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Introduction

- EU member state policies
  - In place: Denmark, UK, Netherlands, Belgium, France and Germany
  - Under development: Italy, Spain, Sweden and Finland
- Means of providing evidence of compliance
  - Certification only
  - Criteria to define legality and sustainability
The comparative study

- Denmark, UK, Netherlands and Belgium sharing experience of development and implementation of timber procurement policies
- Comparative study agreed in Copenhagen in April
  - Policies
  - Criteria defining legality and sustainability
Objective of comparative study

1) To share experience with member states that are developing or considering developing a timber procurement policy

2) To give other member states an understanding of the key components of a public procurement policy for timber and the criteria set for legality and sustainability.
## Current Policy Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product coverage</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Not paper</td>
<td>Not paper</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Binding on: 1. Central state 2. Sub national</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Mandatory 2) Encouraged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum requirement: Legal or legal and sustainable</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sust.</td>
<td>Sust.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government criteria to evaluate schemes/evidence</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criteria for defining legality and sustainability

Denmark: 30 criteria (+ 30 sub-criteria)
- DRAFT April 2007

- The Netherlands: 75 criteria
  - DRAFT May 2008

- United Kingdom: 26 criteria (+ 27 sub-criteria)
  - 2006

- Belgium: 11 criteria
  - 2006
## Requirements for forest standards: Legality (in broad outline)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>DK (Draft)</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal harvest rights</td>
<td>Currently identical</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with national and local laws on:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest management</td>
<td>Currently identical</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Currently identical</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour, Tenure rights etc.</td>
<td>Currently identical</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment of all relevant royalties and taxes</td>
<td>Currently identical</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with CITES</td>
<td>Currently identical</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of illegal activities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Requirements for forest standards: Sustainability (in broad outline)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>DK (Draft)</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>Belgium (Under review)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legality</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Identical</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest health and vitality</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Identical</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production functions of forest resources</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Identical</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection functions of forest resources</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Identical</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological diversity</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Identical</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of forest resources</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>(✔)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social requirements</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest management aspects</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Identical</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard setting</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criteria for assessment of certification schemes: Certification, Accreditation, CoC and labelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key criteria</th>
<th>DK (Draft)</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>Belgium (Under review)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Identical</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification scheme governance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Identical</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain of Custody</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labelling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Identified</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of comparison

Summary of similarities

- 20 out of 30 Danish draft criteria identical to the corresponding UK criteria and further six similar
- Netherlands covers all the same issues but with different criteria
- Belgian criteria more general
- Denmark, the Netherlands and Belgium have criteria about:
  - the extent of forest resource and
  - social issues
- Netherlands draft has additional specific criteria on
  - Certification scheme governance,
  - GMO’s and plantations
  - Benefits to local people
Implementation

- Denmark, UK and Belgium have a guidance note - expected by year end for Netherlands
- Netherlands and the UK support implementation with training courses and a website
- Monitoring of implementation
  - Netherlands monitors within the context of the GPP
  - In the UK CPET has studied implementation in the construction sector
Next Steps
The Netherlands

- **June** : Timber procurement Assessment System approved and ready to start assessments

- **July** : User manual will be available: www.smk.nl/tpac

- **September** : Results first formal assessments
  Assessment procedure: 6 months
  Self-assessment and review
  Positive list

**Implementation:**
- guidelines, model documents
- helpline, training courses, web page
Next Steps
Denmark

- Develop improved and more practical guidance covering all timber – “meet the users, where there needs are” – based on temporarily recommendation to accept both FSC and PEFC as evidence of legal and sustainable timber.

- Carry out an information campaign on green procurement, including legal and sustainable timber.

- Work in partnership with local governments.

- Continue to cooperate in relevant fora and explore options for more harmonised approaches to definitions and requirements for documentation.

- Consider next steps on criteria development.
Next Steps
Belgium

- Start the process on the development of an elaborated set of government criteria for the assessment of certification schemes, in consultation with regional governments.

- Organise an extensive stakeholder consultation on the key elements of the Belgian public procurement policy.

- Update and improve the guidelines for timber purchasing officers and set up a central contact point.

- Seek cooperation with the private sector.

Next Steps
The UK

- **Step change to update policy.** From April 2009, demand only sustainable timber or timber licensed under FLEGT initiative.

From April 2015 only sustainable timber will be accepted on government estate.

- **Biennial assessment of Category A** evidence commenced May 08. Comments from stakeholders accepted until Friday 13\(^{th}\) June.

- **Implementation** of policy across the central government estate. More proactive work with local authorities in conjunction with UK trade and NGO networks.

- Ongoing **work with Denmark, The Netherlands and Belgium** to encourage further coherence between policies.
Progress with policy coherence

- DK, NL and UK legality definitions are harmonised – until 1 April 2009...
- Sustainability-next steps towards full harmonisation:
  - Discussions on criteria where the wording is not identical
    - Standard development process
    - CoC requirements
  - Discussions on criteria which are included or excluded
    - Extend of forest resource
    - Social requirements
    - Other.....

- Explore options for more harmonised approaches with other member states and European Commission i.e. wider Green Public Procurement
  - Workshop on public procurement policy for wood and wood-based products. Brussels, 13 June 2008
- Discussions with system managers (FSC, PEFC, MTCC).
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