

March 2018

PEFC Conformity Assessment

Romanian Forest Certification Scheme



Client

Name	PEFC Council
Contact person	Mr. C. Kämmer and Mr. M. Berger
Address	Case Postale 636 CH-1215 Genève 15 Switzerland
Telephone	+41 22 799 45 40
Fax	+41 22 799 45 50
Email	michael.berger@pefc.org
Website	www.pefc.org

Form international B.V.

Contact person	Mr. Rutger de Wolf
Address	Bevrijdingsweg 3 8051 EN Hattem Netherlands
Telephone	+31(0) 384448990
Fax	+31(0) 384448991
Email	info@forminternational.nl
Website	www.forminternational.nl
Authors	Mr. Rutger de Wolf, Ms. Christine Naaijen, Mr. Andries Polinder
Document version	1
Date of document	March 2018
Reference	PEFC CA Romania_RW



Contents

Acronyms	6
1. Introduction.....	7
1.1. <i>Form international.....</i>	7
1.2. <i>Scope of the assessment.....</i>	7
1.3. <i>Documents and resources used</i>	7
1.4. <i>Methodology adopted</i>	9
1.5. <i>Assessment process.....</i>	10
1.6. <i>Report structure.....</i>	11
2. Recommendation.....	12
3. Summary of the Findings.....	13
3.1. <i>Overall.....</i>	13
3.2. <i>Structure of the System</i>	13
3.3. <i>Standard Setting Procedures and Process</i>	13
3.4. <i>Forest Management Standard</i>	14
3.5. <i>Group Certification Procedures.....</i>	14
3.6. <i>Chain of Custody Standard.....</i>	14
3.7. <i>Certification and Accreditation Procedures</i>	15
3.8. <i>Other aspects</i>	15
4. Structure of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme	16
4.1. <i>Introduction to the forest sector in Romania.....</i>	16
4.2. <i>Organisation of PEFC Romania.....</i>	17
4.3. <i>The Romanian Forest Certification Scheme.....</i>	18
5. Standard Setting Procedures and Process.....	19
5.1. <i>Analysis</i>	19
5.2. <i>Results: Non-Conformities</i>	20
5.3. <i>Results: Selection of Conformities</i>	22
6. Forest Management Standard.....	26
6.1. <i>Analysis</i>	26
6.2. <i>Results: Non-Conformities</i>	26
6.3. <i>Results: Selection of Conformities</i>	29
7. Group Certification Procedures.....	36
7.1. <i>Analysis</i>	36
7.2. <i>Results: Non-Conformities</i>	36
7.3. <i>Results: Selection of Conformities</i>	36
8. Chain of Custody Standard.....	39
9. Certification and Accreditation Procedures	40
9.1. <i>Analysis</i>	40
9.2. <i>Results</i>	41



10. Other aspects.....	42
Annex 1 PEFC Standard and Scheme Requirement Checklist	43
<i>Part I: PEFC Standard Requirements Checklist for standard setting.....</i>	<i>43</i>
<i>Part II: PEFC Standard Requirements Checklist for Group Forest Management Certification.....</i>	<i>66</i>
<i>Part III: PEFC Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Sustainable Forest Management.....</i>	<i>77</i>
<i>Part IV: PEFC Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Certification And Accreditation Procedures.....</i>	<i>113</i>
<i>Part V: Standard and System Requirement Checklist for System Specific Chain of Custody Standards</i>	<i>120</i>
Annex 2 Results of Stakeholder Survey	121
Annex 3 Results of International Consultation	129
Annex 4 Panel of Experts Comments	131
Annex 5 Report on the Field Assessment	151
<i>Schedule of the field visit</i>	<i>151</i>
<i>WG*-members and Stakeholders participating in meetings / interviews.....</i>	<i>153</i>
<i>Structure and organization of the Standard Setting Process</i>	<i>154</i>
<i>Timelines process.....</i>	<i>157</i>
<i>The Romanian context.....</i>	<i>159</i>
Forest.....	159
Legislative Framework	159
Forest Management Planning	160
Inspections.....	163
Tracking Systems.....	163
<i>Summary of the discussions with stakeholders.....</i>	<i>164</i>
<i>Main conclusions of the Assessor.....</i>	<i>165</i>



Acronyms

AG	Assemblee General
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CB	Certifying Body
CoC	Chain of Custody
ENGO	Environmental Non-Governmental Organisation
FM	Forest Management
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
GA	General Assembly
IAF	International Accreditation Forum
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
N.A.	Not applicable
NGB	National Governing Body
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PEFC GD	Guidance Document of PEFC International
PEFC IGD	PEFC Informative Guide
PEFC ST	Standard Document of PEFC International
PEFC	Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification
PEFCC TD	PEFC Council Technical Document
PEFC RO DST	Designation used to indicate a standard as part of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme
PoE	Panel of Experts
Req.	Requirement
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management
SSRC	Standard and Scheme Requirement Checklist
WG	Working Group



1. Introduction

The Programme for Endorsement of Forest Certification schemes (PEFC) admits national standards for Sustainable Forest Management to the PEFC system, after the national standards are endorsed based on a positive evaluation by an independent Assessor. Every five years, the endorsed national schemes need to be revised after which an independent Assessor assesses whether the revised scheme is in conformity with the PEFC Council requirements.

This report presents the results of the initial evaluation of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme against PEFC Council requirements for forest certification schemes. The application for PEFC endorsement was submitted in June 2017.

PEFC Council appointed Form international (Form) as the independent Assessor to carry out the assessment. This assessment report will be the basis for the decision of the PEFC Council, and provides a recommendation to the PEFC Board on the formal endorsement of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme for Sustainable Forest Management (SFM).

1.1. Form international

The assessment benefited from Form's specific experience and expertise in certification and SFM. Form has implemented many studies in which national or international certification standards were analysed versus another standard or scheme, for example for FSC and Keurhout. Moreover, Form has carried out conformity assessments for PEFC, such as the Certification Schemes of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Malaysia (Forest plantation), Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, UK, USA and Canada.

The conformity assessment team consisted of Mr. Rutger de Wolf, Ms. Christine Naaijen and Mr. Andries Polinder (Forestry Experts and Registered PEFC Assessors) and referred to as the Assessor in this report.

1.2. Scope of the assessment

The scope of this assessment is to assess the conformity of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme with the PEFC standards and system requirements as presented in PEFC IGD 1007-01:2012.

1.3. Documents and resources used

Various documents and resources were used in this conformity assessment. The documents received from PEFC Romania are shown in Table 1.1. Table 1.2 lists the documents used from PEFC Council. Besides these documents, the website of PEFC Romania (www.pefc.padurea.org) was consulted during the assessment.



Table 1.1 Documents used for the conformity assessment

	Document number	Document name
Technical documents		
	PEFC RO DST 8000:2017	PEFC Romanian Forest Certification Scheme - System Description v2
Annex 01	PEFC RO DST 8001:2017	Criteria and indicators 2017 v2
Annex 02	PEFC RO DST 8002:2017	Guidelines for SFM 2017 v2
Annex 04	PEFC ST 2002:2013	CoC Standard 2017 v2 (adopted)
Annex 05	PEFC ST 2001:2008v2	PEFC Logo Usage Rules – Requirements 2017 v2 (adopted)
Annex 06	PEFC RO DST 8006:2017	Statutes – PEFC Romania 2017 v2
Annex 07	PEFC RO DST 8007:2017	Declarations – Forest Owners 2017 - Self-commitment v2
Annex 08	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017	Standard setting procedures 2017 v2
Annex 09	PEFC RO DST 8009:2017	Procedure of Arbitration 2017 v2
Annex 10	PEFC RO DST 8010:2017	Group certification – Requirements 2017 v2
Annex 11	PEFC RO DST 8011:2017	Deficiencies – Measures and Consequences 2017 v2
Annex 12	PEFC RO DST 8012:2017	Requirements for Certification Bodies and Auditors 2017 v2
Annex 13	PEFC ST 2003:2012	Requirements for Certification Bodies and Auditors - CoC
Annex 14	PEFC RO DST 8014:2017	Notification of Certification Bodies 2017 v2
Annex 15	PEFC RO DST 8015:2017	Issuance of Logo licences 2017 v2
Annex 16	PEFC RO DST 8016:2017	Scale of fees 2017 v2
		PEFC Romania - scheme submission letter 2017
		PEFC Romania Checklist 12.2017
		Other documentation and evidence (records; minutes)
		Additional clarifications and translations provided by PEFC Romania during the Assessment process

Table 1.2 The PEFC Council Technical documents used.

#	PEFC Council document	Date
1	PEFC GD 1007:2012: Endorsement and Mutual Recognition of National Systems and their Revision	16 November 2012
2	PEFCC TD Annex 1: Terms and Definitions	27 October 2006
3	PEFCC TD Annex 6: Certification and Accreditation Procedures	5 October 2007
4	PEFCC TD Annex 7: Endorsement and Mutual Recognition of National Schemes and their Revisions	5 October 2007
5	PEFC ST 1001:2010 Standard Setting – Requirements	26 November 2010
6	PEFC ST 1002:2010 Group Forest Management Certification – Requirements	26 November 2010
7	PEFC ST 1003:2010 Sustainable Forest Management – Requirements	26 November 2010



#	PEFC Council document	Date
8	PEFC ST 2001:2008 v2 PEFC Logo usage rules - Requirements	26 November 2010
9	PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products - Requirements	24 May 2013
10	PEFC ST 2003:2012 Requirements for Certification Bodies operating Certification against the PEFC International Chain of Custody Standard	16 July 2012
12	PEFC GD 1005:2012 Issuance of PEFC Logo Use Licenses by the PEFC Council	27 November 2012
13	PEFC IGD 1007-01:2012 PEFC Standard and System Requirement Checklist	6 May 2014
14	PEFC IGD 1007-03:2012 The Assessment Report	16 November 2012
15	PEFC Secretariat's clarification concerning the content of the assessment report (clarification 30/10/12).	30 October 2012

1.4. Methodology adopted

The work consisted of a desk study in which an evaluation of the conformity was conducted. The assessment enabled the Assessor to identify any missing information, similarities and differences between the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme and the PEFC Council standards and system requirements. Next to a general analysis of the structure of the scheme, the assessment consisted of:

a. Assessment of the standard setting procedures

This aspect is evaluated on the basis of PEFC ST 1001:2010 Standard Setting - Requirements. The checklist (part I of PEFC IGD 1007-01:2012) has been used to assess the compliance of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme with the demands of PEFC concerning the standard setting procedures and the actual process. The criteria for the standard setting procedure have been assessed in two stages:

1. compliance of the scheme documented procedures ('Procedures')
2. compliance of the standard setting process itself ('Process')

To assess the process, additional evidential records and results of stakeholder consultations are used to evaluate compliance of the process.

The PEFC Council conducted an international public consultation, and a stakeholder survey was held by Form international through questionnaires that were sent out to members of the Working Group and other relevant stakeholders identified by PEFC Romania during the revision process.

b. Assessment of the sustainable forest management standard

The compliance of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme with PEFC ST 1003:2010 Sustainable Forest Management was assessed based on part III of PEFC IGD 1007-01:2012.



c. Assessment of the group certification procedures

The compliance of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme with PEFC ST 1002:2010, Group Forest Management Certification – Requirements was assessed based on part II of PEFC IGD 1007-01:2012.

d. Assessment of the chain of custody standard

The compliance of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme with PEFC ST 2002:2010 – Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products – Requirements was assessed based on part V of PEFC IGD 1007-01:2012.

e. Assessment of the certification and accreditation procedures

The compliance of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme with PEFC TD Annex 6 (Certification and accreditation procedures) and PEFC ST 2003:2012 was assessed based on part IV of PEFC IGD 1007-01:2012.

f. Other aspects regarding functions and efficiency of the scheme

The functions and efficiency of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme were evaluated on the basis of descriptions and information obtained in correspondence with PEFC Romania and stakeholders.

The report is written in line with the guidelines of the PEFC Council, PEFC GD 1007-03:2012 for the content of an assessment report, and the additional PEFC Secretariat's clarification of 30 October 2012.

1.5. Assessment process

The assessment process consisted of the following steps:

1. Public consultation

- The international public consultation by the PEFC Council was held from 20 June 2017 to 7 August 2017. In total 2 comments were received, which are considered in the process and can be found in Annex 3.
- The national stakeholder consultation was held from 1 of March – 30 of April 2016.
- Form sent out questionnaires to all stakeholders that were members of the Working Group and additional stakeholders that were invited and/or participated in public consultation meetings during the revision process. In total 82 questionnaires were sent out, 5 responses were received.

2. Technical desk study

The technical desk study was carried out on the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme documentation. It comprised of a review of the documentation and a verification of the standards and system requirements checklist. During the assessment additional information and translations were requested from PEFC Romania.



3. Elaboration of draft report

The draft report was sent to PEFC Romania and PEFC Council on 17 November 2017.

4. Elaboration of final draft report

Based on the responses and additional references and clarifications to the draft report, a final draft report was developed and sent to PEFC Council, on 22 December 2017.

5. Review of the final draft report

Members of PEFC's Panel of Experts will contribute to the final report by providing Form with their feedback and comments.

6. Final analysis and reporting

The final report will be elaborated taking into account the comments from Panel of Experts members and will be sent to the PEFC Council.

1.6. Report structure

Chapter 2 gives an explicit statement in the form of a recommendation on whether the Board of Directors of PEFC should endorse the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme. In chapter 3, a summary of the findings is presented. Chapter 4 gives an overview of the key structures of the scheme, followed by the results of the assessment of the standard setting procedures and process in chapter 5. The assessment of the forest management standard and group certification procedures are presented in chapters 6 and 7. The Chain of Custody standard is addressed in Chapter 8. The assessment of certification and accreditation procedures is presented in Chapter 9, and other aspects are discussed in Chapter 10. The standards and system requirements checklist (SSRC) is enclosed in Annex 1. Results of the stakeholder survey and international consultation are presented in respectively Annex 2 and Annex 3. The Panel of Experts Comments are presented in Annex 4 and the report on the Field Assessment is presented in Annex 5.



2. Recommendation

Based on the results of this conformity assessment, Form International recommends the PEFC Council Board of Directors **to endorse the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme**, on the condition that the three (3) identified non-conformities in the Sustainable Forest Management Standard, and the two (2) identified non-conformities in the Standard Setting Procedures shall be corrected within six (6) months after endorsement.

In relation to the standard-setting process, five (5) non-conformities are identified. Based on the assessment, it is concluded that the non-conformities found in the process did not undermine or damage the standard-setting process.

All non-conformities identified in the procedures and process are classified as minor.



3. Summary of the Findings

3.1. Overall

The Romanian Forest Certification Scheme is in general quite complete and clear. There are however three (3) non-conformities found in the Forest Management Standard, two (2) in the Standard Setting Procedures, and five (5) in the process. This is in total ten (10) non-conformities. They are all classified as minor.

3.2. Structure of the System

PEFC Romania, as the National Governing Body of the Romanian system, was established in January 2016. Specific tasks and responsibilities of the different organs of PEFC Romania are described in the Statutes. The General Assembly (GA) is comprised of representatives of all members and is responsible for passing resolutions on all basic issues concerning PEFC Romania. The President is elected by the General Assembly.

Most of the standard setting activities were done before the establishment of the NGB. Organization of meetings and record keeping were done by the NGO's Romontana and Open Fields. Development of the Standards was done by a Working Group.

The Romanian PEFC Scheme exists of a System description and 16 normative appendices. The system includes provisions for group certification. The regulations of the international standards for Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products have been adopted, as well as the Logo Usage Rules.

Stakeholders call the Legislative Framework extremely strict. The current valid Forest Code is the version of 2008, but there have been amendments in 2015 and 2017. Core document is the obligatory Forest Management Plan, including an operational plan, for the duration of 10 years. The design of Forest Management Plans and implementation of forest management is furthermore regulated in a set of 8 Technical Norms.

3.3. Standard Setting Procedures and Process

The procedures on standard setting are elaborated in PEFC RO DST 8008:2017. It is a clearly structured document. There are however two (2) non-conformities found:

- No contact details of a contact point are found in the procedures_(req. 4.6);
- It is not defined in the procedures what in the Romanian context is 'in a timely manner' and 'in suitable media' (req. 5.6);



The standard setting process went relatively well, however, five (5) non-conformities are found:

- No evidence was found that a public announcement was made on a website and in the major forestry related internet news sites and printed magazines (req. 5.3);
- The announcement / invitation did not include steps of the standard-setting process, nor a timetable (req. 5.3 a);
- The invitation did not include an invitation to comment on the scope and the standard-setting process (req. 5.3.d);
- The invitation did not include reference to publicly available standard-setting procedures (req. 5.3.e);
- It is not clear how consensus was reached in the whole WG (req. 5.8).

In the opinion of the Assessor, the non-conformities found in the process do not undermine or damage the standard revision process. It would therefore not be adequate to redo the process based on the non-conformities found in the process.

3.4. Forest Management Standard

The Sustainable Forest Management requirements are stipulated in two documents: PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 and PEFC RO DST 8002:2017. In some cases, reference is made to specific parts of the legislative framework, to prove compliance.

Although the standard is in general quite well elaborated, three (3) non-conformities are found in the Forest Management Standard:

- Insufficient evidence is found that conversion does not have a negative impact on threatened forest ecosystems, culturally and socially significant areas, important habitats of threatened species or other protected areas (req. 5.1.11);
- No reference was found ensuring proper equipment and training when using pesticides (req. 5.2.11);
- It is insufficiently ensured that forest management shall comply with legislation applicable to forest management (req. 5.7.1).

3.5. Group Certification Procedures

The procedures on Group Certification are regulated in PEFC RO DST 8010:2017 and PEFC RO DST 8007:2017. The procedures comply with the PEFC Council requirements, no non-conformities are found.

3.6. Chain of Custody Standard

The Romanian Forest Certification Scheme adopted the PEFC ST 2002:2013. The standard complies with the PEFC Council requirements, no non-conformities are found.



3.7. Certification and Accreditation Procedures

The requirements for certification and accreditation are regulated in PEFC RO DST 8012:2017, and include references to EN 45011 (ISO Guide 65), ISO 17021, and ISO 19011:2002. PEFC ST 2003:2012 is furthermore adopted. The procedures comply with the PEFC Council requirements, no non-conformities are found.

3.8. Other aspects

With regards to Scheme Administration Procedures, the following procedures were found:

- Notification of Certification Procedures (PEFC RO DST 8013:2017);
- Logo Usage Rules (PEFC ST 2001:2008 is fully adopted);
- Complaints and Dispute Resolution Procedures (PEFC RO DST 8009:2017).

These are not further assessed in detail, in accordance with the tender document for this assignment. Further assessment of these procedures is conducted by the Technical Unit of PEFC Council.



4. Structure of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme

4.1. Introduction to the forest sector in Romania

The forest sector in Romania can be characterized by the following descriptions:

- Romania has a Forest cover of: 6.5 million hectares (27.5% of the surface). The largest (70%) consists of deciduous forest (Beech, Oak), the other 30% consists mainly coniferous species, like Spruce and Fir.
- The ownership situation in Romania is quite complicated. The Partial privatization of Romanian forested territory has resulted in blurred ownership structures, e.g. referring to situations where assets are transferred into private firms, but liabilities remain state property.
- According to the National Institute of Statistics (data of 2015) roughly 65% is public property, including state owned forests (47%) and 'territorial administrative units' (18%); 35% is considered private ownership (mainly natural and legal persons, but also a small part 'territorial administrative units').
- The state forests are administered by the National Forestry Administration (NFA; Romsilva). The municipal forests (public form of ownership) and private forests can be administrated either by a state forest district or by a private forest district, on a contractual basis.
- The annual wood harvesting volume is relatively stable, about 18 million m³. (Standing volume, representing official volume reported). *Source: National Institute of Statistics; data of 2015.* The amount of round wood is less than half of this, about 8 million m³.

The Legislative Framework: Stakeholders call the system extremely strict. The current valid Forest Code is the version of 2008, but there have been amendments in 2015 and 2017. Core document of the Legislative Framework is the obligatory Forest Management Plan, including an operational plan, for the duration of 10 years. The design of Forest Management Plans and implementation of forest management is furthermore regulated in a set of 8 Technical Norms, from reforestation (species selection, provenance, stocking) to rotation and timing of tending or thinning operations, practically everything is prescribed in the Technical Norms:

1. Afforestation and stand composition
2. Silvicultural works for stand tending
3. Forest regeneration techniques
4. Forest inventory and estimations
5. Forest management planning
6. Forest protection
7. Annual inventory of regeneration
8. Forest fire preventions

For more information on the Romanian Forest Sector, see Annex 5.



4.2. Organisation of PEFC Romania

PEFC Romania, as the National Governing Body of the Romanian system, was established in January 2016. Current members are the founding members:

- Open Fields (NGO – rural development)
- Romontana (NGO; National Association for Mountain Rural Development; initial project-owner)
- Nostra Silva (Federation of Private Forest and Pasture Owners of Romania)
- Association of Companies for Forest Management and Planning
- Consilva (Confederation / 'Union' of Forest Workers)
- Silva (Federation of Forestry Syndicates)

Specific tasks and responsibilities of the different organs of PEFC Romania are described in the Statutes. The General Assembly (GA) is comprised of representatives of all members and is responsible for passing resolutions on all basic issues concerning PEFC Romania. The President is elected by the General Assembly. Currently Mr. Istvan Töke is the President of the NGB.

Most of the standard setting activities were done before the establishment of the NGB. Organization of meetings and record keeping were done by the NGO's Romontana and Open Fields. Development of the Standards was done by a Working Group.



4.3. The Romanian Forest Certification Scheme

The Romanian Forest Certification Scheme is based on a number of documents which define the requirements for forest and traceability certification. The document structure is shown in the figure below.

Standards for operators	Standards for certifying bodies	Scheme governance
PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 Criteria and Indicators for the Assessment of Sustainable Forestry in Romania	PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 Requirements for Certification Bodies and Auditors - FM	PEFC RO DST 8006:2017 PEFC Romania Statutes
PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 PEFC Guidelines for Sustainable Forestry in Romania	PEFC ST 2003:2012 Requirements for Certification Bodies and Auditors – CoC (adopted)	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards
PEFC ST 2002:2013 PEFC Chain of Custody (adopted)	PEFC RO DST 8014:2017 Notification of Certification Bodies	PEFC RO DST 8009:2017 Procedure for Arbitration
PEFC ST 2001:2008v2 Guidelines for Use of the PEFC Logo (adopted)		PEFC RO DST 8015:2017 Issuance of Logo Licenses
PEFC RO DST 8007:2017 PEFC Forest Owner's Declaration of Participation – Self Commitment		PEFC RO DST 8016:2017 Scale of Fees
PEFC RO DST 8010:2017 Group Certification Requirements		
PEFC RO DST 8011:2017 Measures and Consequences in the case of deficiencies		



5. Standard Setting Procedures and Process

This chapter presents the non-conformities and observations found in the Standard Setting Procedures and Process. In total, seven (7) non-conformities are found, two (2) related to the procedures and five (5) related to the process, all classified as minor. They can be addressed by providing additional evidence or by updating the standard. The Standard and Scheme Requirement Checklist related to the Standard Setting Procedures and Process can be found in Annex 1 part I, which presents all the conformities, non-conformities and related references.

5.1. Analysis

The standard setting procedures are elaborated in PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards v2, which is mainly an adoption of the PEFC ST 1001:2010: Standard setting – requirements. It is a clearly structured document. There are however two (2) non-conformities found, both classified as minor. Additionally, two (2) observations¹ are made related to standard setting procedures:

- Requirement 4.1a: From the statutes, the structure of PEFC Romania is not clear. It is not evident which is the body for consensus building, and which is the body responsible for formal adoption of the standard;
- Requirement 4.1b: The implementation of this requirement, the actual record-keeping procedures as described in the stipulation 2.1 are very general and little elaborate.

In general, the process was conducted according to the standard-setting procedures. Activities started early 2015, most of the standard setting activities were done before the establishment of the NGB. Organization of meetings and record keeping were done by the NGO's Romontana and Open Fields. Development of the Standards was done by a Working Group. 6 people within the Working Group were chosen to lead the development of a Criterion of the FM standard. The structure of the Working Group was very open. All identified stakeholders were invited for every WG-meeting. Most meetings were attended by about 20 participants.

As no development report was submitted, timelines were reconstructed, based on records, such as minutes and attendance lists. An elaborate timeline is included in Annex 5 of this report.

The standard setting process went relatively well, however five (5) non-conformities are found in the Standard Setting process, all classified as minor. In the opinion of the Assessor, the non-conformities found in the process do not undermine or damage the

¹ Observations are weaknesses found in the Scheme, which are not considered to be a non-conformity.



standard revision process. It would therefore not be adequate to redo the process based on the non-conformities found in the process.

Additionally, one observation is made related to standard setting process:

- Requirement 4.4: at the start of the standard setting process, there was no official standardizing body. The work started with the set-up of a working group. PEFC Romania, as a national governing body, was registered later (early 2016).

5.2. Results: Non-Conformities

The non-conformities in the procedures are presented in the tables below, followed by the non-conformities in the process.

Requirement	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.
Evidence	Procedures; PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 “1.1.6 The standardizing 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.”
Assessors’ comments	Although contact details have been found on the website of PEFC Romania, the details of such a contact point is not found in the procedures.
Result	Does not conform - minor
CAR	Update the standard

Requirement	5.6 The standardising body shall organise a public consultation on the enquiry draft and shall ensure that: a) the start and the end of the public consultation is announced in a timely manner in suitable media,
Evidence	Procedures; PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 “1.2.6 The standardizing body shall organise a public consultation on the enquiry draft and shall ensure that: - the start and the end of the public consultation is announced in a timely manner in suitable media,”
Assessors’ comments	It is not defined in the procedures what in the Romanian context is ‘in a timely manner’ and ‘in suitable media’.
Result	Does not conform - minor
CAR	Provide evidence to show conformity or update the standard

The non-conformities found in the process are presented in the tables below.

Requirement	5.3 The standardising body shall make a public announcement of the start of the standard-setting process and include an invitation for participation in a timely manner on its website and in suitable media as appropriate to afford stakeholders an opportunity for meaningful contributions.
--------------------	--



Evidence	Process; (none)
Assessors' comments	No evidence was found that a public announcement was made on a website and in the major forestry related internet news sites and printed magazines. An invitation "Invitatie_Brasov_PEFC 2 april 2015" was sent by Email to all stakeholders identified, on the 26th of March 2015, which is less than 15 days prior to the meeting.
Result	Does not conform - minor
CAR	Provide additional evidence to show conformity (public announcement)

Requirement	5.3 The announcement and invitation shall include: a) information about the objectives, scope and the steps of the standard-setting process and its timetable,
Evidence	Process; Invitatie_Brasov_PEFC 2 april 2015: "We are delighted to invite you to attend the meeting to be held on April 02, 2015, in Braşov, (...) An initial meeting, dated 03.02.2015, was held in Suceava, to identify the main representative organizations in the forestry sector in Romania. Which are now invited to establish a Working Group (WG) for the purpose of elaboration National PEFC Standards. [list of identified stakeholders] The purpose of the meeting is the formation of the WG Working Group National Standards (SN-PEFC), establishment of the standards structure, adoption of The Standardization Body and the National Governance Body (National Governing Body - NGB)."
Assessors' comments	PEFC Romania commented that this had been presented during the stakeholder mapping and the meeting of 2nd of April 2015, with reference to two documents that had been made available through the website: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PEFC - Procedura de standardizare in Romania • PEFC - Procesul de standardizare in Romania 2015-2018 However, the announcement / invitation itself did not include steps of the standard-setting process, nor a timetable.
Result	Does not conform - minor
CAR	Provide additional evidence to show conformity

Requirement	5.3 The announcement and invitation shall include: d) an invitation to comment on the scope and the standard-setting process, and
Evidence	Process; (none)
Assessors' comments	The invitation itself did not include an invitation to comment on the scope and the standard-setting process
Result	Does not conform - minor
CAR	Provide additional evidence to show conformity

Requirement	5.3 The announcement and invitation shall include: e) reference to publicly available standard-setting procedures.
Evidence	Process; (none)
Assessors' comments	The invitation itself did not include reference to publicly available standard-setting procedures.



Result	Does not conform - minor
CAR	Provide additional evidence to show conformity

Requirement	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.
Evidence	<p>Process; Minutes Ad-Hoc Meeting 15.05.2017 - Aula University Brasov</p> <p>At the Conference on "Sustainable Forest Management and Forest Certification" with the majority of members of the Working Group and PEFC members, Romania decided to hold an Ad-hoc meeting to make decisions on Romanian PEFC Standards.</p> <p>1. After the discussions, the presentation of the stage of the elaboration and testing of the Standards, the amendments included in the standards following the testing and publication of the final form of the standards on the www.pefc.padurea.org site, the decision was made by consensus by the Standards Working Group to support the forwarding of their AG to PEFC Romania for their approval.</p> <p>2. For the approval of the PEFC Standards Romania, the General Meeting of PEFC Romania will be convened for 29.05.2017</p>
Assessors' comments	In total 13 WG members were participating in the ad-hoc meeting, and according to the minutes they reached consensus. However, as this was an ad-hoc meeting, no previous announcement or invitation was made to all WG members (22) that this was the moment where the WG would take a decision on recommending the final draft for formal approval. It is not clear how the opinion of absent WG members was taken into account.
Result	Does not conform - minor
CAR	Provide additional evidence to show conformity.

5.3. Results: Selection of Conformities

In the tables below, a selection of conformities is presented that are considered to be sensitive issues in the Romanian context and/or illustrative examples of the Standard Setting Procedures and Process. As the Romanian standard setting procedures were mainly an adoption of the PEFC generic standard setting requirements, examples are chosen from the process.

