

A LAND MANAGER'S GUIDE TO FSC & SFI
To CERTIFY OR NOT TO CERTIFY: Is THAT A QUESTION?

DR. JEFF HOWE

KATHRYN FERNHOLZ

PHIL GUILLERY

DR. JIM BOWYER

SEPTEMBER 15, 2004



DOVETAIL PARTNERS, INC.



A Land Manager's Guide to FSC & SFI *To Certify or Not To Certify: Is That a Question?*

Summary

Over the past decade, two forest certification systems, that of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) of the American Forest and Paper Association (AF&PA), have had a significant, positive impact on forest management in the United States. Today these two systems are directly competing in an effort to expand their bases of certified acreage and to develop a clear differentiation in the marketplace. Appendix A provides a summary chart with the details of these two certification systems as well as information on the American Tree Farm System (ATFS) and the International Standards Organization (ISO). This paper provides a discussion of the issues related to selection of a certification system and the differences between FSC and SFI as might be seen from the perspective of a landowner or land manager. The goal of this discussion is to aid land managers in the process of selecting an appropriate certification system for their specific needs. Logically, the cost of the certification process is a consideration as well, and while anecdotal evidence suggests that there is generally very little variation in direct certification costs between the two systems, only through the development of comparative bids on a specific project can actual costs be identified. Therefore, the costs of certification are not addressed in this discussion.

At their heart, it appears the FSC's guidelines are geared to preserve natural systems while allowing for careful harvest, while the SFI's guidelines are aimed at encouraging fiber productivity while allowing for conservation of key resources. Given the current trend toward uncontrolled consumption growth, both approaches are probably not only valuable, but also necessary. Distinction between the two should be directly linked to the organization's vision.



Introduction

In the late 1980s and early 1990s environmentalists began to seek proactive ways to address growing concerns about tropical deforestation. Some of these organizations began selective boycotts of wood products companies like The Home Depot (THD) in an effort to curb THD's usage of wood from threatened tropical forests. Shortly, it became apparent that this broad-brush approach was painting good forestry with the same palette as the bad, and that these boycotts were having a significant negative impact on small, local forest enterprises in particular, and incurring a devaluation of tropical forests in general. Thus, a more positive approach and one that rewarded good forestry, was sought. A major collaborative effort between environmental

organizations, industry representatives, and those representing social and community concerns was undertaken. The Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) arose out of this process. Early on, the FSC developed international standards, principles, and criteria for good forestry with the goal of identifying the “ideal” forest management system. The FSC then developed a means of verifying that these standards were being followed, and a worldwide certification and accreditation system was born. These developments were followed shortly in the U.S. by the development of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) of the American Forest and Paper Association (AF&PA). This separate initiative by industry was based on the belief that the industry was best equipped to develop workable solutions to growing concerns about forest management, and in part on the desire to preempt regulation or having other interest’s solutions imposed on them.

To a certain extent, their very origins forced these two programs to start at opposite ends of the spectrum. In defining the ideal and being international in scope, it was important that FSC take into consideration the worst case scenario and develop extensive control mechanisms that addressed the need for strong monitoring and enforcement. To accomplish this level of quality assurance FSC felt it was necessary to build most of the systems, processes, and procedures from scratch. The SFI, on the other hand, exclusively represented U.S. industrial forestland, which is some of the best-managed forestland in the world. SFI’s originators sought to incorporate as much of the existing regulatory requirements, business systems, processes and procedures into the process as possible, viewing third-party oversight as unnecessary. For both, the goal was to increase the opportunity for the marketplace to support, and fund, good forestry practices. However, it soon became obvious that the creation of a market demand resulted in a demanding market, and both FSC and SFI have needed to adapt significantly over the last ten years such that the differences between the systems have narrowed considerably.

What are the benefits of the different systems?

