



# 2nd Meeting with Monitoring Organisations

Jan Doubal

Forest Management Institute

Czech Republic

# Content of the presentation

---

- Abstract
  - ▣ Participants
  - ▣ Main points and themes
  - ▣ Conclusions

## Second meeting of Monitoring Organisations (MOs) related to Regulation (EU) 995/2010 (the EU Timber Regulation)

- 12th of January 2016, Brussels
- Participants:
  - ▣ European Commission
  - ▣ Monitoring organisations
  - ▣ CA representative – CZ
- MOs present:
  - ▣ AENOR, ConLegno, Control Union, BMTrada, Bureau Veritas, GDHolz, Le Commerce du Bois, NEPCON, SGS UK, Soil Association Woodmark

# Main points and themes (overview)

- Significant topics on the discussion:
  - ▣ Practices and challenges – Tour de table
  - ▣ DDS definition in practice
  - ▣ CA's disagreement with DDS by MO
  - ▣ CPI in risk assessment
  - ▣ Benchmarking

# Main points and themes (1)

- What topics were on the discussion:
  - ▣ Practices and challenges – Tour de table
    - Operators do not have need to use MO DDS
    - Insufficient knowledge about EUTR among subjects
    - MO's worry about DDS failure backfire
    - Responsibility of MO from the contract on DDS
    - New projects thanks to EUTR
    - Risk assessment periodicity
  - ▣ DDS definition in practice
    - More specific information about DDS requirements welcomed
    - Different approaches to DDS between MOs
    - Also between OP

# Main points and themes (2)

- What topics were on the discussion:
  - ▣ CA's disagreement with DDS by MO
    - CA asked more to be done on DDS from MO
    - Required additional information
    - Using DDS from MO – more risk of check from CA?
    - DDS from MO – more relaxed approach from CA?

# Main points and themes (3)

- What topics were on the discussion:
  - ▣ CPI in risk assessment
    - Is a part of risk assessment – approach differs
    - In combination with illegal logging % and other indicators
    - CPI will be further discussed
  - ▣ Benchmarking
    - Purpose: to compare approaches of the MO's towards the DDS for sample/test subject
    - Worry of the MO over negative consequences

# Conclusions

- Standard is the Regulation – MO and OP have to handle DDS according to Regulation
- MO's approach differs – benchmarking?
- Conflict of interests: MO is providing Certification in the source region and DDS in the EU – this can be managed only by transparent processes.
- MO's are aware of national timber legality verification schemes (e.g.China): are these less transparent than service of certification/DDS by MO?



# Thank you for your attention.



Jan Doubal

Forest Management Institute  
EUTR Competent Authority  
Czech Republic  
+420 725 456 297  
+420 321 021 441  
[doubal.jan@uhul.cz](mailto:doubal.jan@uhul.cz)