Requirement	4.4 The standardising body shall establish a permanent or temporary working group/committee responsible for standard-setting activities.
Evidence	<p>Process; On February 3rd, 2015, a meeting was held in Suceava 'Mapping of representative stakeholder groups and organizations from Romania'.</p> <p>On April 2nd, 2015, there was a meeting in Brasov, to set-up a Working Group. Minutes were published at the website Minutes 2 April 2015</p> <p>"Mr. Tóke is proposing that by the end of April all those interested to express their intention / application. It is clearly stated that the presence</p>



	<p>in the working group is voluntary and unpaid. Those who have expressed interest to participate effectively (not solely consultative) in the working group are: (...).”</p> <p>Furthermore, a list of permanently invited stakeholders was submitted, containing 34 organizations that were invited to participate in the Working Group. Existence of the Working Group was confirmed by outcomes of the field mission, that has been carried out for this Conformity Assessment. (see annex 5).</p> <p>Observation: at the start of the standard setting process, there was no official standardizing body. The work started with the set-up of a working group. PEFC Romania, as a national governing body, was registered later (early 2016).</p>
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	4.4 The working group/committee shall: a) be accessible to materially and directly affected stakeholders,
Evidence	<p>Process; Minutes inception meeting 3rd of February 2015, ‘Mapping of representative stakeholder groups and organizations from Romania’: “According to the model proposed by Mr. Toke, there are 8 categories in the WG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Owners (State and private) b. Timber, Pulp and Paper Trade Unions c. Environmental NGO’s d. Unions / Syndicates e. Other representatives of Forestry f. User groups g. Forest service enterprises h. Research and education” <p>Per category, stakeholders were identified. Category a), e), and g) represent materially and directly affected stakeholders. Furthermore, a list of permanently invited stakeholders was submitted, containing 34 organizations that were invited to participate in the Working Group. Open access to the WG for all stakeholders was confirmed by the interviews during the field mission.</p>
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	4.4 The working group/committee shall: b) have balanced representation and decision-making by stakeholder categories relevant to the subject matter and geographical scope of the standard where single concerned interests shall not dominate nor be dominated in the process, and
Evidence	<p>Process; During the field mission, it became clear that the WG had a very open structure. All 34 organisations that were mapped during the stakeholder identification (3 February 2015), were invited for every WG meeting. The list of permanently invited stakeholders represents all</p>



	<p>identified stakeholder categories: Owners (State and private), Timber Pulp and Paper (trade unions), environmental NGO's, Unions / Syndicates, other representatives of Forestry, user groups, forest service enterprises, research and education. Interviews with WG-members and other stakeholders during the field mission confirmed a balanced representation, where no single interest had dominated or was dominated in the process.</p> <p>Decision making was implicitly done during meetings, by discussion and debate. No voting was done, as there was never a substantial issue. This was confirmed by all people interviewed during the field mission (Annex 5).</p>
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	5.1 The standardising body shall identify stakeholders relevant to the objectives and scope of the standard-setting work.
Evidence	<p>Process; During the Inception workshop, held on 3 February 2015 in Suceava, the stakeholder mapping was done.</p> <p>Minutes inception meeting 3rd of February 2015, 'Mapping of representative stakeholder groups and organizations from Romania': "According to the model proposed by Mr. Toke, there are 8 categories in the WG: [...]"</p>
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	<p>5.5 The work of the working group/committee shall be organised in an open and transparent manner where:</p> <p>a) working drafts shall be available to all members of the working group/committee,</p>
Evidence	<p>Process; PEFC Romania explained that working papers and different drafts of the standard have been sent by email before and after each working group meeting. Availability of working drafts was confirmed by the WG members that responded to the survey (annex 2) and by the ones interviewed during the field mission (annex 5).</p>
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	<p>5.5 The work of the working group/committee shall be organised in an open and transparent manner where:</p> <p>b) all members of the working group shall be provided with meaningful opportunities to contribute to the development or revision of the standard and submit comments to the working drafts, and</p>
Evidence	<p>Process; PEFC Romania comments that the meetings themselves were the most meaningful opportunities to contribute to the development of the</p>



	standards. The WG had a very open structure (no official membership). All 34 organisations that were mapped during the stakeholder identification (3 February 2015), were invited for every WG meeting. 6 WG-members were selected to take the lead in the development of the 6 Criteria of the SFM standard. Others could comment and take part in discussions. The WG had at least 4 extensive meetings with a good attendance and also several workshops. Minutes of meetings and Attendance sheets are available. WG-members interviewed during the field mission confirmed that meaningful opportunities were provided to them to contribute to the development of the standard.
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	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.
Evidence	Process; Pilot testing was done in October 2016. A report (in Romanian) is available and contains 5 recommendations. The pilot testing was discussed in detail during the field mission (See Annex 5). All suggestions from the pilot testing report were considered by each of the 6 WG-members that were leading the standard setting for a specific criterion.
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform



6. Forest Management Standard

This chapter presents the findings of the assessment of the Sustainable Forest Management Standard. In total three (3) minor non-conformities are found. Corrective action requests are formulated for each of the non-conformities raised. The Standard and Scheme Requirement Checklist related to the Sustainable Forest Management Standard can be found in Annex 1 part III, which presents all the conformities, non-conformities and related references.

6.1. Analysis

The Sustainable Forest Management requirements are stipulated in two documents:

- PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 Criteria and Indicators for assessing sustainable forest management in Romania
- PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 Guidelines for assessing sustainable forest management in Romania

Furthermore, the legal framework (Forest Code 2008, Law of Forest Contraventions, and Technical Norms) in Romania is elaborate and considered very strict by stakeholders.

As the main decisions relating to forest management planning are largely made by specialized Forest Planning Companies, at the moment when a new Forest Management Plan is designed, and have to be in line with the Technical Norms, there is little room for forest managers to make forest management planning decisions themselves and/or make changes to existing plans. The weakness for certification is the little direct influence a forest manager has on important subjects of forest management. The responsibility for forest management planning is partly covered outside the forest organization that might want to get certified.

Although the standard is in general quite well elaborated, three (3) non-conformities are found. Additionally, one observation was made relating to the SFM standard:

- Requirement 4.1a: In the references to documentation and in the scheme documentation itself, STD and DST are used inconsistently, when referring to scheme documents.

6.2. Results: Non-Conformities

The non-conformities found in the Forest Management Standard are presented in the tables below.

Requirement 5.1.11 Conversion of forests to other types of land use, including conversion of primary forests to forest plantations, shall not occur unless in justified circumstances where the conversion:



	<p>a) is in compliance with national and regional policy and legislation relevant for land use and forest management and is a result of national or regional land-use planning governed by a governmental or other official authority including consultation with materially and directly interested persons and organisations; and</p> <p>b) entails a small proportion of forest type; and</p> <p>c) does not have negative impacts on threatened (including vulnerable, rare or endangered) forest ecosystems, culturally and socially significant areas, important habitats of threatened species or other protected areas; and</p> <p>d) makes a contribution to long-term conservation, economic, and social benefits.</p>
Evidence	<p>Forest Code, 2008:</p> <p>“Article 3. - (1) The national forest is, as appropriate, public or private property and national interest is best. (2) Ownership of land is national forest shall be exercised in accordance with the provisions of this Code.</p> <p>CHAPTER IV Ensure the integrity of the national forest fund</p> <p>Art. 35. - The reduction of the area of the national forest fund is prohibited.</p> <p>Art. 36. - (1) By way of exception from the provisions of art. 35 it is allowed to reduce the area of the national forest fund by removing / finalizing the lands necessary for the achievement of the objectives of national interest, declared for public utility, under the conditions of the law, as well as of lands on which are located production capacities and / or defense services strategic interest for national security.</p> <p>Art 37 (b) the maximum area which may be the subject of definitive removal from the forest fund, including construction, access and fencing, shall not exceed 250 m2 in the case of forest holdings greater than 5 ha and not more than 5% of the forest area but not more than 200 m2, if the area of the forest property is less than 5 ha.”</p> <p>Technical Norms – Volume 5: Forest Management planning:</p> <p>“Chapter 1.2 Clarifications concerning the forest area – Records of area change shall be operated only based on legal documents in the management plans.”</p>
Assessors’ comments	<p>Forest Fund’ is the Romanian expression for the duly registered forest area by the authorities. Although the reduction of the national forest area is prohibited by law (Art. 35), and exceptions to this are described in art. 36 – 47, no reference was found that conversion does not have a negative impact on threatened forest ecosystems, culturally and socially significant areas, important habitats of threatened species or other protected areas.</p>
Result	Does not conform – minor
CAR	Provide evidence to show conformity or update the standard

Requirement	5.2.11 The use of pesticides shall follow the instructions given by the pesticide producer and be implemented with proper equipment and training.
Evidence	PEFC RO DST 8002:2017



	<p>“2.3.1. The use of chemicals is limited by national and international usage regulations. It is not allowed to use herbicides and pesticides which are prohibited by international conventions.”</p> <p>Government Ordinance 4/1995- related to pesticides:</p> <p>“Art.19.- Use of plant protection products may only be done for the purposes for which it has been approved and only in accordance with the instructions for use, the rules and recommendations provided by the technologies approved by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food and the Ministry of Waters, Forests and Environmental Protection, for forestry.”</p>
Assessors’ comments	No reference was found with regard to implementation with proper equipment and training.
Result	Does not conform – minor
CAR	Provide evidence to show conformity or update the standard

Requirement	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.
Evidence	<p>PEFC RO DST 8000:2017</p> <p>“2.5.1 Criteria and Indicators</p> <p>(...) On this basis, concrete certification criteria have been defined, considering the specific national conditions and the legal situation in Romania, in particular the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Romanian Constitution, • Forestry Code 2008 (in its current amended version) and subsequent legal regulations, • Hunting Act 2008 (in its current amended version) • Nature protection regulations, including the 2007 Protected Areas Act (in its current amended version) • Water Act 1996 (in its current amended version) • Legislation on plant protection products and substances • Fiscal Code 2015 (in its current amended version) • Labor Code 2003 (in its current amended version) • Technical rules (Norms) in forestry • International Treaties and Declarations ratified by Romania <p>The criteria include economic, ecological and social aspects of forest management and apply to activities of all operators in the defined forest area who have a measurable impact on achieving compliance with the requirements.”</p>
Assessors’ comments	It is insufficiently ensured in the Romanian scheme requirements that forest management <u>shall comply with legislation</u> applicable to forest management.
Result	Does not conform – minor
CAR	Provide evidence to show conformity or update the standard



6.3. Results: Selection of Conformities

In the tables below, a selection of conformities is presented that are considered to be sensitive issues in the Romanian context and/or illustrative examples of the Sustainable Forest Management Standard.

Requirement	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.
Evidence	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“1.1 Distribution of forests included in the certification, in terms of destination and assigned functions</p> <p>Subcriterion: The management plans aim a sustainable use of forest resources, in line with the main functions (production and protection) and defined objectives. It will be pursued the increase of the area covered by forests, by adequate measures for the management and regeneration of the stands.</p> <p>Indicator 1.1.c Distribution of forests included in the certification, in relation to the assigned protection and production functions.</p> <p>Area of forests in functional group I, out of which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forests with water protection role • Forests with soil protection role • Forests with protective role against climate factors • Forests of social interest • Forests with biodiversity protection role” <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“1.1.3. The planned management measures should take into account the functions assigned by the management plans.</p> <p>1.1.4. The forest owners, their managers, representatives of the public authority and, where appropriate, the civil society will take all necessary steps to find technical solutions that meet the economic, technical, ecological and social objectives at the I. management planning conference, making full use of related services and tools that support land-use planning and nature conservation.</p> <p>1.2.1. The forest management plans must provide a growing stock in accordance with established economic, environmental and social functions.”</p>
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	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.
--------------------	---



Evidence	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“Introduction and general information</p> <p>The most important particularity of the forestry system in Romania is that for properties larger than 10 hectares, according to the law, drafting and respecting of the management plans is mandatory. The forest management plans are drawn up by certified specialized companies, respecting the Technical Norms and the management plans made are approved individually by Orders of the responsible minister.</p> <p>1.1.1. The certification area must be endowed with management plans, elaborated, approved and updated in compliance with the technical norms in the field, and going through all stages stipulated by law, considering the cycle of inventory and planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, including an appropriate assessment of the social, environmental and economic impacts of forest management operations</p> <p>3.4.1. The forest management system is based on a detailed study of the situation, maps and plans for forest planning according to legal requirements and voluntary management guidelines.”</p>
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	<p>5.1.7 Monitoring of forest resources and evaluation of their management shall be periodically performed, and results fed back into the planning process.</p>
Evidence	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“1.1.1. The certification area must be endowed with management plans, elaborated, approved and updated in compliance with the technical norms in the field, and going through all stages stipulated by law, considering the cycle of inventory and planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, including an appropriate assessment of the social, environmental and economic impacts of forest management operations</p> <p>3.4.1. The forest management system is based on a detailed study of the situation, maps and plans for forest planning according to legal requirements and voluntary management guidelines.</p> <p>3.4.2 Periodically, there are monitoring of how management plans are implemented and their results will also be taken into account when new management plans are being made.</p> <p>6.4.3. The manager of the administrated areas will support the research and data collection activities necessary for the sustainable management of the managed forests.”</p> <p>Forest Code, 2008:</p> <p>“Art. 22 – (2) Every year, from January 1 to 31, the forest districts are obliged to transmit to the territorial forestry structures units (...), the comparative situation between the provisions of the forest management plan and the forestry works actually carried out in the previous year, at the level of production unit.”</p>



Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	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.
Evidence	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“2.1.2. All abiotic, biotic or anthropogenic factors affecting the health, productivity and stability of the forest must be monitored at all times, following the affected area, the frequency and intensity of the factor, as well as the impact on the stands.</p> <p>2.1.3. The emergence, evolution and harmful influences on forests are pursued for the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Abiotic factors: Wind and snow (falls, breakages), negative temperatures, landslides, floods and fires; - Biotic factors: micro-fauna (insects, mites, gastropods, etc.), phytopathogens, hunting animals and macro-fauna species (rodents, birds, grazing mammals, etc.), domestic animals; - Anthropogenic factors: forest management (eg harvesting damage) and forms of pollution, non-organic waste and litter;”
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	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.
Evidence	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“1.3.2. Management plans solutions will aim to direct the management unit to a balanced age distribution that ensures continuity of long-term yields and functions</p> <p>1.3.3. The forest resource manager implements appropriate management measures to reduce the share of derived, partially derived and sub-productive stands.</p> <p>2.1.1. Forest management must ensure the health and vitality of forests.</p> <p>2.1.2. All abiotic, biotic or anthropogenic factors affecting the health, productivity and stability of the forest must be monitored at all times, following the affected area, the frequency and intensity of the factor, as well as the impact on the stands.</p> <p>2.2.1. Integrated forest protection is based on systematic prevention and environmentally acceptable control of harmful factors. It consists of specific (preventive and curative) protective measures doubled by preventive, revitalizing, sanitary or appropriate forestry measures.</p> <p>2.2.2. Maintaining and increasing the health and vitality of forest ecosystems and the rehabilitation (reconstruction) of degraded forest ecosystems will be done whenever possible through forestry measures.”</p> <p>Forest Code, 2008:</p>



	<p>“Article 55. - (1) monitoring the health of forests and establishment works to prevent and control diseases and pests is done by specialized service within the central public authority responsible for forestry. (2) Measures taken by the service provided in par. (1) are compulsory for all forest owners.</p> <p>Article 57. - (1) Works for combating diseases and pests of forests, regardless of the form ownership, by air means, is performed in a unitary manner under the coordination of the service provided by art. 55. (2) The other works to combat diseases and pests is done by the Forest Department are required to support this work and the owner, administrator concerned for public property forests.”</p>
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	<p>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.</p>
Evidence	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“1.1.3. The planned management measures should take into account the functions assigned by the management plans.</p> <p>1.1.4. The forest owners, their managers, representatives of the public authority and, where appropriate, the civil society will take all necessary steps to find technical solutions that meet the economic, technical, ecological and social objectives at the I. management planning conference, making full use of related services and tools that support land-use planning and nature conservation.</p> <p>6.2.1. Forest planning shall aim to respect the multiple functions offered by the forest to society, taking into account the role of the forest in rural development. Therefore, the planning process will grant great importance to the proper identification of all the social, economic and environmental functions according to the functional zoning criteria existing in the technical regulations in force at the time of certification.</p> <p>6.4.3. The manager of the administrated areas will support the research and data collection activities necessary for the sustainable management of the managed forests.”</p> <p>Forest Code, 2008:</p> <p>“CHAPTER III Ways to support sustainable forest development</p> <p>Article 97. - (1) For the purpose of sustainable management of forest and private property of individuals and legal entities of public or private property of local governments, the annual budget allocated by the budget of the central public authority responsible for forestry, amounts to: (...) f) supporting the establishment and development of forest owners associations;</p> <p>g) make available to owners of forest education materials on forest protection and forest conservation.</p>



	Article 100. - Complete cadastral surveys for the national forest, the IFN-ground monitoring of forest vegetation is funded annually from the state budget through the budget of central government authority responsible for forestry.”
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	5.4.9 Traditional management systems that have created valuable ecosystems, such as coppice, on appropriate sites shall be supported, when economically feasible.
Evidence	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 “4.1 Structural diversity Subcriterion: Structural diversity of stands and forests included for certification purposes Description: - Traditional management systems, which have created valuable ecosystems, such as coppice forests, will be maintained on favorable resorts when economically feasible.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 “4.4.2. Clear-cuts can only be applied on a small scale, in small felling areas and under the conditions foreseen by the applicable forestry legislation. 4.4.3. Coppice system (simple or composed) is not considered to be clear-cut and applies only to certain tree species under the conditions foreseen by the applicable forestry legislation.”</p>
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	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.
Evidence	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 “5.1 Water protection Subcriterion: Maintaining and improving the water protection function Description: - Particular attention should be paid to technologies used to drive and regenerate forests to avoid the negative impact on protected water resources.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 “2.3.2. Herbicides and pesticides are only used on a limited scale and where possible they are replaced by forestry measures or biological methods. 5.1.1. The management of water protection forests will maximize the hydrological function of the stands, ensuring the protection of water resources, aquatic and riparian ecosystems.</p>



	<p>5.1.2. Water courses, mineral and drinking water sources and accumulations of drinking or industrial water should not be affected by forestry activities. Particular attention should be paid to riparian areas and the quality of surface and deep water in the perimeters of water sources.</p> <p>5.1.5. Wood harvesting technologies as well as adjacent activities must be so chosen and executed that the impact on water drainage and the quality of the water is minimal.</p> <p>5.1.6. Particular attention should be paid to the management of harvesting residues as well as waste resulting from forestry activities (hydrocarbons, household waste, etc.) so that river-beds and waters remain clean.”</p>
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	5.6.1 Forest management planning shall aim to respect the multiple functions of forests to society, give due regard to the role of forestry in rural development, and especially consider new opportunities for employment in connection with the socio-economic functions of forests.
Evidence	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 “6.2 Rural development Subcriterion: Forest contribution to rural development Description: - Forest planning should aim to respect the multiple functions offered by the forest to society, taking into account the role of the forest in rural development; In particular, it must consider creating new employment opportunities in relation to the social and economic functions of forests.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 “6.2.1. Forest planning shall aim to respect the multiple functions offered by the forest to society, taking into account the role of the forest in rural development. Therefore, the planning process will grant great importance to the proper identification of all the social, economic and environmental functions according to the functional zoning criteria existing in the technical regulations in force at the time of certification.”</p>
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	5.6.8 Forest managers, contractors, employees and forest owners shall be provided with sufficient information and encouraged to keep up-to-date through continuous training in relation to sustainable forest management as a precondition for all management planning and practices described in this standard.
Evidence	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 “6.4 Education and research Subcriterion: Forestry education and research</p>



	<p>Description - Forest managers, contractors, employees and forest owners must have sufficient information and be encouraged to update their knowledge through a continuous training process in relation to sustainable forest management as a prerequisite for the implementation of the planned management and planning practices in this standard.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“6.4.1. The certified area manager and/or the owner must formally inform the forestry contractors about the conditions imposed by the certification standard in carrying out the contracted works.</p> <p>6.4.2. In Romania, forestry education is offered at all levels. The certified area manager will, however, ensure that all employees receive continuous training activities to understand and implement the certification requirements of this standard.”</p>
Assessors’ comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	<p>5.6.10 Forest management shall provide for effective communication and consultation with local people and other stakeholders relating to sustainable forest management and shall provide appropriate mechanisms for resolving complaints and disputes relating to forest management between forest operators and local people.</p>
Evidence	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“6.7 Public relations</p> <p>Subcriterion: Public participation and information</p> <p>Description: - Forest management shall provide effective communication and consultation with the local population and other stakeholders concerned with sustainable forest management and must provide appropriate mechanisms to resolve complaints and disputes related to forest management between forestry workers and the local population.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“6.7.2. The certified site manager and or the owner shall, at least once a year, consult stakeholders (local communities, NGOs, institutions, harvesting and processing companies) on the impact of forest management.</p> <p>6.7.3. The certified area manager shall record, document, and settle any complaint regarding deviations from the implementation of the provisions of the management plans in relation to the legal provisions.”</p>
Assessors’ comments	(none)
Result	Does conform



7. Group Certification Procedures

This chapter presents the findings of the assessment of the Group Forest Management Certification Procedures. No non-conformities are found. The Standard and Scheme Requirement Checklist related to the Group Forest Management Certification can be found in Annex 1 part II, which presents all the conformities and related references.

7.1. Analysis

The procedures for Group Certification are regulated in PEFC RO DST 8010:2017 Group certification – Requirements for assessing sustainable forest management in Romania. Additionally, the Romanian scheme contains PEFC RO DST 8007:2017 (Declarations Voluntary Self-commitments of Forest Owners), describing the commitments of a group member.

7.2. Results: Non-Conformities

No non-conformities are found in the Group Certification Procedures.

7.3. Results: Selection of Conformities

In the tables below, a selection of conformities is presented that are considered to be sensitive issues in the Romanian context and/or illustrative examples of the Group Certification Procedures.

Requirement	4.1 Does the forest certification scheme provide clear definitions for the following terms in conformity with the definitions of those terms presented in chapter 3 of PEFC ST 1002:2010: a) the group organisation b) the group entity c) the participant d) the certified area e) the group forest certificate f) the document confirming participation in group forest certification
Evidence	PEFC RO DST 8010:2017 "3.1.5 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. 3.1.2 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. 3.1.6 Participant



	<p>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.</p> <p>3.1.1 Certified area The forest area covered by a group forest certificate representing the sum of forest areas of the participants.</p> <p>3.1.3 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.</p> <p>3.1.7 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.”</p>
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	<p>4.2.1 The forest certification scheme shall define the following requirements for the function and responsibility of the group entity:</p> <p>a) To represent the group organisation in the certification process, including in communications and relationships with the certification body, submission of an application for certification, and contractual relationship with the certification body;</p>
Evidence	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017</p> <p>“3.3.1. Group representation (applicant) (...) The group representation is the responsible body for the group certification and applicant in the certification process.</p> <p>3.3.2. Assignments of the group representation The group representation has the following tasks: Application at an accredited certification body, including: a) communication with the certification body b) submission of an application for certification c) contractual relationship with the certification body”</p>
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform

Requirement	<p>4.2.1 The forest certification scheme shall define the following requirements for the function and responsibility of the group entity:</p> <p>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</p>
--------------------	--



certification in the event of non-conformity with the sustainable forest management standard	
Evidence	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017</p> <p>“3.3.2. Assignments of the group representation The group representation has the following tasks: Group entity shall have contract or other written agreement with all group participants including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the long-term commitment of the group participant to the principles of sustainable forest management and to the participation in PEFC Romania c) the group participants commitment to comply with the sustainable forest management standard and other applicable parts of the PEFC Romania scheme on all its forest area and other wooded land d) the group participants commitment to subject itself to external audit e) the right of the group entity to carry out internal monitoring f) the right of the group entity to implement and enforce any preventive or corrective measures g) the right of the group entity to exclude the group participant in the event of non-conformity with the sustainable forest management standard.” <p>PEFC RO DST 8007:2017 Declarations – Voluntary Self-commitments of Forest Owners</p>
Assessors' comments	(none)
Result	Does conform



8. Chain of Custody Standard

According to PEFC Romania, the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme uses the PEFC International Standard for Chain of Custody, as is explained in PEFC RO DST 8000:2017 Romanian Forest Certification Scheme 2017, chapter 2.4: “The regulations of the international standards in PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products – Requirements (...) have been adopted for the certification of the chain of custody, and their implementation is mandatory.” The Chain of Custody Standard of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme does therefore comply with the PEFC Council requirements, no further assessment was carried out.



9. Certification and Accreditation Procedures

This chapter presents the findings of the assessment of the Certification and Accreditation Procedures. No non-conformities are found. The Standard and Scheme Requirement Checklist related to the Certification and Accreditation Procedures can be found in Annex 1 part IV, which presents all conformities and related references.

9.1. Analysis

The requirements for accreditation and certification are regulated in PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 Requirements for Certification Bodies and Auditors for assessing forest certification in Romania. These define the requirements and responsibilities that are to be met by certification bodies and auditors, in case of SFM certification. PEFC RO DST 8000:2017, chapter 2.4 refers to PEFC ST 2003:2012: “The regulations of the international standards in (...) PEFC ST 2003:2012, Requirements for Certification Bodies operating Certification against the PEFC International Chain of Custody Standard have been adopted for the certification of the chain of custody, and their implementation is mandatory.”

The following steering documents are included as references for requirements for certification organizations:

- Accreditation in compliance with EN 45011 (ISO Guide 65)
- The certification process has to be conducted according to the stipulations in EN 45011 (ISO Guide 65) or ISO 17021, and the auditing process according to ISO 19011:2002

The PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 does not contain direct reference to the SFM standards of the Romanian System (PEFC RO DST 8001:2017, Criteria and Indicators for the Assessment of Sustainable Forestry in Romania and PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 PEFC Guidelines for Sustainable Forestry in Romania), nor to Group Forest Procedures (PEFC RO DST 8010:2017, Group certification - Requirements). Only general references were found: “Accreditation (...) for the Romanian forest management standards” and “The requirements defined in this document apply to certification bodies which want to audit according to the PEFC system regulations in Romania.”

Three observations are made, related to Part IV of the SSRC checklist:

- Related to requirement 1: The introduction of PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 contains the following: ‘In addition to general requirements in the scope of the accreditation process, PEFC Romania specifies some complementary requirements.’ However, no general requirements on accreditation are found within the PEFC Romanian Scheme. The reference is unclear.
- Related to requirement 1: Although the PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 v2 only contains requirements for CBs and auditors (in chapter 1), there is still a sentence in the Introduction that is incorrect: ‘The requirements are defined



both for certifications bodies operating forest certification (ch. 1) and for certification bodies auditing the Chain of Custody regulations (ch. 2).’

- Related to requirement 2: Both mentioned standards (EN 45011, ISO Guide 65) are no longer valid, they are replaced by ISO 17065.

9.2. Results

No non-conformities are found in the certification and accreditation procedures.



10. Other aspects

This chapter presents other findings of the assessment of the Scheme. With regards to Scheme Administration Procedures, the following procedures were found:

- **Notification of Certification Procedures**
These procedures are elaborated in PEFC RO DST 8013:2017 Notification of Certification Bodies;
- **Logo Usage Rules**
PEFC ST 2001:2008 is fully adopted by the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme;
- **Complaints and Dispute Resolution Procedures**
These procedures are elaborated in PEFC RO DST 8009:2017 Procedure for Arbitration.

It shall be noted that the conformity of these procedures with respectively chapter 5, 6 and 8 of PEFC GD 1004:2009 Administration of PEFC scheme is not further assessed in detail, in accordance with tender document for this assignment. Further assessment of these procedures is conducted by the Technical Unit of PEFC Council.



Annex 1 PEFC Standard and Scheme Requirement Checklist

The tables below present the PEFC Standard Requirement Checklist, in which the following formatting is applied in the “reference” column:

- **Bold text** – Source of the quotation
- “Text between quotation marks” – Quotation from either standard, procedures, legislation, response from PEFC Uruguay, minutes etc.
- *Italic text* – Comments made by the Assessor.

Part I: PEFC Standard Requirements Checklist for standard setting

1 Scope

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

2 Checklist

Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
Standardising Body			
4.1 The standardising body shall have written procedures for standard-setting activities describing:			
a) its status and structure, including a body responsible for consensus building (see 4.4) and for formal adoption of the standard (see 5.11),	Procedures	YES	<p><i>The status and structure of PEFC Romania is laid out in PEFC RO DST 8006:2017 Statutes PEFC Romania.</i></p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:</p> <p>“1.1.1 The standardizing body shall have written procedures for standard-setting activities describing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - its status and structure, including a body responsible for consensus building (see 1.1.5) and for formal adoption of the standard (see 1.2.11), - the record-keeping procedures, - the procedures for balanced representation of stakeholders, - the standard-setting process, - the mechanism for reaching consensus, and - revision of standards/normative documents.”



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
			<i>Observation: From the statutes, the structure of PEFC Romania is not clear. It is not evident which is the body for consensus building, and which is the body responsible for formal adoption of the standard.</i>
b) the record-keeping procedures,	Procedures	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:</p> <p>“1.1.1 The standardizing body shall have written procedures for standard-setting activities describing: (...)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the record-keeping procedures <p>2.1 The requirements for sustainable forest management defined by regional, national or sub-national forest management standards shall: (...) require record-keeping that provides evidence of compliance with the requirements of the forest management standards.”</p> <p><i>Observation: The implementation of this requirement, the actual record-keeping procedures as described in the stipulation 2.1 are very general and little elaborate.</i></p>
c) the procedures for balanced representation of stakeholders,	Procedures	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:</p> <p>“1.1.1 The standardizing body shall have written procedures for standard-setting activities describing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the procedures for balanced representation of stakeholders”
d) the standard-setting process,	Procedures	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:</p> <p>“1.1.1 The standardizing body shall have written procedures for standard-setting activities describing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the standard-setting process, <p>1.2 Standard-setting process”</p>
e) the mechanism for reaching consensus, and	Procedures	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:</p> <p>“1.1.1 The standardizing body shall have written procedures for standard-setting activities describing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the mechanism for reaching consensus,” <p>1.2.8 The decision of the working group to recommend the final draft for formal approval shall be taken on the basis of a consensus. In order to reach a consensus the working group/committee can utilise the following alternative processes to establish whether there is opposition: (...)”</p>



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
f) revision of standards/normative documents.	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: “1.1.1 The standardizing body shall have written procedures for standard-setting activities describing: - revision of standards/normative documents. 1.3 Revision of standards/normative documents”
4.2 The standardising body shall make its standard-setting procedures publicly available and shall regularly review its standard-setting procedures including consideration of comments from stakeholders.	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: “1.1.2 The standardizing body shall make its standard-setting procedures publicly available and shall regularly review its standard-setting procedures including consideration of comments from stakeholders.”
	Process	YES	<i>PEFC Romania used the PEFC Toolkit and the PEFC International standard-setting procedures. Both are publicly available from the website of PEFC Romania. www.pefc.padurea.org. The complete Romanian scheme documents are found on the website, including the standard-setting procedures. Also, the PEFC Romania Secretariat keeps up to date in electronic format and paper format a record named ‘documents available to the public’ containing all the relevant documents including the standard-setting procedure.</i>
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	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: “1.1.3 The standardizing body shall keep records relating to the standard-setting process providing evidence of compliance with the requirements of this document and the standardizing body’s own procedures. The records shall be kept for a minimum of five years and shall be available to interested parties upon request.”
	Process	YES	<i>Records on the standard setting process, such as stakeholder lists, invitations, minutes from meetings and working drafts, were provided by PEFC Romania Secretariat and are available from the website.</i>



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
procedures. The records shall be kept for a minimum of five years and shall be available to interested parties upon request.			
4.4 The standardising body shall establish a permanent or temporary working group/committee responsible for standard-setting activities.	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: "1.1.4 The standardizing body shall establish a permanent or temporary working group/committee responsible for standard-setting activities."
	Process	YES	<i>On February 3rd, 2015, an Inception Workshop was held in Suceava 'Mapping of representative stakeholder groups and organizations from Romania'.</i> <i>On April 2nd, 2015, there was a meeting in Brasov, to set-up a Working Group. Minutes were published at the website</i> Minutes 2 April 2015 "Mr. Tőke is proposing that by the end of April all those interested to express their intention / application. It is clearly stated that the presence in the working group is voluntary and unpaid. Those who have expressed interest to participate effectively (not solely consultative) in the working group are: (...)." <i>Furthermore, a list of permanently invited stakeholders was submitted, containing 34 organizations that were invited to participate in the Working Group. Existence of the Working Group was confirmed by outcomes of the field mission, that has been carried out for this Conformity Assessment. (see annex 5).</i> <i>Observation: at the start of the standard setting process, there was no official standardizing body. The work started with the set-up of a working group. PEFC Romania, as a national governing body, was registered later (early 2016).</i>
4.4 The working group/committee shall:			
	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:

Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
a) be accessible to materially and directly affected stakeholders,			<p>“1.1.4 The standardizing body shall establish a permanent or temporary working group/committee responsible for standard-setting activities. The working group/committee shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - be accessible to materially and directly affected stakeholders,”
	Process	YES	<p>Minutes inception Workshop, 3rd of February 2015, ‘Mapping of representative stakeholder groups and organizations from Romania’:</p> <p>“According to the model proposed by Mr. Toke, there are 8 categories in the WG:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Owners (State and private) b. Timber, Pulp and Paper Trade Unions c. Environmental NGO’s d. Unions / Syndicates e. Other representatives of Forestry f. User groups g. Forest service enterprises h. Research and education” <p><i>Per category, stakeholders were identified. Category a), e), and g) represent materially and directly affected stakeholders. Furthermore, a list of permanently invited stakeholders was submitted, containing 34 organizations that were invited to participate in the Working Group. Open access to the WG for all stakeholders was confirmed by the interviews during the field mission.</i></p>
b) have balanced representation and decision-making by stakeholder categories relevant to the subject matter and geographical scope of the standard where	Procedures	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:</p> <p>“1.1.4 The standardizing body shall establish a permanent or temporary working group/committee responsible for standard-setting activities. The working group/committee shall: (...)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - have balanced representation and decision-making by stakeholder categories relevant to the subject matter and geographical scope of the standard where single concerned interests shall not dominate nor be dominated in the process, and”
	Process	YES	<p><i>During the field mission, it became clear that the WG had a very open structure. All 34 organisations that were mapped during the stakeholder identification (3 February 2015), were invited for every WG meeting. The list of permanently invited stakeholders represents all identified stakeholder categories: Owners (State</i></p>



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
single concerned interests shall not dominate nor be dominated in the process, and			<p><i>and private), Timber Pulp and Paper (trade unions), environmental NGO's, Unions / Syndicates, other representatives of Forestry, user groups, forest service enterprises, research and education. Interviews with WG-members and other stakeholders during the field mission confirmed a balanced representation, where no single interest had dominated or was dominated in the process.</i></p> <p><i>Decision making was implicitly done during meetings, by discussion and debate. No voting was done, as there was never a substantial issue. This was confirmed by all people interviewed during the field mission (Annex 5).</i></p>
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	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:</p> <p>“1.1.4 The standardizing body shall establish a permanent or temporary working group/committee responsible for standard-setting activities. The working group/committee shall: (...)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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.”
	Process	YES	<p><i>Respondents of the stakeholder survey (Annex 2) and stakeholders interviewed during the field mission (Annex 5) concluded that the members of the WG had sufficient expertise to contribute.</i></p> <p><i>Several associations, reflecting the interests of materially affected stakeholders and those that can influence the implementation of the standard (Nostra Silva – association of forest owners, AAP – Association of Forest Administration Companies, Consilva – Union of forest workers, ASFOR – Association of (private) forest logging companies) were active in the standard setting process (WG). As they represented large groups of stakeholders, this is considered a meaningful segment of the participants.</i></p>
4.5 The standardising body shall establish procedures for dealing with any substantive and	Procedures	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:</p> <p>“1.1.5 The standardizing body shall establish procedures for dealing with any substantive and procedural complaints relating to the standardizing activities which are accessible to stakeholders.”</p> <p><i>The procedures are further elaborated in the rest of clause 1.1.5 (see also below).</i></p>
	Process	YES	<p><i>All scheme documents, including the standard setting procedures, are accessible on the PEFC Romania website. According to PEFC Romania, no complaints have been received. This was supported by the</i></p>



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
procedural complaints relating to the standardising activities which are accessible to stakeholders.			<i>stakeholder survey (Annex 2) and interviews during the field mission (Annex 5): None of the respondents was aware of any substantive or procedural complaints related to the standard-setting process.</i>
4.5 Upon receipt of the complaint, the standard-setting body shall:			
a) acknowledge receipt of the complaint to the complainant,	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: 1.1.5 (...) Upon receipt of the complaint, the standard-setting body shall: - acknowledge receipt of the complaint to the complainant,”
	Process	N/A	<i>According to PEFC Romania, no complaints have been received. This was supported by the stakeholder survey (annex 2) and interviews during the field mission (Annex 5): None of the respondents was aware of any substantive or procedural complaint related to the standard-setting process.</i>
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 RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: 1.1.5 (...) Upon receipt of the complaint, the standard-setting body shall: - 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”
	Process	N/A	<i>According to PEFC Romania, no complaints have been received. This was supported by the stakeholder survey (annex 2) and interviews during the field mission (Annex 5): None of the respondents was aware of any substantive or procedural complaint related to the standard-setting process.</i>
c) formally communicate the	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: 1.1.5 (...) Upon receipt of the complaint, the standard-setting body shall:



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
decision on the complaint and of the complaint handling process to the complainant.			- formally communicate the decision on the complaint and of the complaint handling process to the complainant.”
	Process	N/A	<i>According to PEFC Romania, no complaints have been received. This was supported by the stakeholder survey (annex 2) and interviews during the field mission (Annex 5): None of the respondents was aware of any substantive or procedural complaint related to the standard-setting process.</i>
4.6 The standardising body shall establish at least one contact point for enquiries and complaints relating to its standard-setting activities. The contact point shall be made easily available.	Procedures	NO	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: “1.1.6 The standardizing 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.” <i>Although contact details have been found on the website of PEFC Romania, the details of such a contact point are not found in the procedures.</i>
Standard-setting process			
5.1 The standardising body shall identify stakeholders relevant to the objectives and scope of the standard-setting work.	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: “1.2.1 The standardizing body shall identify stakeholders relevant to the objectives and scope of the standard-setting work. Note: A stakeholder mapping exercise that includes defining which interest sectors are relevant and why, and for each sector what are likely to be the key issues, who are the key stakeholders, and what means of communication will best reach them, is a recognised means of meeting the requirement.”
	Process	YES	<i>During the Inception workshop, held on 3 February 2015 in Suceava, the stakeholder mapping was done.</i> Minutes inception meeting 3rd of February 2015, ‘Mapping of representative stakeholder groups and organizations from Romania’:



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
			<p>“According to the model proposed by Mr. Toke, there are 8 categories in the WG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Owners (State and private) b. Timber, Pulp and Paper Trade Unions c. Environmental NGO’s d. Unions / Syndicates e. Other representatives of Forestry f. User groups g. Forest service enterprises h. Research and education”
<p>5.2 The standardising body shall identify disadvantaged and key stakeholders. The standardising body shall address the constraints of their participation and proactively seek their participation and contribution in the standard-setting activities.</p>	Procedures	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:</p> <p>“1.2.2 The standardizing body shall identify disadvantaged and key stakeholders. The standardizing body shall address the constraints of their participation and proactively seek their participation and contribution in the standard-setting activities.”</p>
	Process	YES	<p>Minutes inception meeting 3rd of February 2015, ‘Mapping of representative stakeholder groups and organizations from Romania’:</p> <p>“According to the model proposed by Mr. Töke, there are 8 categories in the WG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Owners (State and private) b. Timber, Pulp and Paper Trade Unions c. Environmental NGO’s d. Unions / Syndicates e. Other representatives of Forestry f. User groups g. Forest service enterprises h. Research and education” <p><i>During the Inception workshop, held on 3 February 2015 in Suceava, the stakeholder mapping was done. The list includes disadvantaged and key stakeholders. PEFC Romania explained that all stakeholders have</i></p>



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
			<i>been invited to all the meetings of the Working Group, in all stages of the process. In some cases, the travelling distances within Romania were identified as a constraint of participation. Therefore, meetings were held in different places (Brasov, Bucharest, Suceava), and travel costs for participants could be reimbursed. Several stakeholders made use of these provisions.</i>
5.3 The standardising body shall make a public announcement of the start of the standard-setting process and include an invitation for participation in a timely manner on its website and in suitable media as appropriate to afford stakeholders an opportunity for meaningful contributions.	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: “1.2.3 The standardizing body shall make a public announcement of the start of the standard-setting process and include an invitation for participation 15 days prior to the start on its website and in the major forestry related internet new sites and printed magazines to afford stakeholders an opportunity for meaningful contributions.”
	Process	NO	<i>No evidence was found that a public announcement was made on a website and in the major forestry related internet news sites and printed magazines. An invitation “Invitatie_Brasov_PEFC 2 april 2015” was sent by Email to all stakeholders identified, on the 26th of March 2015, which is less than 15 days prior to the meeting.</i>
5.3 The announcement and invitation shall include:			
a) information about the objectives, scope and the steps of the standard-setting process and its timetable,	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: “1.2.3 (...) The announcement and invitation shall include: - information about the objectives, scope and the steps of the standard-setting process and its timetable,”
	Process	NO	Invitatie_Brasov_PEFC 2 april 2015: “We are delighted to invite you to attend the meeting to be held on April 02, 2015, in Braşov, (...)”



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
			<p>An initial meeting, dated 03.02.2015, was held in Suceava, to identify the main representative organizations in the forestry sector in Romania. Which are now invited to establish a Working Group (WG) for the purpose of elaboration National PEFC Standards. <i>[list of identified stakeholders]</i></p> <p>The purpose of the meeting is the formation of the WG Working Group National Standards (SN-PEFC), establishment of the standards structure, adoption of The Standardization Body and the National Governance Body (National Governing Body - NGB)."</p> <p><i>PEFC Romania commented that this had been presented during the stakeholder mapping and the meeting of 2nd of April 2015, with reference to two documents that had been made available through the website:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>PEFC - Procedura de standardizare in Romania</i> • <i>PEFC - Procesul de standardizare in Romania 2015-2018</i> <p><i>However, the announcement / invitation itself did not include steps of the standard-setting process, nor a timetable.</i></p>
b) information about opportunities for stakeholders to participate in the process,	Procedures	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:</p> <p>"1.2.3 (...) The announcement and invitation shall include:</p> <p>- information about opportunities for stakeholders to participate in the process,"</p>
	Process	YES	<p>Invitatie_Brasov_PEFC 2 april 2015:</p> <p>"An initial meeting, dated 03.02.2015, was held in Suceava, to identify the main representative organizations in the forestry sector in Romania. Which are now invited to establish a Working Group (WG) for the purpose of elaboration National PEFC Standards. <i>[list of identified stakeholders]</i></p> <p>The purpose of the meeting is the formation of the WG Working Group National Standards (SN-PEFC), establishment of the standards structure, adoption of The Standardization Body and the National Governance Body (National Governing Body - NGB). (...)</p> <p>Also, to be able to make decisions about the above, please indicate whether the participant is empowered - to the extent possible - to represent your organization."</p>
(c) an invitation to stakeholders to	Procedures	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:</p> <p>"1.2.3 (...) The announcement and invitation shall include:</p>



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
nominate their representative(s) to the working group/committee. The invitation to disadvantaged and key stakeholders shall be made in a manner that ensures that the information reaches intended recipients and in a format that is understandable,			- an invitation to stakeholders to nominate their representative(s) to the working group/committee. The invitation to disadvantaged and key stakeholders shall be made in a manner that ensures that the information reaches intended recipients and in a format that is understandable,”
	Process	YES	Invitatie_Brasov_PEFC 2 april 2015: “Also, to be able to make decisions about the above, please indicate whether the participant is empowered - to the extent possible - to represent your organization.” <i>From the field mission it became clear that communication by Email is common in Romania. Furthermore, the potential participants that were interviewed during the field mission (annex 5), indicated they received the invitation(s), but also phone calls.</i>
d) an invitation to comment on the scope and the standard-setting process, and	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: “1.2.3 (...) The announcement and invitation shall include: - an invitation to comment on the scope and the standard-setting process, and”
	Process	NO	<i>The invitation itself did not include an invitation to comment on the scope and the standard-setting process.</i>
e) reference to publicly available standard-setting procedures.	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: “1.2.3 (...) The announcement and invitation shall include: - reference to publicly available standard-setting procedures.”
	Process	NO	<i>The invitation itself did not include reference to publicly available standard-setting procedures.</i>
5.4 The standardising body shall review the standard-setting	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: “1.2.4 The standardizing 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



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
<p>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.</p>			<p>nominations shall be justifiable in relation to the requirements for balanced representation of the working group/committee and resources available for the standard-setting.”</p>
	Process	YES	<p><i>No comments were received from the public announcement. Therefore, no review of comments by the Standardizing Body was needed. A Working Group was established. During the field mission, it became clear that the WG had a very open structure (no official nominations and acceptance or refusal). All 34 organisations that were mapped during the stakeholder identification (3 February 2015), were invited for every WG meeting. The list of permanently invited stakeholders represents all identified stakeholder categories: Owners (State and private), Timber Pulp and Paper (trade unions), environmental NGO's, Unions / Syndicates, other representatives of Forestry, user groups, forest service enterprises, research and education. Interviews with WG-members and other stakeholders during the field mission confirmed a balanced representation, where no single interest had dominated or was dominated in the process.</i></p>
<p>5.5 The work of the working group/committee shall be organised in an open and transparent manner where:</p>			
	Procedures	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:</p>



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
a) working drafts shall be available to all members of the working group/committee,			<p>“1.2.5 The work of the working group/committee shall be organised in an open and transparent manner where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - working drafts shall be available to all members of the working group/committee”
	Process	YES	<i>PEFC Romania explained that working papers and different drafts of the standard have been sent by email before and after each working group meeting. Availability of working drafts was confirmed by the WG members that responded to the survey (annex 2) and by the ones interviewed during the field mission (annex 5).</i>
b) all members of the working group shall be provided with meaningful opportunities to contribute to the development or revision of the standard and submit comments to the working drafts, and	Procedures	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards v2:</p> <p>“1.2.5 (...) all members of the working group shall be provided with meaningful opportunities to contribute to the development or revision of the standard and submit comments to the working drafts, and”</p>
	Process	YES	<i>PEFC Romania comments that the meetings themselves were the most meaningful opportunities to contribute to the development of the standards. The WG had a very open structure (no official membership). All 34 organisations that were mapped during the stakeholder identification (Inception Workshop, 3 February 2015), were invited for every WG meeting. 6 WG-members were selected to take the lead in the development of the 6 Criteria of the SFM standard. Others could comment and take part in discussions. The WG had at least 4 extensive meetings with a good attendance and also several workshops. Minutes of meetings and Attendance sheets are available. WG-members interviewed during the field mission confirmed that meaningful opportunities were provided to them to contribute to the development of the standard.</i>
c) comments and views submitted by any member of the working group/committee shall be considered in an open and transparent way and their resolution and	Procedures	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards v2:</p> <p>“1.2.5 (...) comments and views submitted by any member of the working group/committee shall be considered in an open and transparent way and their resolution and proposed changes shall be recorded.”</p>
	Process	YES	<i>The minutes / reports of meetings contain evidence of debates, different opinions and contributions from participants. PEFC Romania explained that draft meeting reports were previously sent to the participants to add comments, before being approved and posted on the website. WG-members interviewed during the field mission explained that there was a high level of transparency, their comments and views were discussed, which would be translated into a next version of the scheme documentation.</i>



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
proposed changes shall be recorded.			
5.6 The standardising body shall organise a public consultation on the enquiry draft and shall ensure that:			
a) the start and the end of the public consultation is announced in a timely manner in suitable media,	Procedures	NO	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:</p> <p>“1.2.6 The standardizing body shall organise a public consultation on the enquiry draft and shall ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the start and the end of the public consultation is announced in a timely manner in suitable media,” <p><i>It is not defined in the procedures what in the Romanian context is ‘in a timely manner’ and ‘in suitable media’.</i></p>
	Process	YES	<p><i>The public consultation was done in two ways:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>From 1st of March – 30 April 2016, there was the possibility to anyone to comment through the website. The announcement of the Public consultation on the website did indicate the start and the end of the public consultation. The page on Public Consultation was last updated on 5th of February 2016, which is more than 2 weeks before the start of the consultation.</i> - <i>A public debate, held on the 20th of May 2016. The invitation to this public debate was sent to all stakeholders and to the press, and posted on the PEFC Romania website, (not clear when it was sent / published). The invitation was also published on the website of NostraSilva, (Romanian Federation of Forest owners), on 21 of April 2016, which is considered in a timely manner and in suitable media.</i>
b) the invitation of disadvantaged and key stakeholders shall be made by means that ensure that the information reaches its recipient and is understandable,	Procedures	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:</p> <p>“1.2.6 (...)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the invitation of disadvantaged and key stakeholders shall be made by means that ensure that the information reaches its recipient and is understandable,”
	Process	YES	<p><i>The public consultation was done in two ways:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>From 1st of March – 30 April 2016, there was the possibility to anyone to comment through the website. The announcement of the Public consultation was done on the website.</i> - <i>A public debate, held on the 20th of May 2016. The invitation to this public debate was sent to all stakeholders and to the press, and posted on the PEFC Romania website. The invitation was also published on the website of NostraSilva, (Romanian Federation of Forest owners).</i>



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
			<i>Stakeholders confirmed that the chosen means are adequate means in the Romanian context.</i>
c) the enquiry draft is publicly available and accessible,	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: "1.2.6 (...) the enquiry draft is publicly available and accessible,"
	Process	YES	<i>The public consultation was done in two ways:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>From 1st of March – 30 April 2016, there was the possibility to anyone to comment through the website. The announcement of the Public consultation did not include a reference to the enquiry draft. The enquiry draft however was available on the website.</i> - <i>A public debate, held on the 20th of May 2016. The invitation to this public debate was sent to all stakeholders and to the press, and posted on the PEFC Romania website. The invitation was published on the website of NostraSilva (Romanian Federation of Forest owners), and did contain links to the enquiry drafts on the PEFC Romania website.</i>
d) the public consultation is for at least 60 days,	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: "1.2.6 (...) the public consultation is for at least 60 days,"
	Process	YES	<i>On the website of PEFC Romania is found that the consultation lasted from 1st of March to 30 of April 2016, which is 60 days. This was confirmed during interviews with supporting staff, during the field mission.</i>
e) all comments received are considered by the working group/committee in an objective manner,	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: "1.2.6 (...) - all comments received are considered by the working group/committee in an objective manner,"
	Process	YES	<i>Both PEFC Romania and WG members consulted during the field mission state that no comments have been received from the Public Consultation. From the report of the Public Debate, dd 20th of May 2016, it becomes clear that no comments were received, only clarifications were given on the process and a solution was sought on how to organize the pilot testing.</i>
f) a synopsis of received comments compiled from	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: "1.2.6 (...) a synopsis of received comments compiled from material issues, including the results of their consideration, is publicly available, for example on a website."



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
material issues, including the results of their consideration, is publicly available, for example on a website.	Process	YES	<i>Both PEFC Romania and WG members consulted during the field mission state that no comments have been received from the Public Consultation. From the report of the Public Debate, dd 20th of May 2016, that is also available from the website, it becomes clear that no comments were received, only clarifications were given on the process and a solution was sought on how to organize the pilot testing.</i>
5.7 The standardising body shall organise pilot testing of the new standards and the results of the pilot testing shall be considered by the working group/committee.	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: “1.2.7 The standardizing body shall organise pilot testing of the new standards and the results of the pilot testing shall be considered by the working group/committee. Note: Pilot testing is not required in case of revision of a standard where experience from its usage can substitute for pilot testing.”
	Process	YES	<i>Pilot testing was done in October 2016. A report (in Romanian) is available and contains 5 recommendations. The pilot testing was discussed in detail during the field mission (See Annex 5). All suggestions from the pilot testing report were considered by each of the 6 WG-members that were leading the standard setting for a specific criterion.</i>
5.8 The decision of the working group to recommend the final draft for formal approval shall be taken on the basis of a consensus.	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: “1.2.8 The decision of the working group to recommend the final draft for formal approval shall be taken on the basis of a consensus.”
	Process	NO	Minutes Ad-Hoc Meeting 15.05.2017 - Aula University Brasov “At the Conference on "Sustainable Forest Management and Forest Certification" with the majority of members of the Working Group and PEFC members, Romania decided to hold an Ad-hoc meeting to make decisions on Romanian PEFC Standards. 1. After the discussions, the presentation of the stage of the elaboration and testing of the Standards, the amendments included in the standards following the testing and publication of the final form of the standards



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
			<p>on the www.pefc.padurea.org site, the decision was made by consensus by the Standards Working Group to support the forwarding of their AG to PEFC Romania for their approval.</p> <p>2. For the approval of the PEFC Standards Romania, the General Meeting of PEFC Romania will be convened for 29.05.2017”</p> <p><i>In total 13 WG members were participating in the ad-hoc meeting, and according to the minutes they reached consensus. However, as this was an ad-hoc meeting, no previous announcement or invitation was made to all WG members (22) that this was the moment where the WG would take a decision on recommending the final draft for formal approval. It is not clear how the opinion of absent WG members was taken into account.”</i></p>
5.8 In order to reach a consensus the working group/committee can utilise the following alternative processes to establish whether there is opposition:			
a) a face-to face meeting where there is a verbal yes/no vote, show of hands for a yes/no vote; a statement on consensus from the Chair where there are no dissenting voices or hands (votes); a formal balloting process, etc.,	Procedures	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:</p> <p>“1.2.8 (...). In order to reach a consensus the working group/committee can utilise the following alternative processes to establish whether there is opposition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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.”
	Process	YES	<p><i>According to PEFC Romania, only discussion and debate was used to reach consensus, no voting was done. This was confirmed by the stakeholders (WG-members) during the field assessment (annex 5). Although no recorded evidence was found that a statement of consensus was made by the chair during meetings records / minutes meetings, also no sign of sustained opposition was noted by the Assessor during the field mission.</i></p>
b) a telephone conference meeting where there is a verbal yes/no vote,	Procedures	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:</p> <p>“1.2.8 (...) a telephone conference meeting where there is a verbal yes/no vote, “</p>
	Process	N/A	

Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
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 RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: “1.2.8 (...) 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”
	Process	N/A	
d) combinations thereof.	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: “1.2.8 (...) combinations thereof.”
	Process	N/A	
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 RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: “1.2.9 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): - discussion and negotiation on the disputed issue within the working group/committee in order to find a compromise,”
	Process	N/A	<i>According to PEFC Romania, there has been no vote against, nor sustained opposition. This was confirmed by the stakeholders (WG-members) during the field assessment (annex 5).</i>
b) direct negotiation between the stakeholder(s)	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: “1.2.9 (...) direct negotiation between the stakeholder(s) submitting the objection and stakeholders with different views on the disputed issue in order to find a compromise,”



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
submitting the objection and stakeholders with different views on the disputed issue in order to find a compromise,	Process	N/A	<i>According to PEFC Romania, there has been no vote against, nor sustained opposition. This was confirmed by the stakeholders (WG-members) during the field assessment (annex 5).</i>
c) dispute resolution process.	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: "1.2.9 (...) dispute resolution process."
	Process	N/A	<i>According to PEFC Romania, there has been no vote against, nor sustained opposition. This was confirmed by the stakeholders (WG-members) during the field assessment (annex 5).</i>
5.10 Documentation on the implementation of the standard-setting process shall be made publicly available.	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: "1.2.10 Documentation on the implementation of the standard-setting process shall be made publicly available."
	Process	YES	<i>All documentation is available from the PEFC Romania website: www.pefc.padurea.org and was sent to the stakeholders by Email, together with invitations for WG meetings.</i>
5.11 The standardising body shall formally approve the standards/normative documents based on evidence of consensus reached by the working group/committee.	Procedures	YES	PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards: "1.2.11 The standardizing body shall formally approve the standards/normative documents based on evidence of consensus reached by the working group/committee."
	Process	YES	GA PEFC Romania minutes, dd. 29th of May 2017: "Agenda: - introduction - approval of the 2016 activity and balance sheet - approving PEFC standards for Romania - various"



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
			<p>The formal approval of the PEFC standards for Romania took place at the conference "National Standards for Forest Certification - A Tool for the Sustainable Management of Forests in Romania", held in the Great Hall of the Patriarchal Palace in Bucharest on October 18, 2016. (...) the content and documents National PEFC® Standards for Romania have been adopted by consensus at national level. These documents are the basis for the official approval of the national PEFC standards for Romania, which is ensured at the level of the standardization body - PEFC Romania, on the occasion of today's general meeting, 29.05.2017. (...)</p> <p>Approved documents are as follows:</p> <p>The PEFC standard for forest certification in Romania - description of the scheme (follows list of documents of the Romanian system)."</p> <p><i>During the meeting all so-called 'founding members' of PEFC Romania were represented.</i></p>
5.12 The formally approved standards/normative documents shall be published in a timely manner and made publicly available.	Procedures	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards:</p> <p>"1.2.12 The formally approved standards/normative documents shall be published in 15 days and made publicly available."</p>
	Process	YES	<p><i>Publication of the standards approved by the General Assembly on the PEFC Romania website was done in June 2017. Issue date, mentioned on the SFM standard, is 29-05-2017 (which was the moment of formal approval by the General Assembly of PEFC Romania).</i></p>
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	Process	N/A	<p><i>The current process is an initial process. The requirement applies for revision processes.</i></p>



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
documents shall follow those set out in chapter 5.			
6.2 The revision shall define the application date and transition date of the revised standards/normative documents.	Process	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 Criteria and Indicators for assessing sustainable forest management in Romania:</p> <p>“Approved by: PEFC Romania General Assembly Date: 2017-05-29 Issue date: 2017-05-29 Date of entry into force: 2018-04-01 <i>The current process is an initial process, meaning that the requirement of the transition date is not applicable.</i></p>
6.3 The application date shall not exceed a period of one year from the publication of the standard. This is needed for the endorsement of the revised standards/normative documents, introducing the changes, information dissemination and training.	Process	YES	<p><i>The current application date is 1st of April 2018, while the publication date (issue date), is 29th of May 2017. The application date is not exceeding a period of one year from the publication of the standard.</i></p>
6.4 The transition date shall not	Process	N/A	<p><i>The current process is an initial process. The requirement is therefore not applicable.</i></p>



Question	Assess. basis	YES /NO	Reference to application documents
<p>exceed a period of one year except in justified exceptional circumstances where the implementation of the revised standards/normative documents requires a longer period.</p>			

Part II: PEFC Standard Requirements Checklist for Group Forest Management Certification

1 Scope

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

2 Checklist

Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
General		
4.1 Does the forest certification scheme provide clear definitions for the following terms in conformity with the definitions of those terms presented in chapter 3 of PEFC ST 1002:2010:		
a) the group organisation,	YES	PEFC RO DST 8010:2017 “3.1.5 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.”
b) the group entity,	YES	PEFC RO DST 8010:2017 “3.1.2 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.”
c) the participant,	YES	PEFC RO DST 8010:2017 “3.1.6 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.”



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
d) the certified area,	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017</p> <p>“3.1.1 Certified area The forest area covered by a group forest certificate representing the sum of forest areas of the participants.”</p>
e) the group forest certificate, and	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017</p> <p>“3.1.3 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.”</p>
f) the document confirming participation in group forest certification.	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017</p> <p>“3.1.7 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.”</p>
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.	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017</p> <p>“3.3.2. Assignments of the group representation The group representation has the following tasks: Group entity shall have contract or other written agreement with all group participants including: b) declaration of the group participant on not taking part in other group organizations, or individual forest certification under PEFC Romania.”</p> <p><i>As the standard does not allow to be certified under more than one certificate, the requirement does not apply.</i></p>
4.1.3 The forest certification scheme shall define requirements for group forest certification which ensure that participants’ conformity with the sustainable forest management standard is centrally	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017</p> <p>“3.3.2. Assignments of the group representation The group representation has the following tasks: (...) Planning and implementation of internal audits.</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
<p>administered and is subject to central review and that all participants shall be subject to the internal monitoring programme.</p>		<p>Development of objectives and measures. Elaboration of an annual review. 3.3.4. Procedures and processes (Procedures for system stability) The group shall demonstrate effective procedures that contribute to the stability of the system. In this context measures and elements can be of particular use to assure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on the compliance with the PEFC standards in the participating forest properties is presented and if necessary appropriate measures will be taken. • Information on the PEFC certification in the group is analysed and if necessary appropriate measures will be taken. <p>3.7. Internal audits 3.7.1. Elements and design The group representation shall plan and implement internal audits annually in order to check the compliance with group regulations and to detect potential respectively demand for improvements. Especially the audits shall ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The compliance with the standards for sustainable forest management. <p>3.7.2. Participants All group participants shall be subject to the internal monitoring programme.</p> <p>3.8. Review The group representation shall undertake an annual review. This review shall consist of an assessment with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The audit results. • The inputs of third parties, if there have been received any. • The implementation of the planning (objectives and measures) <p>Consequences shall be deduced in the review as base of future planning (objectives and measures).</p>

Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		Following the review corrective and preventive measures will be operated, if required, and evaluation of the effectiveness of corrective actions taken.”
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	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017</p> <p>“3.7. Internal audits</p> <p>3.7.1. Elements and design</p> <p>The group representation shall plan and implement internal audits annually in order to check the compliance with group regulations and to detect potential respectively demand for improvements. Especially the audits shall ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The compliance with the standards for sustainable forest management. <p>3.7.2. Participants</p> <p>All group participants shall be subject to the internal monitoring programme.</p> <p>Applicants for membership shall be considered in the audit plan in the course of the application and shall be included in the audits at the earliest possible date.”</p>
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;	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017</p> <p>“3.3.1. Group representation (applicant)</p> <p>(...) The group representation is the responsible body for the group certification and applicant in the certification process.</p> <p>3.3.2. Assignments of the group representation</p> <p>The group representation has the following tasks:</p> <p>Application at an accredited certification body, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) communication with the certification body b) submission of an application for certification c) contractual relationship with the certification body”



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
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;	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017</p> <p>“3.3.2. Assignments of the group representation</p> <p>The group representation has the following tasks: (a – g)</p> <p>Application at an accredited certification body, including:</p> <p>d) providing 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.”</p>
c) To establish written procedures for the management of the group organisation;	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017</p> <p>“3.3.4. Procedures and processes (Procedures for system stability)</p> <p>The group shall demonstrate effective procedures that contribute to the stability of the system. In this context measures and elements can be of particular use to assure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group Entity’s management operation shall be based on written procedures.”
<p>d) To keep records of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the group entity and participants’ conformity with the requirements of the sustainable forest management standard, and other applicable requirements of the forest certification scheme, - all participants, including their contact details, identification of their forest property and its/their size(s), - the certified area, - the implementation of an internal monitoring programme, its review and any preventive and/or corrective actions taken; 	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017</p> <p>“3.3.2. Assignments of the group representation</p> <p>The group representation has the following tasks:</p> <p>List all members and their forest areas, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Name of participant b) Address of participant c) Contact details d) Contact person e) Forest area on which participant is a registered forest management f) Other wooded area used by the participant. <p>Planning and implementation of internal audits.</p> <p>Elaboration of an annual review.</p> <p>3.3.4. Procedures and processes (Procedures for system stability)</p>

Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		<p>The group shall demonstrate effective procedures that contribute to the stability of the system. In this context measures and elements can be of particular use to assure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on the compliance with the PEFC standards in the participating forest properties is presented and if necessary appropriate measures will be taken. • Information on the PEFC certification in the group is analysed and if necessary appropriate measures will be taken. <p>Measures, assignments and responsibilities shall be defined and documented.</p> <p>3.4. Documentation</p> <p>The procedures, required according to the regulation of PEFC Romania shall be documented. Especially the following issues shall be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Register of members as well as their forest areas. • Audit results • Review • Planning (Objectives and measures) <p>A management handbook is a suitable instrument for the documentation of these procedures and elements.</p> <p>3.7.3. Auditors and report</p> <p>(...) A documented audit report shall contain a short description of the main results as well as measures for improvement and corrective actions.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8007:2017</p> <p>“Private/state-owned/communal forest; Forest area: ha*</p> <p>* = ha forest area or, if differentiated further, ha lumber producing area (rounded up to full ha).</p> <p>With my signature I commit myself:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · I agree that the above-mentioned data on the forest area I own will be forwarded to and published by the authorities in charge of registration and certification.



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
<p>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 management standard</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017 "3.3.2. Assignments of the group representation The group representation has the following tasks: Group entity shall have contract or other written agreement with all group participants including: a) the long-term commitment of the group participant to the principles of sustainable forest management and to the participation in PEFC Romania c) the group participants commitment to comply with the sustainable forest management standard and other applicable parts of the PEFC Romania scheme on all its forest area and other wooded land d) the group participants commitment to subject itself to external audit e) the right of the group entity to carry out internal monitoring f) the right of the group entity to implement and enforce any preventive or corrective measures g) the right of the group entity to exclude the group participant in the event of non-conformity with the sustainable forest management standard." PEFC RO DST 8007:2017 Declarations – Voluntary Self-commitments of Forest Owners</p>
<p>f) To provide participants with a document confirming participation in the group forest certification;</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017 "3.9. Issuance of confirmations of participation 3.9.1. Procedure of issuance The group shall develop procedures how to issue confirmations of participation to the participating persons or organisations after the group certificate has been issued by the certification body The participant receives an individual attestation from the group representation stating the successful participation in the certification process and referring to the group certificate."</p>
<p>g) To provide all participants with information and guidance required for the effective implementation of the sustainable forest management standard and other applicable</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017 "3.3.2. Assignments of the group representation The group representation has the following tasks: Informing the group members.</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
requirements of the forest certification scheme;		3.3.4. Procedures and processes (Procedures for system stability) The group shall demonstrate effective procedures that contribute to the stability of the system. In this context measures and elements can be of particular use to assure that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group members and interested parties are sufficiently informed and involved in the PEFC requirements and the certification process.”
h) To operate an annual internal monitoring programme that provides for the evaluation of the participants’ conformity with the certification requirements, and;	YES	PEFC RO DST 8010:2017 “3.7. Internal audits 3.7.1. Elements and design The group representation shall plan and implement internal audits annually in order to check the compliance with group regulations and to detect potential respectively demand for improvements. Especially the audits shall ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The compliance with the standards for sustainable forest management.”
i) To operate a review of conformity with the sustainable forest management standard, that includes reviewing the results of the internal monitoring programme and the certification body’s evaluations and surveillance; corrective and preventive measures if required; and the evaluation of the effectiveness of corrective actions taken.	YES	PEFC RO DST 8010:2017 “3.8. Review The group representation shall undertake an annual review. This review shall consist of an assessment with respect to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The audit results. • The inputs of third parties, if there have been received any. • The implementation of the planning (objectives and measures) Consequences shall be deduced in the review as base of future planning (objectives and measures). Following the review corrective and preventive measures will be operated, if required, and evaluation of the effectiveness of corrective actions taken.”
Function and responsibilities of participants		
4.3.1 The forest certification scheme shall define the following requirements for the participants:		



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
a) To provide the group entity with a written agreement, including a commitment on conformity with the sustainable forest management standard and other applicable requirements of the forest certification scheme;	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017</p> <p>“3.3.2. Assignments of the group representation</p> <p>The group representation has the following tasks:</p> <p>Group entity shall have contract or other written agreement with all group participants including:</p> <p>a) the long-term commitment of the group participant to the principles of sustainable forest management and to the participation in PEFC Romania”</p>
b) To comply with the sustainable forest management standard and other applicable requirements of the forest certification scheme;	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017</p> <p>“3.3.3.2. Assignments of the members</p> <p>The members of the group are assigned to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obligation to comply with the regulations of the group by signing contract with the group representation. • Obligation to manage their forest in line with the sustainable forest management standards of PEFC Romania (Standards for forest management)”
c) To provide full co-operation and assistance in responding effectively to all requests from the group entity or certification body for relevant data, documentation or other information; allowing access to the forest and other facilities, whether in connection with formal audits or reviews or otherwise;	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017</p> <p>“3.3.2. Assignments of the group representation</p> <p>The group representation has the following tasks:</p> <p>Group entity shall have contract or other written agreement with all group participants including:</p> <p>d) the group participants commitment to subject itself to external audit</p> <p>e) the right of the group entity to carry out internal monitoring</p> <p>f) the right of the group entity to implement and enforce any preventive or corrective measures</p> <p>g) the right of the group entity to exclude the group participant in the event of non-conformity with the sustainable forest management standard.</p> <p>3.3.3.2. Assignments of the members</p> <p>The members of the group are assigned to:</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obligation to comply with the regulations of the group by signing contract with the group representation. • Give information about their forest area to the group representation. • Provide information and to provide access to the forest area and administration for the purpose of both internal audits and external certification and surveillance audits.” <p>PEFC RO DST 8007:2017</p> <p>“With my signature I commit myself: (...)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If I get previously informed that my forest is chosen for an on-site-audit, review or monitoring, I am willing to provide access to the auditor sent by the certification body or group entity. In a confidential conversation, I will also lay open all relevant information. - To provide full co-operation and assistance in responding effectively to all requests from the group entity or certification body for relevant data, documentation or other information. - I agree that the above-mentioned data on the forest area I own will be forwarded to and published by the authorities in charge of registration and certification.”
<p>d) To implement relevant corrective and preventive actions established by the group entity.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8010:2017</p> <p>“3.3.2. Assignments of the group representation</p> <p>The group representation has the following tasks:</p> <p>Group entity shall have contract or other written agreement with all group participants including:</p> <p>f) the right of the group entity to implement and enforce any preventive or corrective measures</p> <p>3.3.3.2. Assignments of the members</p> <p>The members of the group are assigned to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obligation to comply with the regulations of the group by signing contract with the group representation. <p>3.3.4. Procedures and processes (Procedures for system stability)</p> <p>The group shall demonstrate effective procedures that contribute to the stability of the system. In this context measures and elements can be of particular use to assure that:</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The achievement of the objectives and measures is pursued and if necessary appropriate measures will be taken. <p>Measures, assignments and responsibilities shall be defined and documented.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8007:2017</p> <p>“With my signature I commit myself:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To implement relevant corrective and preventive actions established by the group entity.”

Part III: PEFC Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Sustainable Forest Management

1 Scope

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

2 Checklist

Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
General requirements for SFM standards		
4.1 The requirements for sustainable forest management defined by regional, national or sub-national forest management standards shall		
a) include management and performance requirements that are applicable at the forest management unit level, or at another level as appropriate, to ensure that the intent of all requirements is achieved at the forest management unit level.	YES	<p><i>The requirements for sustainable forest management are covered by two documents:</i></p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 Criteria and Indicators for assessing sustainable forest management in Romania</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 Guidelines for assessing sustainable forest management in Romania</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8000:2017</p> <p>“2.4 Scope</p> <p>This system description applies to the certification of sustainable forest management.</p> <p>(...) The standards, with normative character are those presented in Annex 01 – Annex 16, excepting Annex 03, which is reserved for the future.</p> <p>2.6 Levels of Application</p> <p>Based on the situation in Romania, there are two options of forest certification: These are</p> <p>(1) Individual certification and</p> <p>(2) Group certification.</p>

Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		<p>(...) A forest owner can apply for his individual forest enterprise to be certified, or a group of forest owners can apply for certification as a group. All owners represented in the group are obliged to fulfill the requirements of the certification scheme. The participating area will be documented. The necessary data concerning the participants will be recorded in a list.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 Criteria and Indicators for assessing sustainable forest management in Romania:</p> <p>“Introduction</p> <p>The following set of criteria and indicators for Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) is designed to assess SFM at the property level (individual properties or property groups).”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“Introduction and general information</p> <p>(...) In principle, sustainable management in an assessment unit is proven by analyzing the provisions of the "Criteria and Indicators for Assessing Sustainable Management in Romania" catalog. Some guidelines refer to catalog indicators and are the desired objectives, others are management principles.</p> <p>The most important particularity of the forestry system in Romania is that for properties larger than 10 hectares, according to the law, drafting and respecting of the management plans is mandatory. The forest management plans are drawn up by certified specialized companies, respecting the Technical Norms and the management plans made are approved individually by Orders of the responsible minister.”</p> <p>Forest Code, 2008:</p> <p>“Art. 20. - (1) The forest management plan shall be elaborated on production and / or protection units, respecting the technical norms for management planning. (...) (2) The preparation of forest management plans is mandatory for properties of forest fund larger than 10 ha.”</p> <p><i>Additional explanation provided by PEFC Romania:</i></p> <p><i>1 Management plan contains 1 forest management unit only. Properties under 10 ha can be certified if they are part of a management plan, else not. So, PEFC requirements apply.</i></p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 Criteria and Indicators for assessing sustainable forest management in Romania:</p> <p>“Indicator 3.4.a Management plans and / or equivalent documents for the certification area”</p> <p><i>Observation: in the references to documentation and in the scheme documentation itself, STD and DST are used inconsistently, when referring to scheme documents.</i></p>
b) be clear, objective-based and auditable.	YES	<p><i>The standard is clearly structured with auditable parameters and documents, especially in the guidelines.</i></p>
c) apply to activities of all operators in the defined forest area who have a measurable impact on achieving compliance with the requirements.	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8000:2017</p> <p>“2.4 Scope</p> <p>This system description applies to the certification of sustainable forest management.</p> <p>(...) The standards, with normative character are those presented in Annex 01 – Annex 16, excepting Annex 03, which is reserved for the future.</p> <p>2.6 Levels of Application</p> <p>Based on the situation in Romania, there are two options of forest certification: These are</p> <p>(1) Individual certification and</p> <p>(2) Group certification.</p> <p>(...) A forest owner can apply for his individual forest enterprise to be certified, or a group of forest owners can apply for certification as a group. All owners represented in the group are obliged to fulfill the requirements of the certification scheme. The participating area will be documented. The necessary data concerning the participants will be recorded in a list.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 Criteria and Indicators for assessing sustainable forest management in Romania:</p> <p>“Introduction</p> <p>The following set of criteria and indicators for Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) is designed to assess SFM at the property level (individual properties or property groups).”</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
d) require record-keeping that provides evidence of compliance with the requirements of the forest management standards.	YES	<i>It must be noted that in the case of Romania, the mandatory Forest Management Plan is the main record, in which many aspects are planned and described, according to applicable Technical Norms. Implementation is regulated through reporting obligations and enforcement is extremely strict (see Annex 5 on field assessment). The Romanian PEFC standard does mainly identify the relevant records in the indicators in PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 Criteria and Indicators.</i>
Specific requirements for SFM standards		
Criterion 1: Maintenance and appropriate enhancement of forest resources and their contribution to the global carbon cycle		
5.1.1 Forest management planning shall aim to maintain or increase forests and other wooded areas and enhance the quality of the economic, ecological, cultural and social values of forest resources, including soil and water. This shall be done by making full use of related services and tools that support land-use planning and nature conservation.	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“1.1 Distribution of forests included in the certification, in terms of destination and assigned functions</p> <p>Subcriterion: The management plans aim a sustainable use of forest resources, in line with the main functions (production and protection) and defined objectives. It will be pursued the increase of the area covered by forests, by adequate measures for the management and regeneration of the stands.</p> <p>Indicator 1.1.c Distribution of forests included in the certification, in relation to the assigned protection and production functions.</p> <p>Area of forests in functional group I, out of which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forests with water protection role • Forests with soil protection role • Forests with protective role against climate factors • Forests of social interest • Forests with biodiversity protection role” <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“1.1.3. The planned management measures should take into account the functions assigned by the management plans.</p>

Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		<p>1.1.4. The forest owners, their managers, representatives of the public authority and, where appropriate, the civil society will take all necessary steps to find technical solutions that meet the economic, technical, ecological and social objectives at the I. management planning conference, making full use of related services and tools that support land-use planning and nature conservation.</p> <p>1.2.1. The forest management plans must provide a growing stock in accordance with established economic, environmental and social functions.”</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8000:2017 Romanian Forest Certification Scheme - System Description: “2.5.3 Continuous Improvement Process (CIP) Continuous improvement of forestry management is an important objective of PEFC certification.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 “1.1.1. The certification area must be endowed with management plans, elaborated, approved and updated in compliance with the technical norms in the field, and going through all stages stipulated by law, considering the cycle of inventory and planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, including an appropriate assessment of the social, environmental and economic impacts of forest management operations”</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 “Introduction and general information (...) The most important particularity of the forestry system in Romania is that for properties larger than 10 hectares, according to the law, drafting and respecting of the management plans is mandatory. The forest management plans are drawn up by certified specialized companies, respecting the Technical Norms and the management plans made are approved individually by Orders of the responsible minister.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 “1.1.1. The certification area must be endowed with management plans, elaborated, approved and updated in compliance with the technical norms in the field, and going through all stages stipulated by law, considering the cycle of inventory and planning, implementation, monitoring</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		<p>and evaluation, including an appropriate assessment of the social, environmental and economic impacts of forest management operations</p> <p>3.4.1. The forest management system is based on a detailed study of the situation, maps and plans for forest planning according to legal requirements and voluntary management guidelines.</p> <p>3.4.2 Periodically, there are monitoring of how management plans are implemented and their results will also be taken into account when new management plans are being made.</p> <p>6.4.3. The manager of the administrated areas will support the research and data collection activities necessary for the sustainable management of the managed forests.”</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“Introduction and general information</p> <p>The most important particularity of the forestry system in Romania is that for properties larger than 10 hectares, according to the law, drafting and respecting of the management plans is mandatory. The forest management plans are drawn up by certified specialized companies, respecting the Technical Norms and the management plans made are approved individually by Orders of the responsible minister.</p> <p>1.1.1. The certification area must be endowed with management plans, elaborated, approved and updated in compliance with the technical norms in the field, and going through all stages stipulated by law, considering the cycle of inventory and planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, including an appropriate assessment of the social, environmental and economic impacts of forest management operations</p> <p>3.4.1. The forest management system is based on a detailed study of the situation, maps and plans for forest planning according to legal requirements and voluntary management guidelines.”</p>
<p>5.1.5 Management plans or their equivalents shall include at least a description of the current condition of the forest management unit, long-term objectives; and the average annual allowable cut, including its justification and, where relevant,</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“1.1.1. The certification area must be endowed with management plans, elaborated, approved and updated in compliance with the technical norms in the field, and going through all stages stipulated by law, considering the cycle of inventory and planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, including an appropriate assessment of the social, environmental and economic impacts of forest management operations</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
the annually allowable exploitation of non-timber forest products.		<p>1.2.2. The management plan must ensure the maintenance of the medium and long term resources in terms of quantity and quality, through a balance between growth and harvesting indices.</p> <p>1.2.3. The volume of wood harvested as principal yield in a unit of management cannot exceed the allowable cut of the principal yield of this unit, established by forest management plans, for the period of its validity.</p> <p>3.4.1. The forest management system is based on a detailed study of the situation, maps and plans for forest planning according to legal requirements and voluntary management guidelines.”</p>
5.1.6 A summary of the forest management plan or its equivalent appropriate to the scope and scale of forest management, which contains information about the forest management measures to be applied, is publicly available. The summary may exclude confidential business and personal information and other information made confidential by national legislation or for the protection of cultural sites or sensitive natural resource features.	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“6.7.1. The manager/owner of the certified area must prepare and make available to those concerned a summary of management plan fundamentals used in the certified area containing information on: the assigned functions, the constituent subunits of production, the harvesting age, the composition and the treatment methods applied in the certified area.”</p>
5.1.7 Monitoring of forest resources and evaluation of their management shall be periodically performed, and results fed back into the planning process.	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“1.1.1. The certification area must be endowed with management plans, elaborated, approved and updated in compliance with the technical norms in the field, and going through all stages stipulated by law, considering the cycle of inventory and planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, including an appropriate assessment of the social, environmental and economic impacts of forest management operations</p> <p>3.4.1. The forest management system is based on a detailed study of the situation, maps and plans for forest planning according to legal requirements and voluntary management guidelines.</p> <p>3.4.2 Periodically, there are monitoring of how management plans are implemented and their results will also be taken into account when new management plans are being made.</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		<p>6.4.3. The manager of the administrated areas will support the research and data collection activities necessary for the sustainable management of the managed forests.”</p> <p>Forest Code, 2008:</p> <p>“Art. 22 – (2) Every year, from January 1 to 31, the forest districts are obliged to transmit to the territorial forestry structures units (...), the comparative situation between the provisions of the forest management plan and the forestry works actually carried out in the previous year, at the level of production unit.”</p>
<p>5.1.8 Responsibilities for sustainable forest management shall be clearly defined and assigned.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Forest Code, 2008:</p> <p>“Article 17. - (1) Compliance with forestry regime is compulsory for all forest owners.</p> <p>(2) forest owners have the following obligations in applying to the forest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) to ensure respect for forest planning and preparation; b) to ensure security and integrity of the forest; c) to perform work on forest regeneration; d) to perform maintenance work and management of trees; e) carry out works to prevent and control forest diseases and pests; f) to ensure that measures for preventing and extinguishing fires; g) to exploit the timber only after valuing, authorizing prosecution and release of specific documents by authorized personnel; h) maintenance and repair of forest roads that are in management or ownership; i) to delineate forest property according to property deeds and maintain appropriate signs in the border state; j) notify the territorial structures of specialized central public authority responsible for forestry, within 60 days of the transfer of ownership of forest land. <p>(3) In case of forest management by forest districts authorized obligations under par. (2) belong to them.”</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
<p>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.</p>	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“1.2.2. The management plan must ensure the maintenance of the medium and long term resources in terms of quantity and quality, through a balance between growth and harvesting indices.</p> <p>3.1.1. The volume of harvested wood cannot exceed a level that can be sustained quantitatively and qualitatively over the long term, and optimum use shall be made of the harvested forest products, with due regard to nutrient off-take</p> <p>3.5.1. Treatment methods and tending operations for the management of stands are applied in such a way that the productive potential of the site is not reduced in time.</p> <p>3.5.2. Appropriate infrastructure, such as forest roads, tractor roads and bridges, are planned, built and maintained to ensure efficient transport of goods and services, minimizing the negative environmental impact.”</p>
<p>5.1.10 Appropriate silvicultural measures shall be taken to maintain or reach a level of the growing stock that is economically, ecologically and socially desirable.</p>	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“1.1.3. The planned management measures should take into account the functions assigned by the management plans.</p> <p>1.2.1. The forest management plans must provide a growing stock in accordance with established economic, environmental and social functions.</p> <p>1.3.3. The forest resource manager implements appropriate management measures to reduce the share of derived, partially derived and sub-productive stands.”</p>
<p>5.1.11 Conversion of forests to other types of land use, including conversion of primary forests to forest plantations, shall not occur unless in justified circumstances where the conversion:</p> <p>a) is in compliance with national and regional policy and legislation relevant for land use and forest management and is a result of national or regional land-use planning governed by a governmental or other official</p>	NO	<p>Forest Code, 2008:</p> <p>“Article 3. - (1) The national forest is, as appropriate, public or private property and national interest is best. (2) Ownership of land is national forest shall be exercised in accordance with the provisions of this Code.</p> <p>CHAPTER IV Ensure the integrity of the national forest fund</p> <p>Art. 35. - The reduction of the area of the national forest fund is prohibited.</p> <p>Art. 36. - (1) By way of exception from the provisions of art. 35 it is allowed to reduce the area of the national forest fund by removing / finalizing the lands necessary for the achievement of the</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
<p>authority including consultation with materially and directly interested persons and organisations; and</p> <p>b) entails a small proportion of forest type; and</p> <p>c) does not have negative impacts on threatened (including vulnerable, rare or endangered) forest ecosystems, culturally and socially significant areas, important habitats of threatened species or other protected areas; and</p> <p>d) makes a contribution to long-term conservation, economic, and social benefits.</p>		<p>objectives of national interest, declared for public utility, under the conditions of the law, as well as of lands on which are located production capacities and / or defense services strategic interest for national security.</p> <p>Art 37 (b) the maximum area which may be the subject of definitive removal from the forest fund, including construction, access and fencing, shall not exceed 250 m² in the case of forest holdings greater than 5 ha and not more than 5% of the forest area but not more than 200 m², if the area of the forest property is less than 5 ha.”</p> <p>Technical Norms – Volume 5: Forest Management planning:</p> <p>“Chapter 1.2 Clarifications concerning the forest area – Records of area change shall be operated only based on legal documents in the management plans.”</p> <p><i>‘Forest Fund’ is the Romanian expression for the duly registered forest area by the authorities. Although the reduction of the national forest area is prohibited by law (Art. 35), and exceptions to this are described in art. 36 – 47, no reference was found that conversion does not have a negative impact on threatened forest ecosystems, culturally and socially significant areas, important habitats of threatened species or other protected areas.</i></p>
<p>5.1.12 Conversion of abandoned agricultural and treeless land into forest land shall be taken into consideration, whenever it can add economic, ecological, social and/or cultural value.</p>	YES	<p>Forest Code, 2008:</p> <p>“Art. 24. - (1) In the case of forest vegetation from land outside the forest fund, as defined in this Code, and of any other land, the owner may opt for inclusion in the national forest fund, in which case it is being prepared forest management plans or be included in an existing forest management plan. (2) The change of the destination of the lands stipulated in par. (1) shall be approved by order of the head of the central public authority responsible for forestry and shall be exempt from taxes and duties.”</p> <p><i>Additional explanation by PEFC Romania: “any other land”, includes abandoned agricultural or treeless lands too, although the abandoned agricultural land does not exist as concept in Romania.</i></p>
<p>Criterion 2: Maintenance of forest ecosystem health and vitality</p>		
<p>5.2.1 Forest management planning shall aim to maintain and increase the health and vitality of</p>	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p>

Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
forest ecosystems and to rehabilitate degraded forest ecosystems, whenever this is possible by silvicultural means.		"2.2.2. Maintaining and increasing the health and vitality of forest ecosystems and the rehabilitation (reconstruction) of degraded forest ecosystems will be done whenever possible through forestry measures."
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.	YES	PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 "2.1.2. All abiotic, biotic or anthropogenic factors affecting the health, productivity and stability of the forest must be monitored at all times, following the affected area, the frequency and intensity of the factor, as well as the impact on the stands."
5.2.3 The monitoring and maintaining of health and vitality of forest ecosystems shall take into consideration the effects of naturally occurring fire, pests and other disturbances.	YES	PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 "2.1.2. All abiotic, biotic or anthropogenic factors affecting the health, productivity and stability of the forest must be monitored at all times, following the affected area, the frequency and intensity of the factor, as well as the impact on the stands. 2.1.3. The emergence, evolution and harmful influences on forests are pursued for the following factors: - Abiotic factors: Wind and snow (falls, breakages), negative temperatures, landslides, floods and fires; - Biotic factors: micro-fauna (insects, mites, gastropods, etc.), phytopathogens, hunting animals and macro-fauna species (rodents, birds, grazing mammals, etc.), domestic animals; - Anthropogenic factors: forest management (eg harvesting damage) and forms of pollution, non-organic waste and litter;"
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 RO DST 8002:2017 "1.3.2. Management plans solutions will aim to direct the management unit to a balanced age distribution that ensures continuity of long-term yields and functions 1.3.3. The forest resource manager implements appropriate management measures to reduce the share of derived, partially derived and sub-productive stands. 2.1.1. Forest management must ensure the health and vitality of forests."



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		<p>2.1.2. All abiotic, biotic or anthropogenic factors affecting the health, productivity and stability of the forest must be monitored at all times, following the affected area, the frequency and intensity of the factor, as well as the impact on the stands.</p> <p>2.2.1. Integrated forest protection is based on systematic prevention and environmentally acceptable control of harmful factors. It consists of specific (preventive and curative) protective measures doubled by preventive, revitalizing, sanitary or appropriate forestry measures.</p> <p>2.2.2. Maintaining and increasing the health and vitality of forest ecosystems and the rehabilitation (reconstruction) of degraded forest ecosystems will be done whenever possible through forestry measures.”</p> <p>Forest Code, 2008:</p> <p>“Article 55. - (1) monitoring the health of forests and establishment works to prevent and control diseases and pests is done by specialized service within the central public authority responsible for forestry. (2) Measures taken by the service provided in par. (1) are compulsory for all forest owners.</p> <p>Article 57. - (1) Works for combating diseases and pests of forests, regardless of the form ownership, by air means, is performed in a unitary manner under the coordination of the service provided by art. 55. (2) The other works to combat diseases and pests is done by the Forest Department are required to support this work and the owner, administrator concerned for public property forests.”</p>
<p>5.2.5 Forest management practices shall make best use of natural structures and processes and use preventive biological measures wherever and as far as economically feasible to maintain and enhance the health and vitality of forests. Adequate genetic, species and structural diversity shall be encouraged and/or maintained to enhance the stability, vitality and resistance capacity of the forests to adverse environmental</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“2.2.1. Integrated forest protection is based on systematic prevention and environmentally acceptable control of harmful factors. It consists of specific (preventive and curative) protective measures doubled by preventive, revitalizing, sanitary or appropriate forestry measures.</p> <p>2.3.2. Herbicides and pesticides are only used on a limited scale and where possible they are replaced by forestry measures or biological methods.</p> <p>4.1.1. Promoting maintenance and / or installation of mixed tree stands with tree species adapted to the crop sites. Pure stands, naturally installed (from seed, coppice shoots, root shoots), are exempted from this recommendation.</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
factors and strengthen natural regulation mechanisms.		<p>4.3.1. Where possible, natural regeneration of seed shall be preferred, with the condition it is adapted to the site and satisfactory from a qualitative and quantitative point of view. If necessary, the empty areas from natural regenerations can be completed by planting.</p> <p>4.4.1. Forestry treatment methods will promote irregular and mixed stands with various horizontal and vertical structures.”</p>
5.2.6 Lighting of fires shall be avoided and is only permitted if it is necessary for the achievement of the management goals of the forest management unit.	YES	<p>Forest Code, 2008: “Title IV. CHAPTER V Prevention and firefighting Art. 48. - Owners of forest lands, forest protection curtains and degraded lands on which afforestation works have been carried out, as well as forest district which provide forestry services, or their management are obliged to apply and comply with the specific rules of defense against fires, approved by order of the head of the central public authority responsible for forestry.”</p> <p>Law of Forest Contraventions: “Chapter 4, Art. 9b) ignition of fire in the national forest fund in places other than those specially arranged and marked or less than 30 meters from the forest boundary, is contravention.”</p>
5.2.7 Appropriate forest management practices such as reforestation and afforestation with tree species and provenances that are suited to the site conditions or the use of tending, harvesting and transport techniques that minimise tree and/or soil damages shall be applied. The spillage of oil during forest management operations or the indiscriminate disposal of waste on forest land shall be strictly avoided. Non-organic waste and litter shall be avoided, collected, stored in designated areas and removed in an environmentally-responsible manner.	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“2.1.3. The emergence, evolution and harmful influences on forests are pursued for the following factors: (...) - Anthropogenic factors: forest management (eg harvesting damage) and forms of pollution, non-organic waste and litter;</p> <p>2.2.1. Integrated forest protection is based on systematic prevention and environmentally acceptable control of harmful factors. It consists of specific (preventive and curative) protective measures doubled by preventive, revitalizing, sanitary or appropriate forestry measures.</p> <p>3.5.1. Treatment methods and tending operations for the management of stands are applied in such a way that the productive potential of the site is not reduced in time.</p> <p>4.3.1. Where possible, natural regeneration of seed shall be preferred, with the condition it is adapted to the site and satisfactory from a qualitative and quantitative point of view. If necessary, the empty areas from natural regenerations can be completed by planting.</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		<p>4.3.4. The forest seeds and the afforestation material used for the planting of forests must be of known and verifiable origin. They are required to come from seed-source stands seed orchards included in the National catalog of forest reproductive material.</p> <p>5.1.6. Particular attention should be paid to the management of harvesting residues as well as waste resulting from forestry activities (hydrocarbons, household waste, etc.) so that river-beds and waters remain clean.</p> <p>5.2.2. Specific management, measures and work should focus on soil protection and reducing the impact of operations at its level.</p> <p>5.4.2. For the protection of waters and soils, the use of biodegradable hydraulic oils should be promoted, and in the event of leakage, measures to neutralize and remove effects should be urgently taken.”</p> <p><i>In the case of Romania, appropriate forest management practices, are described in detail in the Technical Norms. The requirements of the Technical Norms shall be followed during design and implementation of Forest Management Plans.</i></p> <p>Law of Forest Contraventions:</p> <p>“Chapter 4, Art. 12. Stocking, accidental disposal or spillage of household, industrial, oil or chemical waste or residues from wood processing, in forests is a contravention.”</p>
<p>5.2.8 The use of pesticides shall be minimised and appropriate silvicultural alternatives and other biological measures preferred.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“2.3.2. Herbicides and pesticides are only used on a limited scale and where possible they are replaced by forestry measures or biological methods.”</p>
<p>5.2.9 The WHO Type 1A and 1B pesticides and other highly toxic pesticides shall be prohibited, except where no other viable alternative is available.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“2.3 Biological and chemical pest control</p> <p>Subcriterion: Biological and chemical control of harmful factors</p> <p>Description: Actions to prevent and combat forest-damaging phenomena that can not be prevented or controlled only by cultural means are included in an integrated system of forest protection measures. The use of chemicals is limited by national and international usage</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		<p>regulations (WHO lists 1A and 1B as well as the List of active substances authorized for use in plant protection products on the territory of Romania).</p> <p>Indicator 2.3.a Use of allowed substances (pesticides, herbicides, repellents, etc.)</p> <p>Pesticides prohibited by international agreements are defined in the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants of 2001 and subsequent amendments</p> <p>In the case of use of an unauthorized substance from previous lists or use above the admitted thresholds, is there an expertise to prove that it was the only possible option to effectively combat an extremely dangerous agent?”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“2.3.1. The use of chemicals is limited by national and international usage regulations. It is not allowed to use herbicides and pesticides which are prohibited by international conventions.”</p>
<p>5.2.10 Pesticides, such as chlorinated hydrocarbons whose derivatives remain biologically active and accumulate in the food chain beyond their intended use, and any pesticides banned by international agreement, shall be prohibited.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“2.3 Biological and chemical pest control</p> <p>Subcriterion: Biological and chemical control of harmful factors</p> <p>Description: Actions to prevent and combat forest-damaging phenomena that can not be prevented or controlled only by cultural means are included in an integrated system of forest protection measures. The use of chemicals is limited by national and international usage regulations (WHO lists 1A and 1B as well as the List of active substances authorized for use in plant protection products on the territory of Romania). Pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, fungicides, rodenticides, molluscicides, etc.) are only used on a limited scale and where possible they are replaced by forestry or biological methods. The use of pesticides prohibited by international conventions is not permitted. All chemical substances must comply with standards, thresholds and conditions (hygienic, toxicological and ecological) on nature protection.</p> <p>Indicator 2.3.a Use of allowed substances (pesticides, herbicides, repellents, etc.)</p> <p>Pesticides prohibited by international agreements are defined in the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants of 2001 and subsequent amendments”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		"2.3.1. The use of chemicals is limited by national and international usage regulations. It is not allowed to use herbicides and pesticides which are prohibited by international conventions."
5.2.11 The use of pesticides shall follow the instructions given by the pesticide producer and be implemented with proper equipment and training.	NO	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>"2.3.1. The use of chemicals is limited by national and international usage regulations. It is not allowed to use herbicides and pesticides which are prohibited by international conventions."</p> <p>Government Ordinance 4/1995- related to pesticides:</p> <p>"Art.19.- Use of plant protection products may only be done for the purposes for which it has been approved and only in accordance with the instructions for use, the rules and recommendations provided by the technologies approved by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food and the Ministry of Waters, Forests and Environmental Protection, for forestry."</p> <p><i>No reference was found with regard to implementation with proper equipment and training.</i></p>
5.2.12 Where fertilisers are used, they shall be applied in a controlled manner and with due consideration for the environment.	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>"2.3.3. Fertilizers or stimulants shall be applied in a controlled and environmentally responsible manner."</p>
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	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>"1.2.2. The management plan must ensure the maintenance of the medium and long term resources in terms of quantity and quality, through a balance between growth and harvesting indices.</p> <p>3.1.1. The volume of harvested wood cannot exceed a level that can be sustained quantitatively and qualitatively over the long term, and optimum use shall be made of the harvested forest products, with due regard to nutrient off-take</p> <p>3.2.1. The amount of non-wood products harvested from flora or fauna must not exceed a level that can be sustained in the long run, and optimum use shall be made of the harvested forest products, with due regard to nutrient off-take."</p>
5.3.2 Forest management planning shall aim to achieve sound economic performance taking into	YES	PEFC RO DST 8002:2017



