

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