According to the American Forest and Paper Association website “*many organizations are finding that the SFI program helps them “do good” by expanding the practice of sustainable forestry and “do well” by meeting their customer and their organization’s demands.*”¹ In addition, the website lists the following specific benefits:

- *“Use of the SFI program logo on organization’s materials*
- *Greater access to professional foresters throughout the U.S.*
- *Increased involvement in community forestry activities including outreach and training*
- *Opportunity to participate in the SFI Certification Process and on-product labeling program*
- *Those involved in the program demonstrate leadership by working to broaden the practice of sustainable forestry*
- *Those that participate demonstrate they are part of the solution to the conservation of America’s forestlands and the wildlife and biological diversity dependent on these lands*
- *The praise, awards and recognition earned by the program have benefits that accrue to those who participate in the program”*

¹ http://www.afandpa.org/Content/NavigationMenu/Environment_and_Recycling/SFI/Licensing_Program/Licensing_Program.htm

According to the Forest Stewardship Council website, “Landowners and companies that sell timber or forest products seek certification as a way to verify to consumers that they have practiced forestry consistent with FSC standards.”² In addition the website lists the following specific benefits:

- *“International recognition that the forest management does not put the forest’s natural heritage at risk and that the management activities efforts are appropriate.*
- *The opportunity to find new markets for FSC labeled products, thus acquiring market recognition for responsible forest management*
- *The opportunity for interaction and cooperation among the various players involved in responsible forest management – forest owners, social and environmental organizations – to solve the problems that forests face*
- *The assurance for future generations that they will enjoy the benefits of the forest*
- *The assurance that forest management practices are responsible and will be further improved*
- *The assurance that ownership rights are respected*
- *The assurance that wood harvesting is legal*
- *The assurance that the rights of workers and indigenous communities are respected*
- *The assurance that areas of natural wealth and endangered wildlife habitat are not being negatively affected*
- *The opportunity to use the FSC trademark on products to demonstrate that they come from legal and well managed sources*
- *The possibility of new markets for products produced as FSC*
- *The possibility of benefiting from local, national, or international government support for responsible forest management”²*

So, how do I choose the certification system that best fits our organization?

The most important question a land manager must answer is – Why are you thinking of getting certified in the first place? There may be one major driver or several, but the important point is that your motivations must be clear to be sure you select the certifying organization and standard that is the best match for you. The following are among the most common reasons for landowners and land managers to seek certification.

- *Insure credibility with stakeholders (External validation)*
- *Gain market access*
- *Avoid conflict*
- *Increase value (And obtain a premium)*
- *Do the right thing (Internal validation)*
- *Assure adequate long-term supply*
- *Link to “like-minded” organizations*
- *Obtain feedback on forestry practices (Identify improvements)*

² http://www.fsc.org/fsc/about/about_fsc/benefits

Insure Stakeholder Credibility

Each land manager generally has a number of key stakeholders to which they are accountable. These stakeholders range from company executives, board members, stockholders, employees, customers, and community members. For large publicly held forest products companies, the “stock market” is the key stakeholder, with its emphasis on financial matters, ranging from quarterly returns to return on capital asset value. The SFI³ program, with a greater emphasis on productivity, seems well suited to meet the needs and financial expectations of the stockholder group of stakeholders. For large privately held forest products businesses the issue becomes more complex and, perhaps, more personal. In this case it is often the board of directors that identifies a need for certification to ensure the identity of the organization. The choice of the certification system is tied to the specific vision, goals, and values of the organization.

For public land managers (e.g. those managing federal, state or county lands) the stakeholders group is increasingly broad. Politicians, interest groups, and the public-at-large are holding public land managers to a growing level of scrutiny. The breadth of interests in this stakeholder group ranges from pure protectionism to pure productivity, making it the most complex group to satisfy. For this mixed group the critical issue, rightly or wrongly, is often about addressing the perception that lands are being poorly managed. Third-party certification provides the independent oversight that many of these stakeholders desire. Choice between the two competing certification systems should be based on prioritization of land use as shown in the comprehensive plan for the region.