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
<p>account any available market studies and possibilities for new markets and economic activities in connection with all relevant goods and services of forests.</p>		<p>“1.2.1. The forest management plans must provide a growing stock in accordance with established economic, environmental and social functions.</p> <p>3.3.1. Marketable services are only used to an extent that will not endanger the sustainable management of forests from an ecological, economic or socio-economic point of view (tourism services, leasing, educational services, etc.), 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.</p> <p>6.2.3. In the forest management process, it is also recommended to market non-wood products in the possession of the forest owner, as an alternative source of income both for the owner and for the local communities.”</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“1.1.3. The planned management measures should take into account the functions assigned by the management plans.</p> <p>1.1.4. The forest owners, their managers, representatives of the public authority and, where appropriate, the civil society will take all necessary steps to find technical solutions that meet the economic, technical, ecological and social objectives at the I. management planning conference, making full use of related services and tools that support land-use planning and nature conservation.</p> <p>6.2.1. Forest planning shall aim to respect the multiple functions offered by the forest to society, taking into account the role of the forest in rural development. Therefore, the planning process will grant great importance to the proper identification of all the social, economic and environmental functions according to the functional zoning criteria existing in the technical regulations in force at the time of certification.</p> <p>6.4.3. The manager of the administrated areas will support the research and data collection activities necessary for the sustainable management of the managed forests.”</p> <p>Forest Code, 2008:</p> <p>“CHAPTER III Ways to support sustainable forest development</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		<p>Article 97. - (1) For the purpose of sustainable management of forest and private property of individuals and legal entities of public or private property of local governments, the annual budget allocated by the budget of the central public authority responsible for forestry, amounts to: (...) f) supporting the establishment and development of forest owners associations; g) make available to owners of forest education materials on forest protection and forest conservation.</p> <p>Article 100. - Complete cadastral surveys for the national forest, the IFN-ground monitoring of forest vegetation is funded annually from the state budget through the budget of central government authority responsible for forestry.”</p>
<p>5.3.4 Forest management practices shall maintain and improve the forest resources and encourage a diversified output of goods and services over the long term.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“1.2.2. The management plan must ensure the maintenance of the medium and long term resources in terms of quantity and quality, through a balance between growth and harvesting indices.</p> <p>1.3.3. The forest resource manager implements appropriate management measures to reduce the share of derived, partially derived and sub-productive stands.</p> <p>2.1.1. Forest management must ensure the health and vitality of forests.</p> <p>3.1.1. The volume of harvested wood cannot exceed a level that can be sustained quantitatively and qualitatively over the long term, and optimum use shall be made of the harvested forest products, with due regard to nutrient off-take</p> <p>3.2.1. The amount of non-wood products harvested from flora or fauna must not exceed a level that can be sustained in the long run, and optimum use shall be made of the harvested forest products, with due regard to nutrient off-take.</p> <p>6.2.3. In the forest management process, it is also recommended to market non-wood products in the possession of the forest owner, as an alternative source of income both for the owner and for the local communities.”</p>
<p>5.3.5 Regeneration, tending and harvesting operations shall be carried out in time, and in a way that does not reduce the productive capacity</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
<p>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.</p>		<p>“2.1.3. The emergence, evolution and harmful influences on forests are pursued for the following factors: (...) - Anthropogenic factors: forest management (eg harvesting damage) and forms of pollution, non-organic waste and litter;</p> <p>3.5.1. Treatment methods and tending operations for the management of stands are applied in such a way that the productive potential of the site is not reduced in time.</p> <p>4.3.1. Where possible, natural regeneration of seed shall be preferred, with the condition it is adapted to the site and satisfactory from a qualitative and quantitative point of view. If necessary, the empty areas from natural regenerations can be completed by planting.”</p> <p>Forest Code, 2008:</p> <p>“Article 28. - (1) ecological reconstruction, restoration and care of forests is done in accordance with the forest management and / or studies, studies grounded in accordance with specific technical norms. (2) apply the forest regeneration, aiming to preserve the genetic and ecologic sources, making stands for quality and continuous exercise by them of the protection functions. (3) is exempt from the provisions of par. (2) stands of native poplar, willow, acacia, and meadows in the regime allowed grove.</p> <p>Article 65. - (1) The collection of wood harvesting technologies are used for collecting primary platform works and transportation of wood from forests that do not cause soil degradation, forest roads and water banks, destruction or damage seedlings usable, and not for exploitation of the trees, above the permissible limits of technical rules.”</p> <p><i>It was explained during the field mission that ‘in time’ in the Romanian context is before the deadlines as set in the Management Plan. Each Management Plan contains a detailed planning of operations on compartment level, for the 10 years within the planning period. If implementation of operations does not follow the timeframe set in the management plan, this can result in warnings, fines or even prosecution of the forest manager. (See annex 5).</i></p>
<p>5.3.6 Harvesting levels of both wood and non-wood forest products shall not exceed a rate that can be sustained in the long term, and optimum use shall be made of the harvested forest products, with due regard to nutrient off-take.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“3.1.1. The volume of harvested wood cannot exceed a level that can be sustained quantitatively and qualitatively over the long term, and optimum use shall be made of the harvested forest products, with due regard to nutrient off-take.</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		3.2.1. The amount of non-wood products harvested from flora or fauna must not exceed a level that can be sustained in the long run, and optimum use shall be made of the harvested forest products, with due regard to nutrient off-take.”
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	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“1.1.1. The certification area must be endowed with management plans, elaborated, approved and updated in compliance with the technical norms in the field, and going through all stages stipulated by law, considering the cycle of inventory and planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, including an appropriate assessment of the social, environmental and economic impacts of forest management operations</p> <p>2.1.2. All abiotic, biotic or anthropogenic factors affecting the health, productivity and stability of the forest must be monitored at all times, following the affected area, the frequency and intensity of the factor, as well as the impact on the stands.</p> <p>3.2.1. The amount of non-wood products harvested from flora or fauna must not exceed a level that can be sustained in the long run, and optimum use shall be made of the harvested forest products, with due regard to nutrient off-take.</p> <p>3.2.2. The commercial use of non-wood products will be limited to an environmentally sustainable level.</p> <p>4.4.7. The populations of game species will be kept in adequate flocks to avoid significant injuries to young natural or artificial regeneration and tree stands.”</p> <p>Forest Code from 2008</p> <p>“Art. 58. (4) Forest products belong to their owner or owners, as the case may be, with the exception of hunting interest fauna and mountain water wildlife fish. (5) The harvesting and / or purchase of non-timber products specific to the national forest fund shall be made on the basis of the permits issued by the forest districts who provide administration or forestry services, according to the instructions approved by order of the central public authority responsible for forestry, the basis of the harvest / purchase authorization issued by the competent authority for environmental protection.”</p>

Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
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 RO DST 8002:2017 “3.5.2. Appropriate infrastructure, such as forest roads, tractor roads and bridges, are planned, built and maintained to ensure efficient transport of goods and services, minimizing the negative environmental impact.”
Criterion 4: Maintenance, conservation and appropriate enhancement of biological diversity in forest ecosystems		
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 RO DST 8001:2017 “4.1 Structural diversity Subcriterion: Structural diversity of stands and forests included for certification purposes Description: - Planning of management plan will aim maintaining, preserving and enhancing biodiversity at ecosystemic, species and genetic level and where possible, landscape diversity.”
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) protected, rare, sensitive or representative forest ecosystems such as riparian areas and wetland biotopes; b) areas containing endemic species and habitats of threatened species, as defined in recognised reference lists; c) endangered or protected genetic in situ resources; and taking into account <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) globally, regionally and nationally significant large landscape areas with natural 	YES	PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 “4.2 Threatened species Subcriterion: Threatened species and biotope types Description: - Planning, inventory and mapping of forest resources will identify, protect and / or conserve environmentally significant forest areas with significant concentrations of: A) Protected, rare, sensitive or representative forest ecosystems such as littoral areas or wet biotopes; (B) Areas containing endemic species and habitats of threatened species, as defined in official lists; C) Genetic resources threatened or protected in situ; D) Large scale landscapes on a global, regional and national scale, with natural distribution and abundance of species occurring naturally.”



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
distribution and abundance of naturally occurring species.		
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	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“4.2 Threatened species</p> <p>Subcriterion: Threatened species and biotope types</p> <p>Description: - Protected or endangered plant and animal species will not be exploited for commercial purposes. Where necessary, measures will be taken to protect and, where relevant, increase their population.”</p>
5.4.4 Forest management shall ensure successful regeneration through natural regeneration or, where not appropriate, planting that is adequate to ensure the quantity and quality of the forest resources.	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“4.3 Forest regeneration</p> <p>Subcriterion: Forest regeneration</p> <p>Description: - Forest management will ensure successful natural regeneration or where this is not possible through planting, which is adequate to ensure the quantity and quality of forest resources.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“4.3.1. Where possible, natural regeneration of seed shall be preferred, with the condition it is adapted to the site and satisfactory from a qualitative and quantitative point of view. If necessary, the empty areas from natural regenerations can be completed by planting.”</p>
5.4.5 For reforestation and afforestation, origins of native species and local provenances that are well-adapted to site conditions shall be preferred, where appropriate. Only those introduced species, provenances or varieties shall be used whose impacts on the ecosystem and on the genetic integrity of native species and local provenances have been evaluated, and if negative impacts can be avoided or minimised.	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“4.3 Forest regeneration</p> <p>Subcriterion: Forest regeneration</p> <p>Description: - For afforestation and reforestation works, it is preferable, where possible, native species and local origins that are well suited to stationary conditions. Only those allochthonous species, varieties or provenances whose impacts on the ecosystem and genetic integrity of indigenous species and local provenances have been assessed, and whether negative impacts can be avoided or minimized will be used.”</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“4.3.4. The forest seeds and the afforestation material used for the planting of forests must be of known and verifiable origin. They are required to come from seed-source stands seed orchards included in the National catalog of forest reproductive material.”</p>
<p>5.4.6 Afforestation and reforestation activities that contribute to the improvement and restoration of ecological connectivity shall be promoted.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“4.3 Forest regeneration</p> <p>Subcriterion: Forest regeneration</p> <p>Description: - Afforestation and reforestation works that contribute to the improvement and restoration of ecological connectivity will be promoted.”</p>
<p>5.4.7 Genetically-modified trees shall not be used.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“4.1 Structural diversity</p> <p>Subcriterion: Structural diversity of stands and forests included for certification purposes</p> <p>Description: - (...) Genetically modified trees will not be used.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“4.3.5. Genetically modified trees will not be used in afforestation / reforestation activities.”</p>
<p>5.4.8 Forest management practices shall, where appropriate, promote a diversity of both horizontal and vertical structures such as uneven-aged stands and the diversity of species such as mixed stands. Where appropriate, the practices shall also aim to maintain and restore landscape diversity.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“4.1 Structural diversity</p> <p>Subcriterion: Structural diversity of stands and forests included for certification purposes</p> <p>Description: (...) Where possible, through the forest development works, the diversity of horizontal and vertical structures such as irregular stands and diversity of mixed tree species will be promoted. Where possible, these landscaping works will also aim at preserving and restoring the diversity of the landscape.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“4.1.1. Promoting maintenance and / or installation of mixed tree stands with tree species adapted to the crop sites. Pure stands, naturally installed (from seed, coppice shoots, root shoots), are exempted from this recommendation.</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		4.4.1. Forestry treatment methods will promote irregular and mixed stands with various horizontal and vertical structures.”
5.4.9 Traditional management systems that have created valuable ecosystems, such as coppice, on appropriate sites shall be supported, when economically feasible.	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“4.1 Structural diversity</p> <p>Subcriterion: Structural diversity of stands and forests included for certification purposes</p> <p>Description:</p> <p>- Traditional management systems, which have created valuable ecosystems, such as coppice forests, will be maintained on favorable resorts when economically feasible.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“4.4.2. Clear-cuts can only be applied on a small scale, in small felling areas and under the conditions foreseen by the applicable forestry legislation.</p> <p>4.4.3. Coppice system (simple or composed) is not considered to be clear-cut and applies only to certain tree species under the conditions foreseen by the applicable forestry legislation.”</p>
5.4.10 Tending and harvesting operations shall be conducted in a way that does not cause lasting damage to ecosystems. Wherever possible, practical measures shall be taken to improve or maintain biological diversity.	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“3.5.1. Treatment methods and tending operations for the management of stands are applied in such a way that the productive potential of the site is not reduced in time.</p> <p>4.1.3 By applying the tending operations and management of stands and forestry treatment methods, rare species of trees and shrubs will be promoted.”</p>
5.4.11 Infrastructure shall be planned and constructed in a way that minimises damage to ecosystems, especially to rare, sensitive or representative ecosystems and genetic reserves, and that takes threatened or other key species – in particular their migration patterns – into consideration.	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“3.5.2. Appropriate infrastructure, such as forest roads, tractor roads and bridges, are planned, built and maintained to ensure efficient transport of goods and services, minimizing the negative environmental impact.</p> <p>4.2.1. Special forest management measures will be taken to protect representative forest ecosystems, stands in protected areas, threatened, protected wild animal and plant species.”</p>
5.4.12 With due regard to management objectives, measures shall be taken to balance	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“3.5 Management methods</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
the pressure of animal populations and grazing on forest regeneration and growth as well as on biodiversity.		<p>Subcriterion: Treatments, tending operations and management of stands are applied in such a way that the productive potential of the forest site is not reduced over time.</p> <p>As far as management objectives are concerned, measures are being taken to balance the pressure of livestock populations and grazing on the regeneration and growth / development of forests, as well as on biodiversity.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“4.4.7. The populations of game species will be kept in adequate flocks to avoid significant injuries to young natural or artificial regeneration and tree stands.</p> <p>4.4.8 Grazing in the forest of domestic animals is possible only in compliance with the provisions of the forestry legislation in force.”</p>
5.4.13 Standing and fallen dead wood, hollow trees, old groves and special rare tree species shall be left in quantities and distribution necessary to safeguard biological diversity, taking into account the potential effect on the health and stability of forests and on surrounding ecosystems.	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“4.1 Structural diversity</p> <p>Subcriterion: Structural diversity of stands and forests included for certification purposes</p> <p>- Dead or standing trees, cavity trees, aging groves and rare trees will be kept in quantities and distributions necessary to guarantee biological diversity, taking into account the potential effect on the health and stability of forests and surrounding ecosystems.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“4.4.4. An appropriate number of biotope trees (dry trees, scrub trees, rare trees) will be preserved and protected to preserve biological diversity. Their number must not lead to economic disadvantages for the forest owner.”</p>
Criterion 5: Maintenance and appropriate enhancement of protective functions in forest management (notably soil and water)		
5.5.1 Forest management planning shall aim to maintain and enhance protective functions of forests for society, such as protection of infrastructure, protection from soil erosion, protection of water resources and from adverse impacts of water such as floods or avalanches.	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“5.1 Water protection</p> <p>Subcriterion: Maintaining and improving the water protection function</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		<p>Description: - Forest management has to maintain and improve the functions of water and water resources protection, and their management will lead to protection of the population and socio-economic objectives against floods and torrential floods.</p> <p>5.2 Soil protection</p> <p>Subcriterion: Maintain and improve the soil and land protection function</p> <p>Description: - Forest management must maintain and improve the protective functions of forests towards society, such as protection against soil erosion and protection against harmful factors such as avalanches.</p> <p>5.3 Infrastructure protection</p> <p>Subcriterion: Infrastructure protection</p> <p>Description: - Forest management must maintain and improve forest protection functions towards society, such as infrastructure protection.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“3.4.1. The forest management system is based on a detailed study of the situation, maps and plans for forest planning according to legal requirements and voluntary management guidelines.</p> <p>5.1.1. The management of water protection forests will maximize the hydrological function of the stands, ensuring the protection of water resources, aquatic and riparian ecosystems.</p> <p>5.2.1. The forest, as a land-use, ensures the best protection of soils against rain and wind erosion, having in special environmental and structural conditions, special functions for unstable soil and soil consolidation and water balance adjustment in the soil. The way these forests are managed must maintain and improve the protective capacities designated for the concerned forests.</p> <p>5.3.1. In the case of forests in the immediate vicinity of infrastructure elements of local or national interest (motorways, public roads, normal railways, waterways, cultural monuments, etc.), their management, forestry techniques and technologies must be made to avoid the interruption of the protective effect on the protected objectives, and by the specific technological processes not to be harmed.”</p>

Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
<p>5.5.2 Areas that fulfil specific and recognised protective functions for society shall be registered and mapped, and forest management plans or their equivalents shall take these areas into account.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“5.1 Water protection Subcriterion: Maintaining and improving the water protection function Description: - (...) Forest areas for water protection must be recorded and delimited on maps, and forest settings or equivalent documents should take these areas into account.</p> <p>5.2 Soil protection Subcriterion: Maintain and improve the soil and land protection function Description: - Forest areas intended for the protection of land and soils must be recorded and delimited on maps, and forest management plans or equivalent documents should take these areas into account.</p> <p>5.3 Infrastructure protection Subcriterion: Infrastructure protection Description: - Forest areas intended for the protection of the infrastructure must be recorded and delimited on the maps, and forest settings or equivalent documents must take these areas into account.”</p>
<p>5.5.3 Special care shall be given to silvicultural operations on sensitive soils and erosion-prone areas as well as in areas where operations might lead to excessive erosion of soil into watercourses. Inappropriate techniques such as deep soil tillage and use of unsuitable machinery shall be avoided in such areas. Special measures shall be taken to minimise the pressure of animal populations.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“5.2 Soil protection Subcriterion: Maintain and improve the soil and land protection function Description: - Particular attention should be paid to technologies used on sensitive, erosion-prone soils, as well as where operations can lead to excessive sediment accumulations in the watercourses. Works such as deep plowing and the use of improper machinery should be avoided in these areas. Special measures must be taken to minimize the pressure of wild animals.”</p>
<p>5.5.4 Special care shall be given to forest management practices in forest areas with water protection functions to avoid adverse effects on the quality and quantity of water resources.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“5.1 Water protection Subcriterion: Maintaining and improving the water protection function</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
<p>Inappropriate use of chemicals or other harmful substances or inappropriate silvicultural practices influencing water quality in a harmful way shall be avoided.</p>		<p>Description: - Particular attention should be paid to technologies used to drive and regenerate forests to avoid the negative impact on protected water resources.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“2.3.2. Herbicides and pesticides are only used on a limited scale and where possible they are replaced by forestry measures or biological methods.</p> <p>5.1.1. The management of water protection forests will maximize the hydrological function of the stands, ensuring the protection of water resources, aquatic and riparian ecosystems.</p> <p>5.1.2. Water courses, mineral and drinking water sources and accumulations of drinking or industrial water should not be affected by forestry activities. Particular attention should be paid to riparian areas and the quality of surface and deep water in the perimeters of water sources.</p> <p>5.1.5. Wood harvesting technologies as well as adjacent activities must be so chosen and executed that the impact on water drainage and the quality of the water is minimal.</p> <p>5.1.6. Particular attention should be paid to the management of harvesting residues as well as waste resulting from forestry activities (hydrocarbons, household waste, etc.) so that river-beds and waters remain clean.”</p>
<p>5.5.5 Construction of roads, bridges and other infrastructure shall be carried out in a manner that minimises bare soil exposure, avoids the introduction of soil into watercourses and preserves the natural level and function of water courses and river beds. Proper road drainage facilities shall be installed and maintained.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“3.5.2. Appropriate infrastructure, such as forest roads, tractor roads and bridges, are planned, built and maintained to ensure efficient transport of goods and services, minimizing the negative environmental impact.</p> <p>5.3.2. The construction and maintenance of forest roads and access roads must be made in such a way that the impact on the soil is minimal and the material resulting from excavations does not reach the watercourses. Crossing the watercourses should be used bridges and beam bridges whose hydraulic section can ensure the transit of exceptional flows for each watercourse.”</p> <p>Forest Code, 2008:</p> <p>“Title IV, Chapter 12 – Accessibility of forests</p> <p>Art. 85. - (1) The design and construction of forest roads shall be based on the principles that respect the landscape and do not affect the quality of the water, the soil and the habitats. (5)</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		<p>Forest road design and construction activities shall be carried out in accordance with the good practice guides and the norms approved by the central public authority responsible for forestry.</p> <p>(6) The feasibility studies for the development of the forest road network are made in correlation with those for torrent correction works.</p> <p>Art. 87. - (1) The maintenance and repair of the forest roads shall be the responsibility of the owner, respectively the administrator, for the forest roads belonging to the state forest ownership fund, respecting the norms or guides of good practices approved by order of the head of the public authority responsible for forestry.”</p>
Criterion 6: Maintenance of other socio-economic functions and conditions		
<p>5.6.1 Forest management planning shall aim to respect the multiple functions of forests to society, give due regard to the role of forestry in rural development, and especially consider new opportunities for employment in connection with the socio-economic functions of forests.</p>	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“6.2 Rural development</p> <p>Subcriterion: Forest contribution to rural development</p> <p>Description: - Forest planning should aim to respect the multiple functions offered by the forest to society, taking into account the role of the forest in rural development; In particular, it must consider creating new employment opportunities in relation to the social and economic functions of forests.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“6.2.1. Forest planning shall aim to respect the multiple functions offered by the forest to society, taking into account the role of the forest in rural development. Therefore, the planning process will grant great importance to the proper identification of all the social, economic and environmental functions according to the functional zoning criteria existing in the technical regulations in force at the time of certification.”</p>
<p>5.6.2 Forest management shall promote the long-term health and well-being of communities within or adjacent to the forest management area.</p>	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“6.2 Rural development</p> <p>Subcriterion: Forest contribution to rural development</p> <p>Description: - Forest management must support the well-being and long-term vitality of communities living in or near the forest area”</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
<p>5.6.3 Property rights and land tenure arrangements shall be clearly defined, documented and established for the relevant forest area. Likewise, legal, customary and traditional rights related to the forest land shall be clarified, recognised and respected.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“6.1 Property Subcriterion: Property, ownership and management rights Description: Ownership rights and other possession rights over forest land must be well defined, documented and established for the relevant forestry areas. In the same way, the legal, traditional and customary rights related to forest lands must be clarified, recognized and respected”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“6.1.1. The ownership right must be clear to any forest to be certified. Ownership must be complete, legally unquestionable, and cannot be a reason for further disputes, in order not to compromise the sustainability of the management of the forest to be certified.”</p>
<p>5.6.4 Forest management activities shall be conducted in recognition of the established framework of legal, customary and traditional rights such as outlined in ILO 169 and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which shall not be infringed upon without the free, prior and informed consent of the holders of the rights, including the provision of compensation where applicable. Where the extent of rights is not yet resolved or is in dispute there are processes for just and fair resolution. In such cases forest managers shall, in the interim, provide meaningful opportunities for parties to be engaged in forest management decisions whilst respecting the processes and roles and responsibilities laid out in the policies and laws where the certification takes place.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p><i>According to PEFC Romania and several stakeholders interviewed during the field assessment, there are no recognized indigenous people, such as outlined in ILO 169 and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. This is supported by information from Minority Rights Group International (www.minorityrights.org). Therefore, the specific PEFC Council requirements to these issues are not applicable for the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme.</i></p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
<p>5.6.5 Adequate public access to forests for the purpose of recreation shall be provided taking into account respect for ownership rights and the rights of others, the effects on forest resources and ecosystems, as well as compatibility with other functions of the forest.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“6.5 Recreational services Subcriterion: Recreational services Description: - Recreational public access must be adequately provided in forests while respecting the rights of property and the rights of third parties, taking into account the effects on forest resources and ecosystems as well as compatibility with other forest functions.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“6.5.1. Recreational activities involving the use of motorized vehicles are permitted only with the consent of the owner and the manager of the forest. The manager/owner of the certified areas will ensuring access to the marked routes and will appropriately mark areas where public access is restricted, to avoid potential conflicts between the public and the owner.</p> <p>6.5.2 In the certified areas in protected areas, access with motorized vehicles will be restricted, as required by law.</p> <p>6.5.3. The forest planning system will aim to maintain and increase the quality of the recreational services offered by the forest, respecting the principles of functional zoning.”</p>
<p>5.6.6 Sites with recognised specific historical, cultural or spiritual significance and areas fundamental to meeting the basic needs of local communities (e.g. health, subsistence) shall be protected or managed in a way that takes due regard of the significance of the site.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“6.6 Cultural values Subcriterion: Historical, spiritual and cultural values of forests Description: Areas with recognized historical, cultural or spiritual values and forest areas essential to meeting the basic conditions of local communities (eg health and subsistence) must be protected or managed in a way that considers the importance of the area.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“6.6.3. In the forest areas identified by the management plans or by the manager/owner as having historical, cultural and spiritual values, forestry works will be applied to preserve their natural structure.”</p>
<p>5.6.7 Forest management operations shall take into account all socio-economic functions,</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
<p>especially the recreational function and aesthetic values of forests by maintaining for example varied forest structures, and by encouraging attractive trees, groves and other features such as colours, flowers and fruits. This shall be done, however, in a way and to an extent that does not lead to serious negative effects on forest resources, and forest land.</p>		<p>“6.5 Recreational services Subcriterion: Recreational services Description: - Forest management works must consider all socio-economic functions and, in particular, the recreational function and aesthetic values of the forest, for example by maintaining structural diversity and promoting tree sprawls or attractive trees as well as other floral, floristic or fruit features. However, this must be done in a way that does not lead to serious negative effects on forestry and soil.” PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 “6.5.4. In the areas identified by the management plans as having a recreational role, elements of structural and compositional diversity will be promoted to increase the aesthetic value of the forest.”</p>
<p>5.6.8 Forest managers, contractors, employees and forest owners shall be provided with sufficient information and encouraged to keep up-to-date through continuous training in relation to sustainable forest management as a precondition for all management planning and practices described in this standard.</p>	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 “6.4 Education and research Subcriterion: Forestry education and research Description - Forest managers, contractors, employees and forest owners must have sufficient information and be encouraged to update their knowledge through a continuous training process in relation to sustainable forest management as a prerequisite for the implementation of the planned management and planning practices in this standard.” PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 “6.4.1. The certified area manager and/or the owner must formally inform the forestry contractors about the conditions imposed by the certification standard in carrying out the contracted works. 6.4.2. In Romania, forestry education is offered at all levels. The certified area manager will, however, ensure that all employees receive continuous training activities to understand and implement the certification requirements of this standard.”</p>
<p>5.6.9 Forest management practices shall make the best use of local forest-related experience and</p>	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 “6.7 Public relations Subcriterion: Public participation and information</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
knowledge, such as those of local communities, forest owners, NGOs and local people.		Description: - Forestry shall make best use of the experiences and knowledge of local forest management such as those of local communities, owners, NGOs and the local population. PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 “6.7.2. The certified site manager and or the owner shall, at least once a year, consult stakeholders (local communities, NGOs, institutions, harvesting and processing companies) on the impact of forest management.”
5.6.10 Forest management shall provide for effective communication and consultation with local people and other stakeholders relating to sustainable forest management and shall provide appropriate mechanisms for resolving complaints and disputes relating to forest management between forest operators and local people.	YES	PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 “6.7 Public relations Subcriterion: Public participation and information Description: - Forest management shall provide effective communication and consultation with the local population and other stakeholders concerned with sustainable forest management and must provide appropriate mechanisms to resolve complaints and disputes related to forest management between forestry workers and the local population.” PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 “6.7.2. The certified site manager and or the owner shall, at least once a year, consult stakeholders (local communities, NGOs, institutions, harvesting and processing companies) on the impact of forest management. 6.7.3. The certified area manager shall record, document, and settle any complaint regarding deviations from the implementation of the provisions of the management plans in relation to the legal provisions.”
5.6.11 Forestry work shall be planned, organised and performed in a manner that enables health and accident risks to be identified and all reasonable measures to be applied to protect workers from work-related risks. Workers shall be informed about the risks involved with their work and about preventive measures.	YES	PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 “6.3 Work conditions Subcriterion: Working conditions, health and safety at work Description: - The organization, planning and conduct of work must be carried out in a manner that makes it possible to identify the risks of accidents at work and to affect the health of workers so that all acceptable measures are applied to protect workers from these risks. Workers must



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		<p>be informed of the risks involved in their work and their prevention measures. These provisions apply to both own employees and contractors performing forestry or exploitation services.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“6.3.2. Prevention of occupational accidents and occupational diseases in the forest sector is an important social aspect of sustainable management. The certified area manager must implement and systematically pursue occupational health and safety activities, in accordance with national legislation.”</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“6.3 Work conditions</p> <p>Subcriterion: Working conditions, health and safety at work</p> <p>Description: - Working conditions must be safe, rules and training on work safety being offered to all those who carry out forestry activities and works.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“6.3.2. Prevention of occupational accidents and occupational diseases in the forest sector is an important social aspect of sustainable management. The certified area manager must implement and systematically pursue occupational health and safety activities, in accordance with national legislation.”</p>
<p>5.6.13 Forest management shall comply with fundamental ILO conventions.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“6.3. Working conditions, health and safety at work</p> <p>6.3.1. Both the owner and the manager of certified areas must ensure employment on non-discriminatory basis, in accordance with conventions initiated by the International Labor Organization and implemented by Romanian legislation.”</p> <p><i>All 8 fundamental ILO conventions are ratified by Romania.</i></p>
<p>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</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PEFC RO DST 8001:2017</p> <p>“6.4 Education and research</p> <p>Subcriterion: Forestry education and research</p>



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
management or support relevant research activities carried out by other organisations, as appropriate.		<p>Description: - Forest management should be based, among other things, on the results of scientific research. Forest managers should contribute to research and data collection necessary for sustainable forest management or support, if they deem appropriate, the relevant research activities carried out by other organizations.”</p> <p>PEFC RO DST 8002:2017</p> <p>“6.4.3. The manager of the administrated areas will support the research and data collection activities necessary for the sustainable management of the managed forests.</p> <p>6.4.4. In the process of planning and execution of forestry works it is recommended to use the results of the relevant research activities obtained by itself or by dissemination by the research organizations.”</p>
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.	NO	<p>PEFC RO DST 8000:2017</p> <p>“2.5.1 Criteria and Indicators</p> <p>(...) On this basis, concrete certification criteria have been defined, considering the specific national conditions and the legal situation in Romania, in particular the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Romanian Constitution, • Forestry Code 2008 (in its current amended version) and subsequent legal regulations, • Hunting Act 2008 (in its current amended version) • Nature protection regulations, including the 2007 Protected Areas Act (in its current amended version) • Water Act 1996 (in its current amended version) • Legislation on plant protection products and substances • Fiscal Code 2015 (in its current amended version) • Labor Code 2003 (in its current amended version) • Technical rules (Norms) in forestry • International Treaties and Declarations ratified by Romania



Question	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
		<p>The criteria include economic, ecological and social aspects of forest management and apply to activities of all operators in the defined forest area who have a measurable impact on achieving compliance with the requirements.</p> <p>3.4.1. The forest management system is based on a detailed study of the situation, maps and plans for forest planning according to legal requirements and voluntary management guidelines.”</p> <p><i>It is insufficiently ensured in the Romanian scheme requirements that forest management shall comply with legislation applicable to forest management.</i></p>
<p>5.7.2 Forest management shall provide for adequate protection of the forest from unauthorised activities such as illegal logging, illegal land use, illegally initiated fires, and other illegal activities.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Law of Forest Contraventions, 2010:</p> <p>“Regulations for forest guarding”</p> <p>Government Decision 1076/2009 - Regulation for forest guarding- Art. 1-26 and Annex 1-5, concerning exclusively the forest personal, which shall provide for adequate protection of the forest from unauthorised activities such as illegal logging, illegal land use, illegally initiated fires, and other illegal activities.</p> <p>“Art. 2. - The guarding of a forest fund in a canton is carried out and ensured by the forester by permanent surveillance, taking special measures in places where illegal tree cuts, unauthorized grazing, fires or other facts that contradict the forestry regime.</p> <p>Art. 3. - The forestry staff with the duties of guarding the forestry fund has the obligation to take measures to prevent the committing of acts which, according to the legal provisions, constitute contraventions or forestry crimes, to identify the persons who have committed them and to take measures in to sanction them and to recover damages, according to the law.”</p>



Part IV: PEFC Standard and System Requirement Checklist for Certification And Accreditation Procedures

1 Scope

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

2 Checklist

No.	Question	Reference to PEFC PROCEDURES	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
Certification Bodies				
1.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification shall be carried out by impartial, independent third parties that cannot be involved in the standard setting process as governing or decision making body, or in the forest management and are independent of the certified entity?	Annex 6, 3.1	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors - FM:</p> <p>“Introduction and general information</p> <p>The requirements for certification bodies and auditors have to be classed as need for certification bodies to be accredited in an international framework.</p> <p>In addition to general requirements in the scope of the accreditation process PEFC Romania specifies some complementary requirements.</p> <p>The requirements defined in this document apply to certification bodies which want to audit according to the PEFC system regulations in Romania.</p> <p>1. Sustainable Forest Management Certification</p> <p>1.1. Requirements for Certification Bodies</p> <p>The certification bodies have to fulfil the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Certification bodies have to be independent and impartial third parties, which are not involved in the process of drawing up the technical documents. - Certification bodies have to be independent from the certified unit <p>1.2. Tasks of Certification Bodies</p>



No.	Question	Reference to PEFCC PROCEDURES	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
				<p>The tasks of certification bodies are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation of individual and group certification, regarding conformity with the requirements of sustainable forest management made by this certification scheme.“ <p><i>Observation: The introduction of PEFC RO DST 2012:2017 contains the following 'In addition to general requirements in the scope of the accreditation process, PEFC Romania specifies some complementary requirements.' However, no general requirements on accreditation are found within the PEFC Romanian Scheme. The reference is unclear.</i></p> <p><i>Next, although the PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 v2 only contains requirements for CBs and auditors (in chapter 1), there is still a sentence in the Introduction that is incorrect: 'The requirements are defined both for certifications bodies operating forest certification (ch. 1) and for certification bodies auditing the Chain of Custody regulations (ch. 2).'</i></p>
2.	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	<p>PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors:</p> <p>“1. Sustainable Forest Management Certification</p> <p>1.1. Requirements for Certification Bodies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The certification process has to be conducted according to the stipulations in EN 45011 (ISO Guide 65), and the auditing process according to ISO 19011:2002” <p><i>Observation: Both mentioned standards (EN 45011, ISO Guide 65) are no longer valid, they are replaced by ISO 17065.</i></p>
3.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification bodies carrying out forest certification shall have the technical competence in forest management on its economic,	Annex 6, 3.1	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors:</p> <p>“1. Sustainable Forest Management Certification</p> <p>1.1. Requirements for Certification Bodies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Employment of professionally competent auditors (see chapter 1.3.)



No.	Question	Reference to PEFCC PROCEDURES	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
	social and environmental impacts, and on the forest certification criteria?			- Competent in forestry issues concerning economic, ecological and social implications, as well as the certification criteria.”
4.	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 RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors: “1. Sustainable Forest Management Certification 1.1. Requirements for Certification Bodies - Good knowledge of the corresponding certification criteria.”
5.	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 RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors: “1. Sustainable Forest Management Certification 1.2. Requirements for Certification Bodies - Employment of professionally competent auditors (see chapter 1.3.) 1.3. Requirements for the Auditors The auditors have to fulfil the following requirements: - Graduate of forestry school, at a university or at technical college. - Several years of professional experience, at least 2 of which must have been in the forest sector. - Practical experience in auditing (at least 5 audit days as co-auditor with PEFC, thereof 3 days at on-site-audits). - Good knowledge of the national technical documents of PEFC.”
6.	Does the scheme documentation require that the auditors must fulfil the general criteria of ISO 19011 for Quality Management Systems auditors or for Environmental Management Systems auditors?	Annex 6, 3.2	YES	PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors: “1.3. Requirements for the Auditors (SFM) The auditors have to fulfil the following requirements: - General requirements for auditors according to ISO 19011:2002.”



No.	Question	Reference to PEFCC PROCEDURES	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
7.	Does the scheme documentation include additional qualification requirements for auditors carrying out forest management audits? [*1]	Annex 6, 3.2	YES	PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors: “1.3. Requirements for the Auditors (<i>SFM</i>) The auditors have to fulfil the following requirements: - Participate in annual training, organized by PEFC Romania.”
Certification procedures				
8.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification bodies shall have established internal procedures for forest management certification?	Annex 6, 4	YES	PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors: “1.1 Requirements for Certification Bodies The certification bodies have to fulfil the following requirements: - Developed a set internal procedure for the certification process.”
9.	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 RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors: “1. Sustainable Forest Management Certification 1.1. Requirements for Certification Bodies - The certification process has to be conducted according to the stipulations in EN 45011 (ISO Guide 65), and the auditing process according to ISO 19011:2002.”
10.	Does the scheme documentation require that applied auditing procedures shall fulfil or be compatible with the requirements of ISO 19011?	Annex 6, 4	YES	PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors: “1.3. Requirements for the Auditors (<i>SFM</i>) The auditors have to fulfil the following requirements: - General requirements for auditors according to ISO 19011:2002.”
11.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification body shall inform the relevant PEFC National Governing Body about all issued forest management certificates and	Annex 6, 4	YES	PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors: “1.2. Tasks of Certification Bodies (<i>SFM</i>) The tasks of certification bodies are:



No.	Question	Reference to PEFC PROCEDURES	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
	changes concerning the validity and scope of these certificates?			- Informing PEFC Romania about issuing of certificates, the termination/revocation of a certificate, as well as its validity and applicability.”
12.	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?	Annex 6, 4	YES	PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors: “1.2. Tasks of Certification Bodies (<i>SFM</i>) The tasks of certification bodies are: - Inspection of the certificate holder's logo use, or the participating forest owner's logo use, in the range of annual audits according to the guidelines for use of the PEFC logo (PEFC ST 2001:2008: PEFC Logo usage rules - requirements) and informing PEFC Romania in case of non-conformities.”
13.	Does a maximum period for surveillance audits defined by the scheme documentation not exceed more than one year?	Annex 6, 4	YES	PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors: “1.1. Requirements for Certification Bodies The certification bodies have to fulfil the following requirements: (...). Re-audits must be conducted after five years at the latest, and a monitoring audit has to be conducted on an annual basis, not exceeding 12 months.”
14.	Does a maximum period for assessment audit not exceed five years for forest management certifications?	Annex 6, 4	YES	PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors: “1.1. Requirements for Certification Bodies The certification bodies have to fulfil the following requirements: - (...). Re-audits must be conducted after five years at the latest, “
15.	Does the scheme documentation include requirements for public availability of certification report summaries?	Annex 6, 4	YES	PEFC RO DST 8000:2017 System Description: “3.2 Certification Process for Individual and Group Certification 3.2.1.7 Report by the Certification Body, Summary of Results The certification body draws up a report on the evaluation and the results, (...). Summary of certification reports publicly available upon request.”
16.	Does the scheme documentation include requirements for usage of	Annex 6, 4	YES	PEFC RO DST 8000:2017 System Description:



No.	Question	Reference to PEFCC PROCEDURES	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
	information from external parties as the audit evidence?			<p>“3.2.1.3 Checking the System and Documents for Certification</p> <p>The following points are comprised in the evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consideration of relevant information from external interest groups (government bodies, associations, environmental groups, etc.), in as far as sensible and appropriate. “
17.	Does the scheme documentation include additional requirements for certification procedures? [*1]	Annex 6, 4	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8000:2017 System Description:</p> <p><i>Chapter 3 of ‘PEFC RO DST 8000:2017 - Certification Procedure for Individual and Group Certification’ contains additional requirements for certification procedures.</i></p>
Accreditation procedures				
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	<p>PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors:</p> <p>“1.1. Requirements for Certification Bodies</p> <p>The certification bodies have to fulfil the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accreditation in compliance with EN 45011 (ISO Guide 65) for the forest sector according to PEFC with an independent national accreditation body, which is a member of EA (European co-operation for Accreditation) or IAF (International Accreditation Forum)”
19.	Does the scheme documentation require that an accredited certificate shall bear an accreditation symbol of the relevant accreditation body?	Annex 6, 5	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors:</p> <p>“1.1. Requirements for Certification Bodies</p> <p>The certification bodies have to fulfil the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The issued certificates have to list the accreditation number, the name and the accreditation symbol of the accreditation body, which has conducted the certifications as "accredited certifications."
20.	Does the scheme documentation require that the accreditation shall be	Annex 6, 5	YES	<p>PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors:</p> <p>“1.1. Requirements for Certification Bodies</p>



No.	Question	Reference to PEFCC PROCEDURES	YES / NO	Reference to scheme documentation
	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?			The certification bodies have to fulfil the following requirements: Accreditation (...) with an independent national accreditation body, which is a member of EA (European co-operation for Accreditation) or IAF (International Accreditation Forum)”
21.	Does the scheme documentation require that certification body undertake forest management certification as “accredited certification” based on ISO 17021 or ISO Guide 65 and the relevant forest management standard(s) shall be covered by the accreditation scope?	Annex 6, 5	YES	PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 – Requirements for CBs and auditors: “1.1. Requirements for Certification Bodies The certification bodies have to fulfil the following requirements: (...) Accreditation in compliance with EN 45011 (ISO Guide 65) or ISO 17021 for the Romanian forest management standards, as “accredited certification” according to PEFC with an independent national accreditation body, which is a member of EA (European co-operation for Accreditation) or IAF (International Accreditation Forum)”
22.	Does the scheme documentation include a mechanism for PEFC notification of certification bodies?	Annex 6, 6	YES	PEFC RO DST 8014:2017 Notification of Certification Bodies for assessing sustainable forest management in Romania
23.	Are the procedures for PEFC notification of certification bodies non-discriminatory?	Annex 6, 6	YES	<i>No evidence is found that procedures for the PEFC notification of certification bodies are discriminatory.</i>



Part V: Standard and System Requirement Checklist for System Specific Chain of Custody Standards

1 Scope

Part V is used for the assessment of scheme specific chain of custody standards against PEFC ST 2002:2013 (Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products - Requirements).

2 Checklist

Not applicable. According to PEFC Romania, the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme uses the PEFC International Standard for Chain of Custody, as is explained in PEFC RO DST 8000:2017 Romanian Forest Certification Scheme 2017, chapter 2.4: “The regulations of the international standards in PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products – Requirements (...) have been adopted for the certification of the chain of custody, and their implementation is mandatory.” The Chain of Custody Standard of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme does therefore comply with the PEFC Council requirements, no further assessment was carried out.



Annex 2 Results of Stakeholder Survey

The paragraphs below present the summarized results of the stakeholder survey conducted by the Assessor.

General

In total 5 stakeholders responded to the request to fill-out the questionnaire, some of them represented more than 1 stakeholder category:

- 1 respondent indicated that he/she works as state owned forest management operator, private forest management operator, and for an education and research institute
- 2 respondents work for education and research Institutes, of which 1 of them also works as FSC FM auditor
- 2 respondents work for NGO's / Civil Society

The response rate was 5 out of 82 (6%).

Participation in the process

2 respondents participated in the standard setting Working Group. 3 respondents received information on the standard setting process by personal letter or E-mail. These respondents indicated that they received this invitation in 2015. 1 respondent participated in the public meetings on May 20th of 2016. 1 respondent took part in Public consultation. None of the respondents indicated that they took part in the Pilot testing of the standard. 2 respondents indicated that they did not participate in the standard setting WG, because one was organizer (respondent 4) and the other because his company was represented by his/her colleagues (respondent 3). 4 respondents stated that PEFC Romania provided them with relevant information to participate in the standard revision process.

Balanced representation of the Working Group

According to 3 respondents, the Working Group had a balanced representation. 2 respondents did not know whether this was the case.

Complaints

None of the respondents was aware of any substantive or procedural complaint related to the standard-setting process.

Working Group

The respondents that had been part of the WG positively answered to the questions whether:

- Records (or minutes) have been kept from meetings of the WG;
- They received invitations for meetings and documents in a timely manner;
- All working draft documents have been available to all stakeholders involved in the WG activities;



- They have been provided with meaningful opportunities to contribute to the development of the standard and submit comments to the working drafts;
- Comments and views submitted have been considered in an open and transparent way;
- The public consultation of the scheme documentation lasted for at least 60 days;
- All comments received during the public consultation have been considered in an objective manner by the WG;
- The members of the WG had sufficient expertise to the subject matter to contribute.

Aspects for further consideration

None of the respondents brought up aspects for further consideration in the conformity assessment.

Consequences to the overall assessment decision

All the above findings are further considered in the assessment of the respective topics / requirements.

Stakeholders that were invited for the survey

This survey was received by 82 e-mail addresses. Some doubling up of addresses occurred in this list (several persons with more than 1 e-mail addresses).

Name contact	Name organization	Stakeholder category
Rey Adrian-Radu	Romontana	Environmental NGO
Bogdan Papuc	AER - Eco-Romania	Environmental NGO
Luminita Tanasie	Federatio Coalitia Natura 2000	Environmental NGO
	WWF	Environmental NGO
	Coalitia pentru Mediu	Environmental NGO
General Email	AER Eco-Romania	Environmental NGO
Alin Tekonczia	Open Fields	Environmental NGO
Blumer Andrei	AER Eco-Romania	Environmental NGO
Coca Andrei	Romontana	Environmental NGO; Project secretariat
Fechete Dorel	AAP -Asociatia Administratorilor de Paduri	Forest Service Companies
	AAP	Forest service companies
Maria Mihul	AAP	Forest service companies
Secretariat	Romsilva	Forest service companies
Töke Istvan	PEFC Romania	Nat. Governing Body
Bolea Valentin	Societatea Progresul Silvic	Other Forest Representatives
Brasov office	Kronospan	Private company - industry
Monac Emilian	Egger	Private company - industry
Vornicel Tudor	Egger	Private Company - industry



Name contact	Name organization	Stakeholder category
Ionut Apostol	Schweighofer	Private company - industry
Lucan Adrian	Schweighofer	Private company - industry
Teodorovici Dimitrie	Schweighofer	Private company - industry
Batîr Ionuț	Schweighofer	Private company - industry
Bursucanu Gigi-Sergiu	Greengold	Private Forest owner
Bogdan Tudor	Nostra Silva	Private Forest Owners
Nițulescu Alexandru	Proforest	Private forest owners
Toza Veronica	Proforest	Private Forest owners
	APAPET	Private Forest owners
Drăgoi Marian	Stefan cel Mare University of Suceava (USV)	Research and education
Chira Danut	ICAS	Research and education
Valeriu-Norocel Nicolescu	ASAS	Research and education
Davidescu Șerban	ICAS	Research and education
Liviu Nichiforel	USV	Research and education
Cristian Hera	Academia Romana	Research and education
Halalisan Florin	Facultatea Silvicultura Brasov	Research and education
Laura Bouriaud	USV	Research and education
Secretariat	Facultatea Silvicultura Brasov	Research and education
Secretariat	ICAS	Research and education
Secretariat	ASAS	Research and education
secretariat	USV	Research and education
Secretariat direct	Academia Romana	Research and education
Palaghianu Ciprian	Stefan cel Mare University of Suceava - Forestry faculty	Research and education
	PR Ministry Environment	State Forest owner
Mihăilă Laurențiu	Romsilva	State Forest owners / Forest Service Company
Pahonțu Ciprian	Romsilva	State Forest owners / Forest Service Company
Szilagyi Eugen	Consilva + FAP	Syndicate, Union
Motaș Dănuț	FSLIL	Syndicate, Union
Silviu Geana	Consilva	Syndicate, Union
	FSLIL	Syndicate, Union
Alexa Vasile	Carpatisa + AAP	Syndicate, Union + Forest Service companies
Adrian Borza	ASFOR	Timber, pulp and paper
	APM	Timber, pulp and paper
	APM	Timber, pulp and paper
	ASFOR	Timber, pulp and paper
	ASFOR	Timber, pulp and paper
	ROMPAP	Timber, pulp and paper
	ROMPAP	Timber, pulp and paper
Office	CONPIROM	Timber, pulp and paper
	ASFOR	Timber, pulp and paper
	Aosciatia Oraselor din Romania	User groups



Name contact	Name organization	Stakeholder category
Alexandru Potor	FNGAL	User groups
Drăghici Emil	ACOR	User groups
Găină Iulian	ACOR	User groups
Ionel Chirita	Asociatia Oraselor din Romania	User groups
Marian Oprisan	UNCJR	User groups
Secretariat	ACOR	User groups
Secretariat	AMRCR (Asociatia Marilor Retele Comerciale)	User groups
Secretariat	FNGAL	User groups
Selaru Nicolae	AGVPS	User groups (tourism)
Vasile Diana		
Alex		
Chira		
Marius		
ctobescu		



Questionnaire for the Standard Setting Process of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme

Question to stakeholder	Answer
<p>1. What stakeholder category do you represent?</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> State-owned forest management operators <input type="checkbox"/> Private forest management operators <input type="checkbox"/> Public administration <input type="checkbox"/> Education and research institutes <input type="checkbox"/> Timber industry & trading sector <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental protection civil organizations and civil society organizations <input type="checkbox"/> Other; please specify: Click here to enter your comments </p>
<p>2. Did you actively participate in the standard setting process?</p> <p>If no, why not?</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, I participated in the Working Group <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, by providing comments during the Public consultation on the draft scheme (March 1st – April 30th, 2016) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, I took part in the public meetings of May 20th, 2016 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, by playing a role in the Pilot Testing of the standard <input type="checkbox"/> No, I did not participate in the standard setting process, because: Click here to enter your comments </p>
<p>3. a) How did you find out about the standard setting process?</p> <p>b) When were you invited to participate in the standard setting process of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme?</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Newspaper or magazine <input type="checkbox"/> Website of: Click here to enter your comments <input type="checkbox"/> Personal letter or Email <input type="checkbox"/> Other: </p> <p>Please indicate day, month and year: / /</p>



Question to stakeholder	Answer
<p>4. What was your main concern and your interest to participate in the standard setting process?</p>	<p>Concern:</p> <p>Click here to enter your comments</p> <p>Interest:</p> <p>Click here to enter your comments</p>
<p>5. Did the organizers provide you with relevant material to participate in the standard setting?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, because: Click here to enter your comments</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, because: Click here to enter your comments</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I don't know</p>
<p>6. In your opinion, have all stakeholders that are relevant to the standard setting process been proactively identified and invited, including disadvantaged stakeholders?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, other interest groups that should have been involved: Click here to enter your comments</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I don't know</p>
<p>7. a) Did the Stakeholder representatives in the Working Group represent the range of interests in forest management in your country?</p> <p>b) Did the Working Group, to your opinion, have a balanced representation of various stakeholder categories?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, other interest groups that should have been involved: Click here to enter your comments</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I don't know</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, underrepresented stakeholder categories: Click here to enter your comments</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I don't know</p>
<p>8. a) Are you aware of any substantive and procedural complaints relating to the standardising activities brought forward by you or other stakeholders?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, there was a complaint about: Click here to enter your comments</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I don't know</p>
<p>b) In case of any complaints, have these complaints been validated and objectively evaluated?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I don't know</p>

Questions 9 – 18 are for Working Group members only.

If you did participate in the Working Group, please continue with question 9.

If you did NOT participate in the Working Group, please continue with question 18.



Question to stakeholder	Answer
9. Did all stakeholders in the Working Group have expertise relevant to the subject matter of the standard?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know
10. a) Have records (or minutes) been kept of the standard-setting process? b) How did you receive invitations for the Working Group meetings and documents? c) Did you receive invitations and documents for meetings in a timely manner ?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know <input type="checkbox"/> By mail <input type="checkbox"/> By Email <input type="checkbox"/> By other means: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know
11. Have all working draft documents (draft versions of the standard) been available to all members of the Working Group?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know
12. Have you been provided with meaningful opportunities to contribute to the development of the standard and submit comments to the working drafts?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know
13. Have comments and views submitted by any member of the Working Group been considered in an open and transparent way ?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know
14. Has the Public Consultation of the scheme documentation lasted for at least 60 days ?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know
15. Have all comments received during the public consultation been considered in an objective manner by the Working Group?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know
16. Was pilot testing of the new standards carried out?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know



Question to stakeholder	Answer
<p>▶ If yes, have the results of the pilot testing been considered by the Working Group?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know</p>
<p>17. Was the decision of the Working Group to recommend the final draft for formal approval taken on the basis of consensus?</p> <p>▶ In case no consensus was reached on certain issues, how was the issue resolved?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, the issue was resolved in the following way: Click here to enter your comments</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I don't know</p>

To be answered by all stakeholders:

<p>18. Do you believe any aspects of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme deserve further consideration as part of this conformity assessment?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (please specify) <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know</p>
---	--

Please return the answers latest by 27th of September 2017.

You can direct your response by e-mail to:

r.diemont@forminternational.nl

Thank you for your time and cooperation



Annex 3 Results of International Consultation

Two responses are received during the international consultation. One of these however was empty. The other response contained several items, which are presented in the table below. The Assessor's response is presented in the second column.

Comment	Assessor's response
<p>Some opinions about criteria and indicators:</p> <p>Criteria 2</p> <p>Indicator 2.1.c - I think it would be difficult to assess and verify the affected area by harmful factors and the changes over the last 5 year's average. For nurseries - Indicator 2.1.b it's handy.</p>	<p>Although it could be considered difficult, it should be part of monitoring and is not considered impossible by the Assessor.</p> <p>The requirement is furthermore in line with the international PEFC benchmark.</p>
<p>Indicator 2.1.e - I think the "abnormal stand drying" should be further detailed/explained - it might be a tricky aspect.</p>	<p>The word "abnormal" is indeed not further specified, and therefore leaves room for interpretation. The standard leaves it up to the forest owner to specify "abnormal". It is left to the auditor to assess whether the specification is acceptable.</p>
<p>Indicator 2.3.a - "Qualified expertise" on the need to use a pesticide prohibited by national regulations /international conventions - should be further detailed or limited.</p>	<p>The wording "qualified expertise" is indeed not further specified. The standard leaves it up to the forest owner to specify the wording "qualified expertise". It is left to the auditor to assess whether the specification is acceptable.</p>
<p>Criterion 4</p> <p>Indicator 4.1.b - including PINMATRA as a source for virgin and quasi-virgin is questionable. The source should be more clear and widely accepted</p>	<p>Indicator 4.1b specifies the sources which could provide the evidence for the conformity. Several sources are mentioned, of which one is PINMATRA. As this standard is developed through a broad stakeholder process, and consensus has been reached by the stakeholders, the Assessor interprets the PINMATRA to be an acceptable source in the Romanian context.</p>
<p>Indicator 4.1.c - regarding "Share of stands that include allochtonous species in the total certification area " - a minimum percentage should be specified to consider a stand with allochtonous species.</p>	<p>The indicator does indeed not specify thresholds. The standard leaves it up to the forest owner to determine an acceptable approach. It is left to the auditor to assess whether that will be acceptable.</p>
<p>Indicator 4.1.d - regarding the number of dead standing trees identified and kept - there is a ratio of individuals to ha (which</p>	<p>The standard leaves it up to the forest owner to determine an acceptable approach. It is left to the auditor to assess whether that will be sufficient.</p>



area should be considered to assess that ratio?)	
Indicator 4.1.g - The share of stands where the underwood was identified is difficult to evaluate as a percentage - further details needed?	The standard leaves it up to the forest owner to specify the levels. It is left to the auditor to assess whether the approach is sufficient.
Indicator 4.1.h - similar with 4.1.g - how the percentage of stands where genetically modified trees have been identified is assessed? As a ratio between trees/areas or number of forest management units?	Criteria 4.1 specifies that genetically modified trees are not allowed. Any tree found, will already lead to a non-conformity. Therefore, it does not make sense which method is used.
Indicator 4.1.h - I think that only the documents of origin for the afforestation material is not enough considering that are stricter rules on producing and transferring this material (O.G. 11/ 2004 and Law 107/2011 on forest reproductive) between non-adjacent provenance zones. The quantity (number of saplings/seedlings or seed quantity) should also be specified in the documents of origin.	The standard leaves it up to the forest owner to prove the non-use of genetically modified organisms. Although documents of origin including quantities could assist, this is indeed not specified. It is left to the auditor to assess whether the evidence is sufficient.



Annex 4 Panel of Experts Comments

A panel of three experts commented on this assessment. Their comments are presented in the table below, including the responses from the Assessor.

Report chapter / Page	Assessor's report statement	PoE member comment	Assessor's response
General Statement on Report Quality			
General		The Assessor has completed a thorough assessment of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme and has set out the elements of the scheme in the body text to support the conclusions on conformity. Annex 1 is extremely well populated with evidence from the SFM Standard especially to support the conclusions on conformity for the PEFC requirements.	Well noted.
General		As with previous reports by the Assessor, I found the report well structured, addressing the PEFC's requirements, utilising relevant documentation and ensuring many sources could demonstrate conformity for a requirement not just one source and have logical and sensible evidence for non-conformities – although I may not share such concerns on all identified by the Assessor.	Well noted.



General		I have no hesitation in confirming the Assessor’s recommendation, noting my comment above, but would be keen to ensure the PEFC ensures verification of any corrective action as part of its recommendation to ensure follow up on any endorsement decision – reporting at an appropriate time in the future on the non-conformities would demonstrate the openness, transparency and strength of the PEFC system.	Well noted. Follow-up on open NC’s is not within the scope of work of the Conformity Assessment by an independent assessor and is normally done by the PEFC Technical Unit.
General		The inclusion of a selection of requirements which have demonstrated conformity but have significance to the national system is of merit as this shows the individuality of national schemes and how they can meet the requirements at an international level while maintain relevant to the national situation.	Well noted.
General		I would also like to commend PEFC Romania for SFM Standard on the basis of the evidence used by the Assessor to demonstrate conformity – there has been much thought and effort to reflect the national situation rather than mainly use the PEFC’s SFM meta-standard. Although the normative language is ‘hit and miss’, it still ensures that performance outcomes will be attained to demonstrate compliance against the standard for forest certification.	Well noted.

General		I believe the report should adopt a more streamlined approach to dates in the report – use of DD MMMM YYYY would be more appropriate e.g. 26 February 2018.	Dates mentioned by the Assessor are streamlined as much as possible. When texts (from the Standards or additional evidence) are used as evidence, the exact notation is copied, which might differ from the Assessors approach.
General		In Annex 1, Part IV, the PEFC Romania documents are designated as PEFC RO DST but the body text especially 1.3 and 4.3 indicated the designation as PEFC RO DST – need to ensure the designation is used consistently! Further, in Annex 1, Part II, these designations are used interchangeably!	The standards of the Romanian Scheme, indeed contain inconsistent use of the designations. During the conformity assessment, this did not lead to confusion, and has been included as an observation under paragraph 6.1. In the report, the assessor chose to quote the designation from the cover page of the standards (DST), the report has been checked and updated.
General	Requirement 4.1a: In the references to documentation and in the scheme documentation itself, STD and DST are used inconsistently, when referring to scheme documents	Does this mean that this is a typing error only (and should always read STD for “Standard”)?	See comment above.
General		As Annex 5 doesn’t impact on the assessment but assisted the Assessor in determining conformity against PEFC requirements, I haven’t reviewed it as per the rest of the assessment report.	Well noted.
General		A thorough assessment of a new scheme that closely follows PEFC Requirements and furthermore is backed by detailed forest	Well noted.



		legislation. The Assessors recommendations are sensible and well supported.	
General		Very clear and comprehensive report.	Well noted.
Specific Findings			
Acronyms Pg 6	List of acronyms	Missing the following acronyms from the body text: NGB; NGO; PEFC RO DST; FM; WG; AG; FSC; ISO; GA;	Updated in the report.
1. Intro- duction, 1 st para Pg 7	'... admits national standards for ...'	Surely the PEFC admits schemes or systems from national governing bodies which have various 'standards' including the SFM standard	Well noted.
1.3 Documents and resources used Pg 7	'Table 1.1 Documents used for the conformity assessment'	Move the table heading to next page so that it is linked with the table	Report updated.
1.4 Methodolo gy adopted Pg 9	c Assessment of the group certification procedures	Move the heading to next page so that it is linked with the text	Report updated.
1.6 Report structure Pg 11	Whole of paragraph	As per the Hungarian scheme comment, this text would be better to be displayed in dot point format relating to each chapter	Not updated in the report.
3.2 Structure of the System Pg 13	Heading for 3.2 'Development of the Standards was done by a Working Group.'	The assessment is of the 'Romanian Forest Certification Scheme', so the heading should be use 'scheme' and not 'system' Is it one standard or many standards or the SFM Standard?	Not updated in the report. (A report format, including predefined headers is used by Form International).

2 nd para			
3.3 Standard setting procedures and process Pg 13 1 st para	‘It is a clearly structured document.’	This is clearly correct as it’s an adoption of the PEFC ST!	Well noted.
4.1 Introduction to the forest sector in Romania Pg 16 1 st para, 5 th dot point 2 nd para	‘The annual wood harvesting volume is relatively stable, about 18 million m ³ .’ ‘The current valid Forest Code is the version of 2008, ...’ ‘Core document is the obligatory Forest Management Plan, ...’	Presume this is logs i.e. commonly as round wood, so what is the 2 nd sentence referring to? Really need a short explanation of its purpose and link to the SFM Standard It’s the ‘core document’ of what? Is it the Forest Code, the Legislative Framework, or otherwise – need to specify	Specifications added in report. (Standing volume, representing official volume reported). <i>Source: National Institute of Statistics; data of 2015.</i> More detail on the Forest Code and Legislative Framework is included in Annex 5 of the Report. Updated in the report.
4.2 Organisation of PEFC Romania Pg 17 1 st para, 3 rd dot point	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ‘Nostra Silva (Federation of Private? Forest and Pasture Owners of Romania)’ [no text] 	What is the question mark for? Presume that PEFC Romania is the Standardizing Body – can this be confirmed?	Updated in the report. At the time of the standard setting, there was not yet an officially established Nat. Governing Body (PEFC Romania). See ‘Timelines Process’ in Annex 5 of the Report.
4.3 The Romanian Forest	‘...which define the requirements for forest and traceability certification.’	When ‘traceability’ is used, do you mean CoC?	Indeed. Not updated in the report.



<p>Certification Scheme Pg 18</p>	<p>'The document structure is shown in the figure below.'</p> <p>'PEFC_RO DST 8016:2017 Scale of Fees' [no text]</p>	<p>Suggest that the figure should have a heading – 'Figure 1: Documents of the Romanian Forest Certification Scheme' The sentence would be changed to 'The document structure is shown in Figure 1.' PEFC RO DST 8016:2017 Scale of Fees Shouldn't the titles of the documents agree with those in Table 1.1? I appreciate the full title of a document. If Table 1.1 uses an abbreviation of the title for this report, it should be indicated in the report and a link to this figure</p>	<p>Updated in 4.3</p> <p>Table 1.1 gives the full titles of the documents, as indicated on the cover of the submitted source document. In the Annex 1 (SSRC), we only indicate the number of the quoted document, to save space. Only in case of possible confusion, full titles are given.</p>
<p>5. Standard setting procedures and process Pg 19</p>	<p>'They can be addressed by providing additional evidence or by updating the standard.'</p>	<p>Presume it's the Standard Setting standard – please clarify</p>	<p>Indeed, here the Standard Setting procedures are meant.</p>
<p>5.1 Pg 19 (and Annex 1 – Part 1; req. 4.1a)</p>	<p>Requirement 4.1a: From the statutes, the structure of PEFC Romania is not clear. It is not evident which is the body for consensus building, and which is the body responsible for formal adoption of the standard</p>	<p>It should be discussed whether this observation has to be rated as a Minor non-conformity as the structure and the responsibilities shall be clear.</p>	<p>The Standard Setting Procedures are quoted, which are the main evidence to assess conformity of the requirement 4.1a of the SSRC – Part I. In the procedures this is clearly defined, it is therefore considered a conformity. The fact that in practice (statutes) this was not very well implemented, was worth an observation.</p>
<p>5.1 Analysis Pg 19</p>	<p>'elaboreated'</p>	<p>Spelling incorrect – 'elaborated' Differs from the title in the figure in 4.3 on Pg 18!</p>	<p>Updated in the report. Updated in figures in 4.3</p>

<p>1st dot point 2nd dot point 2nd para</p>	<p>‘PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards v2’ [Assessor’s text] [Assessor’s text] ‘In general, the process was conducted according to the standard-setting procedures.’</p> <p>‘Development of the Standards was done by a Working Group.’</p>	<p>See comment related to Page 45 See comment related to Page 46 But, PEFC RO DST 8008 is dated 2017! So, did they use PEFC ST 1001 for the process and adopted it once PEFC Romania was formed? This could be a telling finding.</p> <p>Is it one standard or many standards or the SFM Standard?</p>	<p>See Annex 5 for an explanation on the Standard Setting Process. “The process of standard setting started in early 2015, based on a project plan (seen by the Assessor), and the PEFC Toolkit, with stakeholder mapping and the establishment of a Working Group.” Standard Setting Process are assessed, as well as the Standard Setting Procedures (submitted version, formally approved by PEFC Romania in 2017).</p> <p>Indeed, the Romanian Scheme exists of more than 10 documents (standards and procedures).</p> <p>The Sustainable Forest Management requirements are stipulated in two (normative) documents or standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 Criteria and Indicators for assessing sustainable forest management in Romania • PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 Guidelines for assessing sustainable forest management in Romania
<p>5.2 Results: Non-conformities</p>	<p>‘Although contact details have been found on the website of PEFC Romania, the details of such a contact point is not found in the procedures.’</p>	<p>Use of ‘procedures’ – this may be confusing as it appears to be a Standard based on the use of PEFC RO DST See comment above and also the comment in PART I, SSRC (Annex 1) at Pg 58</p>	<p>The Standard for Standard Setting is referred to as ‘Standard Setting Procedures’.</p>

<p>Pg 20 Requirement 4.6, 5.6 and 5.3a)</p>	<p>'It is not defined in the procedures what in the Romanian context is 'in a timely manner' and 'in suitable media'. 'PEFC Romania commented that this had been presented during the ...'</p>	<p>Use of 'this' – presumably the relevant information sought under the PEFC requirement?</p>	<p>Not updated in report.</p>
<p>5.3 Results: Selection of Conformities Pg 22 Requirement 4.4 Requirement 4.4 b) Requirement 5.5 a) Requirement 5.5 b) Requirement 5.7</p>	<p>'...to the opinion of the assessment team are sensitive issues in the Romanian context ...' (none) (none) (none) (none) (none)</p>	<p>In 1.1 (Pg 7), the 'Assessor' has been adopted for the inclusive nature of the assessment team – so change text to be consistent with 1.1 See comments in PART I, SSRC (Annex 1) at Pg 48 See comments in PART I, SSRC (Annex 1) at Pg 49 See comments in PART I, SSRC (Annex 1) at Pg 57 See comments in PART I, SSRC (Annex 1) at Pg 58 See comments in PART I, SSRC (Annex 1) at Pg 60/61</p>	<p>Intro paragraph 5.3 updated in report. Well noted.</p>
<p>6.1 Analysis, 1st para Pg 26 1st dot point 2nd dot point</p>	<p>[Assessor's text] [Assessor's text] 'Furthermore, the legal framework ...'</p>	<p>Differs from the title in the figure in 4.3 on Pg 18! In 4.1, it is 'Legislative' – term should be consistent Is this the 'Forest Code 2008' – use one term consistently if it is it!</p>	<p>Updated in report.</p>

2 nd para	'...(Forest Law, ...'		
6.2 results: Non-conformities, Pg 26			Well noted.
Requirement 5.1.11	[Assessors' comments]	See comments in PART III, SSRC (Annex 1) at Pg 88	
Requirement 5.2.11	[Assessors' comments]	See comments in PART III, SSRC (Annex 1) at Pg 94	
Requirement 5.3.5	[Assessors' comments]	See comments in PART III, SSRC (Annex 1) at Pg 97	
Requirement 5.3.7	[Assessors' comments]	See comments in PART III, SSRC (Annex 1) at Pg 98	
Requirement 5.7.1	[Assessors' comments]	See comments in PART III, SSRC (Annex 1) at Pg 114	
6.3 Results: Selection of Conformities, Pg 30	'...to the opinion of the assessment team are sensitive issues in the Romanian context ...'	In 1.1 (Pg 7), the 'Assessor' has been adopted for the inclusive nature of the assessment team – so change text to be consistent with 1.1	Intro paragraph 6.3 updated in report.
Ch. 6.3 / p. 33	Requ. 5.2.4: Article 57. - (1) The works of forest diseases and pests, regardless of ownership by means Avio, is done in a single	What does "by means Avio" mean? See also Part III / p. 90	A different translation of this article has been provided by PEFC Romania and is included in the report. "Article 57. - 1) Works for combating diseases and pests of forests, regardless of the form ownership, by air means, is performed in a



			unitary manner under the coordination of the service provided by art. 55.” By means avio, or by air means, refers to an application of pesticides from the air (spraying).
7.3 Results: Selection of Conformities Pg 38	‘...to the opinion of the assessment team are sensitive issues in the Romanian context ...’	In 1.1 (Pg 7), the ‘Assessor’ has been adopted for the inclusive nature of the assessment team – so change text to be consistent with 1.1	Intro paragraph 7.3 updated in report.
8. Chain of Custody Standard Pg 41	‘...uses the PEFC International procedures for Chain of Custody, ...’ ‘... “The regulations of the international standards in PEFC ST 2002:2013 Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products – Requirements (...) ...’	It’s labelled as a ‘Standard’! It isn’t regulations <i>per se</i> , they are requirements as indicated in the title of the standard	Updated in report. This is a quote from the Romanian standard. Not updated in the report.
9.1 Analysis 1 st para Pg 42 2 nd para, 1 st dot point 3 rd para	‘...: “The regulations of the international standards in (...) PEFC ST 2003:2012, ...’ <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Accreditation in compliance with EN 45011 (ISO Guide 65) Observation from the Assessor: ‘Both mentioned standards (EN 45011, ISO Guide 65) are no longer valid, they are replaced by ISO 17065.’	See similar comment at 8. In relation to term ‘regulations’ Why is this still referenced as such when ISO 17065 is the appropriate standard?	See above. The PEFC generic standard still require compliance with ISO 17021 or ISO 45011 (ISO guide 65). PEFC Romania complies with the requirement (Annex 1 – Part IV, req. 5.2), but the observation is made to indicate which are the valid ISO standards.

4 th para, 1 st dot point	'The PEFC RO DST 8012:2017 does not contain direct reference to the SFM standards of the Romanian System ...'	This isn't acceptable – there should be an explicit reference to the relevant standards	This was included in the analysis, as a finding, but does not indicate non-compliance, as reference is made to the Romanian PEFC Scheme and its SFM standards.
4 th para, 2 nd dot point	'Related to requirement 1: The introduction of PEFC RO STD 2012:2017 ...'	Is this 8012 rather than 2012 and is it v2? Presume this is only for forest management certification – if so, please clarify	It was 8012 indeed, updated in report. Version numbers of assessed documents are correctly mentioned in table 1.1, chapter 1.3. PEFC RO DST 8012 only applies to forest management certification.
4 th para, 3 rd dot point	'...Although the PEFC RO STD 8012:2017 v2 only contains requirements for CBs and auditors ...'	This should have been picked up and rectified before seeking endorsement!	Well noted.
Annex 1, PART I 4.1 a) Pg 45	'It is not evident which is the body for consensus building, and which is the body responsible for formal adoption of the standard.'	But the bracketing in 1.1.1 indicates them specifically? Does the text in the standard identify the bodies or not?	Annex 1 – Part I, Req 4.1 requires that the standardising body has written procedures for standard-setting activities. PEFC Romania has Standard Setting Procedures (PEFC RO DST 8008:2017 Standard setting procedures for setting up Romanian Standards, which identifies the bodies, as is assessed in later requirements of Annex 1 – Part I. The observation refers to the Statutes, which reflect the implementation of the standard (process).
4.1 d) and 4.1 f), Pg 46	'1.2 Standard-setting process' '1.3 Revision of standards/normative documents'	Presume this is a section of the DST – clarify? Presume this is a section of the DST – clarify?	Yes, everything between “quotation marks” is quoted from the document mentioned in bold.
4.4, Pg 48 Process	'On February 3 rd , 2015, a meeting was held in Suceava ...' 'On April 2 nd , 2015, there was a meeting in Brasov, to set-up a Working Group.'	In 5.1, it's 'the Inception Workshop'! Was there a clear indication that it was to draft a forest management standard?	Updated in the report (Inception Workshop). Yes.



	<p>‘Minutes were published at the website “</p> <p>‘Observation: at the start of the standard setting process, there was no official standardizing body. The work started with the set-up of a working group. PEFC Romania, as a national governing body, was registered later (early 2016).’</p>	<p>On which website?</p> <p>This isn’t the usual manner of governance for standard setting! It is akin to ‘putting the cart before the horse!’</p>	<p>www.pefc.padurea.org</p> <p>Well noted.</p>
4.4 a), Pg 48 Process	<p>‘Minutes inception meeting 3rd of February 2015 ...’</p>	<p>See 4.4 for comment on consistent terms!</p>	<p>Updated in report.</p>
4.4 b), Pg 49 Process	<p>‘Decision making was implicitly done during meetings, by discussion and debate. No voting was done, as there was never a substantial issue. This was confirmed by all people interviewed during the field mission (Annex 5).’</p>	<p>Were there any minutes to back up the Assessor’s evaluation?</p>	<p>As no voting was done, this does not appear in minutes. Minutes do contain decisions, but are too general to be quoted as evidence.</p>
5.2, Pg 53 Process	<p>‘The list includes disadvantaged and key stakeholders.’</p>	<p>This would be better expressed as: ‘The Assessor verifies that the list ...’</p>	<p>Not updated in report.</p>
5.3, Pg 54 Process	<p>‘Email to all stakeholders identified, ...’</p>	<p>Presumably from the Inception Workshop?</p>	<p>Indeed. They kept a list of identified stakeholders, that was first made during the Inception Workshop.</p>
5.3 c), Pg 55 Process	<p>“Also, to be able to make decisions about the above, please indicate whether the participant is empowered – to the extent possible – to represent your organization.”</p>	<p>How does the Assessor link this finding back to 5.2?</p>	<p>Whether the participant was empowered to represents its organisation was in practice not used as a criterium to deny access to the standard setting process. All interested people, including key or disadvantaged stakeholders,</p>

			could attend Working Group meetings, but it was preferred to include people that could represent larger stakeholder groups.
5.4, Pg 56 Process	'No comments were received from the public announcement. Therefore, no review was needed.'	While there were no comments and hence no review required, there was also no standardizing body (see 4.4). As it is the standardizing body's task to fulfil this requirement, how does a yes decision come about when only the Working Group existed? Yes, a Working Group was established but the requirement is only partially met.	There was no official standardizing body at that time, only a Working Group. This has been mentioned in other requirements. The core of this requirement 5.4 refers to the need to review the standard setting process, in case of comments from the public announcement.
5.5 a), Pg 57 Process	' and by the ones interviewed during the field mission (annex 5).'	Needs further explanation eg 'the representatives of [companies, organisations, associations, etc] Enter in the relevant entities	These are listed in Annex 5.
5.5 b), Pg 58 Process	'...contribute to the development of the standards.'	But the only mention of the SFM Standard is the standard later in the text!	The Sustainable Forest Management requirements are stipulated in two (normative) documents or standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PEFC RO DST 8001:2017 Criteria and Indicators for assessing sustainable forest management in Romania • PEFC RO DST 8002:2017 Guidelines for assessing sustainable forest management in Romania
5.6 a), Pg 58 Procedures	"1.2.6 The standardizing body shall organise a public consultation on the enquiry draft and shall ensure that:	The assessor's comment is due to just copying the PEFC requirement without understanding the intent was to develop a national level requirement that satisfies the PEFC	Well noted.



	the start and the end of the public consultation is announced in a timely manner in suitable media,”	requirement – if it was done so, it would have included the missing elements	
5.7, Pg 60/61 Process	‘The pilot testing was discussed in detail during the field mission.’	Did the results and responses by the six WG-members go back to the WG and if so, did the SFM Standard change as a result?	This is explained in Annex 5. The results of the Pilot testing were sent to the 6 people responsible for the 6 criteria, and every one of them implemented the changes in his part of the standard in Track Changes. The result was a Version 2 of the FM-standard, which was then approved by the WG-members and published on the website.
5.8, Pg 61 Process	[Text of] Minutes Ad-Hoc Meeting 15.05.2017 – Aula University Brasov ‘...support the forwarding of their AG to PEFC Romania for their approval.’ ‘...and according to the minutes they reached consensus, ...’	While these are official minutes, a date for the conference and clarification of ‘Romania’ being PEFC Romania would have made them more relevant Again, even though in the official minutes – what is AG? By what means was it reached?	Well noted. AG = GA (general assembly), included in Acronyms. Consensus reached after discussion and debate (no substantial issues).
p62 1 last line	“forwarding of the AG to PEFC Romania for their approval..”	Not clear what AG means, give more details.	AG = GA (general assembly), included in Acronyms.
5.8 a), Pg 62 Process	‘According to PEFC Romania, only discussion and debate was used to reach consensus, no voting was done.’	This barely makes the grade in consensus decision making – it appears to be achieved but not by the means acceptable to the PEFC. This is a requirement that PEFC Romania should be put on notice in the revision of the SFM Standard.	Well noted.



5.11, Pg 64 Process	[Text of] GA PEFC Romania minutes, dd. 29th of May 2017	Note that Assessor’s finding at 5.8 was NO which is a negative to the second part of this requirement, hence, it is only partially achieved or not achieved	Well noted. Consensus in the Working Group was already assessed in 5.8. Focus of 5.11 is the part on “The standardising body shall formally approve the standards/normative documents”, which was compliant.
6.2, Pg 65 Process	PEFC RO STD 8001:2017 Criteria and Indicators for assessing sustainable forest management in Romania: ‘Approved by: PEFC Romania General Assembly Date: 2017-05-29 Issue date: 2017-05-29 Date of entry into force: 2018-04-01’	This reference isn’t the same as the one in 4.3 (Pg 18) and it is the only one in Part I which uses ‘STD’ rather than ‘DST’ If 6.1 is N/A, this also must be N/A as the initial standard isn’t the revision of the standard!	Complete report was update on the DST / STD. Although this is not a revision, the part in 6.2 on the ‘application date’ has been checked.
Annex 1, PART II 4.3.1 a) & b) Pg 76	[Text of] PEFC RO STD 8010:2017	Is there any commitments in PEFC RO STD 8007:2017 which provides for these two requirements – see c) and d) as very good examples of the participant’s commitment	All potential group members have to sign the PEFC RO DST 8007:2017 Declarations - Voluntary Self-commitments of Forest Owners, if they want to take part in a group certification. This format of self-commitment contains specifications on the commitment-level.
Annex 1, PART III 4.1 c) Pg 81	[Reference text]	2.5.1 seems to have a statement which covers PEFC requirement 4.1 c) – based on evidence in 5.7.1	Not updated in Report, as 4.1c) was already compliant.
4.1 d) , Pg	‘Implementation is regulated through reporting obligations and enforcement is extremely strict ...’	Reporting obligations are to what – the Forest Code, the Forest Management Plan, the SFM Standard? Also, the enforcement is done by whom?	More information on design and implementation of Forest Management Plans and enforcements can be found in Annex 5. “The Forest Management Plan cannot be made by the Forest owner (or owners), but they are



			<p>designed based on a contract with Forest Management Planning Companies.</p> <p>The implementation of the provisions of the FMP is done by “Forest Districts” that can be called Forest Administration Companies.</p> <p>Enforcement of the FMPs is carried out by the Forest Inspection Service (called Forest Guard or Garda Forestiera). They do this by checking the reports on implementation of FMP’s.</p>
5.1.8, Pg 86	[Reference text]	<p>However, the standard should be referenced by the requirement which indicates compliance with the legal requirements of each country i.e. through 5.7.1. But note the Assessor’s finding for this requirement.</p>	<p>Compliance with national legislation is assessed separately in 5.7.1. (currently non-compliant).</p> <p>Compliance of 5.1.8 is based on evidence from the Forest Code, 2008.</p>
5.1.10, Pg 87	[Reference text]	<p>Wouldn’t 3.5.1 be applicable for evidence?</p>	<p>Not updated in the report, as 5.1.10 already complies.</p>
5.1.11, Pg 87/88	<p>‘Ensure the integrity of the national forest fund ...’</p> <p>[Reference text]</p>	<p>Can the Assessor explain what this is so that context is understood as it seems to have been related to the national forest area.</p> <p>Agree with the Assessor for conformity – a) & b) and hence d) are accounted for in the Forest Code but c) would be lacking under evidence. It would be better to have a requirement in the standard which mirrors 5.1.11</p>	<p>Forest Fund is the Romanian expression for the duly registered forest area by the authorities.</p> <p>The Non-Conformance of 5.1.11 relates to sub c).</p>
5.1.12, Pg 88	[Reference text]	<p>See comment at 5.1.8</p>	<p>Compliance with national legislation is assessed separately in 5.7.1. (currently non-compliant).</p> <p>Compliance of 5.1.12 is based on evidence from the Forest Code, 2008.</p>



5.2.2, Pg 89	[Reference text]	2.1.3 would seem to provide an extensive suite of factors which well and truly covers those in 5.2.2 0 – so wouldn't this be used as evidence?	Focus of requirement 5.2.2 is on monitoring, which is covered by paragraph 2.1.2 of the standard, and is compliant. 2.1.3 is an explanation on biotic and abiotic factors, which are only used as examples, not needed for req. 5.2.2. to be compliant.
5.2.3, Pg 89	'... influences on forests are pursued for the following factors:'	Presume this is 'monitoring and/or prevention/mitigation' – would be useful to confirm	2.1.3 is an explanation on biotic and abiotic factors, of which the emergence, evolution and harmful influences on forests are pursued. It is assumed that the word 'pursued', indicates that the monitoring is done in order to prevent/mitigate harmful influences.
5.2.6, Pg 91	[Reference text]	Also, 2.1.3 does cover fire if interpret the use of 'pursued' as prevent/mitigate/monitor! See also comment at 5.1.8	Well noted. Strongest evidence to prove compliance with 5.2.6 comes from Forest Code, 2008 and Law of Forest Contraventions
5.2.7, Pg 91	[Reference text] especially in relation to 'pursued'	See comment at 5.2.3	See comment 5.2.3.
5.2.11, Pg 94	[Reference text]	See comment at 5.1.8	Compliance with national legislation is assessed separately in 5.7.1. (currently non-compliant).
5.3.5, Pg 97	[Reference text]	I don't support this assessment. The primary concern is regeneration/tending/harvesting being conducted at the most appropriate times under operational circumstances. The evidence definitely supports this – if the FMP has timing deadlines, the 'in time' will be met as provided in the Assessor's explanation	The non-conformity is reconsidered, and is changed to a conformity, the more as clause 3.5.1 covers the primary concern.



5.3.7, Pg 98	[Reference text]	While I can see the Assessor’s reasoning, again I don’t fully support this assessment. Note that 1.1.1 covers ‘monitoring & evaluation’ which is a catch all for all forest management operations in my opinion. Also, 1.1.1 has ‘implementation’ which certainly covers ‘control’. While not in specific indicators, need to take a holistic view of overarching indicators of which 1.1.1 is the primary one for all forest management operations	The non-conformity is reconsidered, and is changed to a conformity. Clauses 1.1.1 and 2.1.2 are added as evidence on monitoring.
5.4.4, Pg 100	[Reference text]	3.5.1 may also assist as evidence	Not updated in report. 5.4.4 does already conform.
5.4.9, Pg 102	[Reference text]	Does 4.1.1 assist as evidence?	Not updated in report. 5.4.9 does already conform.
5.5.2, Pg 105	[Reference text]	Do you link to 3.4.1 to assist with the second part of 5.5.2?	Yes, although protective functions are not specifically mentioned in 3.4.1. Not updated in report. 5.5.2 does already conform.
5.6.7, Pg 109/110	[Reference text]	Does 4.4.4 assist as evidence?	Not updated in report. 5.6.7 does already conform.
p111 5.3.5 Article 58	“(2) apply the forest the forest regenerating..”	Seems to be repetition of the words “the forest”, also a little more explanation would be helpful at this point.	Updated in report.
5.7.1, Pg 113	[Reference text]	Doesn’t 3.4.1 assist where the forest management system is based on legal requirements? Agree with Assessor on this assessment – evidence is a statement of legislative	3.4.1 added as evidence. 5.7.1 remains a non-conformity.

		framework but no explicit requirement for compliance It could be rectified by including 'compliance with' after 'particular' in 2.5.1	
5.7.2, Pg 114	[Reference text]	See comment at 5.1.8	Compliance with national legislation is assessed separately in 5.7.1. (currently non-compliant).
Annex 1 PART IV 2. Pg 116	'The certification process has to be conducted according to the stipulations in EN 45011 (ISO Guide 65), ...' <i>'Observation: Both mentioned standards (EN 45011, ISO Guide 65) are no longer valid, they are replaced by ISO 17065.'</i>	Isn't ISO 17021 the more applicable standard for management systems especially for forest management certification? The procedure should be updated!	The PEFC requirement allows for both ISO 17065 and ISO 17021. Well noted.
4. Pg 117	"1. Sustainable Forest Management Certification 1.2. Requirements for Certification Bodies - Good knowledge of the corresponding certification criteria."	1.3 on Auditors would assist!	Not updated in report. Req. 4 does already conform.
9. Pg 118	' The certification process has to be conducted according to the stipulations in EN 45011 (ISO Guide 65), ...'	See comment for 2.	Well noted.
18. Pg 120	' Accreditation in compliance with EN 45011 (ISO Guide 65) for the forest sector ...'	Noting the comments for 2. And 9. In relation to ISO 17065	Well noted.
Annex 1 PART V	'... the PEFC International procedures for Chain of Custody, ...'	Isn't it a PEFC Standard? Also, there is only one so it's not plural!	Updated in the report.



Pg 123	'... as is explained in PEFC-RO DST 8000:2017 Romanian Forest Certification Scheme 2017, ...'	It has the full title here but the title isn't in Table 1.1 – need to resolve this omission!	Updated in table 1.1
Annex 2, Pg 124	[Assessor's text for Pg 124]	In English, use of the numbers between 1 and 9 within text are usually in words with figures used for 10 and above	Not updated in report.
General, 1st para Pg 124	' In total 5 stakeholders responded to the request to fill-out the questionnaire ...'	How many were sent out and what was the response rate in numbers and percentage?	82 sent out; response rate $5/82 = 6\%$. Updated in report.
Participation in the process, Pg 124	'... standard setting WG, because one was organizer (respondent 4) and the other ...'	Spelling incorrect – 'organiser'	Updated in report.
Stakeholders that were invited for the survey, Pg 125	'This survey was received by 82 e-mail addresses.'	How can the Assessor be assured of this i.e. that they were received? Wouldn't it be that they were 'sent' to the email addresses?	Undeliverable Emails have been deducted from the total of sent Emails.
Table of stakeholders, Pg 127	[Last five contact entries]	What of these contacts – four with no surname and no organisation or stakeholder category for the five!	List of Emails was provided. Assessor did not have all details.

Annex 5 Report on the Field Assessment

From 30 of October to 3 of November 2017, Ms. Christine Naaijen (Assessor of Form international) visited Romania for the field assessment. The schedule of the visit is presented in the table below.

Schedule of the field visit

Date	Activity	
Sunday 29 th of October 2017	Arrival in Brasov, Romania	
Monday 30 October, Brasov	Presentations and discussions with PEFC Romania and WG members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Goals of field assessment; need for additional evidence; - Introduction on PEFC Romania; - backgrounds on standard setting <u>process</u>; - backgrounds on legal framework and organization of forestry sector in Romania 	
	11.00 ICAS Brasov	Mr. Istvan Töke (WG) Mr. Alin Tekonczia (WG) Ms. Alina Rus (WG) Mr. Serban Davidescu (WG) Mr. Danut Chira (WG) Mr. Eugen Szilagyi (WG)
	13.00 Forest faculty Brasov	Prof. Norocel Nicolescu (WG) Mr. Istvan Töke (WG) Ms. Alina Rus (WG)
	16.00 Aro hotel, Brasov	AAP - Forest Administrators Mr. Dorel Fechete (WG) Mr. Alin Tekonczia (WG) Ms. Alina Rus (WG)
Tuesday 31 October, Brasov	Meeting with WG members and Stakeholders	
	9.30 ICAS, Brasov	Mr. Claudiu Bogdan Mr. Adrian Borza - (WG) Mr. Adrian Rey – Radu (WG) Mr. Florin Halalisan (WG) Mr. Florin Nau Mr. Istvan Töke (WG) Mr. Alin Tekonczia (WG) Mw. Alina Rus (WG)
	12.00 – 14.00	Discussion conformity assessment process main findings / non-conformities and need for additional evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - standard setting procedures - SFM standard - group management standard - standard for accreditation and notification of CB's
	14.30:	Travel to Suceava



Date	Activity	
Wednesday 1 st of November, Suceava	Stakeholder Consultation	
	10.00 – 12.30, University of Suceava	Mr. Vasile Varvaroi Mr. Adrian Lucan Mr. Liviu Nichiforel (WG) Mr. Tudor Vornicel Mr. Andrei Vlaison Mr. Toader-Petru Robu Mr. Costet Girigan Mr. Tudor Serban Mr. Alexandru Orban Mr. Andrei Coca Ms. Ramona Scriban Mr. Vasile-Cosmin Cosofret Mr. Alin Tekonczia (WG) Mr. Marian Dragoi (WG) Ms. Alina Rus (WG)
	Pilot testing; explanation and discussion	
	12.30 – 14.00, University of Suceava	Mr. Liviu Nichiforel Mr. Tudor Serban Mr. Alexandru Orban Mr. Andrei Coca Mr. Marian Dragoi Mr. Alin Tekonczia Ms. Alina Rus
	16.00 – 17.30	Working session, documentation standard setting process. with Andrei Coca, Alin Tekonczia and Alina Rus.
Thursday 2 nd of November, Suceava	9.00-10.00, Hotel Suceava	Wrap-up meeting with PEFC Romania (Istvan Töke) General impression on the field assessment General impression standard setting process Current non-compliances
	10.00-17.00 Radauti	Travel to Radauti, visit saw mill Schweighofer Presentation and discussions on the relation Forestry – Industry, DDS, tour.
Friday 3 rd of November, Bucharest; Amsterdam	Flight back to Bucharest; Departure to The Netherlands	



WG*-members and Stakeholders participating in meetings / interviews

	Name	Organization	Representing
1	Mr. Istvan Töke (WG)	PEFC Romania	National Governing Body
2	Mr. Alin Tekonczia (WG)	Open Fields Foundation	NGO (communities / rural development)
3	Ms. Alina Rus (WG)	Open Fields Foundation	NGO (communities / rural development)
4	Mr. Serban Davidescu (WG)	ICAS – National Institute for Research & Development in Forestry – Station of Brasov	Research & Education
5	Mr. Chira Danut (WG)	ICAS – National Institute for Research & Development in Forestry – Station of Brasov	Research & Education
6	Mr. Eugen Szilagyi (WG)	Consilva – Union of forest workers (16,000 members)	Forest Workers
7	Prof. Valeriu- Norocel Nicolescu (WG)	Universitatea Transilvania din Brasov – Faculty of Silviculture and Forest Engineering	Research and education
8	Mr. Dorel Fechete (WG)	AAP – Association of Forest Administration Companies (representing 104 Forest Districts)	Forest Service Enterprises
9	Mr. Claudiu Bogdan	Directia Silvica Brasov – Resia Nationala a Padurilor	National Forest Management (county of Brasov)
10	Mr Adrian Borza (WG)	ASFOR – Association of (private) forest logging companies in Romania (1,500 members)	timber producing - industry
11	Mr. Adrian-Radu Rey (WG)	Romontana Association (NGO; rural development mountainous areas; network of about 5,000 contacts)	NGO (rural development)
12	Dr. Ing. Aureliu-Florin Halalisan (WG)	Universitatea Transilvania din Brasov - Faculty of Silviculture and Forest Engineering	Research and Education
13	Mr. Florin Nau	Chief inspector regional Forest Guard Brasov (Forest Inspection Service)	
14	Mr. Vasile Varvaroi	Holzindustrie Schweighofer	Industry
15	Mr. Adrian Lucan	Holzindustrie Schweighofer (responsible for certifications)	Industry
16	Mr. Liviu Nichiforel (WG)	University of Suceava (USV)	Education
17	Mr. Tudor Vornicel	Egger Romania	Industry
18	Mr. Andrei Vlaison	Egger Romania	Industry
19	Mr. Toader-Petru Robu	Directia Silvica Suceava	Administration
20	Mr. Costet Girigan	Garda Forestiere Suceava	Forest guard
21	Mr. Tudor Serban	Consultant, auditor	Independent
22	Mr. Alexandru Orban	Consultant, auditor	Independent



	Name	Organization	Representing
23	Mr. Andrei Coca (WG)	Romontana (project assistant to PEFC project)	NGO
24	Ms. Ramona Scriban	University of Suceava - Forestry Faculty (project assistant PEFC Development)	Research and Education
25	Mr. Vasile-Cosmin Cosofret	University of Suceava – Forestry faculty	Research and Education / Consultant
26	Mr. Marian Dragoi (WG)	University of Suceava Forestry Faculty	Research and Education / Consultant

* WG = member of the Working Group

Structure and organization of the Standard Setting Process

The whole project was formulated to strengthen the capacities of the forest owners, and funded by the Swiss-Romanian Cooperation. The NGO 'Romontana' formulated the project, which aim was to design a national certification system, that would be appropriate to be endorsed under the PEFC-umbrella. Mr. Adrian-Radu Rey was the director of the project, on behalf of Romontana. Mr. Istvan Töke (Nostra Silva) was contracted to lead the standard setting process. The NGO Open Fields was one of the implementing partners of the project. Mr. Andrei Coca (Romontana) was a project assistant, in charge of keeping the contact list up-to-date, sending out invitations, report on meetings.

The process of standard setting started in early 2015, based on a project plan (seen by the Assessor), and the PEFC Toolkit, with stakeholder mapping and the establishment of a Working Group (Grupul de Lucru). The website www.pefc.padurea.org was launched at the beginning of the project (early 2015), to inform stakeholders and interested parties. At that time there was not yet an officially established Nat. Governing Body.

The Working Group existed of 22 members. In one of the first meetings (meeting report dd.3-4 August 2015), 6 of the WG-members were chosen to be the responsible for drafting 1 out of 6 criteria of the Forest Management Standard:



Criterion	Responsible WG-member
Criterion 1: Maintaining and improving forest resources and their contribution to the global carbon circuit	Mr. Marian Dragoi University of Suceava – Forestry Faculty
Criterion 2: Preserving and maintaining the health and vitality of forest ecosystems	Mr. Chira Danut ICAS – National Institute for Research & Development in Forestry
Criterion 3: Maintaining and encouraging productive functions of forests (wood and non-wood products)	Mr. Istvan Töke Nostra Silva; now also representing PEFC Romania
Criterion 4: Maintaining, preserving and adequately enhancing biological diversity in forest ecosystems	Prof. Valeriu-Norocel Nicolescu Universitatea Transilvania din Brasov – Faculty of Silviculture and Forest Engineering
Criterion 5: Maintaining and improving protective functions in forest management	Mr. Serban Davidescu ICAS – National Institute for Research & Development in Forestry.
Criterion 6: Maintenance of other socio-economic and cultural functions and conditions of forests	Mr. Liviu Nichiforel University of Suceava (USV)

All WG-members had the same rights to participate in meetings and take part in discussions during meetings, but the 6 selected WG-members had a leading role in the drafting of that particular part of the FM-standard. (The CoC standard was adopted).

During the field mission, almost all WG-members have been interviewed, either in small groups or individually. Their reactions were consistent and the impression they gave was that of an enthusiastic and actively involved group of people, that likes to debate. All interviewed WG-members agreed that the whole range of Romanian stakeholders was represented in the WG, no stakeholders were excluded and that people with expertise were taking part in the standard setting. No voting was done to confirm consensus. Consensus was built through extensive discussions and working sessions, and the versions of draft documents were approved (during meetings) when there was no (more) opposition or disagreement. It became clear that forest managers, either private or state, have little liberty to make choices in their forest management, as most of it is pre-defined in the Forest Management plans and legal framework (laws, regulations, Technical Norms, Seed Catalogue). The national system is extremely regulated and strict.

The whole process is well documented and invitations to meetings were sent timely, and to all stakeholders listed. Information, like draft documents were sent as attachments and available from the PEFC website. A few days after invitations had been sent, phone calls were made to make sure the message had reached the recipients.



Pilot testing was done in October 2016, by Mr. Liviu Nichiforel (University of Suceava), Mr. Alexandru Orban (auditor), Gabriel Duduman (University of Suceava) and Ionut Barnoaiea (University of Suceava).

The basis for the pilot testing was a 'case', to test if certification would be possible for a private forest owner with 50 ha. of forest, and a combined management plan. (in Romania having a MP is compulsory by law, but the minimum size of forest for a MP is 100 ha.; this implies owners have to associate in order to have their MP). The FM-standard Version 1 was used for Pilot testing and an example of a combined Management Plan was available.

There were 5 main results coming out from pilot testing (report October 2016):

1. The link between the Criteria & Indicator document and the Guidelines is not always clear. As a solution, a table had been included in the Guidelines document. Guidelines are compulsory for the certificate holders to comply with, but also give guidance to auditors, assuring that different auditors will come to the same conclusions.
2. In Version 1 of the FM-standard, it was not clear whether the requirements apply to the forest owner or at the level of forest management unit. As a solution, the 'scope of the certificate' had been added at indicator level.
3. A risk was identified that auditing would in practice only take place based on paperwork, while some requirements have to be checked in the field. It was added which indicators have to be checked in the field (e.g. harvesting operations, especially in special circumstances).
4. The 'units' defined for auditing (hectares, percentages, figures) needed to be improved.
5. Additional administrative documents were needed. In case an owner has a combined MP, there are two options:
 - he can become certified individually ('isolating' the specific information from the MP that applies to his property, based on the compartments).
 - Or he can either be certified together with the other owners (if they agree), through certification of the total area of the MP and by forming a group. This is an important reason why the option of group certification was added to the scheme.

The results of the Pilot testing were sent to the 6 people responsible for the 6 criteria, and every one of them implemented the changes in his part of the standard in Track Changes. The result was a Version 2 of the FM-standard, which was then approved by the WG-members and published on the website. Although no pilot testing was done in the field, it has led to important improvements in the standard, and the auditability in (future) practice.

PEFC Romania, as the National Governing Body of the Romanian system, was established in January 2016. Current members are the founding members:

1. Open Fields (NGO – rural development)
2. Romontana (NGO; National Association for Mountain Rural Development; initial project-owner)



3. Nostra Silva (Federation of Private Forest and Pasture Owners of Romania)
4. Association of Companies for Forest Management and Planning
5. Consilva (Confederation / 'Union' of Forest Workers)
6. Silva (Federation of Forestry Syndicates)

The General Assembly (GA) is comprised of representatives of all members and is responsible for passing resolutions on all basic issues concerning PEFC Romania. The governing body (in between meetings) is the Managing Board, which meets usually twice a year, or whenever necessary. The President is elected by the General Assembly. Currently Mr. Istvan Töke is the President of the NGB.

Specific tasks and responsibilities of the different organs of PEFC Romania are described in the Statutes.

Other organisations involved in Standard Setting (like AAP, ASFOR, Romsilva) did not (yet) want to take part in the NGB, although additional organisations would be accepted as additional active members and be included in the decision making in the same way as the founding members.

Timelines process

In the table below are the timelines of the standard setting process.

Date	Activity	Description
25 February, 2012	Congres of NOSTRA SILVA, Romanian National Federation of Forest and Pasture Owners	Initiating and public announcement of starting procedures for standard setting process for Romanian National PEFC Standards. To finance the process, a project proposal was submitted to the Swiss-Romanian cooperation Fund, which was granted and started in October, 2014.
3 February, 2015	Inception Workshop in Suceava	Mapping of representative stakeholder groups and organizations from Romania. As a result of the workshop, invitations were sent to all identified stakeholders to participate in the Brasov meeting.
26 th of March, 2015	Mailing Invitation Brasov_PEFC 2 april 2015	This was an invitation to take part in the first WG meeting (of 2 april 2015). It was sent by Email to all identified stakeholders.
2 April, 2015	Meeting in Brasov (22 participants)	Explanations on goals / work to be done. Explanations on certification system. Attendees could show interest in active participation in the process (in the Working Group).
28 May, 2015	WG-meeting in Brasov (18 participants)	Within the WG, 6 responsible persons for the 6 criteria are chosen Participants express their will to work on the development of the standard in thematic working groups, communication between groups being achieved with the help of the already existing forum on the website and/or by direct contact with the leader of each Criteria.
2-3 July, 2015	WG meeting (20 participants)	It is summarized which are the thematic groups and criteria. Every leader will present the criterion on which he worked on. After the discussions concerning the drafting of criteria, all participants agree that in terms of developing each criterion, the document PEFC ST 1003: 2010 will serve as general reference for each criterion, as well as for the national standards in its entirety.



Date	Activity	Description
3-4 August, 2015	WG meeting + NGB (20 participants)	The first hour of the meeting is concerning the establishment of the Romanian PEFC's NGB. Agreement on the establishment of a new structure with the role of NGB is shown, and accepted by all members of the working group. PEFC Romanian Criteria: Each in charge presents its criteria on which he worked on, and the necessary adaptations resulting from the debates are made real time. The afternoon session is committed to Chains of Custody (CoC). The second day of the meeting is committed to the discussions on guidelines. The leader of each criterion becomes responsible for producing the corresponding guidelines.
16 December, 2015	WG meeting + NGB (21 participants)	The interest to become founding members of PEFC RO NGB is shown by the following organizations represented by delegates: ASFOR, ROMONTANA, PROFOREST, OPEN FILEDS, Nostra Silva, CARPATISA Federation, Confederation CONSILVA, the Association of Forest Administrators, the Association of Forestry Planning Companies. The session continues with the standard setting subject, with the review of criteria.
27 January, 2016	Establishment of the NGB PEFC Romania	The organizations (interested in the 'NGB' subject) present at the meeting, represented by delegates. There is a lack of representatives of the following organizations, which initially were interested in the subject: Carpatisa Federation, ASFOR, PROFOREST, Association of Forest Administrators.
28 January, 2016	WG meeting, Brasov (11 participants)	Final review of the Romanian PEFC Standard documents based on the checklist review.
1 of March – 30 of April 2016	National Public Consultation	No comments received through the website.
21.04.2016	Announcement public debate / consultation meeting	Announcement / invitation to take part in public debate was published.
May 20 th , 2016	Public debate / consultation, Brasov (20 participants)	Public consultation (meeting), open to anyone.
18 October, 2016	National Certification Conference (200 participants)	Conference on Certification in Romania (FSC and PEFC), organized by Open Fields as part of the Swiss-Romanian Cooperation Project. At the event, national consensus was reached and the documents that will be compile the National PEFC™ Standards for Romania were adopted. Report available. After the event a Press release was sent to the media, published on the website, on Romontana's newsletter (sent to +2000 contacts)
October, 2016	Pilot testing	The testing was done considering a case of certification of an owner who owns 50 hectares integrated in a wider forestry management plan, having an administration contract with a forest district. Following the results of the pilot testing, amendments were made to the documents of the PEFC National Standard for Romania.
15 th of May, 2017	SFM and Forest Certification – Conference, Brasov 15.05.2017,	During this conference an ad-hoc meeting of 13 WG members was held. The WG members present reached consensus on the standards and decided to forward it to their General Assembly.
29 th of May, 2017.	Meeting GA PEFC Romania	Approval final draft by General Assembly of PEFC Romania. (minutes available).



The Romanian context

Forest

- Romania has a Forest cover of: 6.5 million ha (27.5% of the surface). The biggest (70%) consists of deciduous forest (Beech, Oak), the other 30% consists mainly coniferous species, like Spruce and Fir. *Source: National Institute of Statistics; data of 2015.*
- The ownership situation in Romania is quite complicated. The Partial privatization of Romanian forested territory has resulted in blurred ownership structures best described by Stark and Bruszt's term 'recombinant property', referring to situations where assets are transferred into private firms, but liabilities remain state property. *Source: 2014, Antoaneta Dimitrova and Aron Buzogany; Post-Accession Policy-making in Bulgaria and Romania.*
- According to the *National Institute of Statistics (data of 2015)*, roughly 65% is public property (including state owned forests (47%) and 'territorial administrative units' (18%); 35% is considered private ownership (mainly natural and legal persons, but also a small part 'territorial administrative units').
- The share of state forests has fallen from 65% in 2004, to about 50% in 2015, mainly due to forest restitutions and subsequent transactions between private persons. *Source: USDA Gain Report, nr. RO1707.* The public forest (state and municipal) cannot be sold in Romania.
- The state forests are administered by the National Forestry Administration (NFA; Romsilva). The municipal forests (public form of ownership) and private forests can be administrated either by a state forest district or by a private forest district, on a contractual basis.
- Total production of timber According to the National Forestry Inventory (a relatively recently developed research tool by ICAS - the Institute for Research and Development in Forestry), the yearly increment is 7.8 m³/ ha. This figure has not been validated, and the 7.8 is believed to be too high. The 'official' figure based on the inventory from 1984 is 5.4 m³/ha/yr.
- The annual wood harvesting volume is relatively stable, about 18 million m³. (Standing volume, representing official volume reported from APVs). *Source: National Institute of Statistics; data of 2015.* The amount of round wood is less than half of this, about 8 million m³.

Legislative Framework

Forest Code

The current valid Forest Code is the version of 2008, but there have been amendments in 2015 and 2017.

The implementation of forest management is furthermore regulated in a set of 8 Technical Norms, from reforestation (species selection, provenance, stocking) to rotation and timing of tending or thinning operations, practically everything is prescribed in the Technical Norms.



1. Afforestation and stand composition
2. Silvicultural works for stand tending
3. Forest regeneration techniques
4. Forest inventory and estimations
5. Forest management planning
6. Forest protection
7. Annual inventory of regeneration
8. Forest fire preventions

Regardless of ownership, all forests in Romania are divided into categories T1 – T6 based on the main functions they are meant to fulfil. The functional categories are assigned by the forest management planner based on the provision of the technical norm No. 5.; T1 and T2 represent stands where fully protection or strict conservation measures are envisaged, where no or little interventions are permitted. T6 is the type of forest designated for the production of roundwood, thus stand tending interventions and forest regeneration techniques are planned based on the stand composition.

Stakeholders call the system extremely strict, but at the same time unpredictable, because of the frequent changes in regulations. An example of this is that the scope of some regulations has been extended to pastoral lands, making it extremely hard to harvest firewood from pastoral lands, which caused scarcity or a ‘firewood crisis’.

A weakness of the national system is the absence of a good long-term national forestry strategy. The current strategy (1995-2020) dates from the communist era. Several attempts to make an -interim- plan failed. The system of Forest Management Planning should be based on the national strategy. Also, the Technical Norms (1986 -1988) are in need of revisions, according to most stakeholders, at least to incorporate the management objectives of small private owners and thus to reflect the change of ownership patterns. On the other side, some of the “traditional foresters” prefer to preserve the strict regulations and have a nostalgia of the communist times when all forests were managed by the state.

Forest Management Planning

The Romanian system of Forest Management Planning (as laid down in the Forest Code) was explained to the Assessor. Forest Management Plans have a validity of 10 years. For forest ownerships larger than 10 hectares, it is compulsory by law to have a forest management plan, this change being made only in 2015. Before, all forests needed by law to have a forest management plan, even though in practice, small private owners would not have their forest under a FMP.

The Forest Management Plan cannot be made by the Forest owner (or owners), but they are designed based on a contract with Forest Management Planning Companies. There are Public and Private Forest Management Planning Companies. The public management planning company is integrated in ICAS (the National Institute for Research & Development in Forestry) and writes all the MPs for all state forests (by



law). Private owners can choose to have their plan written by ICAS, or by a private management planning company.

The implementation of the provisions of the FMP is done by “Forest Districts” that can be called Forest Administration Companies. The relation between the owner and the forest administration company is defined by the type of contract they make. An owner can contract the forest management company for several services, from just guarding the forest (protection against illegal activities) to organisation of the marking of thinnings to a more inclusive contract e.g. including timber sales.

- Forest Management Planning Companies – just design the FMP (every 10 years); Their umbrella association is part of PEFC Romania (NGB)
- Forest Districts (or Forest Administration Companies) are doing the administration of forests – thus implementing the provisions of FMP. Their umbrella association is AAP, which was also involved in the standard setting process.

Properties smaller than 10 hectares can become PEFC-certified, but will need a management plan, that has to be written by a Forest Management Planning Company. As the minimum area for a MP is 100 ha, smaller owners will need to associate first, before they can have their management plan written. At the same time, in order to be certified, the owners have to prove they have an administrative contract with a Forest District, to implement the provisions of the MP.

The structure of the Forest Management Plan is pre-defined. The contents of the forest plan:

Chapter 1. Localization, neighbourhoods, total forest area, ownership, maps, forest bodies included into the scope of the forest plan.

Chapter 2. Natural conditions. Climate, forest sites, soils, forest species, forest areas against slopes, types of soil, types of natural forests, hydrology, etc. The most valuable piece of information in this chapter is the so-called ecological scheme, where all possible correspondences between forest sites and corresponding types of soil and natural vegetation shall be drawn by the chief forest planner. For each combination of site-soil-natural forest vegetation the Technical Norms provide a different composition for afforestation works.

Chapter 3. A thorough analysis of the forest fund. Different cross-tabulations on age, productivities, functional types (T1 – T6) and functional zoning.

Chapter 4. Past management – description of historical interventions.

Chapter 5. Managerial pillars. Socio economic conditions, rotation, forest regime (coppice or high forest), functional zoning.

Chapter 6. Technical regulation of wood production. Different methods to calculate the Annual Allowable Cut.

Chapter 7. Different additional plans (thinnings, new forest roads, etc.)

Chapter 8. Cost effectiveness and efficiency; Internal Rate of Return. (this is not compulsory, and therefore economic analysis of the MPs is considered a weakness; even if an economic analysis is made, it will be difficult to suggest changes to the MP, as the Technical Norms will not allow many alternatives).



In addition to the written chapters, there is a compartment table and a series of thematic maps (soils, forest stands, land-uses). The compartment table includes the proposed operations that should take place in a certain year within the validity of the MP, and an estimated production volume for both harvesting and thinnings. The MP provides an estimation of the standing volume made by the management planner – every 10 years and based on inventories and production tables. The accuracy is higher for stands at the harvesting age. A new MP has to be approved by the Ministry.

An APV is a more precise inventory done every time when trees are marked to be harvested. It applies for silvicultural works carried from the basal diameter of trees higher than 6 cm. Yearly reports on implementation of the MP have to be made (by the Forest District) and submitted to the Authorities.

Relation with Natura 2000 Management Plans

Last year many Natura 2000 Management Plans were approved in Romania. For forests within Natura2000 areas, the management plan has to be synchronised within a year. This way it is assured that requirements from the Natura 2000 is translated to the compulsory Forest management plans.

Renewal of a Management Plan

Assuming that e.g. in year 2018 a new forest management plan shall be implemented (e.g. when the 10-year validity period will expire, or because of Natura 2000 consequences), several activities have to be organised to assure a new (and approved) MP:

A). In 2017 (the last but one year of plan in force) the Forest District has to write down and hand over the "terms of reference" for the next forest management plan. A private forest district will hand it over to the Forest Guard, while a National Forest Administration Forest District (public FD) shall hand it over to the NFA headquarter.

The compulsory contents of these TORs are:

1. a critical analysis of the actual management plan (% of allowable cut (AC) has been harvested, different aspects worth being improved like volume estimation biases, flawed soil mapping, wrong technical solutions, like too much or too less thinnings, improper silvicultural, etc.
2. new proposal for functional zoning, if needed
3. changes of the forest area (ins and/or outs) and legal supporting documents (scope)
4. new proposals for setting up new sub-management units (within the same forest unit there can be several sub-units, depending on functional zoning; for some sub-units the AC must be calculated

B). At the end of 2017 the TOR is being publicly approved and all stakeholders may attend this meeting. This is the first planning conference and it is a public event.

C). in 2018 the field works (inventories and writing of the new MP) are carried out by the Forest District (company) who has been assigned.

D). At the beginning of 2019, the second planning conference is organized by the contractor providing that all preparatory field works have been finalized and the AC



has been calculated. Technical details are being thoroughly discussed with all stakeholders. Although many technical details are set in the Technical Norms, aspects like harvestable volume per sub-compartment, regeneration periods, thinning intensities can be discussed and agreed upon for each sub-compartment.

E). No later than end of 2019 the whole forest plan is being approved by the ministry and the plan comes into force for the next 9 years (the first year of validity is 2019).

Inspections

Enforcement of the FMPs is carried out by the Forest Inspection Service (called Forest Guard or *Garda Forestiera*). They do this by checking the reports on implementation of MP's. It was explained that the realised production volume needs to be close to the estimation (APV), hardly any error margin is accepted, otherwise non-compliance is raised by the Forest Inspection, which can lead to high fines or even prosecution). When the estimated and realised production volume do not coincide, the whole volume is considered 'illegal' by the Forest Guard. Forest Managers are extremely frustrated by this system, causing not only high costs and 'adaptive management', but also a negative image of the forestry sector.

Tracking Systems

Romsilva has a timber monitoring system to detect illegal harvests in the state forests. The monitoring system itself is not public, but the results of this are reported and made public at the Romsilva website. http://www.rosilva.ro/rnp/comunicate_de_interes_public_p_72.htm. These documents contain figures on 'illegal cuttings'. Page 12, chapter 9.1.4 - Romanian language only.

The official tracking system, run by the public system, has been designed in 2008, called 'Sumal'. Its use is compulsory for everyone dealing with timber, lumber or forest biomass. Any wood which is not registered in the SUMAL System is by definition illegal, and is subject to fines, prosecution and/or confiscation. Through an app that can be installed on a phone or mobile device by everyone, every truck loaded with timber can be checked. Based on license plate number of the truck, it becomes clear whether all necessary paperwork has been done, and if the transported volume of timber and related data were uploaded in the national database before departure. In case the papers are not found, one can report the situation to the authorities.

Holzindustry Schweighofer has launched its own tracking system (to comply with legislation, and carry out due diligence for EUTR compliance), called TimFLOW, based on GPS tracking. All 700 trucks that bring in bought timber, are equipped with a fixed GPS, and can be followed real-time. Photos of the loaded truck are made at the point of departure (forest yard), and compared when the truck arrives at the mill gate.



Summary of the discussions with stakeholders

This paragraph presents the main responses from the interviews with WG-members and stakeholders and stakeholder interest in PEFC. PEFC Romania distinguishes 8 stakeholder categories, but they have a strong legislative framework in common, so their interests do not differ much from each other.

There are different reasons to assume that a PEFC system will add value to sustainable forestry in Romania. For the industry, no price premiums are expected for certified timber products. Access to markets could play a role, if the demand for certified timber rises. Some customers of Romsilva ask for certified timber.

An aspect that has been mentioned as an incentive is the Fiscal Code. Certified forests (either PEFC or FSC) are exempt from paying local property taxes (which is about € 8,- per hectare per year).

The most important reason is to establish an alternative for FSC-certification. Advantages of the PEFC-system for the interviewed stakeholders is that bottom-up approach, resulting in a better fit between the National Legislative Framework and the (PEFC) certification standard. NFA Romsilva (3.5 million hectares) is currently FSC-certified, but is interested in PEFC-certification as well. Big companies in the timber industry, like Schweighofer and Egger, already have a PEFC-CoC certificate, but currently cannot buy PEFC-certified timber from Romania.

NGO's in rural development appreciate the possibilities of the PEFC scheme for small forest owners. Through participation in the standard setting, and intensive contact with their members / contacts, their awareness was raised, and the PEFC system will give many opportunities to improve sustainability in practice.

Another reason why sustainable forestry through certification is high on the agenda, is the public opinion. The image people (inside and outside Romania) have on the forestry sector is very negative because of allegations of illegal logging. Although technically speaking the PEFC-scheme will not add many aspects to the legal framework, certification is seen as symbol of 'external recognition' of efforts to comply with sustainable forestry requirements, that might change the public image of the sector as well. As a recommendation from auditors and industry to PEFC Romania, the need for set-up and implementation of communication plan was mentioned, to work on a more positive image of the whole sector.

Health and safety and the use of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE's) is a topic that has been mentioned by several stakeholders. The legislation was not very prescriptive / demanding on this point, and according to the stakeholders had room for improvement. Although (voluntary) improvements have been made in the last years by individual companies, stakeholders are happy with the added value on this point of the PEFC system.



The intensive standard setting process for PEFC has been beneficial to the stakeholders. The platform and possibilities to debate amongst them were appreciated.

Main conclusions of the Assessor

During the wrap-up meeting, the most relevant and important findings of the field assessment were discussed:

1. Very positive impression on the standard setting process and involvement of stakeholders, from all stakeholder categories.
2. The information obtained through the interviews did not reveal any complaints or disputes. All information fitted the information from PEFC Romania, dates on records corresponded and absolutely no inconsistencies were found.
3. Ownership situation and management responsibilities is special in Romania.
4. Very strong legislative framework. The system of Forest Management Planning is limiting the choices and responsibilities of the Forest Manager, whether private or state, but at the same time is a solid basis for complying with requirements related to Forest Management Planning.
5. As the PEFC standard is based on this legal framework, there will be few requirements added for the forest manager to comply with. The risks of non-compliance are quite low.
6. Excellent improvements made through the pilot testing exercise, resulting in a much better auditable and applicable FM-standard.
7. Coherence of the different documents within the scheme is not yet completely clear to the Assessor. This could be improved (e.g. in the System Description).
8. An overview was given of non-conformities within the current version of the scheme documentation, and the additional references to be provided. Specific references (and translations) from the legal framework will have to be provided to demonstrate compliance with PEFC generic requirements.



