



High Conservation Values (HCVs) evaluation framework

For use in the context of implementing FSC Certification to the FSC Principles and Criteria and Controlled Wood standards.

FSC Australia

Final 3.4
March 2013

Contents:

| | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Introduction and background..... | 3 |
| 2. Context of this Framework..... | 4 |
| ▪ 2.1 The FSC Principles and Criteria require | |
| ▪ 2.2 The Controlled Wood standard requires | |
| ▪ 2.3 Where this framework fits in the FSC system | |
| 3. Using the Framework..... | 6 |
| ▪ 3.1 Scope | |
| ▪ 3.2 Status | |
| ▪ 3.3 Users | |
| ▪ 3.4 Structure | |
| 4. References..... | 7 |



The Australian HCV Framework

Overriding note.....8

HCV 1..... 9

HCV 2..... 10

HCV 3..... 12

HCV 4..... 13

HCV 5..... 14

HCV 6..... 15

Glossary..... 17

Abbreviations..... 18



1. Introduction and background

In early 2008, the Board of FSC Australia instigated a working party of experts selected by the three Chambers (Social, Environmental and Economic) to develop a formal Risk Assessment for 'Controlled Wood' in the Australian context. The final Controlled Wood Risk Assessment Matrix for Australia, published in July 2009, provides guidance to both companies and certification bodies seeking to identify risks in accordance with the FSC Standard for Company Evaluation of FSC Controlled Wood (FSC-STD-40-005 (Version 2-1) and FSC 30-010), hereafter referred to as the CW Standards.

Importantly, the treatment of high conservation values (HCV) in the Controlled Wood Risk Assessment, and the resulting need for an Annex 3 determination by the company purchasing the Controlled Wood required a guidance document to be developed. A first draft (D1-0) of the guidance document, produced by a 3-chamber committee, was submitted for stakeholder consultation during a consultation period that lasted 6 months. More than 30 comments were received during the consultation period with a balance of stakeholder input from the social, environmental and economic chambers.

The second draft (2-0) addressed issues raised during the stakeholder consultation process and provided the critical elements to be considered in a last round of consultations.

One of the main concerns during the first stakeholder consultation process was the use of the framework within FSC full certification and its use for the implementation of the Controlled Wood standard. The latter does not require consideration of other principles and criteria as it specifies a set of international indicators that are applied universally.

For this reason, the current framework focuses on supporting the implementation of Annex 3 of the FSC Controlled Wood standards. However, the framework will serve as a basis for interpretation of HCV definition for Principle 9 in the context of the Australian National Standard and shall be used in the interim as guidance for Certification Body adapted standards applied in Australia.

Following the consultation, draft (2-0) framework was developed using the HCV Assessment Framework within the FSC US Forest Management Standard. Further detailed advice was also provided by FSC International regarding the revised draft.

Draft (2-0) was made available to stakeholders and presented to a public forum attended by over 40 people in Melbourne in April 2011. Richard Robertson, Forest Program Manager of FSC International attended the forum to provide an overview and advice on key issues from an FSC International



perspective, and Rod Knight presented an overview of how the *Directory of Information Sources* would work.

Issues of concern raised at the Forum resulted in revised Draft (2.1). This Draft was placed on the FSCA website for a 60-day stakeholder comment period. Nineteen submissions were received containing over 70 separate comments, (mostly from the economic chamber), though all chambers contributed. The 3-chamber Policy & Standards Committee reviewed the comments, with assistance from Pina Gervassi, and incorporated where possible stakeholder concerns into the Final Draft (3.0).

Draft 3.0 has now been submitted to FSC International for approval. Once approved, use of the Framework will apply to all types of FSC certification in Australia as described above. Draft 3.0 has been put on the FSCA website, together with the HCV *Directory of Information Sources* and the Committee's responses to the Stakeholder submissions regarding Draft 2.1.

Stakeholders are encouraged to comment on all aspects of the *Directory* but especially provide additional items to be considered for inclusion. FSCA will be seeking advice on the most effective and user-friendly format for the *Directory*.