"A key feature of the SFI is its requirement to engage with local third parties who have unique knowledge and expertise. The...SFI provided an impetus to greatly intensify interaction with local NGOs, land trusts, universities and others. We derived great benefit from these new relationships with The Nature Conservancy, state units of the National Wildlife Federation, the National Wild Turkey Federation, the Izaak Walton League of America, the Ruffed Grouse Society, Lowcountry ReLeaf in South Carolina, local land trusts, etc. And I think they learned a lot from us too, so there was a mutual benefit."³

- Scott Wallinger, former SFI Steering Committee Chair

Small, non-industrial private landowners are by far the largest forest landowner group in the U.S., and their needs and interests are as varied as their numbers. For this group the primary stakeholder is often the same individual who chooses the certification system. As with the other land manager types, it is critical that the landowner understand his or her key motivation in seeking certification. In this case it is often the balance of issues that are of greatest concern to the landowners rather than credibility with outside stakeholders or interest groups.

³ http://www.certificationwatch.org/article.php3?id_article=1659

Gain market access

Today a number of major international businesses (e.g. Time Warner⁴, B&Q, The Home Depot, IKEA) are giving priority to materials from certified forests. In addition, the LEED certification program (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) that has been adopted by cities like Chicago, Illinois and Portland, Oregon, specifies third-party certified wood as one of their requirements. To date, a number of organizations have identified only FSC certification as being comprehensive enough to meet their needs because of its exclusive use of only third-party assessments and early adoption of a chain-of-custody tracking mechanism to allow for on-product labeling and certified-source verification. The SFI program provides for, but does not mandate, third party oversight, and now requires chain of custody tracking when product labeling is used.

"...[forest]certification is very important for us. It is one of the key things that we look for when we evaluate our supplier's performance and certainly critical for any new supplier to come in the door here."⁴

-David Refkin, Pres. Time Inc. Paperco

Forest certification arose out of a desire to eliminate boycotts, and some organizations have successfully avoided boycotts through their use of FSC certified products. As a domestic program, SFI has been less involved in this dominantly international issue. Participation in any certification program does not guarantee avoidance of conflict over land management practices. However, genuine efforts to manage forests responsibly and for the long term provide a basis for minimizing the potential for loss of productive capacity, discord, and conflict.

Avoid Conflict

Forest certification arose out of a desire to eliminate boycotts, and some organizations have successfully avoided boycotts through their use of FSC certified products. As a domestic program, SFI has been less involved in this dominantly international issue. Participation in any certification program does not guarantee avoidance of conflict over land management practices. However, genuine efforts to manage forests responsibly and for the long term provide a basis for minimizing the potential for loss of productive capacity, discord, and conflict.

Increase value

A number of landowners and land managers have adopted third-party certification in an effort to increase the value of the materials from their forests. Unfortunately, in the short-term at least, there is little evidence that suggests that certified landowners, either FSC or SFI, will be able to obtain a consistent, substantial premium. In some instances and with some customers, businesses have been able to obtain a premium for some products. However, even when premiums are realized the channels are so long from consumer to the forest that it is difficult to transmit that premium back to landowners. In a future article Dovetail will discuss methods of adding value to a forest.

FSC Netherlands reaches young people. Spontaneous recognition of the FSC logo up to 33%

A successful campaign targeting consumers in the Netherlands showed spontaneous recognition of the FSC logo by consumers increased to 33 per cent during 2004. In a third annual campaign, the highest recognition of the FSC logo was achieved by 18-35 years old, who reached 42 per cent. Ab Sulman, representative of Heliview, the company responsible to carry out the survey, said "It is very special that recognition was high under young people, since this group is difficult to reach. It is difficult to compare the market introduction with other products but, it is clear that this one was very successful".⁵ August 6th, 2004

It is important to note that the relative value of certified products varies greatly internationally. For example, it is likely that the percentage of Americans recognizing either the FSC or SFI

⁴ http://certificationwatch.org/article.php3?id_article=822

logos is less than one percent, whereas in Holland research has recently shown that brand awareness of FSC in some segments exceeds thirty three percent⁵. This survey result reflects the varying focus of the national certification organizations in different regions. FSC-US has focused on the production end and getting acres certified whereas FSC-Holland (without significant forest acreage) has focused on the consumption end and brand awareness.

The picture to the right is of a soccer pitch (field) in Germany. In general, the level of consumer awareness of environmental issues is higher in Western Europe than in the U.S. As a result, an internationally recognized certification program such as FSC may better serve American companies desiring to do business in international arenas.



Do the right thing

In general, both the SFI and FSC programs can provide the satisfaction of “doing the right thing.” In the details of the programs the difference is similar to the difference between sending money to a charity and volunteering. Both are beneficial, but one is a bit more proactive. FSC standards generally require attention to a broader set of issues and a higher level of organizational responsibility and action.

SFI Objectives⁶

1. Broadening the practice of sustainable forestry
2. Ensuring long-term forest productivity
3. Protecting water quality
4. Enhancing wildlife habitat and contributing to biodiversity
5. Protecting special sites
6. Continuing improvements in wood utilization
7. Ensuring continual improvements in sustainable forestry practices
8. Fostering the practice of sustainable forestry on all forestlands
9. Reporting publicly on program progress

Assure adequate long-term supply

Both programs are focused on the sustainability of the forestland and the ability of that forest to provide products ad infinitum. However, SFI has a significantly stronger focus on creating the ability to increase production over time⁶. With its acceptance of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and lack of distinction between the origin of plantations it is in a much better position, and has put much more emphasis, on achieving higher fiber volumes in the future. For many, this is a critical point, as population growth issues and uncontrolled consumption are their driving concern and simply maintaining a constant volume of supply may not be adequate.

Link to “like-minded” organizations

The SFI, arising out of programs by a forest industry association, does a better job of offering the opportunity for organizations to pool their resources, meet and discuss issues, and implement activities collaboratively. On the other hand, FSC has placed little effort or focus on convening FSC-certified organizations. As a strictly a standard setting body, with a certification trademark (like Underwriters Laboratories) rather than a product

⁵ http://www.fsc.org/fsc/whats_new/news/news/15

⁶ www.afandpa.org/.../SFI/Publications1/Current_Publications/A_Good_Sign_Somebody_Cares/SFI_tri-fold.pdf

trademark, FSC has adopted a more distant role with certified organizations. Increasingly, however, both traditional “green” conferences and trade shows focused on FSC participants have provided a mechanism for linking those producing FSC certified wood with potential customers.

Obtain feedback on forestry practices

For many organizations and individuals, a certification assessment is an opportunity to receive objective feedback and constructive criticism on forest management practices. For natural resource professionals this opportunity may facilitate greater application of current science or management technologies. For supervisors and program managers, third-party feedback may help to increase operational efficiencies or other valuable changes. The FSC certification process is a third-party assessment with mandated annual audits that provide additional opportunity for this type of feedback to occur; this oversight is an essential element of the program. The SFI program offers first-party verification (self-verified), second-party verification, or third-party certification approaches and more flexibility in surveillance audits, while still providing for feedback opportunities. If an organization is primarily interested in operational efficiencies and an evaluation of their operational structure, ISO 14001 may be an appropriate standard to investigate.

Conclusion: Is there a core difference between the two?

Possibly the most distinguishing characteristic between the FSC and SFI programs lies not in the size of the culverts, width of roads, or size of clear cuts, but rather in the distinctive philosophy at the core of each. At its heart, SFI forestry is about productivity and lowest fiber cost. This focus does not diminish SFI’s interest in sustaining that production ad infinitum, but it is the basis of SFI standards. The FSC’s standards recognize and support the need for harvest, but this is a much smaller aspect of the total standards and management plan that must be prepared for an FSC-certified forest. In this case, the primary focus is maintenance of the ecological system and all of its parts.

To a certain extent the issue of selecting the most compatible forest certification system is about vision, and vision is about choices. Professor Michael E. Porter suggested that a company must choose one of three business approaches, that of a low-cost producer, an innovator, or one that focuses on customer intimacy. He noted that you need to do all three well, but that in the final analysis one and only one approach must be your focus. Similarly, choosing between these two certification systems reflects the same kind of decision.

For organizations weighing the choice between third party certification systems, careful consideration must be given to the perceived bias in each. To some, SFI certification is like having the fox guarding the hen house. Alternately, submitting to FSC oversight can be viewed as giving in to the added control and costs demanded by tree-huggers. Often, resistance to certification by either system is a result of fear, based on hidden, or subconscious, bias. It is bad organizational policy to make decisions based on fear and bias. Organizational stakeholders deserve better, and land managers need to recognize this and develop a comparison based on analysis of the actual merits of the varying standards instead.

Finally, both SFI and FSC have unresolved issues. Specifically, the role of plantations within forest management plans of the future is unresolved. Both systems allow for third party certification of plantations, although FSC is slightly more restrictive in this regard. Today, the biggest risk to forests is conversion to agriculture. What is unclear is how plantations delineate clearly enough between agriculture and forestry, to the point where the down hill slide from plantations, to agro-forestry, to agriculture isn't simply extended over a longer time period, but with the same ultimate result. This doesn't mean to imply that plantations are bad, but that the drivers for preserving plantations and natural forests are different, and should be clearly recognized as such.

Dr. Jeffrey Howe specializes in strategic planning, marketing, and coaching leaders to a clearer vision of themselves and their organization. Prior to Dovetail Partners Jeff was the President of Colonial Craft, a MN manufacturing firm recognized for its social and environmental responsibility with awards that included handicap employer of the year and environmental company of the year. This was accomplished while being one of only two companies to be on "Wood & Wood Products" magazine's Top 100 fastest growing companies every year; proving you can be responsible, and profitable. Jeff has a B.S. degree in Biology from Bates College, a M.S. degree in Forest Products Marketing from the University of Maine, and a PhD in Marketing from the University of Minnesota.

Appendix A: Systems Summaries

Number of Participating Landowners/ Companies	Area Enrolled	Scope of System	Year Established	Contact Information	
51,000 family forest owners in 46 states ⁱ	33 millions acres	United States	1941	1111 19 th St. NW, Suite 780, Washington, DC 20036 tel: 202-463-2462 info@treefarmsysite.in.org www.treefarmssystem.org	American Tree Farm System (ATFS)
3,220 companies in 66 countries (523 in North America); 644 forest mgmt certifies in 62 countries (156 in North America)	113 million acres (26 million acres in North America)	International	1993	1155 30 th Street NW, Suite 300 Washington, DC 20007 tel: 202-342-0413 info@fscus.org www.fsc.org www.fscus.org	Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)
ISO 9000 and ISO 14000 standards are implemented by some 610,000 organizations in 160 countries.ii	<i>(not applicable)</i>	International	1947	American National Standards Institute (ANSI), 25 West 43 rd St. 4 th Floor New York, NY 10036 tel: 212-642-4900 info@ansi.org www.ansi.org www.iso.org	International Standards Organization (ISO)
68 SFI Program Participants have completed 3rd Party Certification (93.4 million acres)	136 million acres in North America	Canada and the United States	1994	American Forest & Paper Association (AF&PA) 1111 Nineteenth Street, NW, Suite 800 Washington, DC 20036 Tel: 202-463-2700 www.aboutsfi.org www.aboutsfb.org	Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI)

Standards	Applicable Standard for Minnesota	Membership	Governance Structure
<p>There are 9 Standards, 14 Performance Measures, and 22 Indicators. