the Standard revision process minor changes to the PEFC LV were made; however the guidelines to the standard revision itself were however altered to make the process more transparent. Document PEFC LV05 “Guidelines for PEFC Latvia documentation development and revision” was developed by PEFC Latvia prior to the formation of the Technical Committee.

An overall appeal procedure is available in PEFC LV05.

PEFC LV makes use of various ISO standards that are compulsory for certification (ISO 19011, ISO 17011, ISO 17021 and ISO 45011). Whenever relevant, all system documents make a clear link to these ISO standards.
5. STANDARD SETTING PROCESS

During the standard setting process the guidelines of document PEFC LV05 “Guidelines for PEFC Latvia documentation development and revision” were respected and documents related to the process were well structured and easy accessible. However, almost all documents related to the standard setting process were only available in the Latvian language.

The decision making power is divided amongst five entities:
1. PEFC Latvia General Assembly;
2. PEFC Latvia Council;
3. PEFC Latvia Secretariat;
4. Technical Committee; and
5. Person authorized by the PEFC Latvia Council.

The responsibilities of each entity are well defined in the scheme documentation and are explained in Chapter 4.1 of this report.

The standard setting process in PEFC Latvia has a project resembling approach: within that stage of the standard setting process is described in sufficient detail, including the responsibilities and roles of each of the five entities in each stage. Additionally, the voting procedures are defined, as well as the procedures for consensus building.

If complaints or disputes arise, an Arbitral Commission shall be established by the PEFC Latvia Council. A distinction is made between a dispute and a complaint.

In the case of a dispute resolution process of any contentious issue or objection raised in developing or reviewing the Standard and/or the Documentation or sections thereof, the disputed subject matter is presented in writing to the PEFC Latvia Secretariat, indicating also the previous actions taken to resolve the dispute.

Complaints shall be addressed in writing to PEFC Latvia. It is the responsibility of the complainant to submit written information supporting the complaint, which can be verified as accurate and correct through an independent source.

No complaint or dispute occurred during the standard setting process.

In total 45 stakeholders were personally invited to take part in the standard setting process (See Annex G).

In the announcement and invitation the explicit text to comment on the scope and the standard-setting process was missing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount of stakeholders invited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Forest owners/managers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Forest based industry</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consumers and customers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Civil society, NGO</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Governmental institutions

Table: Stakeholders invited to participate sorted by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Forest owners/managers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Forest based industry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consumers and customers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Civil society, NGO</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Governmental institutions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stakeholder categories given above are provided by PEFC Latvia on request.

Only one (1) organisation was invited (trade union) relating to the category consumers and customers, and not for example The Latvian National Association for consumer protection – LPIAA (http://www.pateretajs.lv/) or recreational organisations.

The workers union invited is the Free Trade Union Confederation of Latvia (LBAS). It is the largest non-governmental organisation in Latvia, which protects the interests of professional trade union members and employees on the branch and inter-branch level. Unfortunately, it did not participate.

However other categories should also be identified according to the definition of stakeholder provided in PEFC LV05: “4.9. Stakeholder: A person, group or organisation with an interest in the subject of the standardisation.” …

“Note: The nine major groups that have been defined by Agenda 21 of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 provides an example of stakeholders involved in/concerned by sustainable forest management: (i) business and industry, (ii) children and youth, (iii) forest owners, (iv) indigenous people, (v) local authorities, (vi) NGOs, (vii) scientific and technological community, (viii) women, and (ix) workers and trade unions.”

Although the note relating definition of stakeholder in PEFC LV05 suggest nine major groups, these categories were not actively used to define the stakeholders. Reviewing the invited stakeholders in relation with these nine categories: No (0) stakeholders were invited of (ii) children and youth, and (viii) women. Only one (1) local municipality and one (1) workers unions were invited.

Nevertheless, the majority of the invited stakeholders (69 per cent) were non-materially affected stakeholders with a large emphasis on NGO and civil society (mostly associations).

Latvia has a population of less than 2 million people and 700 newspapers. After an internal discussion, PEFC Latvia decided not to publish an announcement in the papers, social media, radio, or a TV broadcaster, but to send personal emails to all 45 identified stakeholders.

A total of twelve (12) organisations participated in the Technical Committee. The Technical Committee is divided in 5 different stakeholder categories (see Annex E) by PEFC Latvia:
According to PEFC Latvia, lack of interest to participate in the Technical committee can be explained by the fact that almost every activity in forestry (planning, operations, nature protection, social aspects, etc.) in Latvia is strictly regulated by legislation; the stakeholders already participate in continuously ongoing legislation revision working groups.

The comment by PEFC Latvia states that “the FMS revision Technical Committee meets its documented requirements to “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”, based on:

- 4 of 5 stakeholders categories were represented in FMS revision Technical committee,
- for all and every point in the FMs standard consensus was reached in the Technical committee
- Public consultation in Latvia and PEFC International public consultation results, with no any complaint or negative comment about FMS or revision process.”

The organisations related to the category of consumer/customer were not invited personally to participate (only one trade union), as it is not clear if they would honour this invitation. However, the assessors saw the absence of this category in the Technical Committee as a direct result of not identifying these stakeholders. No open invitation, in a newspaper or other media was sent, to inform stakeholders about the standard setting process apart from the article on the Latvian PEFC website. No statistics on the amount of visitors to the PEFC Latvia website were available to the assessors.

Accordingly, this results in one (1) minor non-conformity on the standard setting process which is related to balanced representation in the Technical Committee.

A notable issue in the standard setting process was the separate consultation request to the PEFC Latvia members. They received the enquiry draft and had three weeks to respond.

The public consultation period of the enquiry draft was sixty days. One (1) response was received. The comments were reviewed and discussed by the Technical Committee in the presence of the submitter of those comments (a certification body) at the Technical Committee meeting of 22 of July 2015.

An electronic stakeholder survey was sent to all 18 stakeholders (Annex F) involved in the Technical Committee by the assessors. The stakeholder survey received replies from 6 respondents, of which 1 skipped the last 4 questions. A summary of the answers provided can be found at Annex B: Results of stakeholder survey.

Respondents to the stakeholder survey replied that the standard setting process was very well planned and documentation was available to members on time. No concerns were raised by the stakeholders on the decision-making process and how consensus was reached. Almost 40 per cent of the respondents (2) partially or completely agreed on the fact that the standard deserves further consideration. One explanatory comment was received on this issue: “Further considerations will be done within next endorsement.”

An extra requirement was assessed as a consequence of the PEFCC Boards’ decision (June 2014): “By the time of their next full assessment of all PEFC Systems a major noncompliance will be deemed to have occurred if they do not:
• Have written standards setting procedures in place in compliance with PEFC ST 1001:2010 which have demonstrably been applied in the standard setting process, or
• Have documented mandatory reference to PEFC ST 1001:2010 in their scheme whose requirements have demonstrably been applied in the standard setting process”.

In the document PEFC LV05:2015: ‘Guidelines for PEFC Latvia documentation development’ a reference is made to PEFC ST 1001:2010 and is stated as:
PEFC LV05:2016: “3. Normative references
The documents referenced below are indispensable for the application of this document. For both dated and undated references, the latest edition of the referenced document (including any amendment) applies.

The assessors did not identify non-conformities at the level of the standard setting procedures and conclude that PEFC LV conforms to PEFC ST 1001:2010 requirements.

Considering the standard setting process, two (2) minor non-conformities were identified. The assessors conclude PEFC LV does not conform to PEFC ST 1001:2010. Annex A, chapter 14 PART I: STANDARD AND SYSTEM REQUIREMENT CHECKLIST FOR STANDARD SETTING (PEFC ST 1001:2010) provides more information on conformity with requirements.

The two non-conformities relating the standard setting process are specified as:

1. PEFC ST 1001:2010 requirement 4.4b: “The working group/committee shall:
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,”

In Document Nr5: the minutes of the council of PEFC Latvia provided information on the establishment of the Technical committee (30.07.2014) in which five nominations to participate were received; in total 12 participants are members of the Technical Committee. All nominations were honored by the Council of PEFC Latvia. No representatives were present from recreational associations, consumers, youth organization, research institutes, hunters, Worker representative organisation (Annex E).

In response to the assessor’s finding, the comment by PEFC Latvia states: “PEFC Latvia considers that FMS revision Technical committee “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”, based on:
• 4 from 5 stakeholders categories was represented in FMS revision Technical committee,
• for all and every point in the FMs standard in Technical committee was reached consensus
• Public consultation in Latvia and International public consultation results, with no any complaint or negative comment about FMS or revision process.
Lack of interest to participate in FMS Technical committee from many stakeholders side can be explained with situation that in Latvia almost every activity in forest (starting from FM planning, FM activities, nature protection, social aspects e.t.c.) are strictly regulated by legislation (centimeters, numbers, hectares, cubic
meters, meters e.t.c) and stakeholders participate in continuously ongoing legislation revision working groups”

PEFC Latvia categorized the stakeholders into 5 categories:
- Forest owners/managers
- Forest based industry
- Consumers and customers
- Civil society, NGO
- Governmental institutions

The organisations relating to the category consumer/customer were not invited personally to participate (only one trade union). It is not clear if they would have honored this invitation, but the assessors saw the absence of this category in the Technical Committee directly related to not identifying these stakeholders. An open invitation in a newspaper or other media was also not available to them as it was only when they had the opportunity to visit the website that they would know about the standard setting process. No numbers were available on the amount of visitors of the PEFC Latvia website.

However, PEFC Latvia did invite 31 NGO/civil societies to participate in the standard setting process.

The assessors agree with PEFC Latvia that the detailed legislation on forestry and their continuous amendments detain NGO and others from putting in a lot of time in PEFC related standard settings.

The assessors conclude that more stakeholders should have been invited to participate in the Technical Committee and that the committee did not sufficiently represent the ecological and social functions of forestry. The current committee was dominated by participants with an economical interest in Forestry (receiving income directly, or indirectly from forest related activities). Only one NGO and one educational institute participated in the standard setting process.

2. PEFC ST 1001:2010 requirement 5.3 d: “The announcement and invitation shall include: d) an invitation to comment on the scope and the standard-setting process.”

Invitation document Nr1: “PEFC Latvia plans to launch the review of PEFC forest management certification standard for Latvia in June 2014. The PEFC forest management certification standard for Latvia and the rest of the PEFC Latvian scheme documentation is available on the "Latvian PEFC Council" website, in the section "Documentation"– http://www.pefc.lv/dokumentacija/.”

The assessors conclude that the text is not explicit on commenting the scope and the standard-setting process.

The assessors concluded PEFC LV does not conform to the PEFC Council Requirements. PEFC LV does not fully comply with the criteria of PEFC ST 1001:2010 due to these two (2) minor non-conformities.
6. FOREST MANAGEMENT STANDARD

The criteria for Sustainable Forest Management are stated in PEFC LV FMS ‘PEFC Forest Management Standard for Latvia’. The document was approved by PEFC Latvia on 18 August 2015. ‘The Guidelines for Forest Management certification application’ (LV04) were approved by PEFC Latvia on 10 March 2015.

The’ PEFC LV FMS’ specifies the framework and requirements for the sustainability assessment of forest management and confirms the conformity of management practices with the PEFC certifications system’ requirements. PEFC LV FMS sets no minimum levels or limitations for forest management practices and sustainability criteria and indicators.

The standard has been written exclusively for the PEFC certification of forests in Latvia. It covers public forests, as well as a large amount of small privately owned forest holdings.

The forest holding is the basic unit for PEFC certification. The forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager may divide the holding into individual management units, applying PEFC Certification on a per-unit basis or certifying a part of the management units. Single cadastral units in a forest holding cannot be divided. Individual management units are explicitly shown on maps and are identifiable out in the field. In case the forest owner, legal possessor, or forest manager chooses to exclude some units from PEFC Certification and certify a part of the holding.

In Latvia PEFC Forest management certification can be realized as:

- Certification of individual forest holdings;
- Forest owner group certification.

In Latvia, the State Register of Forests (SRF) manages a forest resources database, which includes related cartographic material. Information on forest management activities carried out and/or changes in the characteristics of the forest resources are recorded in this database. This policy instrument is also being used by Forest owners/managers, and yearly relevant data should be delivered as required by law.

During the conformity assessment of PEFC LV against the requirements stated in PEFC ST 1003:2010 using ‘Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Sustainable Forest Management’ (based on PEFC IGD 1007-03:2012) the assessors found no non-conformities. Annex A, chapter 16 PART III provides more information about the assessment results for the forest management standard.

The assessors conclude that the ‘PEFC Forest Management Standard for Latvia’ does conform to the PEFC Council Requirements. PEFC LV does fully comply with the criteria of PEFC ST 1003:2010.
7. GROUP CERTIFICATION MODEL

The standard PEFC LV04 ‘Guidelines for Forest Management certification application’ addresses the two different organisational forms of PEFC forest management certification in Latvia, and the procedural aspects of certifying forest owners and/or companies. The forest management certification can be implemented as Individual Forest Management certification or Forest owner Group Forest Management certification. PEFC LV04 includes requirements for Group Forest Management Certification (PEFC ST 1002:2010)

Forest owner Group Forest Management certification: The forest owners or managers can join together and apply for the certification as the group. In Forest owner Group Forest Management certifications all participants of the group decide to achieve and ensure conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia. There must be clearly a defined group entity (as separate legal entity) that separates the responsibilities between the group entity and all group participants about ensuring the conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia as shown in the Figure below. The group entity shall sign a written certification agreement with all group participants and submit the certification application to the Certification Body.

In the responsibilities of the Forest owner group entity (PEFC LV04 5.2.2) no explicit reference could be found to the agreement mentioned in PEFC LV04 5.2.1.7: "Document confirming participation in group forest certification: A document issued to an individual participant that refers to the group forest certificate and that confirms the participant as being covered by the scope of the group forest certification."

However reference can be found to procedures written about the participants’ admission and the participant receiving the attestations of participation. The assessors conclude that based on these points a document to confirm participation is available for each participant and is provided by the Forest owner group entity.

In Latvia there are 150,000 private forest owners with an average property size of just 6 ha. The PEFC has developed Forest owner Group Forest Management certification as a proven and effective option for small family- and community-owned forests to obtain forest management certification. An alternative approach to individual certification, it allows multiple forest owners to become certified as a group and share the financial costs arising from certification.
Until now, group certification in Latvia has been very limited. PEFC Latvia is working with the Forest Owners’ Cooperative “Mežsaimnieks” to implement a group certification pilot project. This project will be used to further develop the group certification process in Latvia, as well as serve as a positive example to other private forest owners.

The PEFC International website lists these certificates as ‘Group Certificates FM’. According to the PEFC International website, there are currently no valid group forest management certificates in Latvia.

During the conformity assessment of PEFC LV against the requirements stated in PEFC ST 1002:2010 ‘Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Group Forest Management Certification’ (based on PEFC IGD 1007-03:2012) the assessors found no non-conformities.

The assessors have concluded that PEFC LV does conform to PEFC ST 1002:2010.
8. CHAIN OF CUSTODY STANDARD

The PEFC Council's International standard PEFC ST 2002:2013 ‘Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products’, was fully adopted by PEFC Latvia without any modifications on 24 May 2013.


The PEFC ST 2002:2013 was not assessed, as it fully conforms to the PEFCC requirements.
9. PEFC NOTIFICATION OF CERTIFICATION BODIES

Standard PEFC LV03:2016: ‘Guidelines for PEFC notification of the Certification Body’ describes procedures for the issuance of the notification of certification bodies and has been written exclusively for the PEFC certification of Forest management and verification of Chain of Custody of forest-based products in Latvia. The standard is comprehensive and structured. Users of the standard can easily find relevant topics and the wording of the standard is clear and understandable. The standard explicitly mentions the scope of the certification and clearly refers to the system’s CoC standard (PEFC ST 2002:2013), PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia (PEFC LV FMS:2015), the Guidelines for forest management certification application (PEFC LV04:2016) and the Guidelines for Certification Body and Auditors to conduct Forest Management and Chain of Custody certification (PEFC LV02:2016).

The preconditions for certification bodies to become a notified certification body for PEFC Latvia are comprehensively elaborated. Firstly, certification bodies must be accredited by Latvian National Accreditation Bureau (LATAK), or by the European co-operation for Accreditation (EA) or an International Accreditation Forum (IAF) member’s Body. Secondly certification bodies must also fulfil the general criteria for certification bodies:

for PEFC forest management certification in accordance with:
- PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia;
- LVS EN 17021 – „Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems” or
  LVS EN 45 011 – „General Requirements for bodies operating product certification systems”;
for PEFC chain of custody certification in accordance with:
- PEFC International Standard PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products – Requirements;
- LVS EN 45 011 – „General Requirements for bodies operating product certification systems”.

They also have to use a documented auditing methodology and have certified, general knowledge on forest management and its environmental impacts. If all preconditions are met, a certification body can apply for PEFC notification. When approved, a notification contract is signed between PEFC Latvia and the certification body. Such a notification contract must ensure proper administration of the PEFC LV system, submission of the requested data to PEFC Latvia, recognition of the certification body by PEFC Latvia and the recognized PEFC certification.

The standard PEFC LV03:2016 uses clear referencing to PEFC and ISO standards which makes the standard more comprehensive and mandatory. Required references are made to ISO 17021:2011 (Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems) and ISO 45 011 – ‘General Requirements for bodies operating product certification systems’;

The application for the PEFC notification of a certification body (Latvian): PEFC logo pieteikuma forma.pdf, the contract between the certification body and PEFC Latvia (English): "PEFC notification contract 2016.pdf" and PEFC LV03 standard: "Guidelines for PEFC notification of the Certification Body” cover and conform to all criteria of chapter 5 of PEFC GD 1004:2009.

The application form is in Latvian, and it only requires basic information: Applicant’s contact details, Mark one of the categories: Individual forest management certificate, Group forest management certification participant, Individual chain of custody certificate, Group chain of custody certification
participant, Other (specify operation) and submit documentation on logo use: PEFC certificate copy (group certification for participation copy of the certificate) or description of the intended use of the logo.

The contract obligations as well as the conditions for termination of the contract for both the certification bodies and PEFC Latvia are presented in an English version of the standard agreement. The notification process seems open and democratic. No discriminatory elements have been found in the standard nor in other documentation.


No non-conformity was found relating certification bodies. Annex 17. PART IV: STANDARD AND SYSTEM REQUIREMENT CHECKLIST FOR CERTIFICATION AND ACCREDITATION PROCEDURES (ANNEX 6) provides detailed information on conformity with requirements.

The assessors concluded PEFC LV does conform to the PEFC Council Annex 6 requirements regarding the notification of certification bodies.
10. PROCEDURES FOR ISSUANCE OF LOGO LICENSING

The PEFC logo/label provides information relating to the origin of forest based products of sustainably managed forests, and recycled- and other non-controversial sources. Purchasers can use this information by choosing a product based on environmental or other considerations. The PEFC Logo is a registered trademark owned by the PEFC Council. PEFC Latvia requires that the PEFC Logo can only be used by entities based on a valid logo license that is issued by PEFC Latvia (which is the PEFC authorized body in Latvia). The issuance of the PEFC logo by PEFC Latvia is carried out on the condition that the current contract between PEFC Latvia and the PEFC Council remains valid.

The requirements of PEFC LV concerning PEFC logo licensing are provided in three documents:
- Guidelines for issuance of PEFC Logo use licenses (in accordance with the PEFC Logo usage rules – requirements, PEFC ST 2001:2008.)
- Application form of the PEFC logo license (Latvian): PEFC logo pieteikuma forma.pdf
- Terms of the PEFC logo license contract (Latvian): Liguma projekts PEFC Logo 2016.pdf

Three distinct user groups are defined for issuance of PEFC logo license:
- User group 2 (group B): Forest owners/managers with a recognised Forest Management certificate
- User group 3 (group C): Forest related industries with a certified CoC.
- User group 4 (group D): Other users, in which the purpose of the PEFC logo use does not conflict with the objectives and good name of the PEFC International and they are registered in Latvia.

The logo usage contract covers the following aspects (Articles):
1. Object of the Contract,
2. The PEFC Logo Copyright,
3. Obligations of the Parties,
4 Penalties,
5. Duration,
6. Provision of information
7. Dispute Resolution Procedure,
8. Other provisions.

In Chapter 8 of the Guidelines for issuance of PEFC Logo use licenses’ it is stated that disputes and complaints are appointed to PEFC Latvia in accordance with PEFC LV05.

The assessors concluded PEFC LV does conform to all criteria of chapter 6 and chapter 8 of PEFC GD 1004:2009.
11. CERTIFICATION AND ACCREDITATION ARRANGEMENTS

Three standards are relevant in relation to the requirements concerning the qualifications of certification bodies and auditors:

- PEFC LV02: “Guidelines for Certification Bodies and Auditors to conduct Forest Management and Chain of Custody certification”
- Guidelines for issuance of PEFC Logo use licenses) (in accordance with the PEFC Logo usage rules – requirements, PEFC ST 2001:2008.)
- PEFC ST 2003:2012 (Certification Body Requirements – Chain of Custody)

In PEFC LV02 the auditors for COC and SFM are required to have a higher education degree in engineering, forestry, biology, geography or management sciences.
PEFC LV02 Chapter 9 presents guidance for indicating non-conformities in PEFC Forest Management certification, this chapter was included during the latest revision period.

The following mechanism for PEFC notification of certification bodies and logo usage are in place:
- The contract between the certification body and PEFC Latvia (English): document "PEFC notification contract 2016.pdf"
- PEFC LV03 standard: "Guidelines for PEFC notification of the Certification Body”
- Application form of the PEFC logo license ( Latvian): PEFC logo pieteikuma forma.pdf
- Terms of the PEFC logo license contract ( Latvian): Liguma projekts PEFC Logo 2016.pef

Annex 17. PART IV: STANDARD AND SYSTEM REQUIREMENT CHECKLIST FOR CERTIFICATION AND ACCREDITATION PROCEDURES (ANNEX 6) provides more detailed information on conformity with requirements.

The assessors concluded PEFC LV does conform to the PEFCC requirements, related to Annex 6.
12. COMPLAINTS AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURES

An overall complaints and dispute procedure is available in chapter 8 within Standard LV 05 “Guidelines for PEFC Latvia documentation development and revision, chapter 8”. References to this chapter are made in the guidelines of logo usage, PEFC LV02: “Guidelines for Certification Bodies and Auditors to conduct Forest Management and Chain of Custody certification.” and PEFC LV03: “Guidelines for PEFC notification of the Certification Body.

In the standard setting document PEFC LV05: “Guidelines for PEFC Latvia documentation development and revision”, chapter 8 conforms to the appeal procedure as required in PEFC ST 1001:2010, Standard Setting – Requirements.

PEFC LV05 “Guidelines for PEFC Latvia documentation development and revision, chapter 8” also conforms to all criteria of chapter 8 of PEFC GD 1004:2009.

In the PEFC logo-contract (Latvian) there is a requirement that when there are potential differences and disputes between the parties, they should be solved through mutual negotiation. If a dispute cannot be solved through negotiations, it is dealt with by the procedure stipulated by Latvian Republic Law

Appeal procedure in the document "Liguma projekts PEFC Logo 2016": "7. Strīdu izskatīšanas kārtība
7.1. Puses apnemās iespējamas domstarpības un strīdus, kādi varētu rasties šī liguma izpildes gaitā, risināt savstarpējo sarunu celā.
7.2. Gadījumā, ja radušos strīdus neizdodas atrisināt sarunu celā, tie tiek izskatīti Latvijas Republikas likumdošanā noteiktā kārtībā."

1. This contract is subject to the law of Latvia.
2. Any disputes arising out of this agreement shall be finally settled by the courts in the judicial district of Latvia.”

In chapter 8 of the Guidelines for Certification Bodies and Auditors to conduct Forest Management and Chain of Custody certification (PEFC LV02) there is a section on this matter which states: “8. Appeals, complaints and disputes
Appeals, complaints and disputes at first deal between certification applicant/certificate holder and Certification Body in accordance with standard LVS EN 17021 points 9.7. and 9.8., or standard LVS EN 45 011 point 7.
Certification Body shall inform in written the certification applicant about dealing with appeals, complaints and disputes in accordance with standards LVS EN 17021 or LVS EN 45 011.
The appeals, complaints and disputes which are not solved by the Certification Body and certification applicant/certificate holder, together with all relevant information are appointed to Association “PEFC Latvijas Padome” in accordance with PEFC LV05.”

Hence, the assessors concluded that PEFC LV does conform to the PEFC Council requirements regarding the complaints and dispute resolution procedures for logo usage and the standard setting process.
13. ANNEXES

Annex A: PEFC Standard Requirements Checklist

Purpose
The PEFCC Standard Requirement Checklist was used by the assessors to identify compliance and non-compliance of the revised PEFC LV with the requirements of the PEFCC.

Methodology of Indication of conformities and non-conformities
The results of the assessments are shown in the column ‘Reference to application documents’ of the standard requirement checklist and a definitive statement regarding its conformity with the PEFCC requirements is made in the column ‘YES/NO’. When PEFC LV Standard Documents were found to be fully compliant with the relevant PEFCC requirements, the requirement was indicated with a ‘YES’. In addition, in that case, the statement ‘CONFORMS’ is written in the column ‘Reference to application documents’. When the text of the PEFC LV standard documents are an accurate copy of the text in the PEFCC standards no extra comments were provided.

In the case of a non-conformity, the assessors marked the column ‘YES/NO’ with a ‘NO’. This means that at least one element of the relevant PEFCC requirement question is answered with a ‘NO’.

Subsequently, in the case of a non-conformity, a NON-CONFORMITY statement is made in the column ‘Reference to application documents’, together with a clear argumentation as to why the criteria was assessed as a non-conformity.

References, citations and description of non-conformities and observations
The references to the respective PEFC LV standard documents and chapters are provided at the beginning of the relevant section (e.g. ‘PEFC LV04: “5.1). To clarify the conformity or non-conformity citations from the PEFC LV and related documents are copied into the checklists to demonstrate compliance or non-compliance. Citations are marked with quotation marks ("..."). Specific reference is made to ‘Comments by PEFC Latvia’ when additional comments were received during the compilation of the assessment report. When explanations are in the assessors own wording (e.g. by interpreting the content of the provided documented information), the text is written without quotation marks. In cases where the feedback from the assessors’ stakeholder survey is used, an explicit reference is made to the stakeholder survey.

Legend for column YES/NO:
YES = Assessment demonstrated compliance with the PEFC International Benchmark Standards
NO = Assessment demonstrated non-compliance with the PEFC International Benchmark Standards
N/A = Not applicable

14.1 **Scope**


14.2 **Checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Assess. basis*</th>
<th>YES/NO*</th>
<th>Reference to application documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standardising Body</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The standardising body shall have written procedures for standard-setting activities describing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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),</td>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>PEFC LV05:2016: &quot;5.4. Technical Committee Technical Committee shall be established by the Council on the basis of nominations received. The Technical Committee composition shall provide for balanced representation and decision-making by stakeholder categories relevant to subject matter and scope of the Standard, where single concerned interest shall not dominate nor should be dominated in the process.&quot; PEFC LV05:2016: &quot;6.3.2. Consensus building The decision of the Technical Committee to recommend the working draft for public consultations or final draft for formal approval shall be taken on the basis of a consensus.&quot; PEFC LV05:2016: &quot;5.1. PEFC Latvia General Assembly The PEFC Latvia General Assembly is the standardizing body, which is responsible for the approval of the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia (Standard). The General Assembly is competent to pass decisions provided two thirds of the Association members are present. A decision of the General Assembly is passed provided no less than two thirds of the voters have voted in the affirmative. Each PEFC Latvia member has one vote.&quot; CONFORMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) the record-keeping procedures,</td>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>PEFC LV05:2016: &quot;9 Records on Standard setting The following records shall be kept from the Standard setting and reviewing: a) Standard setting/reviewing proposal, stakeholders determination, list of invited stakeholders b) Written documentation for the establishment of Technical Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Minutes of the PEFC Latvia Council meetings and PEFC Latvia General Assembly  
d) Minutes of the Technical Committee meetings, including the comments and proposals of the members of Technical Committee and public consultation, and changes to the documentation  
e) Results of the consensus building and resolution of opposition  
f) Minutes of meetings with stakeholders  
g) Comments from public consultations  
h) Results of pilot testing  
i) Received appeals and complaints  
j) Decisions of the Arbitral Committee  
k) Results of the General Assembly and/or e-mail voting  
l) Development report  
m) All drafts of the Standard and changes to the Standard elaborated within the individual stages of standard setting or reviewing process.  

The records shall be kept for a minimum of five years and shall be available to interested parties upon request.”

| c) the procedures for balanced representation of stakeholders, | Procedures | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "5.4. Technical Committee  
Technical Committee shall be established by the Council on the basis of nominations received.  
The Technical Committee composition shall provide for balanced representation and decision-making by stakeholder categories relevant to subject matter and scope of the Standard, where single concerned interest shall not dominate nor should be dominated in the process.  
The Technical Committee shall include stakeholders with expertise relevant to the subject matter of the specific Standard, those who are materially affected by the Standard and those that can influence the implementation of the Standard."

CONFORMS |}

| d) the standard-setting process, | Procedures | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "6. Standard setting process  
The process of development and revision of Standard is organised in the stages to which the following responsibilities and versions of Standard are associated (Table 1).  
Table 1 Stages, responsibilities and Standard versions in the process of Standard development and/or revision”  
Content of Table 1: proposal stage, Preparatory stage, Development stage, Enquiry stage, Approval stage, Publication stage

CONFORMS |}

| e) the mechanism for reaching consensus, and | Procedures | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "4.1. Consensus  
General agreement characterised by the absence of sustained opposition to substantial issues by any important
part of the concerned interest and by a process that involves seeking to take into account the views of all parties concerned and to reconcile any conflicting arguments.

Note: Consensus need not imply unanimity (ISO/IEC Guide 2).

“PEFC LV05:2016 ”6.3.2. Consensus building

The decision of the Technical Committee to recommend the working draft for public consultations or final draft for formal approval shall be taken on the basis of a consensus. In order to reach a consensus the Technical 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.,

b) a telephone conference meeting where there is a verbal yes/no vote,

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

d) combinations thereof.

In any case of a negative vote which represents sustained opposition of any important part of the concerned interests to a substantive issue, the issue shall be resolved using the following mechanisms:

a) discussion and negotiation on the disputed issue within the Technical Committee in order to find a compromise,

b) direct negotiation between the stakeholders submitting the objection and stakeholders with different view on the disputed issue in order to find a compromise,

c) dispute resolution process.

The dispute resolution process is described in point 9.

CONFORMS |

f) revision of standards/normative documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEFC LV05:2016: &quot;7 Revision of Standard, The Standard shall be reviewed and revised at intervals that do not exceed a five-year period. &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONFORMS |

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PEFC LV05:2016: "6.2.2. Public announcement The start of the process of Standard development and/or revision shall be announced on PEFC Latvia website and in suitable media as appropriate to afford stakeholders an opportunity for meaningful contributions. The announcement shall include:

a) information about the objectives, scope and the steps of the standard-setting process and its timetable,

b) information about opportunities for stakeholders to participate in the process,

c) an invitation to stakeholders to nominate their representatives to the Technical Committee,

d) an invitation to comment on the scope and the standard-setting process, and |
e) reference to publicly available standard-setting procedures available on PEFC Latvia website. The Secretariat shall proactively seek participation of the disadvantaged and key Stakeholders. The invitation to disadvantaged and key stakeholders shall be made in understandable format and in a manner that ensures that the information reaches intended recipients, e.g. registered post, e-mail receipt confirmation. Secretariat shall make the standard-setting procedures publicly available on PEFC Latvia webpage and review it based on comments received from the public announcement.

| Process | YES | At [http://www.pefc.lv/dokumenti-un-materiali/standarti](http://www.pefc.lv/dokumenti-un-materiali/standarti) all information about the standard setting procedures and information about opportunities for stakeholders to participate in the process is available |

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 | PEFC LV05:2016: "9 The following records shall be kept from the Standard setting and reviewing:
   a) Standard setting/reviewing proposal, stakeholders determination, list of invited stakeholders
   b) Written documentation for the establishment of Technical Committee
   c) Minutes of the PEFC Latvia Council meetings and PEFC Latvia General Assembly
   d) Minutes of the Technical Committee meetings, including the comments and proposals of the members of Technical Committee and public consultation, and changes to the documentation
   e) Results of the consensus building and resolution of opposition
   f) Minutes of meetings with stakeholders
   g) Comments from public consultations
   h) Results of pilot testing
   i) Received appeals and complaints
   j) Decisions of the Arbitral Committee
   k) Results of the General Assembly and/or e-mail voting
   l) Development report
   m) All drafts of the Standard and changes to the Standard elaborated within the individual stages of standard setting or reviewing process.

The records shall be kept for a minimum of five years and shall be available to interested parties upon request."

| Process | YES | Scheme Description 2015: “All the records of Scheme revision process are available to any interested parties upon request in Council bureau - Republikas laukums 2, Riga, LV-1010, Latvia.” Records requested by the assessors were received from PEFC Latvia. |

4.4 The standardising body shall

| Procedures | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "5.4. Technical Committee
**Technical Committee shall be established by the Council on the basis of nominations received.**

Technical Committee is established on a temporary basis for the period of Standard development or revision."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Document Nr5: Minutes of the PEFC council of Latvia established the Technical committee (30.07.2014) five (5) additional nominations to participate were received; in total 12 participants take part in the Technical Committee (annex E).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.4 The working group/committee shall:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEFC LV05:2016: “5.4 The Technical Committee composition shall provide for balanced representation and decision-making by stakeholder categories relevant to subject matter and scope of the Standard, where single concerned interest shall not dominate nor should be dominated in the process. The Technical Committee shall include stakeholders with expertise relevant to the subject matter of the specific Standard, those who are materially affected by the Standard and those that can influence the implementation of the Standard.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard revision Technical Committee members + category.doc: Four (4) keystakeholders are mentioned: JSC “Latvia’s State Forests, JSC „Latvijas Finieris“, Latvian Forest Owners’ Association, Riga City Forests all of them are materially and directly affected stakeholders, or a representative organisation. &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PEFC LV05:2016: “5.4. The Technical Committee composition shall provide for balanced representation and decision-making by stakeholder categories relevant to subject matter and scope of the Standard, where single concerned interest shall not dominate nor should be dominated in the process. The Technical Committee shall include stakeholders with expertise relevant to the subject matter of the specific Standard, those who are materially affected by the Standard and those that can influence the implementation of the Standard. The Technical Committee shall include representatives nominated by:
  a) PEFC Latvia members,
  b) PEFC Latvia Council,
  c) PEFC Latvia secretariat,
  d) other stakeholder groups.

The materially affected stakeholders shall represent a meaningful segment of the participants. The members of the Technical Committees are accessible to the materially and directly affected stakeholders through the publicly available contact information on PEFC Latvia web page. |
Technical Committee members vote for a committee chairman who leads the discussions and authorises correctness and completeness of implementation of adopted decisions into documents. Administration of the Technical Committee activities is provided by the national secretary or by the person authorised by the Council."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Document Nr5: Minutes of the PEFC council of Latvia established the Technical committee (30.07.2014) 5 nominations to participate were received; in total 12 participants are part of the Technical Committee. Nobody was rejected. No representatives present of recreational associations, consumers, youth organization, research institutes, hunters, Worker representative organisation (Annex E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment by PEFC Latvia: “PEFC Latvia considers that FMS revision Technical committee “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”, based on:

- 4 from 5 stakeholders categories was represented in FMS revision Technical committee,
- for all and every point in the FMs standard in Technical committee was reached consensus
- Public consultation in Latvia and International public consultation results, with no any complaint or negative comment about FMS or revision process.

Lack of interest to participate in FMS Technical committee from many stakeholders side can be explained with situation that in Latvia almost every activity in forest (starting from FM planning, FM activities, nature protection, social aspects e.t.c.) are strictly regulated by legislation (centimetres, numbers, hectares, cubic meters, meters e.t.c) and stakeholders participate in continuously ongoing legislation revision working groups”

PEFC Latvia categorized the stakeholders into 5 categories:
- Forest owners/managers
- Forest based industry
- Consumers and customers
- Civil society, NGO
- Governmental institutions

The organisations relating the category consumer/customer were not invited personally to participate (only one trade union). It is not clear if they would have honored this invitation, but the assessors do see the absence of this category in the technical committee also directly related to not identifying these stakeholders. An open
invitation in a newspaper or other media was also not available to them, only when they had visit the website they would know about the standard setting process. No numbers available on the amount of visitors of the PEFC Latvia website.

PEFC Latvia however did invited 31 NGO/civil societies to participate in the standard setting process.

The assessors agree with PEFC Latvia that the detailed legislation on forestry and their continuous amendments detain NGO and others to put a lot of time in PEFC related standard settings.

**MINOR NON-CONFORMITY**

The assessors conclude that more stakeholders should have been invited to participate in the technical committee and that the committee did not sufficiently represent the ecological and social functions of forestry. The current committee was dominated by participants (9 out of 12) with an economical interest in Forestry (receiving income directly, or indirectly from forest related activities). Only one NGO and one educational institute participated in the process.

c) include stakeholders with expertise relevant to the subject matter of the standard, those that are materially affected by the standard, and those that can influence the implementation of the standard. The materially affected stakeholders shall represent a meaningful segment of the participants.

| Procedures | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "5.4 The Technical Committee shall include stakeholders with expertise relevant to the subject matter of the specific Standard, those who are materially affected by the Standard and those that can influence the implementation of the Standard. The Technical Committee shall include representatives nominated by: a) PEFC Latvia members, b) PEFC Latvia Council, c) PEFC Latvia secretariat, d) other stakeholder groups. The materially affected stakeholders shall represent a meaningful segment of the participants. The members of the Technical Committees are accessible to the materially and directly affected stakeholders through the publicly available contact information on PEFC Latvia web page." |
| Process | YES | The materially affected stakeholders or their representative organisation represent a meaningful segment, In the technical committee only one NGO is present and one educational institute. Other participants receive income directly or indirectly of forest related activities (including the Ministry of Agriculture, Forest department) |

| 4.5 The standardising body shall establish procedures for dealing with any substantive and procedural | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "5.6. Arbitral Commission The Arbitral Commission shall be established by the Council on the basis of information received from Secretariat. It deals with any substantive and/or procedural complaints relating to the standardising activities in |
4.5 Upon receipt of the complaint, the standard-setting body shall:

- **a) acknowledge receipt of the complaint to the complainant,**
  - **Procedures** YES PEFC LV05:2016: "8.2. Complains investigation and resolution process."
  8.2.1. All complaints shall be addressed in writing to the PEFC Latvia.
  8.2.2. It is responsibility of the complainant to submit written information supporting the complaint, which can be verified as accurate and correct through an independent source.
  8.2.3. Regardless of the outcome of any complaint, the complainant and PEFC Latvia will each meet their own costs.
  8.2.4. The Secretariat shall without delay:
  8.2.4.1. evaluate the submitted complaint to ensure that it can be verified as accurate and correct through an independent source,
  8.2.4.2. if necessary request (in writing) for additional information about complaint,
  8.2.4.3. inform (in writing) the complaint about receipt and Council about receipt and subject of complaint.

- **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 PEFC LV05:2016: "8.2. Complains investigation and resolution process."
  8.2.1. All complaints shall be addressed in writing to the PEFC Latvia.
  8.2.2. It is responsibility of the complainant to submit written information supporting the complaint, which can be verified as accurate and correct through an independent source.
  8.2.3. Regardless of the outcome of any complaint, the complainant and PEFC Latvia will each meet their own costs.
  8.2.4. The Secretariat shall without delay:
  8.2.4.1. evaluate the submitted complaint to ensure that it can be verified as accurate and correct through an independent source,
  8.2.4.2. if necessary request (in writing) for additional information about complaint,
  8.2.4.3. inform (in writing) the complaint about receipt and Council about receipt and subject of complaint.
| Process | YES | Scheme Description 2015: "There were no any disputes and/or complaints within Scheme revision process."
| c) formally communicate the decision on the complaint and of the complaint handling process to the complainant. | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "8.2.7. The Secretariat shall inform (in writing) the complainant and other interested parties about the outcomes of complaint resolution process."  
CONFORMS |
| 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. | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "8.2. Complains investigation and resolution process.  
8.2.1. All complaints shall be addressed in writing to the PEFC Latvia."  
PEFC LV05:2016: "5.3. PEFC Latvia secretariat  
The PEFC Latvia secretariat (Secretariat) shall be responsible, inter alia, for the implementation of the document procedures and other rules relating to the Standard and/or other PEFC Latvia documentation development. For this purpose, the secretariat arranges all contacts between the Technical Committee, authorised person and the Council. In particular, the secretariat shall be responsible for:  
m) establishing contact point for enquires and complaints relating the standard setting activities, administration of disputes and complaints,"
PEFC Latvia contact points (including enquires and complaints) are pointed in PEFC Latvia website - http://www.pefc.lv/par-pefc/kontakti  
CONFORMS |
### Standard-setting process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>PEFC LV05:2016:</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>&quot;6.1. Proposal stage&lt;br&gt;Council shall review the Standard and decide whether the Standard will be reaffirmed, changed or withdrawn. The proposal stage includes the formulation and approval of a proposal of the Standard development or revision. The proposal shall be prepared by the Secretariat or Council and shall be approved by the Council. The proposal shall cover the following issues: (...) b) identification of relevant stakeholders, including the disadvantaged and key stakeholders, and identification of constrains of their participation,&lt;br&gt;c) requirements for representation of members and interested stakeholders in the Technical Committee and their balanced representation,&quot;</td>
<td>CONFORMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | YES        | PEFC LV05:2016: "4.2. Disadvantaged stakeholder<br>A stakeholder who might be financially or otherwise disadvantaged in participating in the standard-setting work."<br>PEFC LV05:2016: "6.1 b) identification of relevant stakeholders, including the disadvantaged and key stakeholders, and identification of constrains of their participation, c) requirements for representation of members and interested stakeholders in the Technical Committee and their balanced representation,"
PEFC LV05:2016: "6.2.2. Public announcement. The Secretariat shall proactively seek participation of the disadvantaged and key Stakeholders. The invitation to disadvantaged and key stakeholders shall be made in understandable format and in a manner that ensures that the information reaches intended recipients, e.g. registered post, e-mail receipt confirmation." | CONFORMS |
|      | YES        | Scheme description 2015: "No disadvantaged stakeholder was identified."<br>Standard revision Technical Committee members + category.doc: Four (4) keystakeholders are mentioned: JSC “Latvia’s State Forests, JSC „Latvijas Finieris”, Latvian Forest Owners’ Association, Riga City Forests. | CONFORMS |
| 5.3  | YES        | PEFC LV05:2016: "5.3. PEFC Latvia secretariat<br>(...) In particular, the secretariat shall be responsible for:<br>(...) e) public announcement of the start of the Standard development process and invitation to stakeholders," | CONFORMS |

The invitation letter for participation in Standard revision of 27 May 2014 was posted to 45 key stakeholders, Annex G lists the 45 organisations invited to participate in the Standard revision..
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Conforms</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.2.2. Public announcement. The start of the process of Standard development and/or revision shall be announced on PEFC Latvia website and in suitable media as appropriate to afford stakeholders an opportunity for meaningful contributions. The announcement shall include: | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "6.2.2. Public announcement. The start of the process of Standard development and/or revision shall be announced on PEFC Latvia website and in suitable media as appropriate to afford stakeholders an opportunity for meaningful contributions. The announcement shall include:

a) information about the objectives, scope and the steps of the standard-setting process and its timetable,

b) information about opportunities for stakeholders to participate in the process,

c) an invitation to stakeholders to nominate their representatives to the Technical Committee,

d) an invitation to comment on the scope and the standard-setting process, and

e) reference to publicly available standard-setting procedures available on PEFC Latvia website.

The Secretariat shall proactively seek participation of the disadvantaged and key stakeholders. The invitation to disadvantaged and key stakeholders shall be made in understandable format and in a manner that ensures that the information reaches intended recipients, e.g. registered post, e-mail receipt confirmation. Secretariat shall make the standard-setting procedures publicly available on PEFC Latvia webpage and review it based on comments received from the public announcement.”

Conforms |

5.3 The announcement and invitation shall include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Conforms</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a) information about the objectives, scope and the steps of the standard-setting process and its timetable, | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "6.2.2. Public announcement. The start of the process of Standard development and/or revision shall be announced on PEFC Latvia website and in suitable media as appropriate to afford stakeholders an opportunity for meaningful contributions. The announcement shall include:

a) information about the objectives, scope and the steps of the standard-setting process and its timetable,

b) information about opportunities for stakeholders to participate in the process,

c) an invitation to stakeholders to nominate their representatives to the Technical Committee,

d) an invitation to comment on the scope and the standard-setting process, and

e) reference to publicly available standard-setting procedures available on PEFC Latvia website.

The Secretariat shall proactively seek participation of the disadvantaged and key stakeholders. The invitation to disadvantaged and key stakeholders shall be made in understandable format and in a manner that ensures that the information reaches intended recipients, e.g. registered post, e-mail receipt confirmation. Secretariat shall make the standard-setting procedures publicly available on PEFC Latvia webpage and review it based on comments received from the public announcement.”

Conforms |

The announcement can be found on the PEFC website: [http://www.pefc.lv/jaunumi-un-media/jaunumu/199-pefc-mezu-apsaimniekosanas-sertifikacias-standarta-latvijai-parskatīšana](http://www.pefc.lv/jaunumi-un-media/jaunumu/199-pefc-mezu-apsaimniekosanas-sertifikacias-standarta-latvijai-parskatīšana). Furthermore, 45 stakeholders received a letter by post and email. However, no announcement was made via the newspapers, social media, or mass media.

Comment by PEFC Latvia: According media definition e-mail is electronic media ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Media_%28communication%29#Electronic_media](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Media_%28communication%29#Electronic_media)). In Latvia they are more than 700 newsletters ([https://abone.pasts.lv/lv/latvijas_preses_izdevumi/page_0](https://abone.pasts.lv/lv/latvijas_preses_izdevumi/page_0)) and our decision was not the formal announcement publication in any of these newsletters, but personal 45 stakeholder invitation via e-mail and post (in additional to the information/press release in PEFC Latvia webpage).

The announcement was available on the Latvian PEFC website and 45 stakeholders received a personal invite by email.

Conforms |
The url does contain the PEFC LV.

English translation:
“PEFC Latvia plans to launch the review of PEFC forest management certification standard for Latvia in June 2014.
The PEFC forest management certification standard for Latvia and the rest of the PEFC Latvian scheme documentation is available on the "Latvian PEFC Council" website, in the section "Documentation" - http://www.pefc.lv/dokumentacija/.

English translation:
“The PEFC Latvian Council invites you to participate in the review of the Latvian PEFC forest management certification standard.
If you are interested to participate in the review of the Latvian PEFC forest management certification standard, please inform us by sending an email with information about your organization until the 30th of June 2014 - aiga.grasmane@pefc.lv or in writing to the address - Republikas laukums 2, Rīga, LV-1010" CONFORMS |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEFC LV05:2016: &quot; 6.2.2. Public announcement&lt;br&gt;The start of the process of Standard development and/or revision shall be announced on PEFC Latvia website and in suitable media as appropriate to afford stakeholders an opportunity for meaningful contributions. The announcement shall include: &quot; (...) &quot;c) an invitation to stakeholders to nominate their representatives to the Technical Committee. &quot;(...) &quot;The Secretariat shall proactively seek participation of the disadvantaged and key Stakeholders. The invitation to disadvantaged and key stakeholders shall be made in understandable format and in a manner that ensures that the information reaches intended recipients, e.g. registered post, e-mail receipt confirmation.&quot; CONFORMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Description 2015: “The invitation letter for participation in Standard revision in May 27 was posted to 45 key stakeholders, which also was informed electronically to their e-mail addresses.” CONFORMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEFC LV05:2016: &quot; 6.2.2. Public announcement&lt;br&gt;The start of the process of Standard development and/or revision shall be announced on PEFC Latvia website and in suitable media as appropriate to afford stakeholders an opportunity for meaningful contributions. The announcement shall include: &quot; (...) &quot;d) an invitation to comment on the scope and the standard-setting process,&quot; CONFORMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| e) reference to publicly available standard-setting procedures. | Procedures | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "6.2.2. Public announcement
The start of the process of Standard development and/or revision shall be announced on PEFC Latvia website and in suitable media as appropriate to afford stakeholders an opportunity for meaningful contributions. The announcement shall include: " (...) "e) reference to publicly available standard-setting procedures available on PEFC Latvia website." | CONFORMS |
| 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 | PEFC LV05:2016: "6.2.3. Establishment of Technical Committee
The invitation to stakeholders to nominate their representatives to the Technical Committee is done as part of the announcement. The nominations are collected by the Secretariat. The Council shall be responsible for the acceptance or refusal of the nominations for establishing the Technical Committee or adjusting already existing Technical Committee based on the received nominations. The acceptance and refusal of nominations shall be justifiable in relation to the requirements for balanced representation of the Technical Committee and resources available for the standard-setting. The Secretariat shall inform the members of the Technical Committee of their acceptance. "
PEFC LV05:2016: "5.4. Technical Committee
Technical Committee shall be established by the Council on the basis of nominations received. The Technical Committee composition shall provide for balanced representation and decision-making by stakeholder categories relevant to subject matter and scope of the Standard, where single concerned interest shall not dominate nor should be dominated in the process.
The Technical Committee shall include stakeholders with expertise relevant to the subject matter of the specific Standard, those who are materially affected by the Standard and those that can influence the implementation of the Standard. The Technical Committee shall include representatives nominated by:
- a) PEFC Latvia members,
- b) PEFC Latvia Council,
- c) PEFC Latvia secretariat,
- d) other stakeholder groups.
The materially affected stakeholders shall represent a meaningful segment of the participants.
The members of the Technical Committees are accessible to the materially and directly affected stakeholders. |
through the publicly available contact information on PEFC Latvia web page. Technical Committee members vote for a committee chairman who leads the discussions and authorises correctness and completeness of implementation of adopted decisions into documents. Administration of the Technical Committee activities is provided by the national secretary or by the person authorised by the Council."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>Scheme Description 2015: &quot;In public consultation process was received technical and editorial comments from one certification body. The received comments was discussed in July 22, 2015 Technical Committee meeting, where also participate submitter of comments. All changes to the Standard draft version was recorded, e-mailed to all Council and Technical Committee members and placed in PEFC Latvia website&quot; (<a href="http://www.pefc.lv/images/02_06_2015_KOPSAVILKUMS.pdf">http://www.pefc.lv/images/02_06_2015_KOPSAVILKUMS.pdf</a>) &quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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 all members of the working group/committee,

Proposed document that is available generally for comments or voting within a technical committee."
PEFC LV05:2016: "5.5. Person authorised by the PEFC Latvia Council
The person authorised by the Council is generally an expert in the respective field. His/her role is mainly to elaborate a preparatory/working draft of documents, supply it to the Technical Committee and to participate in the process of comments consideration. The Council can also nominate an external expert (physical person or legal entity) for this position that can either be or not to be a member of the Technical Committee. In case the authorised person is a Technical Committee member he/she can be voted for a position to chair the committee."
PEFC LV05:2016: "6.2. Preparatory stage
6.2.1. Elaboration of preparatory draft of documentation
Either the Secretariat or the person authorised by the Council shall prepare a preparatory draft of the Standard, which shall be supplied to and serve as a working draft for the Technical Committee.
PEFC LV05:2016: "6.3. Development stage
6.3.1. Submitting and consideration of comments
All members of the Technical Committee shall be provided with meaningful opportunities to contribute to the development or revision of the standard and submit comments to the working draft. Comments and views submitted by any member of the Technical Committee, together with the preliminary proposals for their resolutions shall be considered in an open and transparent way. All proposed resolutions and changes to the working draft shall be recorded."
CONFORMS |
In the survey: Everyone agreed on the fact that the organizers provided on time and relevant material to participate in the scheme development and revision. They also agreed on the fact that the development and revision process was well planned and structured."

**CONFORMS**

| Procedures | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "6.3. Development stage
6.3.1. Submitting and consideration of comments
All members of the Technical Committee shall be provided with meaningful opportunities to contribute to the development or revision of the standard and submit comments to the working draft."

**CONFORMS** |

| Process | YES | In the survey: Everyone agreed on the fact that the organizers provided on time and relevant material to participate in the scheme development and revision. They also agreed on the fact that the development and revision process was well planned and structured. All respondents answered "yes" to the question: "In your view, were all interested parties given the possibility to participate and contribute equally to the scheme development and revision"

**CONFORMS** |

| Procedures | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "6.3. Development stage
6.3.1.1 "(...) Comments and views submitted by any member of the Technical Committee, together with the preliminary proposals for their resolutions shall be considered in an open and transparent way. All proposed resolutions and changes to the working draft shall be recorded."

**CONFORMS** |

| Process | YES | In the survey: All respondents agreed that comments and views are considered in an open and transparent way. In Document Nr3.pdf: The minutes of the meetings are presented, where the comments of the members are presented as well as changes in the working draft.

**CONFORMS** |

| Procedures | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "6.4.2. Public consultation
The Secretariat shall organise a public consultation on the enquiry draft. The start and the end of the public consultation shall be announced in a timely manner on PEFC Latvia website and in suitable media."

**CONFORMS** |

| Process | YES | The public consultation for Standard draft version was organized from April 13, 2015 till June 15, 2015.
1) The announcement to the public consultation can be found on the pefc website: http://www.pefc.lv/janumi-
### Final Report for the assessment of the revised Latvian PEFC Certification System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>PEFC LV05:2016: &quot;6.4.2. The invitation of disadvantaged and key stakeholders shall be made in understandable format and ensure that the information reaches its recipient, e.g. registered post, e-mail receipt confirmation.&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Scheme Description 2015: &quot;The Standard and proposal submission form was published in PEFC Latvia website. The invitation letter for participation in public consultation process in April 13 was posted to 45 key stakeholders, which also was informed electronically to their e-mail addresses. Document Nr2: Evidence received of the letters being sent using Post.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) An article on the public consultation can also be found at: http://www.latforin.info/2015/04/14/pefc-mezu-apsaimniekosanas-sertifikacijas-standarta-latvijai-publiska-apspriesana

---

b) the invitation of disadvantaged and key stakeholders shall be made by means that ensure that the information reaches its recipient and is understandable,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>PEFC LV05:2016: &quot;6.4.2. The invitation of disadvantaged and key stakeholders shall be made in understandable format and ensure that the information reaches its recipient, e.g. registered post, e-mail receipt confirmation.&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Scheme Description 2015: &quot;The Standard and proposal submission form was published in PEFC Latvia website. The invitation letter for participation in public consultation process in April 13 was posted to 45 key stakeholders, which also was informed electronically to their e-mail addresses. Document Nr2: Evidence received of the letters being sent using Post.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

c) the enquiry draft is publicly available and accessible,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>PEFC LV05:2016: &quot;6.4.2. The public consultations shall be at least 60 days and the enquiry draft shall be made publicly available and accessible on the PEFC Latvia website and on request.&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pefc.lv/dokumenti-un-materiali/standarti">http://www.pefc.lv/dokumenti-un-materiali/standarti</a> The form to submit comments can be found under link: &quot;Priekšlikumu iesniegšanas forma&quot; The enquiry draft is available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

d) the public consultation is for at least 60 days,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>PEFC LV05:2016: &quot;6.4.2. The public consultations shall be at least 60 days and the enquiry draft shall be made publicly available and accessible on the PEFC Latvia website and on request.&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Scheme Description 2015: The public consultation for Standard draft version was organized from April 13, 2015 till June 15, 2015. &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

e) all comments received are considered by the working group/committee in an objective manner,

| Procedures | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "6.4.2. The received comments together with the preliminary proposals for their resolutions shall be considered in an open and transparent way as set out in chapter 6.3.2. All proposed resolutions and changes to the enquiry draft shall be recorded." PEFC LV05:2016: "6.3.2. Consensus building The decision of the Technical Committee to recommend the working draft for public consultations or final draft for formal approval shall be taken on the basis of a consensus." |

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the survey no comments were provided on the objectivity of the Technical Committee. In the document: <a href="http://www.pefc.lv/images/02_06_2015_KOPSAVILKUMS.pdf">http://www.pefc.lv/images/02_06_2015_KOPSAVILKUMS.pdf</a> the comments received during the public consultation, the interpretation and the final decisions by the Technical Committee are provided.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>PEFC LV05:2016: &quot;6.4.2. A synopsis of received comments compiled from material issues, including the results of their consideration, shall be publicly available on PEFC Latvia website.&quot;</td>
<td>CONFORMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) a synopsis of received comments compiled from material issues, including the results of their consideration, is publicly available, for example on a website.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>PEFC LV05:2016: &quot;6.4.2. A synopsis of received comments compiled from material issues, including the results of their consideration, shall be publicly available on PEFC Latvia website.&quot;</td>
<td>CONFORMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the document: <a href="http://www.pefc.lv/images/02_06_2015_KOPSAVILKUMS.pdf">http://www.pefc.lv/images/02_06_2015_KOPSAVILKUMS.pdf</a> the comments received, the interpretation and the final result are given</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>PEFC LV05:2016: &quot;6.4.2. A synopsis of received comments compiled from material issues, including the results of their consideration, shall be publicly available on PEFC Latvia website.&quot;</td>
<td>CONFORMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>PEFC LV05:2016: &quot;6.4.3. Pilot testing The Secretariat shall organise pilot testing of the new Standard and the results of the pilot testing shall be considered by the Technical Committee.&quot;</td>
<td>CONFORMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable, the standard was only revised.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>PEFC LV05:2016: &quot;6.4.3. Pilot testing The Secretariat shall organise pilot testing of the new Standard and the results of the pilot testing shall be considered by the Technical Committee.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>PEFC LV05:2016: &quot;6.5. Approval stage 6.5.1. Development report The final draft shall be presented for the formal approval together with a development report which provides the following evidence on the process compliance with this document’s procedures: g) evidence on the consensus building, including a summary of submitted and considered comments and their resolution&quot; PEFC LV05:2016: &quot;6.3.2. Consensus building The decision of the Technical Committee to recommend the working draft for public consultations or final draft for formal approval shall be taken on the basis of a consensus.&quot; PEFC LV05:2016: 6.5.2. Formal approval The final draft shall be submitted to the PEFC Latvia General Assembly for the formal approval. Where the final draft has not received a sufficient number of votes to be formally approved, the General Assembly shall decide to: a) return the document to the preparatory or development stage or b) cancel the procedure. &quot;</td>
<td>CONFORMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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 | PEFC LV05:2016: "6.3.2. Consensus building. The decision of the Technical Committee to recommend the working draft for public consultations or final draft for formal approval shall be taken on the basis of a consensus. In order to reach a consensus the Technical 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.,"
CONFORMS | Process | YES | PEFC Council Minimum Requirements Checklist: at checklist Part I, requirement 5.8 it is written that the voting took place during a face-to-face meeting.
The minutes of 22.07.2015 were formal approval was recommended: point 3: “Darba grupa vienbalsi nolemj apstiprinato standarta redakciju nodot apstiprinasanai” in English: “The Working Group unanimously decided to approve the standard version submitted for approval”
CONFORMS |

| b) a telephone conference meeting where there is a verbal yes/no vote, | Procedures | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "6.3.2. b) a telephone conference meeting where there is a verbal yes/no vote,”
CONFORMS | Process | NA | PEFC Council Minimum Requirements Checklist: 8.PEFC Standard and System Requirement Checklist, at checklist Part I, requirement 5.8 is written that the voting took place during a face-to-face meeting. |

| 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 | PEFC LV05:2016: "6.3.2. 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"
CONFORMS | Process | NA | PEFC Council Minimum Requirements Checklist: 8.PEFC Standard and System Requirement Checklist, at checklist Part I, requirement 5.8 is written that the voting took place during a face-to-face meeting. |
### d) combinations thereof.

| Procedures | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "6.3.2. d) combinations thereof."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>PEFC Council Minimum Requirements Checklist: at checklist Part I, requirement 5.8 is written that the voting took place during a face-to-face meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 mechanism(s):

| a) discussion and negotiation on the disputed issue within the working group/committee in order to find a compromise, | Procedures | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "6.3.2. In any case of a negative vote which represents sustained opposition of any important part of the concerned interests to a substantive issue, the issue shall be resolved using the following mechanisms:

a) discussion and negotiation on the disputed issue within the Technical Committee in order to find a compromise,"
| CONFORMS | |
| Process | NA | Scheme description 2015: "There were no any disputes and/or complaints within Scheme revision process." Also, there was no evidence in the stakeholder survey. |

| 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 | PEFC LV05:2016: "6.3.2. b) direct negotiation between the stakeholders submitting the objection and stakeholders with different view on the disputed issue in order to find a compromise,"
| CONFORMS | |
| Process | NA | Scheme description 2015: "There were no any disputes and/or complaints within Scheme revision process." Also no evidence in the survey. |

| c) dispute resolution process. | Procedures | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "6.3.2. c) dispute resolution process. The dispute resolution process is described in point 8."
| PEFC LV05:2016: "8.1. Dispute resolution process

8.1.2. In case if it is requisite for dispute resolution process of any contentious issue or objection raised in developing or reviewing the Standard and/or the Documentation or sections thereof, the disputed subject matter is presented in writing to the Secretariat, indicating also the actions taken to resolve the dispute.

8.1.2. The Secretariat shall without delay:

8.1.2.1. evaluate the submitted information to ensure that it can be verified as accurate and correct through an independent source,

8.1.2.2. if necessary request (in writing) for additional information about disputed subject matter,

8.1.2.3. inform (in writing) in dispute involved parties and Council about receipt and subject of dispute.

8.1.3. The Council shall assign the Arbitral Commission to investigate the dispute. The investigators shall have no |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th></th>
<th>Scheme description 2015: &quot;There were no any disputes and/or complaints within Scheme revision process.&quot; Also no evidence in the survey.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.10 Documentation on the implementation of the standard-setting process shall be made publicly available. | Procedures | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "6.5.1 Development report
The final draft shall be presented for the formal approval together with a development report which provides the following evidence on the process compliance with this document’s procedures: a) scope and clear identification of the issue, b) timetable of the development process, c) information on identification and seeking disadvantaged and key stakeholders and constrains of their participation, d) information on the announcement of the start of the development process and invitation to stakeholders supported by a list of invited stakeholders, e) establishment and composition of Technical Committee, including the list of nominated representatives of stakeholders, f) information on comments on the scope and the Standard setting or review process, g) evidence on the consensus building, including a summary of submitted and considered comments and their resolution, h) information on public or PEFC Latvia members consultations and summary of submitted and considered comments and their resolution, i) results of pilot testing, j) reference to publicly available documentation and procedures, k) a proposal for the transition period. Development report shall be publicly available on the PEFC Latvia website." |

CONFORMS |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No official link to the development document in the PEFC Latvia website identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scheme Description 2015:** "All the records of Scheme revision process are available to any interested parties upon request in Council bureau - Republikas laukums 2, Riga, LV-1010, Latvia."  
**CONFORMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11 The standardising body shall formally approve the standards/normative documents based on evidence of consensus reached by the working group/committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scheme Description 2015:** "There were no any disputes and/or complaints within Scheme revision process." Also no evidence in the survey suggesting disputes or complaints took place.  
**Document Scheme description 2015:** "The Standard revision development report, together with Standard draft version was placed in PEFC Latvia website and submitted to all members of the Council. The Standard was formally approved in Council General Assembly in August 18, 2015."  
**CONFORMS**

---

**PEFC LV05:2016**  
"5.1. PEFC Latvia General Assembly  
The PEFC Latvia General Assembly is the standardizing body, which is responsible for the approval of the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia (Standard). The General Assembly is competent to pass decisions provided two thirds of the Association members are present. A decision of the General Assembly is passed provided no less than two thirds of the voters have voted in the affirmative. Each PEFC Latvia member has one vote.  
PEFC LV05:2016: "5.2. PEFC Latvia Council  
The PEFC Latvia Council (Council) responsibilities within the Standard setting and/or revision process shall be:  
a) review of documents,  
b) approval of proposal of development or revision of Standard,  
c) establishment of Technical Committee, acceptance or refusal of nominated representatives,  
d) authorisation of the person responsible for elaboration of preparatory/working draft.  
The Council is responsible for the approval of the PEFC Latvia documentation (except Standard, which is responsibility of General Assembly). PEFC Latvia documentation as well as any changes in it is approved by an open vote at the Council. The Council is competent to pass decisions provided two thirds of the Council members are present. A decision is passed provided no less than two thirds of the voters have voted in the affirmative".  
PEFC LV05:2016: "6.5.2. Formal approval  
The final draft shall be submitted to the PEFC Latvia General Assembly for the formal approval.  
Where the final draft has not received a sufficient number of votes to be formally approved, the General Assembly shall decide to:  
a) return the document to the preparatory or development stage or  
b) cancel the procedure."  
**CONFORMS**

---

**PEFC LV05:2016**  
"5.1. PEFC Latvia General Assembly  
The PEFC Latvia General Assembly is the standardizing body, which is responsible for the approval of the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia (Standard). The General Assembly is competent to pass decisions provided two thirds of the Association members are present. A decision of the General Assembly is passed provided no less than two thirds of the voters have voted in the affirmative. Each PEFC Latvia member has one vote.  
PEFC LV05:2016: "5.2. PEFC Latvia Council  
The PEFC Latvia Council (Council) responsibilities within the Standard setting and/or revision process shall be:  
a) review of documents,  
b) approval of proposal of development or revision of Standard,  
c) establishment of Technical Committee, acceptance or refusal of nominated representatives,  
d) authorisation of the person responsible for elaboration of preparatory/working draft.  
The Council is responsible for the approval of the PEFC Latvia documentation (except Standard, which is responsibility of General Assembly). PEFC Latvia documentation as well as any changes in it is approved by an open vote at the Council. The Council is competent to pass decisions provided two thirds of the Council members are present. A decision is passed provided no less than two thirds of the voters have voted in the affirmative".  
PEFC LV05:2016: "6.5.2. Formal approval  
The final draft shall be submitted to the PEFC Latvia General Assembly for the formal approval.  
Where the final draft has not received a sufficient number of votes to be formally approved, the General Assembly shall decide to:  
a) return the document to the preparatory or development stage or  
b) cancel the procedure."  
**CONFORMS**
### 5.12 The formally approved standards/normative documents shall be published in a timely manner and made publicly available.

| Procedures | YES | PEFC LV05:2016: "6.6. Publication stage
Within four weeks of the formal approval of the developed standard, the secretariat shall correct any errors in the formally approved standard, and distribute the document amongst its members and make it publicly available at the PEFC Latvia website." |
|---|---|---|

| Process | YES | Document Scheme description 2015: "The Standard revision development report, together with Standard draft version was placed in PEFC Latvia website and submitted to all members of the Council. The Standard was formally approved in Council General Assembly in August 18, 2015."
At the www.PEFC.lv website the following link can be found:
http://www.pefc.lv/images/2.PEFC_FM_standard_2015.pdf (English)
On the PEFC Latvia website a reference is made to the Public Consultation of PEFCC, were the revised standards and other documentation is presented: http://www.pefc.lv/jaunumi-un-media/jaunumu/2015-pefc-latvijas-sistemas-dokumentacija-atverta-sabiedriskai-apspriesanai. |

### 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 | Procedure: PEFC LV05:2016: " 7. Revision of Standard
The Standard shall be reviewed and revised at intervals that do not exceed a five-year period.
The revision shall define the application date and transition date of the revised Standard. 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 Standard, introducing the changes, information dissemination and training.
The transition date shall not exceed a period of one year except in justified exceptional circumstances where the implementation of the revised Standard requires a longer period."
The process of revision of the standard was initiated by the PEFC Council of Latvia on May 27th, 2014 which approved a preparatory draft of the Standard. (document: Nr6.pdf)
The endorsement of the current scheme documentation expires on 31.12.2016 |
|---|---|---|

| 6.2 The revision shall define the application date and transition date of the revised standards/normative documents. | Process | YES | Document Scheme description 2015: ""Transition period for Standard is three months after re-endorsement in PEFC International"
This means the application date is the re-endorsement date of PEFCC. |

| 6.3 The application date shall not | Process | YES | The Standard PEFC LV FMS is approved by PEFC Latvia on 18.08.2015. The standard application date is the re- |
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Document Scheme description 2015: "Transition period for Standard is three months after re-endorsement in PEFC International"

CONFORMS |
15. **PART II: STANDARD AND SYSTEM REQUIREMENT CHECKLIST FOR GROUP FOREST MANAGEMENT CERTIFICATION**

15.1 **Scope (PEFC ST 1002:2010)**

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

15.2 **Checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES / NO*</th>
<th>Reference to system documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a) the group organisation, | YES | PEFC LV04:2016, 5.2.1.5. "Group organisation"  
A group of participants represented by the group entity for the purposes of implementation of the sustainable forest management standard and its certification.  
Note1: The term “group organisation” is equivalent to the term “region” or other terms chosen by the relevant forest certification scheme and complying with the content of this definition.  
Note 2: The relationship between the terms “group organisation”, “group entity” and “participant” is shown in Figure 1." CONFORMS |
| b) the group entity, | YES | PEFC LV04:2016, 5.2.1.2.:"Group entity"  
An entity that represents the participants, with overall responsibility for ensuring the conformity of forest management in the certified area to the sustainable forest management standard and other applicable requirements of the forest certification scheme.  
Note 1: The term “group entity” is equivalent to the term “regional/group applicant”, etc.  
Note 2: The relationship between the terms “group organisation”, “group entity” and “participant” is shown in Figure 1." CONFORMS |
| c) the participant, | YES | PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.1.6.: "Participant"  
A forest owner/manager or other entity covered by the group forest certificate, who has the legal right to manage the forest in a clearly defined forest area, and the ability to implement the requirements of the sustainable forest management standard in that area.  
Note1: The term “ability to implement the requirements of the sustainable forest management standard” requires the entity to have a long-term legal right to manage the forest and would disqualify one-off contractors from becoming participants in group certification.  
Note 2: The relationship between the terms “group organisation”, “group entity” and “participant” is shown in Figure 1." |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) the certified area,</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.1.1.: &quot;Certified area The forest area covered by a group forest certificate representing the sum of forest areas of the participants&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) the group forest certificate, and</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.1.3.: &quot;Group forest certificate A document confirming that the group organisation complies with the requirements of the sustainable forest management standard and other applicable requirements of the forest certification scheme. Note: The term “group forest certificate” is equivalent to the term “regional certificate” or other terms chosen by a relevant forest certification scheme which comply with the content of this definition.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) the document confirming participation in group forest certification.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.1.7.: &quot;Document confirming participation in group forest certification A document issued to an individual participant that refers to the group forest certificate and that confirms the participant as being covered by the scope of the group forest certification.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 is addressed in any other forest management certification that covers the forest owner.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.2., 5.2.4.: &quot;Forest owner group entity responsibilities: - in cases when any of group participants have also any other forest management certification, ensure that nonconformity, identified in any of group participants by additional individual or group forest management audit, is addressed to all group participants. Forest owner group participants obligations: - in cases when group participant have also any other forest management certification, provide to the group entity additional individual or group forest management certification audit report (including all identified nonconformities), within five working days after receiving the report.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.1.3 The forest certification scheme shall define requirements for group forest certification which | YES | PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.2. - 5.2.4.: "Forest owner group entity responsibilities: - ensure forest management planning and forest management conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia to the all group participants, - performing internal audits to all group participants at least once a year, identifying the required improvement and/or preventive
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.

actions to ensure forest management planning and forest management conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia,

Forest owner group participants obligations:
- confirm in written to ensure forest management planning and forest management in accordance with PEFC certification Scheme requirements.

CONFORMS |

| 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. | YES | PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.2.: "Forest owner group entity responsibilities:
- developing the appropriate written procedures for internal audit program and audit for all group participants in accordance with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia,
- performing internal audits to all group participants at least once a year, identifying the required improvement and/or preventive actions to ensure forest management planning and forest management conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia."
CONFORMS |

Functions and responsibilities of the group entity

4.2.1 The forest certification scheme shall define the following requirements for the function and responsibility of the group entity:

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;

PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.2.: "Forest owner group entity responsibilities:
- certification application submission to the Certification Body,
- information provision on group organization certification system to all group participants and interested parties,
- providing all necessary technical assistance and render all documents and materials that are required to carry out audits available for Certification Body,
- applying and receiving from Association “PEFC Latvijas Padome” the rights to use the PEFC logo."
PEFC LV04:2016, point 5.2. “The group entity shall sign written certification agreement with all group participants and submit the certification application to the Certification Body”
PEFC LV02:2016, point 5.1. “The certification process begins with filling the written application from certification applicant or its proxy person and submitting to the Certification Body, together with relevant documentation”, point 5.2. “The Certification Body assesses the submitted application and its possibilities to offer the certification service and sign the contract with certification applicant about certification"
Comment assessor: The forest owner group entity represents the group in contractual relationships with the certification body: submission of certification application to the certification body and when the certification body signs the contract with certification applicant."

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) To provide a commitment on behalf of the whole group organisation to comply with the sustainable forest management standard and other applicable requirements of the forest certification scheme;</td>
<td>YES PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.2.: &quot;Forest owner group entity responsibilities: - ensure forest management planning and forest management conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia to the all group participants.&quot; CONFORMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) To establish written procedures for the management of the group organisation;</td>
<td>YES PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.2.: &quot;Forest owner group entity responsibilities: - developing the appropriate written procedures for: 1) new group participants admission into the group entity and participants excluding from the group entity; 2) informing the Certification Body about new group participants admission into the group entity and participants excluding from the group entity; 3) fulfillment and implementation of the follow-up actions regarding in the certification audit identified nonconformities; 4) internal audit program and audit for all group participants in accordance with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia; 5) settlement of the dispute between group participants and group entity.&quot; CONFORMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) To keep records of:</td>
<td>YES PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.2.: &quot;Forest owner group entity responsibilities: - keeping records, documentations and proofs (including communication about forest management with third parties, all externally or internally identified non compliances and any preventive and/or corrective actions taken) about group entity and participants training, internal audits and conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia for a minimum of five years; - handling the register of the certified forest properties, containing the following information about each forest property: 1) list of the certified properties (name and address of the forest property, total forest are of the property, certified area); 2) list of the attestations of participation, issued to the group participants (attestations of participation number, the issuance date, the expiration date); 3) contact persons of the group participants (name and first name, phone No. e-mail, fax No.); CONFORMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- 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;

4) list of the sign agreements between group entity and group participants (contract number, the signing date, the expiration date);
- performing internal audits to all group participants at least once a year, identifying the required improvement and/or preventive actions to ensure forest management planning and forest management conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia,

CONFORMS |

| e) To establish connections with all participants based on a written agreement which shall include 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 | YES | PEFC LV04:2016, point 5.2. "There must be clearly define the group entity (as separate legal entity) and separate the responsibilities between group entity and all group participants about ensuring the conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia. The group entity shall sign written certification agreement with all group participants": PEFC LV04:2016 5.2.2.: "Forest owner group entity responsibilities:
- clearly define the responsibilities between group entity and all group participants,
- ensure forest management planning and forest management conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia to the all group participants, that includes reviewing the results of the internal audit 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, developing the appropriate written procedures for:
  - new group participants admission into the group entity and participants excluding from the group entity.;
  - fulfillment and implementation of the corrective actions regarding in the certification audit identified nonconformities;"
PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.4. Forest owner group participants obligations
- confirm in written to ensure forest management planning and forest management in accordance with PEFC certification Scheme requirements,"

The right of the group entity to implement and enforce 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 is clearly stated. CONFORMS |
| Management standard; | YES | PEFC LV04:2016: "5.2. Forest owner Group Forest Management certification"
The forest owners or managers can join together and apply for the certification as the group. In Group Forest Management certifications all participants of the group decide achieve and ensure the conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia. There must be clearly define the group entity (as separate legal entity) and separate the responsibilities between group entity and all group participants about ensuring the conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia. The group entity shall sign written certification agreement with all group participants and submit the certification application to the Certification Body."
PEFC LV04:2016 "5.2.1.7. Document confirming participation in group forest certification:
A document issued to an individual participant that refers to the group forest certificate and that confirms the participant as being covered by the scope of the group forest certification."
PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.2.: "Forest owner group entity responsibilities:
- developing the appropriate written procedures for:
  1) new group participants admission into the group entity and participants excluding from the group entity;"
PEFC LV04:2016: "5.2.3. Forest owner group participants rights
- receive the attestations of participation (with reference to the group certificate) from group entity after positive completion of forest owner group PEFC forest management audit (forest owner group comply to the requirements of PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia),
In the responsibilities of the Forest owner group entity (5.2.2) no explicit reference could be found to the agreement mentioned in 5.2 or 5.2.1.7, but reference can be found to procedures written about the participants admission and the participant receiving the attestations of participation. The assessors conclude that based on these points a document to confirm participation is available for each participant and is provided by the Forest owner group entity." |
| 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; | YES | PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.2.: "Forest owner group entity responsibilities;,
- ensure forest management planning and forest management conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia to the all group participants,
- providing all necessary technical assistance and render all documents and materials that are required to carry out audits available for Certification Body.
- information provision on group organization certification system to all group participants and interested parties,
- preparing of publicly available forest management plan or its summary,
- performing internal audits to all group participants at least once a year, identifying the required improvement and/or preventive actions to ensure forest management planning and forest management conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia."
PEFC LV04:2016: "5.2.3. Forest owner group participants rights
- receive information about certification process and forest owners group activities from group entity," |
Although no explicit reference is made to provide guidance to all participants the actions mentioned in PEFC LV04 5.2.2 and 5.2.3 can only be accomplished when guidance or assistance is provided to participants.

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

| CONFORMS | PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.2.: "Forest owner group entity responsibilities: - performing internal audits to all group participants at least once a year, identifying the required improvement and/or preventive actions to ensure forest management planning and forest management conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia." |

### 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.

| CONFORMS | PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.2.: "Forest owner group entity responsibilities: - ensure forest management planning and forest management conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia to the all group participants, that includes reviewing the results of the internal audit 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, - fulfillment and implementation of the corrective actions regarding in the certification audit identified nonconformities; - performing internal audits to all group participants at least once a year, identifying the required improvement and/or preventive actions to ensure forest management planning and forest management conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia." |

### Function and responsibilities of participants

#### 4.3.1 The forest certification scheme shall define the following requirements for the participants:

| YES | PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.4.: "Forest owner group participants obligations - confirm in written to ensure forest management planning and forest management in accordance with PEFC certification Scheme requirements." |

| CONFORMS |
### Final Report for the assessment of the revised Latvian PEFC Certification System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.4.</th>
<th>&quot;Forest owner group participants obligations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- in forest management comply with PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia and take appropriate follow-up actions regarding to the certification findings,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- ensure that forest management comply with PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia also in situations when forest management operations are performed by third parties.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONFORMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.1.2.</th>
<th>&quot;Individual certification applicant obligations: provide access to the forest and other facilities, all necessary technical assistance and render all documents and materials that are required to carry out audits available for Certification Body,&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.3.</td>
<td>&quot;Forest owner group participants rights:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- receive information about certification process and forest owners group activities from group entity,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- receive the attestations of participation (with reference to the group certificate) from group entity after positive completion of forest owner group PEFC forest management audit (forest owner group comply to the requirements of PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- address to the group entity with any objections or complains regarding procedure and/or results of PEFC certification;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 5.2.4. Forest owner group participants obligations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- provide to the group entity access to the forest and other facilities, all necessary documents and materials that are required to ensure forest owner group compliance with PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- provide access to the forest and other facilities, all necessary technical assistance and render all documents and materials that are required to carry out audits available for Certification Body&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONFORMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>PEFC LV05:2016 - 5.2.2.:</th>
<th>&quot;Forest owner group entity responsibilities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- ensure forest management planning and forest management conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia to the all group participants, that includes reviewing the results of the internal audit 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,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- developing the appropriate written procedures for:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- fulfillment and implementation of the corrective actions regarding in the certification audit identified nonconformities; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PEFC LV04:2016 - 5.2.4.:</td>
<td>&quot;Forest owner group participants obligations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- confirm in written to ensure forest management planning and forest management in accordance with PEFC certification Scheme requirements,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- in forest management comply with PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia and take appropriate follow-up actions regarding to the certification findings,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONFORMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment by PEFC Latvia: "relevant corrective and preventive actions established by the group entity are integral part of the PEFC certification findings. In PEFC LV04:2016, point 5.2.4. Forest owner group participants obligations “in forest management comply with PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia and take appropriate follow-up actions regarding to the certification findings” are included also implementation of group entity established corrective and preventive actions."

The assessors agree with the viewpoint of PEFC Latvia. The ‘take appropriate follow-up actions’ implicitly requires the participant to undertake corrective and preventative actions if such are established by the certification body.

CONFORMS |
16. PART III: STANDARD AND SYSTEM REQUIREMENT CHECKLIST FOR SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT

16.1 Scope (PEFC ST 1003:2010)

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

16.2 Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES / NO</th>
<th>Reference to system documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General requirements for SFM standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The requirements for sustainable forest management defined by regional, national or sub-national forest management standards shall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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 | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “Forest holding is the basic unit for PEFC certification (hereinafter Certification) following this Standard. The forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager may divide the holding into individual management units, applying Certification on a per-unit basis or certifying a part of the management units. Single cadastre units in the forest holding cannot be divided. Individual management units are explicitly shown on the maps and are identifiable out in the field. In case the forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager chooses to exclude some units from Certification and certify a part of the holding, this fact ought to be accounted for in forest resource sales in order to meet the requirements of the chain-of-custody certification. The Standard requirements can be implemented and Certification carried out as:
- Certification of individual forest holdings
- Forest owner group certification.
Comment by PEFC Latvia: “
- Legislation in Latvia regulates almost every forestry activity,
- Standard aim is “The PEFC Forest Management Standard for Latvia (hereinafter Standard) specifies the framework and requirements for the sustainability assessment of forest management and confirms the conformity of management practices with the PEFC certifications system’ requirements. Standard sets no minimum levels or limitations for forest management practices and sustainability criteria and indicators. Following the Standard’s criteria and indicators the forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager determines and confirms compliance with the Standard. The conformity assessment is done by an independent Certification Body accredited as provided by the PEFC regulations”.
CONFORMs | |
| b) be clear, objective-based and auditable. | YES | The standard is rather complementary to existing legislation.
The criteria are structured as follows: |
1) Criterion: describes the subject of sub-processes and stages of sustainable forest management, provides essential tools and defines indicators to ensure the improvement of practices and methods for sustainable forest management.

2) Descriptive indicators: Parameters that objectively and clearly describe the subject, no minimum or maximum specified.

Comment by PEFC Latvia:

"Legislation in Latvia regulates almost every forestry activity"

Legislation is very specific on forest practices in Latvia. The minimum and maximum of most specified parameters in the Forest management standard are regulated in the Law on Forest or other regulations.

In depth knowledge of current Latvian legislation is needed when auditing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) apply to activities of all operators in the defined forest area who have a measurable impact on achieving compliance with the requirements.</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PEFC FMS LV:2015 “Scope of Standard
Standard is applicable in the whole territory of Latvia for all forest types, forest holdings and tree plantings regardless of the form of ownership and holding size.
Standard is applicable for all lands which are counted as forestland, i.e. land comprising forest, land under forest infrastructure facilities, including gaps, overflowing clearings and bogs inside and contiguous to forest as well as the lands under forest tree nurseries and tree plantings.” |
This document specify the minimum requirements for forest owners or managers, or forest owner group entities and group participants for Forest Management certification in accordance with PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia and define the certification applicant/certificate holder rights and obligations.” |
| PEFC LV04:2014: “5.1.1. Individual certification applicant rights:
- receive the forest management certificate after positive completion of PEFC forest management audit (certification applicant comply to the requirements of PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia),” |
| PEFC LV04:2014: “5.2.2. Forest owner group entity responsibilities:
- ensure forest management planning and forest management conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia to the all group participants, that includes reviewing the results of the internal audit 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 |
| PEFC LV04:2014: “5.1.2. Individual certification applicant obligations: “keeping records, documentations and proofs (including communication about forest management with third parties, all externally or internally identified non compliances and any preventive and/or corrective actions taken) about forest management, contractors training, internal audits and conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia for a minimum of five years. |
| PEFC LV04:2014: “5.2.2. Forest owner group entity responsibilities: keeping records, documentations and proofs (including communication about forest management with third parties, all externally or internally identified non compliances and any preventive and/or corrective actions taken) about group entity and participants training, internal audits and conformity with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia for a minimum of five years.” |
## 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 support land-use planning and nature conservation.

| YES | PEFC FMS LV:2015 “1.1.1. Forest management planning aims to maintain and/or increase the forest area, and in a system of multiple-goal management preserves and within limits possible enhances the quality of economic, ecological (including soil and water) and social (including cultural) values of forest resources. “
| Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.2.1.8. Forest management is carried out in accordance with all legislation applicable to forest management issues, territorial development (land-use) plans, forest management plans and other forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager internal documents. “ |

#### 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 FMS LV:2015: “1.1.3. Forest management plans, appropriate to the scope and intensity of forest management, are elaborated and periodically updated. Forest management plans shall include relevant descriptive indicators, mentioned in this standard. The forest management plan or its summary is publicly available.

1.1.4. Monitoring of the forest resources’ economic, ecological and social values and evaluation of their management is done on a regular basis. The results of monitoring are reflected in forest management plans and fed back into the planning process.”

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.2.2.4 Existence and capacity of institutional framework to undertake and develop regular assessment of forest resources, if necessary involving research or other competent organizations.”

Law on Forest: “Section 29: (2) It shall be a duty of a forest owner or lawful possessor to perform, in the forests of his ownership or lawful possession, a forest inventory at least once in 10 years, and to submit these materials to the State Forest Service.”

Law on Forest: “Section 31: “A forest management plan shall be developed on the basis of the forest inventory data. A forest owner or lawful possessor shall be entitled to include additional information in the forest management plan.”

Law on Forest: “Section 1 15) forest monitoring – a system of permanent surveillance to evaluate the interaction between the forest and the environment; Section 38.(1) For the evaluation of the interaction between the forest and the environment, forest monitoring shall be performed in all the territory of the State in accordance with the State forest monitoring programme.

(2) Forest monitoring shall be financed from State budget subsidies from general revenue and funds granted by the European Union.
(3) The procedures for the performance of forest monitoring and the State forest monitoring programme shall be determined by the Cabinet.”

Law on Forest: “Section 39. (1) A forest owner or lawful possessor shall obtain a confirmation from the State Forest Service for the following activities:
1) tree felling;
2) construction or reconstruction of land amelioration systems or other buildings, if it may have impact on the forest;
3) road construction for undertakings (forestry);
4) acquisition of forest reproductive material; and
5) use of artificial fertilisers and pesticides in forest land.”

CONFORMS |

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

PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.1.2. There is a forest resources database with the related cartographic material. Information on forest management activities carried out and/or changes in the value of forest resources are recorded in the database.”

PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.2. Terrestrial inventory and mapping of forest resources includes ecologically significant forest areas like protection belts along cities, water bodies and watercourses, sites containing rare and/or protected species, which are included in the list of protected species and habitats in Latvia.”

The frequency inventories in forests take place:

Forest law: “Chapter VIII Information Regarding Forests, and a Forest Management Plan

Section 29. (1) It shall be a duty of a forest owner or lawful possessor to notify the State Forest Service, by 1 February of each year, of the following changes that have occurred in the forest land during the previous year:
1) activities for the performance of which a confirmation was required;
2) forest damage;
3) forest regeneration;
4) afforestation; and
5) maintenance of young growths.

(2) It shall be a duty of a forest owner or lawful possessor to perform, in the forests of his ownership or lawful possession, a forest inventory at least once in 10 years, and to submit these materials to the State Forest Service.”

CONFORMS |

5.1.4 Management plans or their equivalents, appropriate to the size and use of the forest area, shall be elaborated and periodically updated. They shall be based on legislation as well as existing land-use plans, and adequately cover the forest resources also.

YES

PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.1.3. Forest management plans, appropriate to the scope and intensity of forest management, are elaborated and periodically updated. Forest management plans shall include relevant descriptive indicators, mentioned in this standard. The forest management plan or its summary is publicly available.”

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.2.1.8. Forest management is carried out in accordance with all legislation applicable to forest management issues, territorial development (land-use) plans, forest management plans and other forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager internal documents.”

CONFORMS |
| 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 | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.1.3. Forest management plans, appropriate to the scope and intensity of forest management, are elaborated and periodically updated. Forest management plans shall include relevant descriptive indicators, mentioned in this standard. The forest management plan or its summary is publicly available.”

PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.1.2. Forest management planning aims to achieve a stable economic efficiency of forest management, evaluating the potential for developing novel and marketable forest products and services and promoting the related economic activities.”

PEFC FMS LV:2015: “6.1.3. In forest management the public rights to free access to forests are respected with no groundless restrictions for uncommercial utilization of non-wood resources.”

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.2.2. Non-wood products:
3.2.2.1. Total amount of sold non-wood products (e.g. berries, mushrooms, game animals etc.), changes.
3.2.2.2. The approach and/or requirements for commercial non-wood products management are developed and implemented in practice.”

**Current state of the forest**
Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015:

“1.2.1.1. Total forest area managed (ha), changes.
1.2.1.2. Forest and forestland area (ha), changes.
1.2.1.3. Forest area by forest site types (% or ha).
1.2.1.4. Forest area by tree species (% or ha) and age classes (% or ha).
1.2.1.5. Harvested and regenerated forest area by tree species and regeneration method (artificial/natural) (ha), changes.
1.2.1.6. Established forest/plantation forest/tree plantings area (ha), changes.”

**Long term objectives:**
Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015:

“1.2.1.8. Forest management is carried out in accordance with all legislation applicable to forest management issues, territorial development (land-use) plans, forest management plans and other forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager internal documents.
1.2.1.9. Evaluation of the potential for increasing the forest/plantation forest area in agricultural lands.
1.2.1.10. if there are conversion of forests to other types of land use, conversion:
  • shall be done according with the legislation, territorial development (land-use, forest management plans and other forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager internal documents,
  • shall be done according to the impact assessment (makes a contribution to social, economical and environmental (e.g. converted territory is compensated with forest planting in agriculture lands, establishing the new nature protection territories etc.) benefits),
  • does not have negative impacts on ecologically significant forest areas, sites containing rare and/or protected species and special historically or culturally significant forest areas,
  • entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit, with relevant justification.
3.2.1.1. Harvest volume by tree species over past 10 years (m3).
3.2.1.2. Planned harvest volume by tree species in next 10 years (m3)
3.2.1.3. Changes in growing stock over past 10 years (m³/ha) and planned in next 10 years (m³/ha).
3.2.1.4. Annual harvest volume by tree species:
4.1. Main felling t (m³, ha), changes;
4.2. Commercial thinning (m³, ha), changes;
4.3. Sanitary and other cuttings (m³, ha), in past 5 years.
5. Removed residues (branches, stumps) (m³, ha), changes.
6. Pre-commercial thinning (ha), changes.
3.2.1.8. Basic provisions for long-term investments in forest management are worked out.

**Average annual cut:**
Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015
“1.2.2.1. Total growing stock (m³), changes.
1.2.2.2. Average standing volume by tree species and age or diameter classes (m³/ha), changes.
1.2.2.3. Ensuring sustainable forest management, at the same managing forests for standing volume growth and/or quality improvement of forest stands (e. g. tending, pruning).
1.2.2.4. Existence and capacity of institutional framework to undertake and develop regular assessment of forest resources, if necessary involving research or other competent organizations.”

**Exploitation NWFP:**
“3.2.2.1. Total amount of sold non-wood products (e. g. berries, mushrooms, game animals etc.), changes.
3.2.2.2. The approach and/or requirements for commercial non-wood products management are developed and implemented in practice.”

Besides the specific indicators mentioned above, in the standard it is clearly stated (ch 1.1.3) that the management plan shall include relevant descriptive indicators, mentioned in this standard.

**CONFORMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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...</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.1.3. Forest management plans, appropriate to the scope and intensity of forest management, are elaborated and periodically updated. Forest management plans shall include relevant descriptive indicators, mentioned in this standard. The forest management plan or its summary is publicly available.”</td>
<td>CONFORMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
protection of cultural sites or sensitive natural resource features.

5.1.7 Monitoring of forest resources and evaluation of their management shall be periodically performed, and results fed back into the planning process.

| 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 | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.1.4. Monitoring of the forest resources’ economic, ecological and social values and evaluation of their management is done on a regular basis. The results of monitoring are reflected in forest management plans and fed back into the planning process.”

Comment by PEFC Latvia: “As it stated in FMS text “The descriptive indicators are supposed to indicate the changes in the indicator values and dynamics of development at least for a 5-year period before Certification and expected changes for the next 5 years” - it means, that minimum interval for “regular” is one year.

Indicator PEFC FMS LV:2015 1.2.1.1. – 6 “1.2.1.1.Total forest area managed (ha), changes. 1.2.1.2. Forest and forestland area (ha), changes. 1.2.1.3. Forest area by forest site types (% or ha). 1.2.1.4. Forest area by tree species (% or ha) and age classes (% or ha). 1.2.1.5. Harvested and regenerated forest area by tree species and regeneration method (artificial/natural) (ha), changes. 1.2.1.6. Established forest/plantation forest/tree plantings area (ha), changes.”

Comment by PEFC Latvia: “The minimum interval ‘regular’ is one year”.

Law on forest: “Section 29. (1) It shall be a duty of a forest owner or lawful possessor to notify the State Forest Service, by 1 February of each year, of the following changes that have occurred in the forest land during the previous year:
1) activities for the performance of which a confirmation was required;
2) forest damage;
3) forest regeneration;
4) afforestation; and
5) maintenance of young growths.”

CONFORMS |

5.1.8 Responsibilities for sustainable forest management shall be clearly defined and assigned.

| 5.1.8 Responsibilities for sustainable forest management shall be clearly defined and assigned. | YES | PEFC FMS LV:2015:” Operational level guidelines define the objectives and general principles of forest management, which voluntarily practiced by the forest owners, legal possessors or forest managers would ensure sustainable forest management.”

PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.1. Operational level guidelines :
1.1.1. Forest management planning aims to maintain and/or increase the forest area, and in a system of multiple-goal management preserves and within limits possible enhances the quality of economic, ecological (including soil and water) and social (including cultural) values of forest resources.
1.1.2. There is a forest resources database with the related cartographic material. Information on forest management activities carried out and/or changes in the value of forest resources are recorded in the database.
1.1.3. Forest management plans, appropriate to the scope and intensity of forest management, are elaborated and periodically updated. Forest management plans shall include relevant descriptive indicators, mentioned in this standard. The forest management plan or its summary is publicly available.
1.1.4. Monitoring of the forest resources’ economic, ecological and social values and evaluation of their management is done on a regular basis. The results of monitoring are reflected in forest management plans and fed back into the planning process.
1.1.5. Forest management practices safeguard the quantity and quality of forest resources, within limits possible enhancing them in the short and long term
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.1.5. Forest management practices safeguard the quantity and quality of forest resources, within limits possible enhancing them in the short and long term perspective. The harvest volume of and the growth rates are balanced out for a long term perspective. In forest management preference is given to the technologies and techniques that minimize direct or indirect damages to the remaining forest, soils and water resources.” Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.2.1.5. Harvested and regenerated forest area by tree species and regeneration method (artificial/natural) (ha), changes.” CONFORMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.1.6. Appropriate forest management practices (ecologically assessed, economically, silviculturally and scientifically justified for a long-term perspective forest regeneration of high quality, thinning regimes, forest infrastructure maintenance and development) are taken to keep the volume of wood resources on a level that is economically, ecologically and socially desirable, evaluating the possibility to rehabilitate degraded forest ecosystems.” Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.2.2. Growing stock / standing volume 1.2.2.3: Ensuring sustainable forest management, at the same managing forests for standing volume growth and/or quality improvement of forest stands (e. g. tending, pruning).” CONFORMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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:</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.1.1. Forest management planning aims to maintain and/or increase the forest area, and in a system of multiple-goal management preserves and within limits possible enhances the quality of economic, ecological (including soil and water) and social (including cultural) values of forest resources.” Indicator: PEFC FMS LV: 2015: “1.2.1. Forest and forestland management 1.2.1.10 if there are conversion of forests to other types of land use, conversion: - shall be done according with the legislation, territorial development (land-use, forest management plans and other forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager internal documents, - shall be done according to the impact assessment (makes a contribution to social, economical and environmental (e.g. converted territory is compensated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Report for the assessment of the revised Latvian PEFC Certification System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) entails a small proportion of forest type; and</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) does not have negative impacts on threatened (including vulnerable, rare or endangered) forest ecosystems, culturally and socially significant areas, important habitats of threatened species or other protected areas; and</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) makes a contribution to long-term conservation, economic, and social benefits.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

S.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.

5.2.1 Forest management

S.2.1 Forest management

Criterion 2: Maintenance of forest ecosystem health and vitality

5.2.1 Forest management

PEFC FMS LV:2015 “1.1.1. Forest management planning aims to maintain and/or increase the forest area, and in a system of multiple-goal management preserves and within limits possible enhances the quality of economic, ecological (including soil and water) and social (including cultural) values of forest resources. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.2.1. Forest and forestland management

1.2.1.9 Evaluation of the potential for increasing the forest/plantation forest area in agricultural lands.”

CONFORMS
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.

1.1. Operational level guidelines:

1.1.1. Forest management planning aims to maintain and/or increase the forest area, and in a system of multiple-goal management preserves and within limits possible enhances the quality of economic, ecological (including soil and water) and social (including cultural) values of forest resources.

1.1.4. Monitoring of the forest resources’ economic, ecological and social values and evaluation of their management is done on a regular basis. The results of monitoring are reflected in forest management plans and fed back into the planning process.

1.1.5. Forest management practices safeguard the quantity and quality of forest resources, within limits possible enhancing them in the short and long term perspective. The harvest volume of and the growth rates are balanced out for a long term perspective. In forest management preference is given to the technologies and techniques that minimize direct or indirect damages to the remaining forest, soils and water resources.

1.1.6. Appropriate forest management practices (ecologically assessed, economically, silviculturally and scientifically justified for a long-term perspective forest regeneration of high quality, thinning regimes, forest infrastructure maintenance and development) are taken to keep the volume of wood resources on a level that is economically, ecologically and socially desirable, evaluating the possibility to rehabilitate degraded forest ecosystems.

1.2. Descriptive indicators:

1.2.1. Forest and forestland management:
1. Total forest area managed (ha), changes.
2. Forest and forestland area (ha), changes.
3. Forest area by forest site types (% or ha).
4. Forest area by tree species (% or ha) and age classes (% or ha).
5. Harvested and regenerated forest area by tree species and regeneration method (artificial/natural) (ha), changes.
6. Established forest/plantation forest/tree plantings area (ha), changes.
7. Availability of documents which confirm the property/management rights.
8. Forest management is carried out in accordance with all legislation applicable to forest management issues, territorial development (land-use) plans, forest management plans and other forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager internal documents.
9. Evaluation of the potential for increasing the forest/plantation forest area in agricultural lands.
10. If there are conversion of forests to other types of land use, conversion:
   - shall be done according with the legislation, territorial development (land-use, forest management plans and other forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager internal documents,
   - shall be done according to the impact assessment (makes a contribution to social, economical and environmental (e.g. conversed territory is compensated with forest planting in agriculture lands, establishing the new nature protection territories etc.) benefits),
   - does not have negative impacts on ecologically significant forest areas, sites containing rare and/or protected species and special historically or culturally significant forest areas,
   - entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit, with relevant justification.

1.2.2. Growing stock / standing volume:
1. Total growing stock (m3), changes.
2. Average standing volume by tree species and age or diameter classes (m3/ha), changes.
3. Ensuring sustainable forest management, at the same managing forests for standing volume growth and/or quality improvement of forest stands (e.g. tending, pruning).
4. Existence and capacity of institutional framework to undertake and develop regular assessment of forest resources, if necessary involving research or other
competent organizations.

1.2.3. Carbon cycle:
1. Average carbon storage in forest stands (determined according to Latvia’s national greenhouse gas emission inventory methodology) (t C). Methodology is available for download on www.pefc.lv.

PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.1.1. Identification of high risk factors (e. g. potential damage of various forest pests, pathogenic fungi, wildlife, forest fires, extreme meteorological and climatic factors, including damage caused by negative impact of forestry hardware or technologies) for enhancing forest ecosystem health and vitality, appropriate system to monitor and reduce these risks is in place. ”

PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.1.2. To ensure forest health and vitality biological measures are planned and implemented within economic feasibility limits.
2.1.3. Identification of high risk factors (e. g. potential damage of various forest pests, pathogenic fungi, wildlife, forest fires, extreme meteorological and climatic factors, including damage caused by negative impact of forestry hardware or technologies) for enhancing forest ecosystem health and vitality, appropriate system to monitor and reduce these risks is in place.
2.1.4. To avoid or reduce the damages from identified risk factors to forest stands and forest infrastructure objects appropriate activities are planned and implemented within limits possible “

CONFORMS | YES

| 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. | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.1.3. Identification of high risk factors (e. g. potential damage of various forest pests, pathogenic fungi, wildlife, forest fires, extreme meteorological and climatic factors, including damage caused by negative impact of forestry hardware or technologies) for enhancing forest ecosystem health and vitality, appropriate system to monitor and reduce these risks is in place. ”

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.2.1. Hazards of biotic risk factors:
1. Forest area covered by pest control activities (e. g. spruce bark beetle Ips typographus, large pine weevil Hylobius abietis, European pine sawfly Neodiprion sertifer ) (ha), in past 5 years.
2. Volume harvested as a result of pest damages (m³ and/or ha), in past 5 years.
3. Forest areas where management activities for protection against fungal diseases are carried out (ha), in past 5 years.
4. Volume harvested as a result of fungi damages (m³ and/or ha), in past 5 years.
5. Forest stands where management activities for protection against wildlife damage are carried out (ha), in past 5 years.
6. Volume harvested as a result of wildlife damage (m³ and/or ha), in past 5 years.
7. Other forest damages (m³ and/or ha), in past 5 years.
8. Use of the national research and/or monitoring data on forest health and vitality in forest management planning and forestry practices.
9. Procedures are in place for identifying, controlling and eliminating the damages caused by biotic risk factors. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.2.2. Hazards of abiotic risk factors:
1. Forest area affected by fire (ha), in past 5 years.
2. Forest area and harvest volumes in salvage operations as a result of wind and/or snow damages (ha and/or m³), in past 5 years.
3. Other forest damages (m³ and/or ha), in past 5 years.
4. Procedures are in place for identifying, controlling and eliminating the damages caused by abiotic risk factors. “

For the hazards of biotic and abiotic risk factors a period of the past 5 years is defined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.1.2. To ensure forest health and vitality biological measures are planned and implemented within economic feasibility limits. 2.1.3. Identification of high risk factors (e.g. potential damage of various forest pests, pathogenic fungi, wildlife, forest fires, extreme meteorological and climatic factors, including damage caused by negative impact of forestry hardware or technologies) for enhancing forest ecosystem health and vitality, appropriate system to monitor and reduce these risks is in place. 2.1.4. To avoid or reduce the damages from identified risk factors to forest stands and forest infrastructure objects appropriate activities are planned and implemented within limits possible.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015: DI 2.2.1.1. – 9. “2.2.1.1. Forest area covered by pest control activities (e.g. spruce bark beetle Ips typographus, large pine weevil Hyllobius abietis, European pine sawfly Neodiprion sertifer) (ha), in past 5 years. 2.2.1.2. Volume harvested as a result of pest damages (m³ and/or ha), in past 5 years. 2.2.1.3. Forest areas where management activities for protection against fungal diseases are carried out (ha), in past 5 years. 2.2.1.4. Volume harvested as a result of fungi damages (m³ and/or ha), in past 5 years. 2.2.1.5. Forest stands where management activities for protection against wildlife damage are carried out (ha), in past 5 years. 2.2.1.6. Volume harvested as a result of wildlife damage (m³ and/or ha), in past 5 years. 2.2.1.7. Other forest damages (m³ and/or ha), in past 5 years. 2.2.1.8. Use of the national research and/or monitoring data on forest health and vitality in forest management planning and forestry practices. 2.2.1.9. Procedures are in place for identifying, controlling and eliminating the damages caused by biotic risk factors.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015: DI 2.2.2.1. – 4. “2.2.2.1. Forest area affected by fire (ha), in past 5 years. 2.2.2.2. Forest area and harvest volumes in salvage operations as a result of wind and/or snow damages (ha and/or m³), in past 5 years. 2.2.2.3. Other forest damages (m³ and/or ha), in past 5 years. 2.2.2.4. Procedures are in place for identifying, controlling and eliminating the damages caused by abiotic risk factors.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law on Forests: “Section 29. (1) It shall be a duty of a forest owner or lawful possessor to notify the State Forest Service, by 1 February of each year, of the following changes that have occurred in the forest land during the previous year: 1) activities for the performance of which a confirmation was required; 2) forest damage; 3) forest regeneration; 4) afforestation; and 5) maintenance of young growths. (2) It shall be a duty of a forest owner or lawful possessor to perform, in the forests of his ownership or lawful possession, a forest inventory at least once in 10 years, and to submit these materials to the State Forest Service.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monitoring the indicators above will fulfill the requirement furthermore if changes occur the forest owners are required to notify the State Forest Service.

CONFORMS |
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 | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.1.3. Forest management plans, appropriate to the scope and intensity of forest management, are elaborated and periodically updated. Forest management plans shall include relevant descriptive indicators, mentioned in this standard. The forest management plan or its summary is publicly available. “ |
|     | Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.2.1. Forest and forestland management. 1.2.1.8. Forest management is carried out in accordance with all legislation applicable to forest management issues, territorial development (land-use) plans, forest management plans and other forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager internal documents. “ |
|     | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.1.2. To ensure forest health and vitality biological measures are planned and implemented within economic feasibility limits. 2.1.3. Identification of high risk factors (e. g. potential damage of various forest pests, pathogenic fungi, wildlife, forest fires, extreme meteorological and climatic factors, including damage caused by negative impact of forestry hardware or technologies) for enhancing forest ecosystem health and vitality, appropriate system to monitor and reduce these risks is in place. 2.1.4. To avoid or reduce the damages from identified risk factors to forest stands and forest infrastructure objects. “ |
|     | Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.2.1. Hazards of biotic risk factors: 2.2.1.8. Use of the national research and/or monitoring data on forest health and vitality in forest management planning and forestry practices. 2.2.1.9. Procedures are in place for identifying, controlling and eliminating the damages caused by biotic risk factors.” |
|     | In Latvia, the State Register of Forests (SRF) manages a forest resources database, which includes related cartographic material. Information on forest management activities carried out and/or changes in the characteristics of the forest resources are recorded in this database. The policy instrument: The national research and/or monitoring data on forest health and vitality in forest management planning and forestry practices is being used. **CONFORMS** |

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 forests to adverse environmental factors, including strengthening of natural regulation mechanisms.

<p>| YES | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.1.2. To ensure forest health and vitality biological measures are planned and implemented within economic feasibility limits. 2.1.5. Adequate genetic, species and structural diversity is encouraged and/or maintained to enhance the stability, vitality and resistance capacity of forests to adverse environmental factors, including strengthening of natural regulation mechanisms. “ |
|     | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.3. Natural forest regeneration is preferred and promoted in forest sites and areas, where it ensures timely and qualitative forest regeneration. In artificial forest regeneration only certified reproductive material of indigenous tree species of the appropriate provenance region and suitable for the particular forest site is used. Genetically modified trees shall not be used in forest regeneration. 4.1.4. In artificial forest regeneration only certified reproductive material of indigenous tree species of the appropriate provenance region and suitable for the particular forest site is used. Genetically modified trees shall not be used in forest regeneration. “ |
|     | PEFC FMS LV:2015:“4.1.6. In forest management the creation of all-age multispecies stands is promoted, thus reducing the negative impact of external factors.” <strong>CONFORMS</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resistance capacity of the forests to adverse environmental factors and strengthen natural regulation mechanisms.</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **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.** | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.1.12. Lighting of residues (branches, stumps) shall be avoided. Before lighting of residues alternative methods for achieving the desired result are assessed.”  
Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.2.2. Hazards of abiotic risk factors:  
2.2.2.1. Forest area affected by fire (ha), in past 5 years.”  
Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.2.2. Hazards of abiotic risk factors:  
2.2.2.4. Procedures are in place for identifying, controlling and eliminating the damages caused by abiotic risk factors.”  
Comment by PEFC Latvia: “In additional we wish to mention that recreation and restrictions of making fires are strictly regulated by legislation (the Forest law). State Forest Service every year in spring time announce fire hazard period in forest (usually till autumn), when is prohibited any open fires in forests, outside specially arranged places.([http://www.vmmd.gov.lv/valsts-meza-dienests/jaunumi/meza-ugunsnedrosais-periods-sakas-25-aprili?id=4507](http://www.vmmd.gov.lv/valsts-meza-dienests/jaunumi/meza-ugunsnedrosais-periods-sakas-25-aprili?id=4507))”  
Law on forest: “Section 5.  
(2) Access and free movement of natural persons in other forests may be restricted by the owner or the lawful possessor of the forest.  
(3) Upon recommendation of the State Forest Service or an environmental protection institution in the interests of forest fire control, as well as in the interests of specially protected territories and wild plants and animals, a local government may restrict the right of access and free movement of natural persons in a forest.  
Section 6.  
It is an obligation of a person, while staying in a forest, to observe forest fire safety regulations, not to damage forest soil and forest infrastructure, not to pollute the forest with waste, observe the prescribed requirements regarding utilisation of rest areas, not to destroy bird nests and ant hills, and not to otherwise harm wild plants and animals, as well as not to enter the territories specified in Section 5, Paragraphs two and three of this Law.”  
**CONFORMS** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.1.6. Appropriate techniques and technologies are used in forest management to avoid or minimize the damage of retention trees, soil and/or water reservoirs or watercourses. Appropriate forest regeneration material of adequate provenance regions is used in forest regeneration.  
2.1.7. The spillage of oil or fuel in forest operations (as leakage from machinery or storage reservoirs) or an indiscriminate waste disposal on forest lands and/or waters is strictly avoided.”  
PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.3. Natural forest regeneration is preferred and promoted in forest sites and areas, where it ensures timely and qualitative forest regeneration.  
4.1.4. In artificial forest regeneration only certified reproductive material of indigenous tree species of the appropriate provenance region and suitable for the particular forest site is used. Genetically modified trees shall not be used in forest regeneration.” |
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>PEFC FMS LV:2015:</th>
<th>Conforms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2.8</td>
<td>The use of pesticides shall be minimised and appropriate silvicultural alternatives and other biological measures preferred.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>“2.1.8. The pesticide and herbicide application in forest management is minimized, promoting within limits possible the use in pest control of silvicultural alternatives, environmentally friendly and other biological measures.”</td>
<td>CONFORMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.9</td>
<td>The WHO Type 1A and 1B pesticides and other highly toxic pesticides shall be prohibited, except where no other viable alternative is available.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>“2.1.10. WHO Type 1A and 1B pesticides shall be prohibited in forest management, except where no other viable alternative is available and emergency situation in forest is announced by State Forest Service and if there is permission issued by the State Plant Protection Service.”</td>
<td>CONFORMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.10</td>
<td>Pesticides, such as chlorinated hydrocarbons whose derivates remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use, and any pesticides banned by international agreement, shall be prohibited.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>“2.1.11. Pesticides, such as chlorinated hydrocarbons whose derivates remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use and any pesticides banned by international agreement shall be prohibited.”</td>
<td>CONFORMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.11</td>
<td>The use of pesticides</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>“2.1.9. The use of plant protection agents and/or fertilizers in forests or forest lands in every case is justified and in accordance with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
shall follow the instructions given by the pesticide producer and be implemented with proper equipment and training. producer instructions. Only in Latvia registered plant protection agents shall be used in forest management. Before the use of chemicals alternative (non-chemical) methods for achieving the desired result are assessed and environmental impact (soils, waters) assessment is done.“

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.2.3. Use of plant protection agents and/or fertilizers:
2.2.3.3. Procedures are in place for using and inventorying the stock of plant protection agents and/or fertilizers, using the health protection equipment and training of personnel dealing with the said substances.“

CONFORMS | 5.2.12 Where fertilisers are used, they shall be applied in a controlled manner and with due consideration for the environment.

YES PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.1.9. The use of plant protection agents and/or fertilizers in forests or forest lands in every case is justified and in accordance with producer instructions. Only in Latvia registered plant protection agents shall be used in forest management. Before the use of chemicals alternative (non-chemical) methods for achieving the desired result are assessed and environmental impact (soils, waters) assessment is done. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.2.3. Use of plant protection agents and/or fertilizers:
2.2.3.3. Procedures are in place for using and inventorying the stock of plant protection agents and/or fertilizers, using the health protection equipment and training of personnel dealing with the said substances.“

CONFORMS 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 FMS LV:2015: “3.1.1. Forest management planning and forest management aims to maintain and ensure a long-term availability of a wide range of forests products and social benefits while diversifying the forestry production and intensifying the social functions inherent to forest. “

PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.1.3. In forest management planning different uses and functions of managed forest areas are taken into account, offering the potentially widest range of forest products and services. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.2.1. Wood production:
3.2.1.1. Harvest volume by tree species over past 10 years (m3).
3.2.1.2. Planned harvest volume by tree species in next 10 years (m3)
3.2.1.3. Changes in growing stock over past 10 years (m3/ha) and planned in next 10 years (m3/ha).
3.2.1.7. In forest management planning and forest management the latest research results and practical experience regarding silvicultural methods for improving stands growth are taken into consideration.
3.2.1.8. Basic provisions for long-term investments in forest management are worked out.
3.2.1.9. Employee training system about sustainable forest management is in place. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.2.2. Non-wood products:
3.2.2.1. Total amount of sold non-wood products (e. g. berries, mushrooms, game animals etc.), changes. “
3.2.2.2. The approach and/or requirements for commercial non-wood products management are developed and implemented in practice.

CONFORMS | 5.3.2 Forest management

YES PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.1.2. Forest management planning aims to achieve a stable economic efficiency of forest management, evaluating the potential for
Planning shall aim to achieve sound economic performance taking into 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 | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.1.3. In forest management planning different uses and functions of managed forest areas are taken into account, offering the potentially widest range of forest products and services.”

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.2.1. Wood production:
3.2.1.7. In forest management planning and forest management the latest research results and practical experience regarding silvicultural methods for improving stands growth are taken into consideration.
3.2.1.8. Basic provisions for long-term investments in forest management are worked out.”

CONFORMS |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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 stands and trees as well as to the forest soil, and by using appropriate systems.</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.1.4. Timber harvesting and forest regeneration is appropriately timed and carried out by using adequate forestry hardware and technologies without impairing the productive capacity of the respective site.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.1.6. Appropriate techniques and technologies are used in forest management to avoid or minimize the damage of retention trees, soil and/or water reservoirs or watercourses. Appropriate forest regeneration material of adequate provenance regions is used in forest regeneration.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.3. Natural forest regeneration is preferred and promoted in forest sites and areas, where it ensures timely and qualitative forest regeneration. 4.1.4. In artificial forest regeneration only certified reproductive material of indigenous tree species of the appropriate provenance region and suitable for the particular forest site is used. Genetically modified trees shall not be used in forest regeneration.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.1.5. Wood and non-wood products are utilized on a sustained yield basis with due account for nutrient takeoff and the processes of forest natural regeneration.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.2.1. Wood production: 3.2.1.1. Harvest volume by tree species over past 10 years (m3). 3.2.1.2. Planned harvest volume by tree species in next 10 years (m3) 3.2.1.3. Changes in growing stock over past 10 years (m3/ha) and planned in next 10 years (m3/ha). 3.2.1.4. Annual harvest volume by tree species: 1. Main felling t (m3, ha), changes; 2. Commercial thinning (m3, ha), changes; 3. Sanitary and other cuttings (m3, ha), in past 5 years. 3.2.1.5. Removed residues (branches, stumps) (m3, ha), changes.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.2.2.1. Total amount of sold non-wood products (e.g. berries, mushrooms, game animals etc.), changes. 3.2.2.2. The approach and/or requirements for commercial non-wood products management are developed and implemented in practice.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment by PEFC Latvia: According to the Forest law any person shall have the right to harvest wild berries, fruit, nuts and mushrooms in the forests, unless restricted by the forest owner/holder. In the event of restricting the individuals’ right of access and free movement in the forest, the forest owner/holder shall mark out the restricted-access forest area by visible warning signs (the Forest law).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law on Forest: “Section 5. (1) Natural persons have the right of access and free movement in a State or a local government forest, if regulatory enactments do not specify otherwise. Means of transportation may be used only for moving along forest roads, except in cases when it is permitted to move in the forest also for the purpose of forest management and protection. (2) Access and free movement of natural persons in other forests may be restricted by the owner or the lawful possessor of the forest. (3) Upon recommendation of the State Forest Service or an environmental protection institution in the interests of forest fire control, as well as in the interests...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of specially protected territories and wild plants and animals, a local government may restrict the right of access and free movement of natural persons in a forest.

(4) If the rights of access and free movement of a natural person in a forest are restricted, it shall be an obligation of the forest owner or lawful possessor to demarcate the relevant territory with visible warning notices."

CONFORMS | 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.

YES PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.1.2. Forest management planning aims to achieve a stable economic efficiency of forest management, evaluating the potential for developing novel and marketable forest products and services and promoting the related economic activities. “

PEFC FMS LV:2015: “6.1.3. In forest management the public rights to free access to forests are respected with no groundless restrictions for uncommercial utilization of non-wood resources.”

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.2.2. Non-wood products:
3.2.2.1. Total amount of sold non-wood products (e. g. berries, mushrooms, game animals etc.), changes.
3.2.2.2. The approach and/or requirements for commercial non-wood products management are developed and implemented in practice. “

Fishing regulations N1498:

“2. The rights to angle in the waters of the Republic of Latvia have the natural persons (hereinafter – anglers) who during the angling carry a valid angling card in which the given name, surname and personal identity number is indicated, and a document which allows the identification of the person (given name, surname and personal identity number). In places where licensed angling has been established, a licence shall be required in addition to the angling card.

3. Persons up to the age of 16 and persons over the age of 65, as well as disabled persons are permitted to angle without an angling card. The referred to persons must carry a document with them which allows the identification of the person (given name, surname and personal identity number), but disabled persons aged between 16 and 65 years shall require a disability certificate.

7. Angling in the waters of specially protected nature territories shall take place in accordance with this Regulation and the individual regulations on protection and use of the relevant territories.

9. An angler during angling has the right to use the natural towpath free of charge: along the seacoast – 20 metres, along the coast of private waters – 4 metres, along the coast of other waters – 10 metres.

10. The Ministry of Agriculture shall publish in the newspaper Latvijas Vēstnesis [the official Gazette of the Government of Latvia] the decision on temporary measures for the regulation of angling taken in accordance with the procedures set in the regulatory enactments for fishery, as well as send information regarding the decision taken to the informative publication of the administrative territory in which the relevant waters are located.

The State Environmental service has the duty to perform fish resource supervision and protection”

Hunting law, p2 “(5) The Cabinet of Ministers shall determine the procedure by which the State Forest Service has the right to change the dates of the hunting season for mammals, as well as to impose additional restrictions on hunting in accordance with the status of the animal population, meteorological conditions and the phenological situation.”

Article 22.
(1) The State Forest Service issue hunting permits in accordance with the allowed quota to hunting rights users. The procedure for issue of hunting permits is determined by the Cabinet of Ministers.
(2) (Removed according to regulation 14.06.2007)
(3) (Removed according to regulation 14.06.2007)
(4) Information about the number of hunted animals is submitted to the institution that issued the hunter’s seasonal card or hunting permit within one month after the end of the hunting season for species with unlimited quotas or one month after utilisation of a hunting permit for hunting rights users.
(5) If the requirements specified in Paragraph 4 are not met, new hunting permits and hunter’s seasonal cards are not issued.
(As amended by the regulations 14.06.2007 and 06.20.2013, entered into force on 01.01.2014.)

**Article 23.**

(1) The procedures for payment and amounts of the State fee for hunting licenses, leading hunter licenses, hunting seasonal cards and hunting permits, as well as issuing of hunting permits to foreigners to hunt on Latvian territory shall be determined by the Cabinet of Ministers.
(2) The procedures for export of hunting trophies from Latvia shall be determined by the Cabinet of Ministers.
(3) The procedures for issuing hunting seasonal cards shall be determined by the Cabinet of Ministers.
(As amended by regulations 20.06.2013 and 07.09.2013, entered into force on 01.01.2014. Ref. Article 10 of the Transitional Provisions)

Hunting and fishing are not regulated in Management plans but by state bodies.

| 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 | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.1.6. Adequate infrastructure like forest roads and bridges, are planned, established and maintained to ensure efficient delivery of forest products and services with minimum negative impacts on the environment. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.2.1. Wood production:
3.2.1.8. Basic provisions for long-term investments in forest management are worked out. “

CONFORMS |

| 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. | YES | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.1. Forest management planning and forest management shall aim to maintain, conserve and enhance forest biodiversity on the genetic, species and ecosystem level and, if appropriate, on the landscape level. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: DI 4.2.1.2. – 5. “4.2.1.1. Information on identified protected species and habitats is available. 4.2.1.2. Increasing level of knowledge on forest biodiversity and/or threatened species. 4.2.1.3. In case the respective holding comprises no protection categories under 4.2.1.1 measures are taken to promote forest biodiversity (e. g. retaining old-growth stands well beyond the cutting age). 4.2.1.4. Ensuring protection of protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: DI 4.2.2.7. “Ensuring preservation of standing and fallen deadwood in forests” – |
Comment by PEFC Latvia: “In additional we wish to add that they are more than 140 Laws and Cabinet of Ministers regulations, regarding maintaining, conserving and enhancing biodiversity on forest management (FMS DI 1.2.1.8. “Forest management is carried out in accordance with all legislation applicable to forest management issues, territorial development (land-use) plans, forest management plans and other forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager internal documents”.

Comment by PEFC Latvia: Legislation related to indicator 4.2.2.7. (Regulation on Tree Felling in Forest point 55.) – “if there are standing or fallen deadwood in forests, then in cutting shall be preserved at least four larger standing or fallen deadwood trees, firstly choosing these which diameter in 1,3m height, or in the breaking place which is under 1,3m hight, are bigger than 50 cm.”

**CONFORMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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:</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) protected, rare, sensitive or representative forest ecosystems such as riparian areas and wetland biotopes;</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) areas containing endemic species and habitats of threatened species, as defined in recognised reference lists;</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) endangered or protected genetic in situ resources; and taking into account</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) globally, regionally and nationally significant large landscape areas with natural distribution and abundance of naturally occurring species.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PEFC FMS LV:2015: “CRITERION 4. Maintenance, conservation and appropriate enhancement of biological diversity in forest ecosystems

4.1. Operational level guidelines: 4.1.2. Terrestrial inventory and mapping of forest resources includes ecologically significant forest areas like protection belts along cities, water bodies and watercourses, sites containing rare and/or protected species, which are included in the list of protected species and habitats in Latvia. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.2.1. Protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems:

4.2.1.1. Protected forest areas by protection categories (without management activities, with restricted management activities) (ha, %), in past 5 years int. al.:
1. Forests in national parks (ha),
2. Forests in strict nature reserves (ha),
3. Forests in reserved areas (ha)
4. Forests in nature parks (ha),
5. Forests in protected landscape areas (ha),
6. Forests in biosphere reserves (ha),
7. Forests in nature monuments (ha),
8. Forests in micro-reserves and their buffers zones (ha),
9. Including (1.1. – 1.8) forests in Natura 2000 territories (ha),
10. Forests in water and bog protection zones (ha),
11. Forests in green zones around cities (ha).

4.2.1.2. Information on identified protected species and habitats is available. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.2.1. Protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems:

4.2.1.4. In case the respective holding comprises no protection categories under 4.2.1.1 measures are taken to promote forest biodiversity (e. g. retaining old-growth stands well beyond the cutting age).

4.2.1.5. Ensuring protection of protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems. “

PEFC FMS LV:2015 4.1.1. “Forest management planning and forest management shall aim to maintain, conserve and enhance forest biodiversity on the genetic,
species and ecosystem level and, if appropriate, on the landscape level”

PEFC FMS LV:2015 4.1.7. “Forest infrastructure (roads and drainage systems) are planned, constructed and maintained in a way that minimizes the negative impact and on ecologically significant forest areas as genetic resource forests and the like”

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: 4.2.2.4. “Genetic resource stands by tree species in the forest holding (ha), in past 5 years”

Comment by PEFC Latvia: “Genetic in situ sites and landscape management planning, inventory and mapping are also described in legislation - Regulations for forest management plans (points 4.2., 4.4., 4.6.) and Regulation Forest inventory and Circulation of State Forest Register Information (points 26.4.1., 26.4.13.). In addendum please find Regulations mentioned directly above”

Regulation No 177 (2013) of the Latvian Cabinet of Ministers on “establishment and management of genetic resources forest stands” for identifying, mapping and protection of genetic resources in situ forest stands. “14. In developing a forest management plan in accordance with the regulations for forest management plans, the forest owner or legal possessor shall additionally include a forest genetic resources management plan (hereinafter - the plan). A plan shall also be developed for the forest genetic resource stands which are located in special areas of conservation, which shall be included in the specially protected natural areas conservation plan in addition to existing laws and regulations regarding management of special areas of conservation. It is recommended that a plan be developed for those forest genetic resource stands for which a forest management plan or special conservation area management plan is not being developed.

15. The plan shall include:
15.1. a general description of forest genetic resources, broken down by units, including:
15.1.1. location of forest genetic resources, geographic coordinates, area and - if the plan is being developed for a number of landowners - the land owner;
15.1.2. a short description of the geographical characteristics of the territory (climate, hydrology, soil), which may be given in other sections of the forest management plan or conservation area management plan;
15.1.3. a short description of the forest genetic resource protection and management history and an evaluation of forestry activities;
15.1.4. a forest land plan with marked forest genetic resource boundaries;
15.1. 5. forest inventory data about forest genetic resources;
15.2. an assessment of forest tree species in the forest genetic resources unit, including:
15.2.1. forest stand characteristics, target tree species and long-term goals of the establishment of the forest genetic resource stand;
15.2.2. factors influencing the target tree species, assessment of potential threats and an action plan that provides for any necessary additional measures for the ex situ conservation of the genetic diversity of target species;
15.2.3. a brief summary of forest genetic resource research done in the forest genetic resource stand (if available), indicating references to documentation;
15.3. information on the planned management of forest genetic resources:
15.3.1. management objectives for the period of the management plan;
15.3.2. planned management activities and their description (including forest block number, forest compartment number, area, sequence of activities);
15.3.3. performance indicators for the evaluation of management measures (recommendations for monitoring). "

p. 92
Comment by PEFC Latvia: “Legislation related to landscape areas - The Law on Specially Protected Nature Areas (SPNA) (points 4., 41., 5., 8.), Regulations on the General Protection and Use of Specially Protected Nature Territories. SPNA point 4. - The Law on Gauja National Park; SPNA point 41 - The Law on North Vidzeme Biosphere Reserve; SPNA point 5 – Regulations of nature parks; SPNA point 8 – Regulations of protected landscape areas. And then there are individual Cabinet of Ministers regulations for every protected area mentioned above. “

Law On Specially Protected Nature Territories: “Section 1. Purpose of this Law
1) to lay down the basic principles for a system of specially protected nature territories;
2) to lay down the procedures for the establishment of specially protected nature territories and secure their existence;
3) to lay down the procedures for the administration of specially protected nature territories, for control of the condition of such territories, and for their registration; and
4) to combine State, international, regional and private interests in regard to the establishment, preservation, maintenance and protection of specially protected nature territories

The main arguments can be found in the following documents:

a) Indicator 4.2.1. Protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems:
b) Indicator 4.2.1. Protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems:
c) in situ: In regulation Nr 177.
d) Landscape: in legislation: Law On Specially Protected Nature Territories this is embedded also in indicator 4.2.1

CONFORMS

Different terms are used for “ecologically important areas” that are not defined in the Terms and Definition, Annex 1 and it is not evident from the text when the terms are used in their general meaning or when used with a specific meaning (for example defined by the legislation). E.g. chapter 4.1.2 describes „ecologically significant forest areas”; 4.2.1 has title “Protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems”; 4.2.1-1 requires reporting on “protected areas”.

Comment by PEFC Latvia: “We agree that Nature protection terminology in Latvia is very complicate and changeable. It is the reason why we try to avoid from terminology discrepancy in FMS and legislation.”

| 5.4.3 Protected and endangered plant and 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. | YES | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.2. Terrestrial inventory and mapping of forest resources includes ecologically significant forest areas like protection belts along cities, water bodies and watercourses, sites containing rare and/or protected species, which are included in the list of protected species and habitats in Latvia. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.2.1. Protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems:
4.2.1.2. Information on identified protected species and habitats is available.
4.2.1.3. Increasing level of knowledge on forest biodiversity and/or threatened species.
4.2.1.4. In case the respective holding comprises no protection categories under 4.2.1.1 measures are taken to promote forest biodiversity (e. g. retaining old-growth stands well beyond the cutting age).
4.2.1.5. Ensuring protection of protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.2.1. Forest and forestland management:
### 1.2.1.8. Forest management

Forest management is carried out in accordance with all legislation applicable to forest management issues, territorial development (land-use) plans, forest management plans and other forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager internal documents.

Law On the Conservation of Species and Biotopes “ Section 23. Dead Animals

(1) Any dead mammal or bird of the specially protected species shall be property of the State and shall be handed over to the State agency “Natural History Museum of Latvia”. Stuffed animals created from the referred to mammals or birds shall not be sold or be used otherwise commercially.

Section 12. Prohibited Activities with Plants, Mushrooms and Lichens of the Specially Protected Species

The following activities are prohibited in respect of plants, mushrooms and lichens or the parts thereof in all stages of the development:

1) picking, plucking and uprooting, as well as destruction of the habitats;
2) growing, collection, transport, presenting as a gift, sale or exchange, as well as offering for sale or exchange of plants taken in the wild.”

**CONFORMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.3. Natural forest regeneration is preferred and promoted in forest sites and areas, where it ensures timely and qualitative forest regeneration. 4.1.4. In artificial forest regeneration only certified reproductive material of indigenous tree species of the appropriate provenance region and suitable for the particular forest site is used. Genetically modified trees shall not be used in forest regeneration.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.2.2. Biological diversity in production forests: 4.2.2.6. Maintaining records regarding the sources of origin of forest reproductive material.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law on Forests: “Chapter VI Forest Regeneration and Afforestation Section 21. It is an obligation of a forest owner or lawful possessor: 1) to regenerate a forest stand within a period of three years after the performance of felling (not including the year of felling) or the impact of other factors, if the basal area of the forest stand has become, due to such impact, smaller than the critical basal area. For separate forest site types the Cabinet of Ministers may specify various time periods for forest regeneration; and 2) to ensure tending of the regenerated forest stand. ; Regulations Forest regeneration ; 2. 2. Forest regeneration 2.1. Forest regeneration schedule 4. If the stand basal area has become smaller than the critical basal area due to the impact of felling or other factors, depending on forest type, forest regeneration shall be done within the following timeframes: 4.1. five calendar years after the year of felling or the impact of other factors, in forest types – Cladinoso-callunosa, Vacciniosa, Myrtillosa, Hylacomiosa, Oxalidosa, Aegopodiosa, Callunosa-sphagnosa, Vaccinioso- sphagnosa, Myrtilloso-sphagnosa, Myrtilloso-polytrichosa, Dryopteriosa, Callunosa mel., Vacciniosa mel., Myrtillosa mel., Oxalidosa mel., Vaccinioso turf. mel., Myrtillosa turf. mel., Dryopteriosa-caricosa, Filipendulosa.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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. | YES | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.4. In artificial forest regeneration only certified reproductive material of indigenous tree species of the appropriate provenance region and suitable for the particular forest site is used. Genetically modified trees shall not be used in forest regeneration.
4.1.5. As to forest regeneration by introduced tree species used are only the species whose impact on the growth and distribution of indigenous species is assessed with the procedures for mitigating or excluding negative impacts and the related monitoring in place. “
Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.2.2. Biological diversity in production forests:
4.2.2.6. Maintaining records regarding the sources of origin of forest reproductive material. “ |
| 5.4.6 Afforestation and reforestation activities that contribute to the improvement and restoration of ecological connectivity shall be promoted. | YES | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.3. Natural forest regeneration is preferred and promoted in forest sites and areas, where it ensures timely and qualitative forest regeneration.
4.1.4. In artificial forest regeneration only certified reproductive material of indigenous tree species of the appropriate provenance region and suitable for the particular forest site is used. Genetically modified trees shall not be used in forest regeneration.
4.1.5. As to forest regeneration by introduced tree species used are only the species whose impact on the growth and distribution of indigenous species is assessed with the procedures for mitigating or excluding negative impacts and the related monitoring in place
4.1.6. In forest management the creation of all-age multispecies stands is promoted, thus reducing the negative impact of external factors. “
PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.8. In forest operations retained are undergrowth, standing and fallen dead trees, aged trees, trees with hollows, and trees of rare species (juniper, crab tree), evaluating also their impact on the health, vitality and stability of the future crop stand, including labor safety considerations in forestry.
4.1.9. In forest operations care is taken of watercourses like ditches or brooks, taking the necessary measures to restore them as much as possible close to natural condition. “ |

Forest Regeneration Regulations: “15. Maximum clear-cut felling area:
15.1. five hectares in the forest types Cladinoso-callunosa, Vacciniosa, Myrtillosa, Hylocomiosa, Oxalidosa, Aegopodiosa;
15.2. two hectares in other forest types;
15.3. ten hectares in the forest types Cladinoso-callunosa, Vacciniosa, Myrtillosa, leaving at least 20 pine seed trees (seed producing, viable trees with straight trunks and well-developed crowns) per hectare of the clear-cut area;
15.4. two hectares in Baltic Sea and Gulf of Riga restricted operating zones.
19. Clear-cut fellings are located so that the planned clear-cut felling area and forest stands adjacent to the area where there is in force a certificate or registered application for clear-cut felling do not exceed these Regulations in total.

28. If according to the law, clear-cut fellings are prohibited in a forest stand, selection felling is done as follows:

- **28.1.** In forest types Cladinoso-callunosa, Vacciniosa, Myrtillosa, Callunosa-sphagnosa, Vaccinioso-sphagnosa, Callunosa mel., Callunosa turf. mel., Vacciniosa mel., Vacciniosa turf. mel., Hylocomiosa:
  - **28.1.1.** if at least 1000, at least one metre high next generation of pine trees are growing under the stand canopy per hectare of felling, the stand basal area shall not be reduced below the critical basal area;
  - **28.1.2.** if stand under canopy does not meet the provisions of sub-paragraph 28.1.1. regarding the next generation of trees, the stand basal area shall not be reduced below the critical basal area, multiplied by a factor of 1.5;
- **28.2.** in other cases, the stand basal area shall not be reduced below the critical basal area, multiplied by a factor of 1.5;
- **28.3.** to promote forest regeneration and to provide sunlight for the next generation of trees, openings in the stand shall be formed where possible.

**FOREST MANAGEMENT PLAN** regulations:

- **4.** The plan must be accompanied by:
  - **4.1.** forest land plan;
  - **4.2.** cartographic material of specially protected nature territories, micro-reserves, specially protected habitats, specially protected species habitats, forest genetic resource stands and cultural monuments registered in State maintained information systems;
  - **4.3.** cartographic material of areas of natural and cultural value defined by the forest manager;
  - **4.4.** cartographic material of those areas designated for recreation and environmental reference designated as public spaces (forest parks, recreation areas near water bodies and natural objects) in territorial development planning documents;
  - **4.5.** cartographic material of forestry management activities (main and thinning fellings – including volume) are only required in State and local municipality plans;
  - **4.6.** cartographic material of location of landscape felling, including volume, specifying the planned perspectives and view points.

**CONFORMS |**

| **5.4.7 Genetically-modified trees shall not be used.** | **YES** | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.4. In artificial forest regeneration only certified reproductive material of indigenous tree species of the appropriate provenance region and suitable for the particular forest site is used. Genetically modified trees shall not be used in forest regeneration. “ |
| **Indicator:** PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.2.2. Biological diversity in production forests: 4.2.2.6. Maintaining records regarding the sources of origin of forest reproductive material. “ | **CONFORMS |** |

<p>| <strong>5.4.8 Forest management practices shall, where appropriate, promote a diversity of both horizontal and vertical structures such as uneven-aged stands and</strong> | <strong>YES</strong> | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.6. In forest management the creation of all-age multispecies stands is promoted, thus reducing the negative impact of external factors.” PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.1. Forest management planning and forest management aims to maintain, conserve and enhance forest biodiversity on the genetic, species and ecosystem level and, if appropriate, on the landscape level. “ PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.4. In artificial forest regeneration only certified reproductive material of indigenous tree species of the appropriate provenance region and suitable for the particular forest site is used. Genetically modified trees shall not be used in forest regeneration. “ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>PEFC FMS LV:2015</th>
<th>Comment by PEFC Latvia:</th>
<th>Legislation Related to Specific Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.4.9</td>
<td>Traditional management systems that have created valuable ecosystems, such as coppice, on appropriate sites shall be supported, when economically feasible.</td>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.8. In forest operations retained are undergrowth, standing and fallen dead trees, aged trees, trees with hollows, and trees of rare species (juniper, crab tree), evaluating also their impact on the health, vitality and stability of the future crop stand, including labor safety considerations in forestry. “</td>
<td>Comment by PEFC Latvia: In Latvia there are no traditional management systems that economically feasible have created “valuable ecosystems” According terminology in Latvia is Forest ecosystem. Forest ecosystem is not divided in valuable or worthless. “ Besides the criteria/indicators mentioned above the following legislation relates to this specific topic: Law On the Conservation of Species and Biotopes, Law on Specially Protected Nature Territories, Regulations for Microreserve Establishment, Protection and Management and Regulations on the General Protection and Use of Specially Protected Nature Territories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.10</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.6. In forest management the creation of all-age multispecies stands is promoted, thus reducing the negative impact of external factors. “</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.11</td>
<td>Infrastructure shall be planned and constructed in a way that minimises damage</td>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.7. Forest infrastructure (roads and drainage systems) shall be planned, constructed and maintained in a way that minimizes the negative impact and on ecologically significant forest areas as genetic resource forests and the like.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 5: Maintenance and appropriate enhancement of protective functions in forest management (notably soil and water)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5.1 Forest management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.2.1. Protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems:
4.2.1.3. Increasing level of knowledge on forest biodiversity and/or threatened species. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: 1.2.1.10 “If there are conversion of forests to other types of land use, conversion:
• shall be done according with the legislation, territorial development (land-use, forest management plans and other forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager internal documents,
• shall be done according to the impact assessment (makes a contribution to social, economical and environmental (e.g. conversed territory is compensated with forest planting in agriculture lands, establishing the new nature protection territories etc.) benefits,
• does not have negative impacts on ecologically significant forest areas, sites containing rare and/or protected species and special historically or culturally significant forest areas,
• entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit, with relevant justification”

Comment by PEFC Latvia: “Legislation relating this specific topic: Law on Environmental Impact Assessment and Regulations on the General Protection and Use of Specially Protected Nature Territories.”

CONFORMS |

5.4.12 With due regard to management objectives, measures shall be taken to balance the pressure of animal populations and grazing on forest regeneration and growth as well as on biodiversity.

YES | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.1.3. Identification of high risk factors (e. g. potential damage of various forest pests, pathogenic fungi, wildlife, forest fires, extreme meteorological and climatic factors, including damage caused by negative impact of forestry hardware or technologies) for enhancing forest ecosystem health and vitality, appropriate system to monitor and reduce these risks is in place. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.2.1. Hazards of biotic risk factors:
2.2.1.5. Forest stands where management activities for protection against wildlife damage are carried out (ha), in past 5 years. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.2.1. Hazards of biotic risk factors:
2.2.1.9. Procedures are in place for identifying, controlling and eliminating the damages caused by biotic risk factors. “

CONFORMS |

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 | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.8. In forest operations retained are undergrowth, standing and fallen dead trees, aged trees, trees with hollows, and trees of rare species (juniper, crab tree), evaluating also their impact on the health, vitality and stability of the future crop stand, including labor safety considerations in forestry. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.2.2. Biological diversity in production forests:
4.2.2.7. Ensuring preservation of standing and fallen deadwood in forests. “

CONFORMS |
Planning shall aim to maintain and enhance protective functions of forests for society, such as the protection of infrastructure, protection from soil erosion, protection of water resources and from adverse impacts of water such as floods or avalanches.

| 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 | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.2. Terrestrial inventory and mapping of forest resources includes ecologically significant forest areas like protection belts along cities, water bodies and watercourses, sites containing rare and/or protected species, which are included in the list of protected species and habitats in Latvia.”
Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.2.1. Protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems:
4.2.1.1. Protected forest areas by protection categories (without management activities, with restricted management activities) (ha, %), in past 5 years int. al.:
4.2.1.1.11. Forests in green zones around cities (ha).”
Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.2.1. Protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems:
4.2.1.5. Ensuring protection of protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems.”
Law on Forests: Section 2: (2) Additional restrictions for the management of specially protected nature territories, micro-reserve, protected zones and specially protected forest areas shall be prescribed by other laws and Cabinet Regulations.
[16 February 2006]
Protection zone law:
“Section 6. Baltic Sea and Gulf of Riga Coastal Protection Zone
(1) The Baltic Sea and Gulf of Riga coastal protection zone has been established in order to decrease the effects of pollution in the Baltic Sea, to preserve the protective functions of the forest, to eliminate the development of erosion processes, to protect the coastal landscapes, to ensure preservation and protection of coastal natural resources, including resources necessary for leisure and tourism and other territories important for society, and the balanced and the continuous utilisation thereof.
Section 7. Surface Water Body Protection Zones
(1) Surface water body protection zones shall be determined for reservoirs, water courses and artificial water bodies, in order to decrease the negative effects of pollution to water ecosystems, to eliminate the development of erosion processes, and to restrict economic activity in the flood zones, as well as to preserve the characteristic landscape of the area.
Section 7. Protection Zones around Marshes
(1) Protection zones around marshes shall be determined in order to preserve biological diversity and to stabilise the regime of humidity in the zone of contiguity (transition) of the forest and marsh.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 8. Protection Zones (Protection Strips) around Cultural Monuments; (1) Protection zones (protection strips) around cultural monuments shall be specified in order to ensure the protection and preservation of cultural monuments, as well as to decrease different kinds of negative effects on immovable cultural monuments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 9. Protection Zones around Water-supply points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10. Protection Zones around Health Resorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 11. Forest Protection Zones of around Cities (1) Forest protection zones around cities shall be specified in order to ensure the necessary conditions for recreational activities and health improvement for the inhabitants of a city, as well as to decrease or compensate the negative effects of cities on the environment.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONFORMS |**

**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.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES PEFC FMS LV:2015: “5.1.2. The forest management on wet soils is done in proper weather condition, by using appropriate silvicultural methods and technologies, within limits possible avoiding the soil damages and water pollution. “</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.2.1. Hazards of biotic risk factors: 2.2.1.5. Forest stands where management activities for protection against wildlife damage are carried out (ha), in past 5 years. 2.2.1.6. Volume harvested as a result of wildlife damage (m3 and/or ha), in past 5 years. “</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.2.1. Hazards of biotic risk factors:: 2.2.1.9. Procedures are in place for identifying, controlling and eliminating the damages caused by biotic risk factors. “</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.9. In forest operations care is taken of watercourses like ditches or brooks, taking the necessary measures to restore them as much as possible close to natural condition. “</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Law on Forests**

Chapter IX, Protection of Nature in a Forest: Section 35

“2) In the management of a forest, it is a duty of a forest owner or lawful possessor to comply with the general requirements of nature protection, in order to: 1) ensure the preservation of the biological diversity of the forest; 2) preserve the ability of the forest to protect the soil from erosion; 3) protect surface water and underground water from pollution; and 4) preserve the essential elements of cultural heritage in the forest.”

**Protection zone law:**

Section 7. Surface Water Body Protection Zones (1) Surface water body protection zones shall be determined for reservoirs, water courses and artificial water bodies, in order to decrease the negative effects of pollution to water ecosystems, to eliminate the development of erosion processes, and to restrict economic activity in the flood zones, as well as to preserve the characteristic landscape of the area.”

“Section 37. Restrictions in Surface Water Body Protection Zones “3) It is prohibited to perform clear-cut in 50 metres wide zones, except cutting trees for the elimination of consequences of emergency situations and for the elimination of consequences of windthrown, windfall and tree breakage by snow, as well as for the renovation and management of flood-lands meadows. If the
Section 39. Restrictions in Protection Zones around Water-supply Points

It is prohibited in the bacteriological protection zone:

- e) to carry out works with impact mechanisms, to throw out and pour out acid and corrosion causing substances, fuel and lubrication material;
- f) to carry out any kind of acquiring of mineral resources, loading and unloading, dredging work, drawing of soil and detonation works;”

Regulation on tree felling: “XI. Environmental protection requirements for tree felling

61. In ravines (water erosion shaped beds at least 15 meters deep and 10 meters wide, with a slope of at least 30 degrees) and forest edges (transition zones from forest to agricultural land, water bodies, marshes, glades or flooded clearings (which are larger than two hectares), the width of which is not less than half of the average stand canopy tree height) partial growth shall be maintained at a level that does not interfere with reforestation, occupational health and safety requirements, as well as establishment of tourist sites and recreation places.

65. Clear cutting is prohibited in:

65.1. forest clumps (forest areas of less than one hectare located at least 500 meters from other forest areas of more than one hectare). Felling trees, undergrowth shall be maintained at a level that does not interfere with reforestation, occupational health and safety requirements, as well as establishment of tourist sites and recreation places;

65.2. stands where the dominant tree species is oak, linden, maple, elm, hornbeam or elm;

65.3. pine forests growing on dry mineral soils in Baltic Sea and Gulf of Riga restricted operating zones (pines comprising more than 80 percent of the stand basal area);

65.4. stands in floodplains of water courses and water bodies – valley areas which are periodically flooded and contain vegetation characteristic of floodplains;

65.5. marsh protection zones;

65.6. lake islands and marsh islands;”

CONFORMS

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.

YES

PEFC FMS LV:2015: “5.1.3. Planning, construction or maintenance of forest infrastructure (drainage systems, roads and bridges) is carried out in a manner that minimizes soil introduction into watercourses, preserving the natural level and functionality of watercourses.”

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “5.2.2. Water protection in forests:

5.2.2.1. Forest areas next to water bodies or water courses are protected and/or managed primarily for water quality protection (ha), changes.

5.2.2.2. In planning forest operations next to water bodies and bogs the potential environmental impact is assessed and the required measures for mitigating it are envisaged.”

PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.2. Terrestrial inventory and mapping of forest resources includes ecologically significant forest areas like protection belts along cities, water bodies and watercourses, sites containing rare and/or protected species, which are included in the list of protected species and habitats in Latvia.”

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.2.1. Protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems:

4.2.1.1. Protected forest areas by protection categories (without management activities, with restricted management activities) (ha, %), in past 5 years int. al.:

1. Forests in national parks (ha),
2. Forests in strict nature reserves (ha),
3. Forests in reserved areas (ha)
4. Forests in nature parks (ha),
5. Forests in protected landscape areas (ha),
6. Forests in biosphere reserves (ha),
7. Forests in nature monuments (ha),
8. Forests in micro-reserves and their buffers zones (ha),
9. Including (1.1. – 1.8) forests in Natura 2000 territories (ha),
10. Forests in water and bog protection zones (ha),
11. Forests in green zones around cities (ha).

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.2.1. Protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems:
4.2.1.5. Ensuring protection of protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems. “

PEFC FMS LV:2015: “2.1.9. The use of plant protection agents and/or fertilizers in forests or forest lands in every case is justified and in accordance with producer instructions. Only in Latvia registered plant protection agents shall be used in forest management. Before the use of chemicals alternative (non-chemical) methods for achieving the desired result are assessed and environmental impact (soils, waters) assessment is done. “

Protection Zone Law:
“Section 9. Protection Zones around Water-supply points
(2) A strict regime shall be determined around the water-supply points, as well as a bacteriological and chemical protection zone. Protection zones shall not be determined for drillings, wells and springs, which are utilised in farms or for acquisition of drinking water by individual users of water (natural persons) for their own needs, if an improvement has been performed and the infiltration of waste water and water pollution have been eliminated. “

YES

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.

PEFC FMS LV:2015: “5.1.3. Planning, construction or maintenance of forest infrastructure (drainage systems, roads and bridges) is carried out in a manner that minimizes soil introduction into watercourses, preserving the natural level and functionality of watercourses. “

Forest Law:
“Section 39. (1) A forest owner or lawful possessor shall obtain a confirmation from the State Forest Service for the following activities:
(…) 2) construction or reconstruction of land amelioration systems or other buildings, if it may have impact on the forest;
3) road construction for undertakings (forestry);”

Section 3
(3) The following shall not be regarded as forest land:
1) State, local government, undertaking and household existing road and railway subdivision zones at the width specified in regulatory enactments if the road or railway crosses the territory of a forest; and
2) existing electrical network and electronic communication network overhead line routes at the width specified in regulatory enactments if the route crosses the territory of a forest”
Environmental impact law: Section 2. "Purpose of this Law
The purpose of this Law is to prevent or reduce the negative impact of the implementation of the intended activities of natural persons and legal persons or of a planning document thereof on the environment."
Section 4. Necessity of Impact Assessment (3) A strategic assessment shall, in accordance with laws and regulations or other provisions, (...) if the relevant planning documents are developed or adopted by the Saeima, the Cabinet, a local government, a State local government authority, another derived public person or another entity which is delegated a State administration task or management of the State property:
1) in the area of agriculture, forestry, (...) and for the planning documents which are related to regional development, land utilisation, territorial planning and include the basic requirements for implementation of the intended activities provided for in Annex 1 or 2 to this Law;
Environmental impact law Annex 1 states the Objects Requiring Impact Assessment.
Environmental impact law Annex 2 Activities Requiring an Initial Assessment

Law on the Protection belts: "Section 2. Subject of this Law
The subject of this Law shall be different types of protection zones, protected areas, and protection strips, which are specified in laws and other regulatory enactments.

Section 3. Purpose of this Law
The purpose of this Law shall be to determine:
1) the types of protection zones and the functions thereof;
2) the basic principles for the establishment of protection zones;
3) the procedures for the maintenance and control of the condition of protection zones; and
4) restrictions of economic activity in protection zones."

Sufficient mechanism in place to insure minimum impact while implementing infrastructure.

| Criterion 6: Maintenance of other socio-economic functions and conditions |
|----|----|
| 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 | YES |

PEFC FMS LV:2015: "6.1.1. Forest management planning and forest management aims to evaluate the multiple socio-economic functions of forests, especially regarding the local employment and regional development. “

CONFORMS |
employment in connection with the socio-economic functions of forests.

5.6.2 Forest management shall promote the long-term health and well-being of communities within or adjacent to the forest management area.

PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.2. Terrestrial inventory and mapping of forest resources includes ecologically significant forest areas like protection belts along cities, water bodies and watercourses, sites containing rare and/or protected species, which are included in the list of protected species and habitats in Latvia. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.2.1. Protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems:
4.2.1.1. Protected forest areas by protection categories (without management activities, with restricted management activities) (ha, %), in past 5 years int. al.:
1. Forests in national parks (ha),
2. Forests in strict nature reserves (ha),
3. Forests in reserved areas (ha)
4. Forests in nature parks (ha),
5. Forests in protected landscape areas (ha),
6. Forests in biosphere reserves (ha),
7. Forests in nature monuments (ha),
8. Forests in micro-reserves and their buffers zones (ha),
9. Including (1.1. – 1.8) forests in Natura 2000 territories (ha),
10. Forests in water and bog protection zones (ha),
11. Forests in green zones around cities (ha). “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.2.1. Protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems: 4.2.1.5. Ensuring protection of protective, rare and representative forest ecosystems. “

PEFC FMS LV:2015: “6.1.1. Forest management planning and forest management aims to evaluate the multiple socio-economic functions of forests, especially regarding the local employment and regional development.
6.1.3: “In forest management the public rights to free access to forests are respected with no groundless restrictions for uncommercial utilization of non-wood resources.
6.1.7. In forest management planning and practical forestry evaluated is a potential for making, by landscaping and species diversification, the respective area attractive for tourism and recreation while avoiding the risks for forest ecosystem stability, health and vitality.”

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “6.2.2. Forest recreational functions:
6.2.2.1. Total number of recreational objects with improved amenities as tourist trails, foot-bridges, etc., changes
6.2.2.2. Number of recreational sites with a potential to cater for a large number of visitors (more than 30 persons), changes
6.2.2.3. Existing system for maintaining the recreational sites.
6.2.2.4. Inorganic waste resulting from forest operations and other activities are regularly collected for recycling. “
## Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “6.2.3. Forest social functions: 6.2.3.6. Existing system for possible impact assessment and possible negative impact reduction to local community, according with the scale of planned activity, when planning the forest management works in populated territories or by the side. “

### 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.

| Yes | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “6.1.2. The property, land tenure and/or resource utilization rights are clearly defined and accordingly documented.”

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.2.1. Forest and forestland management: 1.2.1.7. Availability of documents which confirm the property/management rights.”

PEFC FMS LV:2015 6.1.3. In forest management the public rights to free access to forests are respected with no groundless restrictions for uncommercial utilization of non-wood resources.

Law on forest: “Section 2. (1) The purpose of this Law is to regulate sustainable management of all the forests of Latvia, by guaranteeing equal rights, immunity of ownership rights and independence of economic activity, and determining equal obligations to all forest owners or lawful possessors.”

Law on Forests section 5.

“(1) Natural persons have the right of access and free movement in a State or a local government forest, if regulatory enactments do not specify otherwise. Means of transportation may be used only for moving along forest roads, except in cases when it is permitted to move in the forest also for the purpose of forest management and protection.

(2) Access and free movement of natural persons in other forests may be restricted by the owner or the lawful possessor of the forest.

(3) Upon recommendation of the State Forest Service or an environmental protection institution in the interests of forest fire control, as well as in the interests of specially protected territories and wild plants and animals, a local government may restrict the right of access and free movement of natural persons in a forest.

(4) If the rights of access and free movement of a natural person in a forest are restricted, it shall be an obligation of the forest owner or lawful possessor to demarcate the relevant territory with visible warning notices.

(5) State officials in the performance of service duties, and performers of forest inventories and forest monitoring in the performance of work duties, shall have the right to move in a forest without restrictions, in case of necessity showing his or her service or work document or forest inventory performer registration document.

(6) Restrictions to access and free movement in a forest shall be in effect only if such restrictions conform with the requirements set out in Paragraph four of this Section.”

### 5.6.4 Forest management activities shall be conducted in recognition of the established framework of legal, customary and traditional rights.

| NA | There are no Indigenous Peoples in Latvia

Not applicable
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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015: “6.1.3. In forest management the public rights to free access to forests are respected with no groundless restrictions for uncommercial utilization of non-wood resources. “</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law on Forests: “Section 5. (1) Natural persons have the right of access and free movement in a State or a local government forest, if regulatory enactments do not specify otherwise. Means of transportation may be used only for moving along forest roads, except in cases when it is permitted to move in the forest also for the purpose of forest management and protection. (2) Access and free movement of natural persons in other forests may be restricted by the owner or the lawful possessor of the forest. (3) Upon recommendation of the State Forest Service or an environmental protection institution in the interests of forest fire control, as well as in the interests of specially protected territories and wild plants and animals, a local government may restrict the right of access and free movement of natural persons in a forest. (4) If the rights of access and free movement of a natural person in a forest are restricted, it shall be an obligation of the forest owner or lawful possessor to...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 6. It is an obligation of a person, while staying in a forest, to observe forest fire safety regulations, not to damage forest soil and forest infrastructure, not to pollute the forest with waste, observe the prescribed requirements regarding utilisation of rest areas, not to destroy bird nests and ant hills, and not to otherwise harm wild plants and animals, as well as not to enter the territories specified in Section 5, Paragraphs two and three of this Law."

### 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.

| YES | PEFC FMS LV:2015: "6.1.4. Forest areas of special historical or cultural significance are protected or managed in a way that ensures proper maintenance and protection of that heritage. “
Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “6.2.4. Forest cultural and historical functions:
6.2.4.1. Number of sites of cultural and historical significance changes.
6.2.4.2. Existence of procedures for managing cultural and historical sites. “
CONFORMS | |

### 5.6.7 Forest management operations shall take into account all socio-economic 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.

| PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.6. In forest management the creation of all-age multispecies stands is promoted, thus reducing the negative impact of external factors. “
PEFC FMS LV:2015: “4.1.8. In forest operations retained are undergrowth, standing and fallen dead trees, aged trees, trees with hollows, and trees of rare species (juniper, crab tree), evaluating also their impact on the health, vitality and stability of the future crop stand, including labor safety considerations in forestry. “
Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: 4.2.2. Biological diversity in production forests
1. Proportion of annual area of natural regeneration in relation to the total area regenerated (%), changes.
2. Area of homogenous spruce stands (over 90% of species composition) older then 40 years (ha), changes.
3. Area of stands regenerated/established by introduced tree species (ha), changes.
4. Genetic resource stands by tree species in the forest holding (ha), in past 5 years.
5. Area of forest stands significantly exceeding the accepted age of exploitation by tree species (ha), changes. (...)
7. Ensuring preservation of standing and fallen deadwood in forests.
PEFC FMS LV:2015: “6.1.4. Forest areas of special historical or cultural significance are protected or managed in a way that ensures proper maintenance and protection of that heritage.”
PEFC FMS LV:2015: “6.1.7. In forest management planning and practical forestry evaluated is a potential for making, by landscaping and species diversification, the respective area attractive for tourism and recreation while avoiding the risks for forest ecosystem stability, health and vitality.”
Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: 6.2.2. Forest recreational functions
6.2.2.3. Existing system for maintaining the recreational sites.
CONFORMS |

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>PEFC FMS LV:2015</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.6.8</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>“6.1.6. The personnel and contractors involved in forest, plantation forest and tree plantings management are well-informed and accordingly trained about forest management sustainability criteria and indicators specified in this standard. In training and awareness raising campaigns the staff is instructed on labor safety and the measures are taken to ensure safe work environment.”</td>
<td>Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.2.1. Wood production: 3.2.1.9. Employee training system about sustainable forest management is in place.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.9</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>“6.1.5. For achieving sustainable forest management, in forest management planning and management shall be evaluated the potential for using the long-term justified scientific results and best silvicultural practice.”</td>
<td>Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “6.2.5.1. The information exchange with local people, interest groups and/or NGOs are documented and kept for the last 5 years. 6.2.5.2. The complains and/or proposals for improving forest management practices and/or planning, submitted by general public, interest groups and NGOs, are duly considered and responded constructively. Complains and disputes resolution process shall be in compliance with legislation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.10</td>
<td>Forest management shall provide for effective communication and consultation with local people and other stakeholders relating to sustainable forest management and shall provide appropriate mechanisms for resolving complaints and disputes relating to forest management between forest operators and local people.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>“6.2.3. Forest social functions: 6.2.3.5. Awareness raising and education of general public in forest and environment matters is within possibilities promoted.”</td>
<td>Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “6.2.5.1. The information exchange with local people, interest groups and/or NGOs are documented and kept for the last 5 years. 6.2.5.2. The complains and/or proposals for improving forest management practices and/or planning, submitted by general public, interest groups and NGOs, are duly considered and responded constructively. Complains and disputes resolution process shall be in compliance with legislation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.11</td>
<td>Forestry work shall be planned, organised and</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>“6.1.6. The personnel and contractors involved in forest, plantation forest and tree plantings management are well-informed and accordingly trained about forest management sustainability criteria and indicators specified in this standard. In training and awareness raising campaigns the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

| 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 FMS LV:2015: “6.1.6. The personnel and contractors involved in forest, plantation forest and tree plantings management are well-informed and accordingly trained about forest management sustainability criteria and indicators specified in this standard. In training and awareness raising campaigns the staff is instructed on labor safety and the measures are taken to ensure safe work environment. “

Indicators: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “6.2.3. Forest social functions:
6.2.3.3. Existence of the system of health protection and labor safety.
6.2.3.4. Employee vocational training system is in place. “

CONFORMS| | 5.6.13 Forest management shall comply with fundamental ILO conventions. | YES | Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.2.1. Forest and forestland management:
1.2.1.8. Forest management is carried out in accordance with all legislation applicable to forest management issues, territorial development (land-use) plans, forest management plans and other forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager internal documents. “


CONFORMS| | 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 | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “6.1.5. For achieving sustainable forest management, in forest management planning and management shall be evaluated the potential for using the long-term justified scientific results and best silvicultural practice. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “6.2.1. Forest economic functions:
6.2.1.2. To increase the value of forest, evaluated with a view to long-term perspective is the potential for implementing research results in forest management. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “3.2.1. Wood production:
3.2.1.7. In forest management planning and forest management the latest research results and practical experience regarding silvicultural methods for improving stands growth are taken into consideration. “

Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.2.2. Growing stock / standing volume:
## Criterion 7: Compliance with legal requirements

**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 | Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “1.2.1. Forest and forestland management: 1.2.1.8. Forest management is carried out in accordance with all legislation applicable to forest management issues, territorial development (land-use) plans, forest management plans and other forest owner, legal possessor or forest manager internal documents. “ Comment by PEFC Latvia: “In the forest management standard a legal basis of Standard are included all relevant legislation, mentioned in the PEFC ST 1003:2010 requirement 5.7.1.:  • forest management practices - Law on Forests, Regulation on Tree Felling in Forest, Forest Regeneration Regulations (and others)  • nature and environmental protection - Environmental Protection Law, Nature Protection Regulation in Forest management (and others)  • protected and endangered species - The Law on species and habitat protection, The Law on Specially Protected Nature Areas (and others)  • property, tenure and land-use rights for indigenous people - Not relevant (there are no Indigenous peoples in Latvia)  • health, labour and safety issues - Labour Law, Health Protection Regulations in Forestry  • the payment of royalties and taxes - Labour Law” Comment by PEFC Latvia: “Within Forest management standard revision in the Technical committee we had long discussions about FMS point 1.2.1.8. and is it necessary to incorporate references to the legislation within FMS also in other points. There was reached consensus, that based on very voluminous, detail and often changeable forestry related legislation in Latvia, we will not do it – in case that FMS suddenly not to get in contradiction or discrepancy with legislation.” The list of references to legislation is provided in PEFC FMS LV:2015: p3-5: chapter “Legal basis of Standard”. |
|   | YES | PEFC FMS LV:2015: “6.1.8. Reasonable measures should be taken in forest management to ensure adequate protection of forest territories from illegal or unauthorized activities (illegal logging, constructions etc.) “ Indicator: PEFC FMS LV:2015: “6.2.3. Forest social functions: 6.2.3.7. Immediate action to prevent the damage is taken, when illegal or unauthorized activities are identified. “ |
17. **PART IV: STANDARD AND SYSTEM REQUIREMENT CHECKLIST FOR CERTIFICATION AND ACCREDITATION PROCEDURES**

17.1 **Scope (Annex 6)**

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

17.2 **Checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Reference to PEFC Council PROCEDURES</th>
<th>YES / NO</th>
<th>Reference to scheme documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Certification Bodies | 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 bodies, or in the forest management and are independent of the certified entity? | Annex 6, 3.1 | YES | PEFC LV02:2016: "6. Requirements for Certification Body Certification Bodies are independent and objective third parties (int. al. not involved in the standard setting process as governing or decision making bodies and are independent from certified entity), which has relevant technical competences and competences in implementing the certification procedures, forest management and timber processing, also having good knowledge about PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia and/or PEFC International Standard PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products - Requirements." PEFC LV03:2015: "6. PEFC notification of the Certification Body The Certification Body, which is accredited in accordance with restricted requirements in the point 3 of this document, performing PEFC forest management and/or chain of custody certification in Latvia shall be notified and sign the contract with the Association „PEFC Latvijas Padome“. In order to ensure the independence of Certification Body, in the contract between Association „PEFC Latvijas Padome“ and Certification Body are included such parts:
- administrative conditions (e.g. transfer of information and communication between Association „PEFC Latvijas Padome“ and Certification Body,
- financial conditions (fees imposed on certified entities),
- compliance with requirements for Certification Body accreditation." | CONFORMS |
| Does the scheme documentation require that certification body for forest management certification shall fulfil requirements defined in ISO 17021 or ISO Guide 65? | Annex 6, 3.1 | YES | PEFC LV02:2016: "6.1. Competence of the Certification Body
Certification Bodies, for PEFC certification in Latvia, shall comply with defined requirements:
- LVS EN 17021 „Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems“ – if certification is carried out as management system certification“
PEFC LV03:2016: "5. Accreditation of the Certification Body
Certification Body carrying out forest management or chain of custody certification shall be accredited by the Latvian National Accreditation Bureau (LATAK), or by the European co-operation for Accreditation (EA) or International Accreditation Forum (IAF) members Body:
- for PEFC forest management certification in accordance with:
  - PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia;
- LVS EN 17021 – „Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems“ or LVS EN 45 011 – „General Requirements for bodies operating product certification systems“;“
CONFORMS |
| 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 certification? | Annex 6, 3.1 | YES | PEFC LV02:2016: 6.1: "Certification Body has good knowledge and understanding about PEFC International and PEFC Latvia Scheme documentation." | CONFORMS |
| 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 certification? | Annex 6, 3.2 | YES | PEFC LV02:2016: 7: "7. 7. Requirements for auditors Certification Body in the certification process shall use the competent auditors. The auditors are obligated to have adequate forestry competence, technical expertise and practical competence for Forest Management certification (its economical, social and environmental aspects) and/or chain of custody certification (timber procurement and processing, material flows, trading) (...) The lead forest management auditors shall have: - higher education degree in forestry, biology, geography or management sciences - at least three years practical experience in operation field which is connected with forestry - good knowledge and understanding about PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia, PEFC Council and PEFC Latvia Scheme documentation The lead chain of custody auditors shall have: - higher education degree in engineering, forestry, biology, geography or management sciences - at least three years practical experience in operation field which is connected with forestry or wood industry - good knowledge and understanding about PEFC International Standard PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products - Requirements, PEFC Council and PEFC Latvia Scheme documentation. The auditors shall constantly raise their professional qualification regarding audit procedures, standards and legislation requirements and provide the proof of such rising of the professional qualification." | CONFORMS |
| Does the scheme documentation require that the auditors must fulfil the general criteria of ISO 19011 for Quality Management Systems auditors or for | Annex 6, 3.2 | YES | PEFC LV02:2016: "7. The auditors shall fulfill the general criteria as defined in LVS EN ISO 19011 "Guidelines for quality and/or environmental management systems auditing"." | CONFORMS |
| Environmental Management Systems auditors? | Annex 6, 3.2 | YES | PEFC LV02:2016: "7. The lead forest management auditors shall have:  
- higher education degree in forestry, biology, geography or management sciences  
- at least three years practical experience in operation field which is connected with forestry  
- good knowledge and understanding about PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia, PEFC Council and PEFC Latvia Scheme documentation  
The lead chain of custody auditors shall have:  
- higher education degree in engineering, forestry, biology, geography or management sciences  
- at least three years practical experience in operation field which is connected with forestry or wood industry  
- good knowledge and understanding about PEFC International Standard PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products - Requirements, PEFC Council and PEFC Latvia Scheme documentation.  
The auditors shall constantly raise their professional qualification regarding audit procedures, standards and legislation requirements and provide the proof of such rising of the professional qualification."  
CONFORMS | |
| Does the scheme documentation include additional qualification requirements for auditors carrying out forest management audits? | Annex 6, 3.2 | YES | PEFC LV02:2016: "7. The lead forest management auditors shall have:  
- higher education degree in forestry, biology, geography or management sciences  
- at least three years practical experience in operation field which is connected with forestry  
- good knowledge and understanding about PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia, PEFC Council and PEFC Latvia Scheme documentation  
The lead chain of custody auditors shall have:  
- higher education degree in engineering, forestry, biology, geography or management sciences  
- at least three years practical experience in operation field which is connected with forestry or wood industry  
- good knowledge and understanding about PEFC International Standard PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products - Requirements, PEFC Council and PEFC Latvia Scheme documentation.  
The auditors shall constantly raise their professional qualification regarding audit procedures, standards and legislation requirements and provide the proof of such rising of the professional qualification."  
CONFORMS | |
| Certification procedures | |
| Does the scheme documentation require that certification bodies shall have established internal procedures for forest management certification? | Annex 6, 4 | YES | PEFC LV02:2016: "5. Certification and audit procedures  
The Certification Body shall establish internal procedures for Forest Management and/or Chain of Custody certification in accordance with the PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia and/or PEFC International Standard PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products - Requirements..  
PEFC LV02:2016: "7. The auditors shall constantly raise their professional qualification regarding audit procedures, standards and legislation requirements and provide the proof of such rising of the professional qualification."  
CONFORMS | |
| Does the scheme documentation require that applied certification procedures for forest management certification shall fulfil or be compatible with the requirements defined in ISO 17021 or ISO Guide 65? | Annex 6, 4 | YES | PEFC LV02:2016: "6.1. Competence of the Certification Body  
Certification Bodies, for PEFC certification in Latvia, shall comply with defined requirements:  
ø LVS EN 17021 „Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems“ – if certification is carried out as management system certification  
ø LVS EN 45 011 – „General Requirements for bodies operating product certification systems“ – if certification is carried out as product certification"  
PEFC LV03:2016: "5. Accreditation of the Certification Body  
The Certification Body carrying out forest management or chain of custody certification shall be accredited by the Latvian National Accreditation Bureau (LATAK), or by the European co-operation for Accreditation (EA) or International Accreditation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Annex</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Scheme Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the scheme documentation require that applied auditing procedures shall fulfil or be compatible with the requirements of ISO 19011?</strong></td>
<td>Annex 6, 4</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>PEFC LV02:2016: &quot;Establishes certification procedures shall be in compliance with standard ISO 19011 — Guidelines for quality and/or environmental management systems auditing&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Does the scheme documentation require that certification body shall inform the relevant PEFC National Governing Body about all issued forest management certificates and changes concerning the validity and scope of these certificates?** | Annex 6, 4 | YES    | PEFC LV03:2016: "6.2. Obligations of the PEFC notified Certification Body
The PEFC notified Certification Body shall:
- inform the Association „PEFC Latvijas Padome“ about any changes in connection with quality criteria of the Certification Body (legal status, audit procedures, scope of the accreditation e.t.c.),
- inform the Association „PEFC Latvijas Padome“ about every issued PEFC certificate in Latvia, within timeline of three working days after certificate issue, submitting at least such information:
  - **Individually certified forest properties:**
    - certified company information (total forest area, number of employee, turnover)
    - name of the certified company
    - address of the certified company
    - certified are (ha)
    - contact person of the certified company (name and first name, phone No. e-mail, fax No.)
    - certificate number
    - date of issue of the certificate
    - date of expire of the certificate
  - **Certified forest owner groups:**
    - name of the certified company
    - address of the certified company
    - contact person of the certified forest owner group (name and first name, phone No. e-mail, fax No.)
    - certificate number
    - date of issue of the certificate
<p>|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> Does the scheme documentation require that certification body shall carry out controls of PEFC logo usage if the certified entity is a PEFC logo user?</td>
<td>Annex 6, 4</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> Does a maximum period for surveillance audits defined by the scheme documentation not exceed more than one year?</td>
<td>Annex 6, 4</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.</strong> Does a maximum period for assessment audit not exceed five years for forest management certifications?</td>
<td>Annex 6, 4</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.</strong> Does the scheme</td>
<td>Annex</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Annex</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the scheme documentation include requirements for public availability of certification report summaries?</td>
<td></td>
<td>6, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the scheme documentation include requirements for usage of information from external parties as the audit evidence?</td>
<td>Annex 6, 4</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Question | Annex | Yes/No | PEFC LV03:2016: "The Certification Body request for PEFC notification shall include relevant documents and evidence for conformity to the PEFC Latvia Scheme requirements, including information about:

(…)

- that it has valid accreditation by the Latvian National Accreditation Bureau (LATAK), or by the European co-operation for Accreditation (EA) or International Accreditation Forum (IAF) members organization for PEFC forest management and/or chain of custody certification in Latvia."

| 18. Does the scheme documentation require that certification bodies carrying out forest management certification shall be accredited by a national accreditation body? | Annex 6, 5 | YES | 

| 19. Does the scheme documentation require that an accredited certificate shall bear an accreditation symbol of the relevant accreditation body? | Annex 6, 5 | YES | PEFC LV03:2016: "6.3. Information specifying on PEFC certificates PEFC certificates shall as a minimum contain information about: (…) o accreditation mark of the Certification Body" CONFORMS | 

| 20. Does the 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? | Annex 6, 5 | YES | PEFC LV03:2016: "5. Accreditation of the Certification Body Certification Body carrying out forest management or chain of custody certification shall be accredited by the Latvian National Accreditation Bureau (LATAK), or by the European co-operation for Accreditation (EA) or International Accreditation Forum (IAF) members Body:

- for PEFC forest management certification in accordance with:
  - PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia;
  - LVS EN 17021 – „Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems“ or LVS EN 45 011 – „General Requirements for bodies operating product certification systems“;
- for PEFC chain of custody certification in accordance with:
  - PEFC International Standard PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products – Requirements ;
  - LVS EN 45 011 – „General Requirements for bodies operating product certification systems“.

CONFORMS | 

| 21. Does the scheme documentation require that certification body undertake forest management certification as “accredited certification” based on ISO | Annex 6, 5 | YES | PEFC LV03:2016: "5. Accreditation of the Certification Body Certification Body carrying out forest management or chain of custody certification shall be accredited by the Latvian National Accreditation Bureau (LATAK), or by the European co-operation for Accreditation (EA) or International Accreditation Forum (IAF) members Body:

- for PEFC forest management certification in accordance with:
  - PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia; |
| 17021 or ISO Guide 65 and the relevant forest management standard(s) shall be covered by the accreditation scope? | o LVS EN 17021 – „Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems” or LVS EN 45 011 – „General Requirements for bodies operating product certification systems”;
for PEFC chain of custody certification in accordance with:
o PEFC International Standard PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products – Requirements;
o LVS EN 45 011 – „General Requirements for bodies operating product certification systems”.
CONFORMS |
| --- | --- |
| Does the scheme documentation include a mechanism for PEFC notification of certification bodies? | Annex 6, 6
| PEFC LV03:2016: “6. PEFC notification of the Certification Body
The Certification Body, which is accredited in accordance with restricted requirements in the point 3 of this document, performing PEFC forest management and/or chain of custody certification in Latvia shall be notified and sign the contract with the Association „PEFC Latvijas Padome”. (...) The Certification Body request for PEFC notification shall include relevant documents and evidence for conformity to the PEFC Latvia Scheme requirements, including information about:
o that it has legal status,
o that it is independent and objective,
o that certification decisions are taken by persons which is not involved in the audit,
o that will be ensure compliance with PEFC Council Guidelines Administration of PEFC Scheme (PEFC GD 1004:2009),
o that it has valid accreditation by the Latvian National Accreditation Bureau (LATAK), or by the European co-operation for Accreditation (EA) or International Accreditation Forum (IAF) members organization for PEFC forest management and/or chain of custody certification in Latvia.
o that it has internal procedures for decisions on issuance, maintenance, expansion and suspension of certificate,
o that it has appropriate competence un possibilities for PEFC forest management and/or chain of custody certification in Latvia,
o that it has good knowledge and understanding about PEFC Latvia Scheme documentation.”
CONFORMS |
| Are the procedures for PEFC notification of certification bodies non-discriminatory? | Annex 6, 6
| PEFC LV03:2016. Although no explicit statement is made that all CB’s complying with the PEFC Latvian requirements may enter the PEFC Latvia notification, no evidence have been found regarding discriminatory elements in the notification procedures for CB’s. As such this requirement is assessed to conform.
CONFORMS |
18. PART V: STANDARD AND SYSTEM REQUIREMENT CHECKLIST FOR SYSTEM SPECIFIC CHAIN OF CUSTODY STANDARDS

The PEFC Council's International standard PEFC ST 2002:2013, Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products-Requirements, was fully adopted by PEFC Latvia, without any modifications on 24 May 2013.

As such, the PEFC ST 2002:2013 will not be assessed as it fully conforms to the PEFCC requirements.
19. PART VI: STANDARD AND SYSTEM REQUIREMENT CHECKLIST FOR SCHEME ADMINISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

19.1 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.

19.2 Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Reference to PEFC GD 1004:2009</th>
<th>YES/NO</th>
<th>Reference to application documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEFC Notification of certification bodies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are procedures for the issuance of PEFC Logo usage licenses in place, which comply with chapter 6 of PEFC GD 1004:2009, Administration of PEFC scheme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEFC Logo usage licensing</th>
<th>Chapter 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong></td>
<td><strong>SFM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEFC Logo usage licensing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chapter 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Are procedures for the issuance of PEFC Logo usage licenses in place, which comply with chapter 6 of PEFC GD 1004:2009, Administration of PEFC scheme?</td>
<td><strong>SFM</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Logo usage contract document is in Latvian but the English translation relating the specific requirements of chapter 6 are provided below:

**LATVIAN**


**ENGLISH**


5.1. The contract is valid from date of signing till March 14, 2016 or till:

5.1.1. PEFC Latvijas Padome have PEFC Logo usage contract with PEFC International (address: World Trade Center 1, 10, Route de l'Aéroport, CH – 1215 Geneva, Switzerland);

5.1.2. Logo user have valid PEFC COC certificate. (for PEFC Logo usage group B there is mentioned FM certificate and for PEFC Logo usage group C there is no point 5.1.2.)

5.4. PEFC Latvijas Padome may suspend the contract with the immediate effect, informing the Logo user in written, in the case of Logo user non adherence to the conditions of this contract or PEFC logo usage rules.


"4. penalty sanctions

4.1. PEFC Latvijas Padome can apply contractual penalty of one fifth of the market value of the products to which the unauthorised PEFC logo use relates - „on-product“ or „off-product“ (according with PEFC ST 2001:2008 „PEFC Logo usage rules - requirements“). In case than Logo user can prove that unauthorised PEFC logo use was unintentional, the penalty can be limited to 15,000 CHF."


**CONFORMS**

**COC**

PEFC Latvia has fully adopted the document PEFC ST 2002:2013 (Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products - Requirements) and in association with the documents mentioned above at SFM complies to this requirement.

**CONFORMS**
### Complaints and dispute procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th>Are complaint and dispute procedures go usage licenses in place, which comply with chapter 8 of PEFC GD 1004:2009, Administration of PEFC scheme?</th>
<th>Chapter 8</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;8.2 Upon receipt of the complaint, the procedures shall provide for: a) acknowledgement of the complaint to the complainant, b) gathering and verification of all necessary information, validation and impartial evaluation of the complaint, and decision making on the complaint, c) formal communication of the decision on the complaint and the complaint handling process to the complainant and concerned parties, d) appropriate corrective and preventive actions.&quot;</td>
<td>In the Guidelines for issuance of PEFC Logo use licenses a reference to chapter 8 Disputes and complaints in PEFC LV05:2016 is made. This document conforms to all criteria of chapter 8 of PEFC GD 1004:2009. As such, the assessors have concluded that the PEFC LV conforms to this PEFCC requirement. PEFC Latvia provided the Civil law and Civil procedure law (in English) – general legislation for solving the contractual disputes by the courts. Small remark – in Latvia they have term “principle of legal certainty” – its meaning is that within one process it is not allowed to continually raise new complaints.</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX B: Results of Stakeholder survey

A stakeholder survey of 12 questions was conducted from 7 to 11 March 2016. Invitations to complete the online stakeholder survey were sent via e-mail to all participants in the standard setting process. 18 stakeholders directly involved in the standard setting process (see Annex F) were approached. The respondents were guaranteed anonymity. The stakeholder survey received replies from six respondents, of which one skipped the last four questions. A summary of the answers provided can be found at the end of this Annex.

The stakeholders included personnel of PEFC Latvia. As some stakeholder organisations participating in the Technical committee also appointed more than one representative on the Technical committee, everybody was also asked to participate. No e-mail invitations bounced. One reminder e-mail was sent 10 March 2016. In total six people responded (33 per cent of all contacted stakeholders), representing forest owners, forest professionals and scientific organizations.

The assessors did not obtain concerns on the representation of different stakeholder categories in the technical committee. All respondents agreed that all members were given the opportunity to participate and contribute equally.

Two of the respondents did not participate in all meetings, the comment received “lack of spare time” and indicated, “nevertheless meetings were organised accurately and interested parties were informed in a timely manner”. The reasons that the other person was unable to attend is unclear.

All respondents agreed that the organizers provided relevant material to participate in the scheme development and revision process on time and that the development and revision process was well planned and structured.

All respondents were satisfied with the decision making process.

In total, almost 40% of the respondents partially or completely agreed on the fact that the standard deserves further consideration. One explanatory comment was received on this issue: “Further considerations will be done within next endorsement.”

All respondents answered “No” to the question: “Have there been any issues or processes during the latest Standard Setting Process that you disagree with?”
Summary of the answers of the stakeholder survey for the Standard Setting Process of the 'Latvian PEFC Certification System'

1. What stakeholder category do you represent? (one choice possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest owners and managers</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing and marketing woodbased products</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer representative</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter, hiker or other recreational user</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker representative organisation or youth</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research centre and scientific organisation</td>
<td>16,7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber trade</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest professional</td>
<td>33,3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govermental organisation</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Association or NGO</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 6  
skipped question 0

2. Did the participating stakeholders represent the range of interest in forest management in your country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If not, please specify other interests groups: 0

answered question 6  
skipped question 0

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide comments and additional information: 1

answered question 6  
skipped question 0

Comment: Yes, information regarding stakeholder meetings time and place were sent by emails to various stakeholders, including social, economical and environmental parties. Draft documents was sent to stakeholders as well.
4. Did the organizers provide you on time with relevant material (working drafts, meeting minutes etc.) to participate in the scheme development and revision?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide comments and additional information:

- *answered question* 6
- *skipped question* 0

Comment: Yes, as mentioned above.

5. Did you (or your organisation) attend all meetings of the Technical Committee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66,7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33,3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If not? or Partially? Please provide comments and additional information on your constraints:

- *answered question* 6
- *skipped question* 0

Comment: No, because of lack of spare time, nevertheless meetings were organised accurate and interested parties were informed in timely manner.

6. In your view were all comments received during the public consultation period considered in an objective manner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide comments and additional information:

- *answered question* 6
- *skipped question* 0

7. In your view were comments received by members of the Technical committee considered in an objective manner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide comments and additional information:

- *answered question* 6
- *skipped question* 0
8. Was a consensus reached in the development of the certification criteria?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide comments and additional information: 0

answered question 6
skipped question 0

9. Were you satisfied with the decision making process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide comments and additional information: 0

answered question 5
skipped question 1

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide comments and additional information: 0

answered question 5
skipped question 1

11. Do you believe any aspects of the scheme deserve further considerations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60,0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide comments and additional information: 1

answered question 5
skipped question 1

Comment: Further considerations will be done within next endorsement.
12. Have there been any issues or processes during the latest Standard Setting Process that you disagree with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide comments and additional information:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question* 5

*skipped question* 1

Comment: I think that a balance between social, economic and environmental interests have been reached.
ANNEX C: Results of international consultation

PEFCC carried out an international stakeholders consultation through the PEFCC website. During a sixty (60) day global public consultation period, all interested stakeholders including the general public were invited to submit comments regarding the PEFC LV. Comments had to be sent directly to PEFCC. The consultation period was open from 19 November 2014, till 18 January 2015.

On 27th of January 2016, PEFCC informed the assessor that no stakeholder comments had been received (e-mail correspondence).
ANNEX D: Panel of Experts comments

Two panel of experts members have commented on this assessment. Their comments are presented in the table below, including the responses from the Assessors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report chapter / page (Final Draft Report)</th>
<th>Consultant’s report statement</th>
<th>PoE member comment</th>
<th>Consultant’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a comprehensive evaluation of the PEFC Latvia Forest Certification Scheme or System. The depth of analysis of the criteria/indicators and supporting information for the forest management standard is to be commended especially in utilising the full suite of requirements or indicators that provide for conformity. All sections displayed the required assessment backed by evidence to enable a clear conclusion on conformance or compliance in the majority of cases. I do have an issue with some of the language, from English as a first language perspective, which sometimes doesn’t provide for coherent comprehension – I have provided some essential editorial changes which I trust the assessors will take on board in finalising the report. Overall, I have no hesitation in agreeing with the assessors on the recommendation as well as most of the non-conformities identified and subject to corrective action or conditions provided with any positive endorsement by the PEFC.</td>
<td>The suggested editorial changes are taken on board. Reviewing the comments of the expert, the Assessors agree on an additional non-conformity of Annex A, 14.2, 5.3 d) And a conformity of requirement Annex A, 16.2, 5.7.1 Additional argumentation is provided by the Assessors to clarify the non-conformities identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear, neat report.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some extra general comments on the report: It is more preferable to use DD Month YYYY format e.g. 31 May 2016 than 31st May 2016 – would suggest adopting for all applicable dates</td>
<td>The suggested date format is applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Would prefer to see ‘per cent’ in text than % - leave % for tables, graphs, etc</td>
<td>Corrected as suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 and 1.2 indicate that it is a ‘scheme’ but the report title (and header and abbreviation and 3.1) indicates that it is a</td>
<td>Corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report chapter / page (Final Draft Report)</td>
<td>Consultant’s report statement</td>
<td>PoE member comment</td>
<td>Consultant’s response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Comment</strong></td>
<td>system – need to decide which the correct terminology is. As it is later abbreviated to PEFC LV, this avoids the issue in the main body of the report</td>
<td><strong>General Comment</strong></td>
<td>The non-conformity is not present in the Final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Comment</strong></td>
<td>The narrative in Chapter 6 to outline one minor non-conformity hasn’t been set out particularly well and contextually doesn’t flow from the PEFC requirement to equivalent PEFC LMS LV indicator to its reason for non-conformity to PEFC Latvia’s comments to support compliance to the final decision of the assessors. This needs a shake up!</td>
<td><strong>General Comment</strong></td>
<td>Text is quoted and identified by italics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Comment</strong></td>
<td>There are a number of paragraphs across sections/chapters of this report where it is difficult to establish whether the text is from the assessors or from PEFC Latvia. Any PEFC Latvian text should always be quoted and possibly identified by italics or underlining</td>
<td><strong>General Comment</strong></td>
<td>Corrected all standards in this report are now referred to as LV01, LV02.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Comment</strong></td>
<td>In 1.7, the identifiers for the standards separate letters from numbers i.e. LV 01 but in many instances in this report they are combined i.e. LV01 – need to use one or the other consistently and it should be as adopted by PEFC Latvia in their documents</td>
<td><strong>General Comment</strong></td>
<td>Corrected in the main body of the report, the quoted text in the checklists remains ‘complains’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Comment</strong></td>
<td>In the PEFC Latvia documentation, ‘complains’ is commonly used but as such it is a verb whereas the context of its use would be as a noun i.e. ‘complaint’ – PEFC Latvia should take on board for its English version</td>
<td><strong>General Comment</strong></td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Comment</strong></td>
<td>In the Specific Findings section, when a page is quoted it is the page number on the document i.e bottom right hand side = p. 135</td>
<td><strong>General Comment</strong></td>
<td><strong>“” is deleted in the text of Annex A. The quotation marks at the end of the assessors comments are corrected.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Comment</strong></td>
<td>In Annex A, the assessors have used double quotation marks at the end of quoted text when only one quotation mark is required i.e. “ NOT ”. Also, in some of the assessors comments they end it with a quotation mark – that isn’t required as it is their comment not a quote</td>
<td><strong>General Comment</strong></td>
<td>The titles of legislation and other documents are corrected in Annex A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Comment</strong></td>
<td>In Section 16, Annex A, there are many instances where the reference to legislation (laws) quoted in ‘Reference to system documentation’ column doesn’t gel with the titles provided in Section 1.7 (Pg 14). The titles should be consistent throughout the report.</td>
<td><strong>General Comment</strong></td>
<td>This information is available in the main body of the report. It</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p. 132
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report chapter / page (Final Draft Report)</th>
<th>Consultant’s report statement</th>
<th>PoE member comment</th>
<th>Consultant’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which PEFC LV documents were applicable to each PART and which are consequently indicated in ‘Reference to application documents’</td>
<td>would involve repetition; the assessors followed the PEFC guideline. (PEFC GD 1007:2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Comment</td>
<td>Also in the Checklist, there are numerous extra full stops or quotation marks, especially at the end of sentences or paragraphs, that are extraneous to the text and should be deleted</td>
<td>Corrected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 5th para p6</td>
<td>‘According to the statistics, …’</td>
<td>Whose or what are these statistics?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repeat of the PEFC ST 2002:2013! Maybe the second PEFC ST reference should be to ST 2003:2012</td>
<td>Corrected: “PEFC Latvia fully adopted the international standards of the PEFCC on ‘PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products’ and ‘PEFC ST 2003:2012 Requirements for Certification Bodies operating Certification against the PEFC International Chain of Custody Standard’ therefore, these components were not assessed in this report”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 5th para p7</td>
<td>“PEFC Latvia fully adopted the international standards of the PEFCC on ‘PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products’ and ‘PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products’ therefore, these components were not assessed in this report.”</td>
<td>Corrected: “PEFC Latvia fully adopted the international standards of the PEFCC on ‘PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products’ and ‘PEFC ST 2003:2012 Requirements for Certification Bodies operating Certification against the PEFC International Chain of Custody Standard’ therefore, these components were not assessed in this report.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 p7</td>
<td>Preliminary desk study</td>
<td>It is usually expressed as ‘desk-top’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>‘… of a preliminary desk study, …’</td>
<td>Corrected, desk study replaced by desk-top study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>‘… was a desk study. …’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘… out the desk study …’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.4 2nd para p8</td>
<td>‘… during the Draft Report:’</td>
<td>Is this while the assessors were developing the Draft Report or provided as a consequence of assessment to date?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These might be the file names but should be set out in the same manner as the titles in 1.2!</td>
<td>While developing the draft report. Text corrected: ‘PEFC Latvia revised the following standard documents during the elaboration of the Draft Report:’ Corrected: - replaced by dot-points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4/p 9</td>
<td>Whole of Section 1.4</td>
<td>This section may be more suitable prior to 1.3 – please</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This order is similar to the summation in PEFC GD 1007:2012: chapter 2.2.1. Corrected, chapters switched.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report chapter / page (Final Draft Report)</td>
<td>Consultant’s report statement</td>
<td>PoE member comment</td>
<td>Consultant’s response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.2 1st para p9</td>
<td>PEFC GD 1007:2012 and PEFC IGD 1007-03:2012</td>
<td>Are two different guidelines or are the same document?</td>
<td>Corrected in the report to ‘PEFC IGD 1007-03:2012.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Table 3rd row. p7</td>
<td>‘ForestSense makes an appointment for a conference call with PEFC Latvia to clarify the findings.’</td>
<td>This comment is not really required</td>
<td>This planning is a copy of the planning send to the applicant to clarify the process. The assessors decided to leave this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Heading &amp;Tables p12</td>
<td>PEFC Latvians’ documents &amp; sources PEFC LV Standards</td>
<td>PEFC Latvia’s documents &amp; sources Its usual to include the year of adoption to indicate the currency of the standard e.g. see Chapter 9</td>
<td>Corrected: title &amp; the years of adoption are included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 1st Table p12</td>
<td>7th row with no identifier in the PEFC LV Standards column</td>
<td>Is this a standard or not? From Chapter 11, its named as Document 7!</td>
<td>PEFC Latvia does not use an identifier in the text the title: “Guidelines for issuance of PEFC Logo use licenses” Corrected: In chapter 11 the reference to document 7 deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 2nd &amp; 3rd Tables p12</td>
<td>Documents in the tables</td>
<td>For these documents, they may be the file names but the document name is still the one in the 1st table and the official document of the scheme/system!</td>
<td>Corrected: the years of adoption are included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 4th Table 5th Table p12 &amp; 8th Table p14</td>
<td>Documents in the table</td>
<td>Do these documents have an identifier? A number for the law, is applicable, and the year would be preferable to include with the name of the Act</td>
<td>The regulations have identifiers and are added in the report. The laws do not contain clear identifiers; the date when the latest amendment was added is included in the report for Latvian documents. The laws are translated by the official Latvian authority (Translation and Terminology Centre) in English and include all amendments. The year of translation is added in the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 p17</td>
<td>1st dot point</td>
<td>If this is the title, why not use this in the table at 1.7?</td>
<td>Corrected: Document 7 is deleted, not the official title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 p17</td>
<td>1st sentence</td>
<td>Is this Chapter 8 of LV 05? If so, it shouldn’t be referenced this way; it should be ‘... ... is available in chapter 8 within Standard LV 05 ...’ ALSO, there is no conclusion statement for this section when</td>
<td>Corrected as suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusion added at the end of the section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report chapter / page (Final Draft Report)</td>
<td>Consultant's report statement</td>
<td>PoE member comment</td>
<td>Consultant's response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.8 1st para p17                         | 1st sentence                   | Is this Chapter 8 of LV 05? If so, it shouldn’t be referenced this way; it should be ‘… … is available in chapter 8 within Standard LV 05 …’
ALSO, there is no conclusion statement for this section when compared to other sections. | Corrected |
|                                          |                                | Conclusion added.  |                       |
| 4.1 3rd para p18                         | 1st sentence - ‘… and Person authorised by the PEFC Latvia Council …’
2nd sentence                            | This is not explained in the context of the other functions of PEFC Latvia
This looks like a statement from PEFC Latvia documentation than a finding of the assessors especially with a ‘shall’ in the text.
Use of ‘Arbitral’ – ‘Arbitration’ would be the more common usage
Presume that this is the Forest Management Standard – should clarify
Presumably for the development or revision of the Forest Management Standard & PEFC LV documentation
Is this really keeping the minutes of the meetings of the Technical Committee?
This sentence should be moved to after the a) to d) dot points to ensure logical progression
The description of this role can be found on the next page. | The description of this role can be found on the next page. This “shall” refers to the fact that this is not a permanent Commission. Added ‘established on a temporary basis’ in the description of the next page. |
| 5th para p18                             | 3rd dot point – ‘… or revision of Standard.’
1st dot point                             |                                | Corrected |
|                                           | 5th dot point – ‘record keeping of nominated members of the Technical Committee …’
Sentence under Technical Committee        |                                | Corrected |
|                                           |                                | To increase readability the title of the standard has quotation marks. |
| 7th para p 18 & 19                       |                                | Yes, PEFC LV05: “5.3
g) record keeping of nominated members of the Technical Committee,
n) record keeping relating to the Standard setting process.” |
| 8th para p19                             |                                | Corrected |
|                                           |                                | |
| 4.2 1st para p20                         | ‘… national PEFC certification system …’
|                                           | The use of system – it isn’t the same language as 1.1 and 1.2! | Corrected. |
|                                           | This referred to the document name (7.PEFC_logo_usage.pdf) and not specifically to the dot points in this chapter. | |

p. 135
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report chapter / page (Final Draft Report)</th>
<th>Consultant’s report statement</th>
<th>PoE member comment</th>
<th>Consultant’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dot point 9.</strong></td>
<td>From Chapter 11, it is Document 7! Need a space prior to this paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph commencing with ‘Furthermore,…’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 2nd para p22</strong></td>
<td>‘The decision making powers …’</td>
<td>Isn’t it at various levels otherwise it looks like each may have 20 per cent of the power!</td>
<td>Corrected: “The decision making power is divided amongst five entities”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5th para</strong></td>
<td>‘Complains shall be addressed in writing to the PEFC Latvia.’</td>
<td>Isn’t this the same as the previous sentence!</td>
<td>Added “If complaints or disputes arise,”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7th para</strong></td>
<td>The text of PEFC LV 05: 4.9</td>
<td>This needs to be linked to the next paragraph in order to finish the sentence!</td>
<td>Text added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8th para</strong></td>
<td>‘Only one (1) local municipality and one (1) workers unions were invited.’ Need to indicate which groups from the list of nine major groups!</td>
<td>ALSO, the note would be better as a footnote</td>
<td>The note is a literally copy of PEFC LV05 4.9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9th para p23</strong></td>
<td>Whole paragraph</td>
<td>Is this categorization correct?</td>
<td>Text added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21st para p 24</strong></td>
<td>‘… relating to category 3, …’</td>
<td>Is this the ‘forest owners’ group?</td>
<td>No international PEFC requirements on categorization, these categories, as provided by PEFC Latvia are considered. It is however atypical they did not use the categories as described in the note of the stakeholder definition as provided in PEFC LV05 4.9. Extra text is added in the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22nd para</strong></td>
<td>The explanatory comment</td>
<td>From whom if this is applicable?</td>
<td>No, the category consumers and customers. Text modified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28th para p25</strong></td>
<td>The PEFCC Board’s text</td>
<td>Is there a specific comment to this?</td>
<td>No further specifics available in the stakeholder survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 5 p24</strong></td>
<td>‘Nobody was rejected.’</td>
<td>A person or organisation?</td>
<td>Text corrected: All nominations were honored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remarkable in the standard setting process is the separate consultation request to the PEFC Latvia members. They received the</strong></td>
<td>Can the assessors explain in more detail what exactly they mean with „remarkable”?</td>
<td>This refers to a separate consultation period exclusively to PEFC Latvia members also non-members of the Technical Committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report chapter / page (Final Draft Report)</td>
<td>Consultant’s report statement</td>
<td>PoE member comment</td>
<td>Consultant’s response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 5 p24</strong></td>
<td>PEFC LV05:2016: “3. Normative references The documents referenced below are indispensable for the application of this document. For both dated and undated references, the latest edition of the referenced document (including any amendment) applies. PEFC ST 1001:2010 Standard Setting – Requirements “</td>
<td>This quoting refers to bullet 2 „mandatory reference“ above. Is requirement of bullet 1 („standard setting procedures in place in compliance with …“) also fulfilled?</td>
<td>The requirements states bullet 1 OR bullet 2. As bullet 2 applies no need to fulfil the requirement of bullet point 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 3rd para p27</strong></td>
<td>Last sentence</td>
<td>This doesn’t seem to make sense for forest certification unless a translation issue Does it cover both public and private? Is this a comment from them to provide evidence of compliance? If so, it needs contextual statement to introduce this and next paragraph While technically correct, it is quite a harsh statement when compared to summary in 3.3 and in light of the recommendation in 2!</td>
<td>Corrected: ‘PEFC Forest Management Standard for Latvia’ Yes both public and private, stated in paragraph 2 This is related to the policy instruments available and used in forest management in Latvia. Added the following text: “Reference to legislation and translation of the relevant parts was provided by PEFC Latvia, and these were indispensable in providing evidence of compliance with PEFC requirements, especially because the PEFC LV FMS sets no minimum levels or limitations for forest management practices and sustainability criteria and indicators.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5th para</strong></td>
<td>Whole of paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9th para</strong></td>
<td>PEFC Latvia comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last para</strong></td>
<td>Assessor’s conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 1st &amp; 2nd paras p29</strong></td>
<td>Use of ‘Forest owner Group’, ‘Group’ and ‘Owner Group’ in both paragraphs</td>
<td>There are three forms of addressing this form of forest management certification – why not just one form? Divide paragraph into two at ‘Until now, …’</td>
<td>In the documents: PEFC LV FMS and PEFC LV04 all three terms are used. In the Assessment report the term is referred to as ‘Forest owner Group’ as described in PEFC LV04 Ch 5.2. Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3rd para</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 1st &amp; 2nd paras p30</strong></td>
<td>‘… fully adopted by PEFC Latvia …’</td>
<td>Is it possible to indicate the date of adoption in relation to</td>
<td>Dates are added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report chapter / page (Final Draft Report)</td>
<td>Consultant's report statement</td>
<td>PoE member comment</td>
<td>Consultant's response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 2nd para p31</td>
<td>‘They have to use a documented …’</td>
<td>Is this a dot point or a new paragraph?</td>
<td>A new paragraph, corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 4th para p33</td>
<td>The whole paragraph</td>
<td>This would be better in a dot point format!</td>
<td>Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 2nd para p34</td>
<td>2nd sentence of paragraph</td>
<td>What is it to be added to?</td>
<td>Corrected: “PEFC LV02 Chapter 9 presents guidance for indicating non-conformities in PEFC Forest Management certification, this chapter was included during the latest revision period”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 2nd para p35</td>
<td>The whole paragraph</td>
<td>See the comment at 3.8!</td>
<td>Corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th &amp; 6th paras</td>
<td>Both paragraphs</td>
<td>Why include a paragraph in Latvian when the English translation is provided?</td>
<td>The text was originally provided in Latvian, the only translation available is in this paragraph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th para</td>
<td>PEFC LV 02 text</td>
<td>If this is LV 02 text, note the spelling mistakes ie ‘complains’ for ‘complaints’</td>
<td>Corrected in the report, still typo in PEFC LV02.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th para</td>
<td>‘… for logo usage.’</td>
<td>Is it just for this or should it be for the whole PEFC LV?</td>
<td>Text modified: Hence, the assessors concluded that PEFC LV does conform to the PEFC Council requirements regarding the complaints and dispute resolution procedures for logo usage and the standard setting process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 2nd para p36</td>
<td>‘… the text of the FI standard documents …’</td>
<td>Presume this is the PEFC LV documentation and not related to whatever FI is?</td>
<td>Corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th para</td>
<td>Whole of paragraph</td>
<td>What of any PEFC Latvia responses – how are they differentiated from the other comments for the ‘Reference’ column?</td>
<td>Added ‘Comments by PEFC Latvia’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th para</td>
<td>‘NO = …’</td>
<td>Could use the same language as YES ie ‘Assessment demonstrated non-compliance with the PEFC International Benchmark Standards ie a non-conformity’</td>
<td>Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1 p37</td>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Isn’t some of the documentation in the tables on Page 13 applicable to the ‘Process’ response?</td>
<td>The scope only refers to the PEFC international standards, as stated in PEFC GD 1007:2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report chapter / page (Final Draft Report)</td>
<td>Consultant's report statement</td>
<td>PoE member comment</td>
<td>Consultant's response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2 4.1 d) p38</td>
<td>(tab. 1)</td>
<td>Does this mean Table or otherwise?</td>
<td>It means table, copied from PEFC LV05. Corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2 4.1 f) p39</td>
<td>The text of the ‘Question’</td>
<td>Isn’t this related to periodicity of revision i.e. to be revised every ‘x’ years?</td>
<td>The text is added: “Revision of Standard, The Standard shall be reviewed and revised at intervals that do not exceed a five-year period.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2 4.2 Process p40</td>
<td>URL</td>
<td>This requires further elaboration as to what is on/available at this webpage</td>
<td>Information added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2 4.3 Procedures p40</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no document as a reference – see 4.1 b)</td>
<td>Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2 5.2 Process p46</td>
<td>‘Document Scheme Description 2015’</td>
<td>Is this the same document as the one at 4.5 a-c? If so, please use a consistent reference and also for any other similar reference eg 5.4 Process</td>
<td>Corrected: Scheme Description 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14.2 5.3 d) Process p49  5.3 e) Process p50 | URL                           | The requirement seems implicit and not explicit to be adjudged as a conformity  
See comment at 4.2 ("This requires further elaboration as to what is on/available at this webpage") | The assessors agree with the reasoning of the Expert. The requirement does not comply as the text is indeed not explicit.  
The URL-page does contain the PEFC LV |
| 14.2 5.5 a) Process p51                  | ‘… draft reports were attached. e’ | Presume they were attached to the minutes which were sent to members of the Technical Committee?  
No need for the single ‘e’! | Corrected: In the minutes which were sent to members of the Technical Committee (received from PEFC Latvia: Documents Nr3.pdf and Nr4.pdf) draft reports are attached. |
| 14.2 5.6 b) Process p53                  |                               | Need to link back to the response at 5.2  
Also, reference a document as a new paragraph | Corrected  
Corrected |
<p>| 14.2 5.6 c) Process p53                  | URL                           | See comment at 4.2 | The enquiry draft is available at the specified URL |
| 14.2 5.6 f) Process p54                  |                               | See text at 5.6 e) if I’m correct! | Indeed the same document, it gives all information on interpretation, and is publically available. |
| 14.2 5.8 a) Process p55                  | ‘The minutes of 22.07.2015…’ | See edits to 5.8 (Pg 54) in the Editorial section | Corrected as suggested. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report chapter / page (Final Draft Report)</th>
<th>Consultant's report statement</th>
<th>PoE member comment</th>
<th>Consultant's response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.2 5.11 Process p58</td>
<td>This doesn’t match the PEFC requirement! What is required is the evidence that the PEFC Latvia GA approved the PEFC FMS LV!</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected: The Standard was formally approved in Council General Assembly in August 18, 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2 5.12 Process p59</td>
<td>The text is essentially required at 5.11!</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 4.2.1 f p66</td>
<td>In the responsibilities of the Forest owner group entity (5.2.2) no explicit reference could be found to the agreement mentioned in 5.2 or 5.2.1.7, but reference can be found to procedures written about the participants admission and the participant receiving the attestations of participation. The assessors conclude that based on these points a document to confirm participation is available for each participant and is provided by the Forest owner group entity.</td>
<td>Is the evidence robust enough not to classify it as a “minor non-conformity”? If not classified as a minor non-conformity then it should be stated at least as a comment in the main report (summary, respective chapter) that this requirement is considered in the next revision process.</td>
<td>This point is stated now in the main body of the report. As the agreement is described in a definition and the rights of the participants mention this agreement. The assessors conclude that based on these points a document to confirm participation is available for each participant and is provided by the Forest owner group entity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2 4.3.1 a)</td>
<td>The text from LV 04 isn’t phrased particularly well but I understand the intent!</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1 d)</td>
<td>The ‘take appropriate follow-up actions’ implicitly requires the participant to undertake corrective and preventative actions if such are established by the certification body</td>
<td></td>
<td>Text added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2 4.1 b) p71</td>
<td>‘In PEFC LV 02 point 7: …’</td>
<td>This requirement doesn’t address the PEFC requirement!</td>
<td>The text is modified: The standard is rather complementary to existing legislation. The criteria are structured as follows: 1) Criterion: describes the subject of sub-processes and stages of sustainable forest management, provides essential tools and defines indicators to ensure the improvement of practices and methods for sustainable forest management. 2) Descriptive indicators: Parameters that objectively and clearly describe the subject, no minimum or maximum specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report chapter / page (Final Draft Report)</td>
<td>Consultant’s report statement</td>
<td>PoE member comment</td>
<td>Consultant’s response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.1 c) p71                               | PEFC LV:2014 5.1.1 and PEFC LV:2014 5.2.2 | Are these quotes that require quotation marks? | Comment by PEFC Latvia: “• legislation in Latvia regulates almost every forestry activity”
Legislation is very specific on forest practices in Latvia. The minimum and maximum of most specified parameters in the Forest management standard are regulated in the Law on Forest or other regulations.
In depth knowledge of current Latvian legislation is needed when auditing.
Quotation marks added. |
| 16.2, 5.1.2, p72                         | PEFC FMS LV:2015 1.1.3, 1.1.4 & 1.2.2.4 | The continuous improvement cycle isn’t explicit in these responses | Law on Forest is added, to provide more evidence. |
| 16.2, 5.1.5, p74                         | 1.2.1.5 | Check the font size of the text! | Corrected |
| 16.2 5.1.7 p 75                          | 5.1.17: - it means, that minimum interval for “regular” is one year | I cannot follow why this means a regular interval of one year. Please explain. | The descriptive indicators are supposed to indicate the changes in the indicator values and dynamics of development at least for a 5-year period before Certification and expected changes for the next 5 years.
PEFC LV02: “5.6. Surveillance audit
At least once a year, during the validity of the issued certificate the Certicate Body shall carry out the surveillance audits, ensuring that certificate holder comply with PEFC Forest management standard for Latvia and/or PEFC International Standard PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products - Requirements.
During the surveillance audits, these changes should be available. (once a year)
Law on forest added. (once a year the owner or manager of the forest should notify the State Forest Service when changes occur.)|
| 16.2 5.1.8 p76                          | PEFC Latvia’s comment | What does it state? No outcome for the statement! I can’t see a Document 8 in the list of documents on Pages 12 & 13! | The text is literally quoted. The forest management standard in total aims to make sure responsibilities for sustainable forest management shall be clearly defined and assigned. Text added.
Document 8 is referred to as: ‘PEFC Council Minimum Requirements Checklist’. Corrected in the text of Annex A. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report chapter / page (Final Draft Report)</th>
<th>Consultant's report statement</th>
<th>PoE member comment</th>
<th>Consultant's response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.2 5.1.11 p77</td>
<td>‘… stated in the law On Environment Impact Assessment: …’</td>
<td>I can’t see this law in the list on Page 14!</td>
<td>1.7, Relevant Latvian Legislation: Law on environmental impact assessment (translated including amendments: 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2 5.1.12 p78</td>
<td>1.2.1.9</td>
<td>Move this indicator onto the next line ie have each indicator on its own line</td>
<td>The first chapter number and name refers to the title of the table. To improve readability the indicator has its own line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2 5.2.1 p79</td>
<td>Whole response</td>
<td>What aren’t 2.1.2 to 4 utilised in this response? But noting that 2.1.4 may be more appropriate for productive capacity</td>
<td>PEFC FMS LV:2015 2.1.2-2.1.4 added in the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2 5.2.3 p80</td>
<td>FMS DI</td>
<td>What is this for the two paragraphs which have this as an identifier?</td>
<td>Corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2 5.2.4 p81</td>
<td>‘The policy instrument: …’</td>
<td>Which is?</td>
<td>Added: In Latvia, the State Register of Forests (SRF) manages a forest resources database, which includes related cartographic material. Information on forest management activities carried out and/or changes in the characteristics of the forest resources are recorded in this database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2 5.3.6 p87</td>
<td>NO in the YES/NO column</td>
<td>This does not gel with CONFORMS in the ‘Reference to system documentation’ column. Section/Chapter 6 indicates only one non-conformity at 5.7.1. There is no indication of non-conformity in 5.3.6!</td>
<td>Corrected into YES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2 5.3.7 p88</td>
<td>‘Fishing regulations No 1498’</td>
<td>Is this in the table at page 16?</td>
<td>Relevant sections of these regulations were provided, added in the chapter 1.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2 Between 5.3.8 &amp; 5.4.1</td>
<td>Blacked out row</td>
<td>The criterion is ‘blacked out’ – any reason why this is so?</td>
<td>Corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2 5.4.9 p96</td>
<td>From ‘Indicator PEFC FMS LV:2015 “4.2.1 …’</td>
<td>Check on the font size!</td>
<td>Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2 5.7.1 p109</td>
<td>‘PEFC Latvia: …’</td>
<td>Check on the font size!</td>
<td>Corrected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The non-conformity was debated by the assessors and changed into conformity. Argument: The requirement 5.7.1 should not be interpreted in a way that a lack of references to applicable forest legislation...*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report chapter / page (Final Draft Report)</th>
<th>Consultant’s report statement</th>
<th>PoE member comment</th>
<th>Consultant’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sentence i.e. 2nd to 3rd sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td>required to meet PEFC benchmark requirements in the FM standard of an applicant scheme should be considered a non-conformity. Especially if references to the applicable legislation is present. Requirement 5.7.1 is considered conform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2 3. p111</td>
<td>LVS EN 45 011</td>
<td>Why isn’t this used in 2.7?</td>
<td>Not clear to the assessors. LVS EN 45 011 is quoted in 17.2 2: “LVS EN 17021 – „Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems” or LVS EN 45 011 – „General Requirements for bodies operating product certification systems”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2 4. p112</td>
<td>‘PEFC LV 02:2015 6.1 …’</td>
<td>This seems to be different from the response in 3.</td>
<td>Only the relevant parts of PEFC LV 02:2015 6.1 are quoted in 3 and 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. p115</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is quoted text from PEFC Latvia which includes ‘curry’ whereas the word should be ‘carry’!</td>
<td>Is corrected in the report, remains a typo in document PEFC LV02.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2 22. p118</td>
<td>6. PEFC notification of the Certification Body …’</td>
<td>Which document? Is it a quote as there are no quotation marks?</td>
<td>PEFC LV03 is quoted, corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 p119</td>
<td>1st paragraph PEFC ST 2002:2010</td>
<td>A date (of adoption) would be appreciated.</td>
<td>Dates are added. Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNEX B p127</td>
<td></td>
<td>Why is there a blank page?</td>
<td>Unintentional: Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNEX E p132</td>
<td></td>
<td>In keeping with Annex G, what are the categories of stakeholders?</td>
<td>In Annex E, the organisations are translated in English (Latvian in Annex G), and in annex F the categories can be found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNEX G p135</td>
<td>‘… (individual persons) …’</td>
<td>Is this correct or is it organisations?</td>
<td>Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNEX G p135</td>
<td>Table Rows 14, 18&amp; 19</td>
<td>Aren’t this just in the ‘Environment’ activity?</td>
<td>The other organisations related to ‘Environment’-activity are rather broad; these 3 NGO’s have very specific interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>They are quite specific when compared to the other 43 organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p. 143
ANNEX E: List of Technical committee participants

Twelve (12) organisations were part of the working group (PEFC Latvia excluded):
1. BM TRADA Latvija
2. JSC “Latvia’s State Forests”
3. JSC „Latvijas Finieris”
4. Latvian Association of Independent Timber Harvesting Companies
5. Latvian Forest Owners’ Association
6. Latvian Timber Producers’ & Traders’ Association
7. Latvian timber quality expert union
8. Ministry of Agriculture, Forest department
9. Professional education institution “Ērgļi arodvidusskola”
10. Riga City Forests
11. SGS Latvia Ltd
12. Vides kvalitāte / Environment quality
**ANNEX F: Stakeholders invited to online survey**

The table below shows the list of 18 stakeholders (individual persons) that received an invitation for the online survey, carried out by ForestSense:

**Category of Stakeholder (included after name of organisation):**
1. Forest owners/managers
2. Forest based industry
3. Consumers and customers
4. Civil society, NGO
5. Governmental institutions

K – Key stakeholder who are materially affected by the Standard and those that can influence the implementation of the Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Žanis Bacāns</td>
<td>JSC „Latvijas Finieris“</td>
<td><a href="mailto:zanis.bacans@finiers.lv">zanis.bacans@finiers.lv</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2, K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jānis Rinkulis</td>
<td>Latvian timber quality expert union</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jrinkulis@inbox.lv">jrinkulis@inbox.lv</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Viktors Gulbis</td>
<td>JSC “Latvia’s State Forests”</td>
<td><a href="mailto:v.gulbis@lvm.lv">v.gulbis@lvm.lv</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1, K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Andris Spaile</td>
<td>Professional education institution “Ergli arodvidus skola”</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andris.spaile@ergliarods.lv">andris.spaile@ergliarods.lv</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kristaps Klauss</td>
<td>Latvian Timber Producers’ &amp; Traders’ Association</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kristaps.klauss@latvianwood.lv">kristaps.klauss@latvianwood.lv</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arnis Mužnieks</td>
<td>Latvian Forest Owners’ Association</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@mezajipsnieki.lv">info@mezajipsnieki.lv</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4, K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Artūrs Bukonts</td>
<td>Latvian Association of Independent Timber Harvesting Companies</td>
<td><a href="mailto:arturs.bukonts@latvianwood.lv">arturs.bukonts@latvianwood.lv</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jānis Švirksts</td>
<td>BM TRADA Latvija</td>
<td><a href="mailto:janis.svirksts@gmail.com">janis.svirksts@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Aiga Grasmane</td>
<td>PEFC Latvijas Padome</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aiga.grasmane@pefc.lv">aiga.grasmane@pefc.lv</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Agnese Trojanovska</td>
<td>SGS Latvija Ltd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Agnese.Trojanovska@sgs.com">Agnese.Trojanovska@sgs.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rita Benta</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Forest department</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rita.Benta@zm.gov.lv">Rita.Benta@zm.gov.lv</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Vita Rudžite</td>
<td>Riga City Forests</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Vita.Rudzite@riga.lv">Vita.Rudzite@riga.lv</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1, K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Inga Spalvēna</td>
<td>JSC “Latvia’s State Forests”</td>
<td><a href="mailto:i.spalvena@lvm.lv">i.spalvena@lvm.lv</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1, K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Karīna Cirse</td>
<td>JSC “Latvia’s State Forests”</td>
<td><a href="mailto:k.cirse@lvm.lv">k.cirse@lvm.lv</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1, K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ivans Nokolajevs</td>
<td>JSC “Latvia’s State Forests”</td>
<td><a href="mailto:i.nokolajevs@lvm.lv">i.nokolajevs@lvm.lv</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1, K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mudrīte Daugaviete</td>
<td>Vides kvalitāte / Environment quality</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mudrite.daugaviete@slava.lv">mudrite.daugaviete@slava.lv</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Edvīns Zakovics</td>
<td>JSC “Latvia’s State Forests”</td>
<td><a href="mailto:e.zakovics@lvm.lv">e.zakovics@lvm.lv</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1, K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ansis Actiņš</td>
<td>PEFC Latvijas Padome</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ansis.actins@pefc.lv">ansis.actins@pefc.lv</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX G: Stakeholders invited to participate in Standard Setting

The table below shows the list of 45 stakeholders (organisations) that received an invitation for participating in the standard setting process by PEFC Latvia

Category of Stakeholder (Included after name of organisation):
1. Forest owners/managers
2. Forest based industry
3. Consumers and customers
4. Civil society, NGO
5. Governmental institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Web page</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Asociācija Izglītība ilgtspējīgai attīstībai (AIIA)</td>
<td><a href="http://nvo.iselv.eu/">http://nvo.iselv.eu/</a></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asociācija Latvijas Koks 2</td>
<td><a href="http://www.latvianwood.lv">http://www.latvianwood.lv</a></td>
<td>Wood production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Baltijas Vides forums 4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bef.lv">www.bef.lv</a></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Biedrība “Latvijas Makšķernieku asociācija” (LMA) 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Biedrība „Latvijas Zalā Josta” 4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.1zj.lv/">http://www.1zj.lv/</a></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BM TRADA Latvija 4</td>
<td><a href="http://bmtrada.lv">http://bmtrada.lv</a></td>
<td>Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dabas retumu krātuve 4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dabasretumi.lv">www.dabasretumi.lv</a></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Latvijas Botāniķu biedrība 4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sapnis.botanika.com">www.sapnis.botanika.com</a></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Latvijas Dabas fonds 4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ldf.lv">www.ldf.lv</a></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Latvijas Dendroekologu biedrība 4</td>
<td><a href="http://dendro.daba.lv/biedriba/index.html">http://dendro.daba.lv/biedriba/index.html</a></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Latvijas Entomologu biedrība 4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leb.daba.lv">www.leb.daba.lv</a></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Latvijas Kokapstrādes uzņēmēju un eksportētāju asociācija (LKUES) 2</td>
<td><a href="http://www.latvianwood.lv">www.latvianwood.lv</a></td>
<td>Wood production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Latvijas koksnes kvalitātes ekspertu savienība (LKKES) 2</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lkkes.lv/">http://www.lkkes.lv/</a></td>
<td>Wood production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Latvijas Malakologu biedrība 4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.gliemji.daba.lv">www.gliemji.daba.lv</a></td>
<td>Fauna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Latvijas Mednieku asociācija 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hunting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Latvijas Mednieku savienība 4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lms.org.lv/">http://www.lms.org.lv/</a></td>
<td>Hunting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Latvijas meža nozaru aru biedrība (LMNA) 3</td>
<td><a href="http://www.iambs.lv/members/forest_sphere_trade_union">http://www.iambs.lv/members/forest_sphere_trade_union</a></td>
<td>Social (workers representative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Latvijas Mikologu biedrība 4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.miko.ldm.gov.lv">www.miko.ldm.gov.lv</a></td>
<td>fungi and lichen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Latvijas Ornitoloģijas biedrība 4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lob.lv">www.lob.lv</a></td>
<td>Birds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Latvijas Pašvaldību savienība 5</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lps.lv">http://www.lps.lv</a></td>
<td>Local municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Latvijas Zalā kustība 4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.zalie.lv/">http://www.zalie.lv/</a></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Latvijas Zemes Draugi 4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.zemesdraugi.lv">http://www.zemesdraugi.lv</a></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>LLU Meža fakultāte 4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mfl.ltu.lv">http://www.mfl.ltu.lv</a></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>LU Bioloģijas fakultāte 4</td>
<td><a href="http://priede.bf.lu.lv/">http://priede.bf.lu.lv/</a></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>LVMI Silava 4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.silava.lv">http://www.silava.lv</a></td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Meža un koksnes produktu pētniecbas un attīstības institūts 4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.e-koks.lv">http://www.e-koks.lv</a></td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>NEPCon 4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nepcon.net/1522/Latvi">http://www.nepcon.net/1522/Latvi</a></td>
<td>Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ogres meža tehnikums</td>
<td>e_u</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Pasaules Dabas fonds</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pdf.lv">www.pdf.lv</a></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SGS LATVIJA LTD</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sgsgroup.lv">http://www.sgsgroup.lv</a></td>
<td>Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Starptautiskais vides konsultāciju uzņēmums Estonian, Latvian &amp; Lithuanian Environment (ELLE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Valsts meža dienests</td>
<td><a href="http://www.vmd.gov.lv">http://www.vmd.gov.lv</a></td>
<td>Governmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Vides aizsardzības klubs</td>
<td><a href="http://www.vak.lv">www.vak.lv</a></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Vides aizsardzības un regionālās attīstības ministrijas dabas aizsardzības departamentam</td>
<td><a href="http://www.varam.gov.lv">http://www.varam.gov.lv</a></td>
<td>Governmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Vides izglītības fonds (VIF)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.videsfonds.lv">http://www.videsfonds.lv</a></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Vides kvalitāte</td>
<td><a href="http://www.videskvalitate.lv">http://www.videskvalitate.lv</a></td>
<td>Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Vides risinājumu institūts (VRI)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.videsinstituts.lv">http://www.videsinstituts.lv</a></td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Zaļā brīvība</td>
<td><a href="http://www.zalabriviba.lv">http://www.zalabriviba.lv</a></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Zemkopības ministrijas Meža departaments</td>
<td><a href="http://www.zm.gov.lv">http://www.zm.gov.lv</a></td>
<td>Governmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Latvijas Biomasas asociācija</td>
<td><a href="http://www.latbio.lv">www.latbio.lv</a></td>
<td>Wood production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Latvijas Kokrūpniecības federācija</td>
<td><a href="http://www.latvianwood.lv">www.latvianwood.lv</a></td>
<td>Wood production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Latvijas Mežizstrādātāju savienība</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wood production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Latvijas Neatkarīgo mežizstrādātāju asociācija</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lnma.lv">www.lnma.lv</a></td>
<td>Wood production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Stādu audzētāju biedrība</td>
<td><a href="http://www.stadi.lv">www.stadi.lv</a></td>
<td>Nursery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Meža īpašnieku kooperācijas atbalsta centrs (biedrība)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forestry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>