FSC Principles and Criteria are under review including HCV. This may involve some updates to this framework consequent on the adoption of those changes.

2. Context of this Framework

This section provides context for the HCV Framework within the FSC system of standards.

2.1 The FSC Principles and Criteria require:

Principle 9 Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach.

9.1 Assessment to determine the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests will be completed, appropriate to scale and intensity of forest management.

9.2 The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.

9.3 The management plan shall include and implement specific measures that ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. These measures shall be specifically included in the publicly available management plan summary.



9.4 Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.

This Framework shall be used within this context to aid the Forest Manager and Stakeholders in the identification of HCVs and their maintenance/or enhancement.

2.2 The Controlled Wood standard requires:

If a district (bioregion) has been identified as ‘unspecified risk’ for HCVF in the risk assessment according to Annex 2, the company shall conduct a field verification audit according to Annex 3 of FSC-STD-40-005 V2.1. The main difference between implementation of the HCVF framework and the requirements from Principle 9 in the FSC P&C is the scale at which the assessment begins. This is termed the District of Origin in the standard and is a central concept to grasp within the CW context.

In the context of the FSC P&C, the scale at which the assessment takes place is the FMU. For Controlled Wood, FSC Australia has defined the bioregion as the District level in which the FMU or FMUs being assessed are situated. The bioregion has been identified by FSC Australia as the ‘technically viable basis upon which the categories relevant to FSC Controlled Wood can be consistently monitored’ (FSC-STD-40-005 p9)

Currently all bioregions in Australia are assessed as being unspecified risk, according to Annex 2 of the Controlled Wood Standard FSC-STD-40-005. This means that any company wishing to source CW in Australia has to either use this framework to assess the evidence they need from each FMU they wish to source from and apply this to each FMU or only source from CW or FSC FM/CoC certified sources.

For Controlled Wood implementation the company verification program shall include:

- a) **Assessment** to identify the presence of high conservation values, appropriate to the size of the FMU and intensity of management. At this stage, companies need to assess whether the HCVs that have been identified through the risk assessment matrix as threatened in the bioregion are present in the FMU or threatened by management activities of the FMU. This framework presents the required approach for assessment of each HCV category.
- b) **Evidence of consultation with relevant stakeholders** on the presence and threats to high conservation values in identified in a) with respect to the evaluated FMU. Stakeholder consultation is a critical part of the validation and identification of HCVs and associated threats at the FMU level. If no HCVs within the bioregion are identified as being threatened by management activities of the FMU, then the supply may be considered as Low Risk for the HCV Category of CW.



- c) **A list of identified high conservation values** together with evidence that these are not threatened within the evaluated FMU by the current or proposed forest management activities. A management plan and associated monitoring may assist in this assessment. Evidence that the current or proposed activities do not threaten the HCV is sought from stakeholders and relevant experts.

While the identification or presence of HCVs does not automatically exclude harvesting, it is the responsibility of the forest manager to demonstrate that the HCVs will not be threatened as a result of management activities, and the precautionary principle has been applied. In some cases the presence or identification of some HCVs, will not be compatible with logging.

The Management plan may or may not include management or mitigation measures such as restoration, monitoring activities, specific reservation or no action. The CoC company shall exclude the supplier from their Controlled Wood Program if the threats to HCVs are difficult to evaluate.

2.3 Where this framework fits in the FSC system

The international FSC P&C provides the basis for development of indicators and verifiers at the national level. In contrast the FSC Controlled Wood standard includes a set of international requirements and indicators that shall be applied at the national level. The FSC CW standard supports the development by National Initiatives of guidance to facilitate implementation, adapted to local conditions for both the FSC P&C and Controlled Wood. This document represents a guidance framework from FSC Australia.

3. Using the Framework

3.1 Scope:

The framework provides a process and advice on some of the tools needed for HCV identification and assessment for FSC Chain of Custody (CoC) certificate holders that wish to control their timber suppliers according to Annex 3, Section 3 of FSC-STD-40-005 V2.1, Company Evaluation of FSC Controlled Wood Field Verification. It also provides guidance on Section 5 of FSC-STD-30-010 V2.0, FSC Controlled Wood Standard for Forest Management Enterprises.

This framework may also be used as the basis for interpretation of HCV definition for Principle 9 in the context of the Australian National Standard and shall be used in the interim as guidance for Certification Body Adapted Standards applied in Australia.



The framework is intended to be used for both native forests and plantations in all bioregions in Australia (IBRA map) according to the results of the Australian risk assessment matrix.

3.2 Status:

In the Controlled Wood Standard FSC-STD-40-005 V2.1 Clause 13.3 requires that any formal guidance (as distinct from risk designations) produced by an FSC accredited National Initiative shall be used by the companies and certification bodies. Guidance may include details of relevant stakeholders, areas of high conservation values or consultation procedures. Once approved by FSC International, failure to use and/or implement this guidance is considered as a noncompliance.

3.3 Users:

This framework is intended to support FSC CoC holders with CW in the scope of their certificate and Forest Managers on the implementation of the Controlled Wood standards and in the context of the FSC P&C, specifically focused on HCV requirements. It shall be used by certifiers in order to align their own verification checklists to the Australian context.

3.4 Structure:

The Framework provides a definition of each HCV class together with a list of values that are considered under each class in the Australian context as far as they are known.

The “Values” are not a comprehensive list. Stakeholders and experts may provide more values and it is essential that they are consulted during any evaluation of HCV.

The framework is supported by a *Directory of Information Sources* to allow for the identification of known values by bioregion and has been structured to allow for the:

- a) Identification of the presence of HCVs in the FMU
- b) Assessment of threats to existing HCVs
- c) Definition of management measures to mitigate threats to HCVs in the CW context and are the basis for measures to maintain and/or enhance the values in the context of the FSC P&C

3.5 Effective date

This framework will be effective from 31 May 2013.



4. References

International

[FSC-STD-40-005 V2-1](#) Standard for company evaluation of FSC Controlled Wood

[FSC-STD-30-010 V2-0](#) FSC Controlled Wood standard for forest management enterprises

[FSC-DIR-40-005](#) FSC Directive on Controlled Wood

[FSC-STD-20-012](#) Standard for evaluation of FSC Controlled Wood in Forest Management Enterprises

[FSC-STD-20-011](#) Accreditation standards for Chain of Custody evaluations

[FSC-STD-01-001](#) FSC Principles and Criteria

ISEAL : Stakeholder consultation practices in Standards Development RO44-Version 1

[FSC-US Forest Management Standard \(v1.0\)](#)

[ProForest: Toolkit Number 2](#) Defining High Conservation Values at a national level: a practical guide

FSC-STD-01-001 V5-0 D4-9 FSC Principles and Criteria for Forest Stewardship, Supplemented by Explanatory Notes and Rationales, Draft 11.11.2011

Australian

[FSC-CWRA-001-AUS](#) FSC risk assessment matrix Australia: Guidance for stakeholder consultation in Australia

[IBRA](#) In all cases including IBRA we are using the latest version



The Australian HCV Framework

Overriding note:

The classes listed as HCVs are consistent with the classes defined internationally.

Before commencing to make a decision on which levels of assessment are required for each HCV, a thorough data audit and gap analysis shall have been undertaken using the FSC Australia HCV *Directory* etc. Use of the *Directory of Information Sources* is required and represents a minimum set of requirements of information. The FSC Australia *Directory of Information Sources* is a work in progress and is not comprehensive. It should not be seen as the only source of information and depending on the region and datasets available, other sources may need to be consulted. Where there is no reliable vegetation mapping or where there have been no recent fauna and flora surveys this will need to be done. Where data is old it will need to be replaced/updated.)

For the purpose of this Framework, legal compliance is a necessary but not sufficient condition for compliance with these requirements. In other words, it should not be assumed that because a forest management operation complies with relevant federal, state and/or local laws and regulations that these laws meet the requirements of the standard. The laws themselves may not be adequate or they may not be applied adequately in order to mitigate threats to HCVs. Compliance will require independent investigation as specified in the standard..

New dataset references can be added to the *Directory* via the FSC Policy and Standards Manager, and in the interim via the Policy and Standards committee. Data will be judged valid that is produced by government agencies, approved by 3 chamber committee or peer-reviewed.

The data audit and gap analysis shall be made available to stakeholders.*

HCV 1: Forest areas containing globally, nationally and regionally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g., endemism, endangered species, refugia).

Definition of ‘Significant concentrations of biodiversity values’: Areas of native forest containing one or more of the VALUES identified are deemed to meet the threshold for significant concentrations of biodiversity values. Plantations are generally unlikely to meet this test other than where significant species are present in remnant forest areas or transiting plantations



Definition of region: Large, geographically distinct areas of land with common characteristics such as geology, landform patterns, climate, ecological features and plant and animal communities as defined by IBRA (Interim Bio- Regionalisation for Australia)

VALUES:

- Areas that contain species that are rare, threatened or endangered, or contain centres of endemism;
- Areas that contain species that are depleted or poorly reserved at the IBRA region scale;
- Areas with mapped significant seasonal concentrations of species (e.g. migratory staging areas);
- Areas of high species/communities diversity
- Refugia and mosaics

Assessment Pathway:

Step 1: Consult the FSC Australia *Director of Information Sources* to identify relevant datasets and prepare lists and maps of potential HCV accordingly.

Step 2: Seek expert advice on basis of Step 1 to further identify HCVs including habitat requirements and range mapping.

Step 3: Undertake targeted flora and fauna surveys to determine presence or absence /range etc of site-specific HCVs.

Step 4: Consult stakeholders* on documentation prepared under Step 1,2 and 3

Tools that will be useful in this process include:- Interrogation of incidental species record databases and range mapping when HCVs are well known/recorded with habitat requirements that are easily defined and well understood. Use specific databases, range maps or overlays.

Statistical modelling and mapping of wildlife habitat requirements may be required when species are poorly recorded or mapped, and habitat requirements are not easily defined and poorly understood. **Population viability analysis and scenario evaluation** may be required when species are critically endangered.

HCV 2. Forest areas containing regionally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.

Definition of ‘Large landscape-level forests’: Relatively contiguous areas of forest (which may be crossed by land management roads or public roads). At the minimum these forests are likely to be thousands or tens of thousands of hectares in size. However, “large” is relative to regional landscape context (particularly the size of forested blocks in the bioregion) and might be smaller or larger than this figure as indicated by consultation with regional experts. In regions where native forests are heavily fragmented by forest type conversion or land use conversion, the increased value of smaller occurrences of remaining natural forest should also be included in the assessment. The forest may be in single or multiple ownerships. HCV2 includes areas that are in (or close to) what might be called their ‘natural’ condition. Such areas have a relatively full complement of the species that are appropriate to the habitat. HCV2 designation may arise because the intact forest area is unusually large and therefore of high value due to its contribution to wilderness or landscape values.

The general approach in assessing for HCV 2 is to compare forest characteristics (such as extent and intensity of harvest practices, forest communities, successional stages, structures, and species composition and abundance) with native forests that have only been subject to natural disturbance processes or minimal human intervention. Aerial photography or satellite images of the surrounding landscape should also be considered.

Definition of ‘Significant’: The forest is significant in the region due to its size, condition, and/or importance to biodiversity conservation. Factors to consider include:
Rarity of forests of this size and quality within the region.

Less affected by anthropogenic factors than similar areas in the region.

VALUES:

Areas with this HCV include:

Landscape-scale native forests that have experienced lesser levels of past human disturbance (e.g., minimal timber harvesting) or other management (e.g. fire suppression), or areas within such forests.

- Native forests that are rare at the regional or finer scale because they contain forest communities



with successional stages, forest structures, and species composition that are similar in distribution and abundance to native forests that have been only subject to natural disturbance processes or minimal human intervention. This would also include areas within such forests. While these forests may not contain old growth, they would typically contain an abundance of older forest attributes (biologically mature or late successional) characteristic of the forest type, as indicated by tree species composition, tree size, or other attributes applicable to the forest community type, such as coarse woody debris, snags, herb diversity, structural understorey diversity, and the lack of invasive plant species.¹

- Forests recognised as being regionally significant at the bioregion or larger scale by conservation organisations (in formally recognised reports or peer reviewed journals) due to the unusual landscape-scale biodiversity values provided by size and condition of the forest relative to regional forest land cover and land use trends.
- Forests that provide regionally significant habitat connectivity between larger forest areas or between refugia and mosaics.
- Roadless areas
- Forests that haven't been affected by forest management activities

Assessment Pathway:

Step 1 - Interrogation of the *Directory of Information Sources* and databases to enable mapping and reporting on vegetation communities, condition assessment, wilderness assessment, concentrations of species, old growth*, wilderness, growth stage, vegetation condition and remnant vegetation, logging history etc and to determine whether further mapping needs to be commissioned.

1

The forest manager may argue HCV2 compliance is managed through a comprehensive and representative reserve system AND through management actions that provide for the maintenance of landscape level values within their FMU. However, this may not suffice if management is likely to result in the loss or alteration of unusual or unique floristic or seral communities. All HCV classes must be satisfied at the production forest level e.g. if there are nationally or state listed threatened species in the production portion of the FMU, then HCV1 would need to be satisfied.

In the case of reserves, it is anticipated that there may be active management (across the landscape) that may include prescribed burning, thinning, removal of disease foci, weeds, management of feral animals and control and removal of invasive species.



Step 2 – Independent third party reviews: World Heritage Reports, values threat analysis; scientific reports of landscape scale impacts, comparative study of historical and current aerial photographs.

Step 3 – Stakeholder* consultation on the outcomes of Steps 1 and 2

HCV 3. Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.

Ecosystems that are rare and/or threatened at a global, national or regional level. (as per [FSC-US Forest Management Standard \(v1.0\)](#))

Distinctiveness in terms of size, quality (particularly lack of human disturbance), or location within the ecosystem's geographic range may be considered in assessing ecosystem rarity.

VALUES: Areas with this HCV may include:

- Extant rainforests
- Areas for conservation of important genes or genetically distinct populations;
- Ecosystems that are depleted or poorly reserved at the IBRA bioregion scale
- Old growth forests
- Remnant vegetation in heavily cleared landscapes

Definition of Old growth*: Old-growth forest is ecologically mature forest where the effects of disturbances are now negligible.

Old-growth and late successional stands and forests include: A) **Type 1 Old Growth:** stands that have never been logged and that display late successional/old-growth characteristics. B) **Type 2 Old Growth:** stands that have been logged, but which retain significant late-successional/old-growth structure and functions.

Assessment Pathway:

Step 1 - Interrogation of ecosystem databases and range mapping
Use when ecosystems/seral stages etc have been well described/mapped.

Step 2 – Where there is no ecosystem mapping undertake ecosystem/seral stage mapping.

Step 3- Consult with stakeholders* on outcomes from Steps 1 and 2.



HCV 4. Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control).

Intent: HCV 4 is focused on basic ecosystem services in *critical* situations. Substantial alteration of these forests is likely to result in an unacceptable impact on the delivery of ecosystem services. These services include: consolidation of highly erodible soils including on steep slopes, forests that protect against flooding or forests that provide barriers to fire.

Guidance on ‘critical situations’

An ecosystem service* is considered to be ‘critical’ where a disruption of that service is likely to cause, or poses a threat of, severe negative impacts on the welfare, health or survival of local communities, on the environment, on High Conservation Values, or on the functioning of significant infrastructure (roads, dams, buildings, etc.). The notion of criticality here refers to the importance and risk for natural resources and environmental and socio-economic values. (Source: FSC-STD-01-001 V5-0 D4-9 p115)

Guidance on ‘critical situation’ thresholds

FSC Australia cannot provide clear thresholds on when an area provides critical protection. An operable question to help address this question may be, “What is the impact of removing the forest cover?”

Guidance on ‘critical situations’ – watershed protection: A forest that is part of a local drinking water catchment, irrigation supply system, or is a critical source for a remote location (i.e., water is pumped to a remote location) may be considered a ‘critical situation, particularly when people are dependent on the guarantee of water, where the regulation of water flow guarantees the existence of fishing grounds or agricultural land or protects downstream communities from flooding. Forests which provide critical protection of water supplies for rare, threatened, or endangered aquatic species and/or ecosystems are also ‘critical situations’.

VALUES: forests which provide:

- protection from flooding
- protection from erosion,
- barriers from destructive fire
- clean water catchments

• **Critical situations encompass:**

- Areas with highly erodible soil
- Areas with steep slopes



- Clean water and/or irrigation supply systems
- Areas which protect against flooding
- Vulnerable areas which support rare or endangered ecosystem functions.

Assessment Pathway:

Step 1- Identification and mapping of HC Value areas

Step 2- Site specific and catchment level management hydrological modelling, monitoring and reporting.

Step 3- Consultation with stakeholders* on outcomes of Steps 1 and 2

HCV 5. Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g., subsistence, health).

Definition of ‘basic human needs’: Local people use the area to obtain resources on which they are critically dependent. This may be the case if local people harvest food products from the forest, or collect building materials or medicinal plants.. “Potential fundamental basic needs include, but are not limited to: unique sources of water for drinking and other daily uses; food, medicine, fuel, building and craft resources; the production of food crops and subsistence cash crops; protection of “agricultural” plots against adverse microclimate (e.g., wind) and traditional farming practices. Forest uses such as recreational hunting or commercial timber harvesting (i.e., that is not critical for local building materials) are not basic human needs.

Definition of ‘fundamental’: Loss of the resources from this area would have a significant impact in the supply of the resource and decrease local community well-being.

Affected vs. Interested parties: In the definition of basic needs, priority is given to potentially **affected parties** e.g. local community and neighbours. The FM operation shall implement a communications and stakeholder* participation plan regarding affected parties. There is also the need to set up a dispute resolution mechanism if conflicts or disputes are present.

Interested parties e.g. NGOs, government organisations shall be considered during the stakeholder consultation process in order to collect information about the values associated to the forest area. (Interested party: Any person or group concerned with or directly affected by a standard. ISEAL Code of Practice for Setting Social and Environmental Standards v 5.0)
However, if affected stakeholders agree that their basic needs are met but interested stakeholders do not, the matter is considered to be agreed for the purpose of meeting this HCV class.



VALUES:

- Unique/main sources of water for drinking and other daily uses
- Unique/main sources of water for the irrigation of food crops
- Food, medicines or fuel etc for local consumption

Assessment Pathway:

Step 1 – Identification and mapping of HCV areas

Step 2 – Identification and Consultation with stakeholders*

HCV 6: Forest areas critical to local communities’ traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities)

Definition of ‘cultural significance’:

The HCV Framework has adopted the ICOMOS Burra Charter definition of Cultural Significance which is recognised at all levels of government and in legislation in Australia:

“Cultural significance means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations. Cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects. Places may have a range of values for different individuals or groups.”

The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter of Places of Cultural Significance 1999.

Definition of ‘cultural identity’

Certain communities are so closely bound to some areas that it is highly likely that these are critical to their traditional cultural identity and heritage. Cultural identity is dynamic and is not just tied to traditions that occurred hundreds or thousands of years ago. In some cases, as in Australia where Indigenous people were dispossessed from their lands by colonisation, knowledge about traditional places may have been lost for several generations, but has been revived in a way that suits the modern context. Significant places may not just relate to ‘traditional’ identity, but to how people see themselves today, which is a combination of traditions and intercultural history (for settler societies) and modernity.

Notes: While the focus on ‘traditional cultural identity’ highlights the importance of traditional owners and areas critical to their cultural identity, HCV6 also recognises places critical to non-Indigenous culture and heritage.



Examples:

Areas may include religious/sacred sites, burial grounds or sites at which regular traditional ceremonies take place. They may also include outstanding natural landscapes that have evolved as a result of social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative (i.e., fossils, artifacts, areas representing a traditional way of life). “They may also include areas that by virtue of their natural properties possess significant religious, artistic, aesthetic or cultural association (such as traditional hunting/gathering) that have been used/recognised over the years.

Values:

- Aesthetic values
- Historic values
- Scientific values
- Social (including economic) values
- Spiritual values

Assessment Pathway:

Step 1 – Use of Maps and registered sites (not always accurate)

- Historical accounts and local knowledge (evidence of consultation required)
- Consult historical and Aboriginal Inventories (national, state and local level) identified in the *Directory of Information Sources*

Step 2 – stakeholder* consultation on outcomes from Step 1.

Step 3 - Field survey and expert report

- Cultural Heritage Agreements with local groups covering all or some of the above points

Note: *Step 3 should be triggered when there is not substantial acceptance by relevant stakeholders.*



Glossary

The terms and definitions given in [FSC-STD-01-002 FSC Glossary of Terms EN, 04 December 2009](#) and the following apply:

Ecosystem services:

The benefits people obtain from ecosystems.

These include:

- a. provisioning services such as food, forest products and water;
- b. regulating services such as regulation of floods, drought, land degradation, air quality, climate and disease;
- c. supporting services such as soil formation and nutrient cycling;
- d. and cultural services and cultural values such as recreational, spiritual, religious and other non-material benefits.

Source: FSC-STD-01-001 V5-0 D4-9 FSC Principles and Criteria for Forest Stewardship, Final Draft 11.11.2011,

IBRA bioregions

IBRA bioregions are the scale for assessment to be used in determining HCV.

Old growth 1+2

The term ‘Old growth 1+2’ refers to undisturbed and negligibly disturbed forests as defined as part of the Comprehensive Regional Assessments.

Stakeholder

FSC International’s definition of stakeholder is: *Any individual or group whose interests are affected by the way in which a forest is managed. (FSC-STD-01-002 FSC Glossary of Terms)*

This will include communities or individuals living in or near the FMU or with a special interest in the FMU. It will also include groups and individuals with a special interest or expertise in HCV and forests. FSC does not differentiate between stakeholders except in regards to HCV5 where the value is related to local communities. Further guidance can be found in *FSC-STD-20-006 Stakeholder consultation for forest evaluations.*

Native forests /Plantations

The terms “natural /managed” forests are used through much of the FSC literature but the terms “native forests” /“plantations” are preferred in Australia. FSCA uses the terms “native forests” /“plantations” in this document.



Well-being

Well-being includes a range of enmeshed indicators such as mental and physical health, education, social identity and belonging. The community concerned should play a significant role in determining the indicators for their community.



Abbreviations:

| | |
|--------|--|
| CoC | Chain of Custody |
| CRA | Comprehensive Regional Assessment |
| CW | Controlled Wood |
| EN | English |
| FM | Forest Management |
| FMU | Forest Management Unit |
| FSC | Forest Stewardship Council |
| FSCA | Forest Stewardship Council Australian |
| HC | High Conservation |
| HCV | High Conservation Value |
| HCVF | High Conservation Value Forests |
| IBRA | Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia |
| ICOMOS | International Council on Monuments and Sites |
| ISEAL | International Social and Environmental Accreditation and Labelling |
| P & C | Principles and Criteria |
| NGO | Non-Government Organisation |
| STD | Standard |
| V2.0 | Version 2.0 |