Forest Stewardship Council® Canada

List of questions received related to the FSC National Forest Stewardship Standard of Canada FSC-STD-CAN-01-2018 V 1-0

Update : 2023-05-05

NFSS Reference	Year	Question[i] or topic	Process	Status
Ind. 6.4.5 b, Table 6.4.5	2021	Are the six (6) "Required Management Strategies" listed in Table 6.4.5 of indicator 6.4.5b to be implemented only for the portions of the Management Unit that are within caribou range, or to the entire Management Unit?	Clarification	Answer available on website
Ind. 6.4.5b, Table 6.4.5 #4	2021	When evaluating the "Required Management Strategy" #4 of Table 6.4.5 (Indicator 6.4.5b), 1. Does the statement "*the area remains reserved for the duration of that period*" mean that the 50% of undisturbed habitat to be set aside is in fact to be reserved for 50 years? 2. Does the phrase "*in the remaining areas*" refer to the rest of the area in the portion of the Management Unit that is within a caribou range excluding the 50% undisturbed habitat set aside? 3. Does the 30-to-50-year timeframe start at January 1st, 2018? 4. Is it possible that a disturbed area as of January 1, 2018, become "*undisturbed*" under the 30–50- year timeframe?	Interpretation	Answer available on website INT-FSC-STD-CAN-01-2018_01
Ind. 6.4.5c	2021	While the Indicator 6.4.5c's first Intent Box mentions that approach 6.4.5c "*provides a means to implement management other than those identified by Approach 6.4.5b", the text of Indicator 6.4.5c states that the "caribou conservation approach" be "consistent with the Range Plan Guidance for Woodland Caribou*", for Boreal population published in 2016 by the Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC 2016). Can the "*caribou conservation approach*" "*consistent with the Range Plan Guidance for Woodland Caribou*" be different from the Range Plan Guidance if it avoids the destruction of woodland caribou critical habitat?	Interpretation	Answer available on website INT-FSC-STD-CAN-01-2018_02

Ind. 6.4.5c, #5	2021	The requirement #5 of the Indicator 6.4.5c allows for the incorporation of an alternative habitat disturbance threshold informed by experts to be used for managing a caribou range. 1. Do experts need to: • be directly involved in determining the alternative habitat disturbance threshold? • confirm the validity of the alternative habitat disturbance threshold specific to the caribou range and local context? 2. Is the involvement of government representatives or stakeholders in the review of the forest management plan that includes the caribou conservation plan sufficient to satisfy the requirement? 3. If the decision is to manage the range using the 65% minimum undisturbed habitat threshold identified by Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) in its Action Plan for Woodland Caribou (*Rangifer tarandus caribou*), Boreal Population in Canada: Federal actions 2018, does it still need to be informed by an expert?	Interpretation	Answer available on website INT-FSC-STD-CAN-01-2018_03
Ind. 6.4.5c, #1 & #9	2021	The requirement # 1 of the Indicator 6.4.5c requires “An assessment of the status of population in the Management Unit” and the requirement #9 of the Indicator 6.4.5c requires “Monitoring of habitat condition and population response”. In most cases, the government is responsible for assessing caribou populations on public lands and this is usually done at the range level. 1. If government-led caribou population assessment and monitoring programs are in place at the range level, is an additional assessment of the status of population (requirement #1) and monitoring of habitat condition and population response (requirement #9) needed at the Forest Management Unit level? 2. If government-led caribou population assessment and monitoring programs are in place but other best information & peer reviewed science are available, should The Organization consider these other sources? 3. If there is no government assessment of the population (requirement #1) and/or a monitoring program (requirement #9) or if the available data is outdated, is The Organization responsible to complete an assessment and conduct monitoring?	Interpretation	Answer available on website INT-FSC-STD-CAN-01-2018_04

Ind. 6.4.5c, #4 and #5	2021	1. Can evidence of an "efficient collaborative process" that is progressing in good faith be sufficient to conclude conformance to Indicator 6.4.5c #4 and #5 despite not yet having determined an alternative disturbance threshold that supports a self-sustaining caribou population?	Interpretation	Answer available on website INT-FSC-STD-CAN-01-2018_05
Ind. 6.4.5	2022	Question related to isolated caribou herds	TBD	In process
Ind. 3.1.2	2022	1. Must an Organization engage directly with the Indigenous Peoples with regards to documenting and/or mapping all elements listed in indicator 3.1.2? And does this have to occur explicitly, or can it be part of ongoing relationship building and engagement? 2. Given the requirement includes the term "engagement", does this mean that conformance is dependent upon the Organization having obtained such information directly from the Indigenous Peoples? 3. In order to avoid "re-inventing the wheel", can output from government processes be used as a source of information for the purpose of documenting and mapping rights, when such information is available?	Clarification	In process
Ind. 6.5.7	2022	1. Does the minimum 10% area have to be located within the boundary of the Management Unit (either the current or former boundary), or can it include areas within the broader Area of Ecological Influence? 2. It is unclear how the area required to meet the 10% target should be calculated; Is it 10% of the area of the management unit currently being certified, or is it the maximal historical extent of the certified management unit?	TBD	In process

[i] Please note that the wording of the question may change as the evaluation is progressing and the process is evolving.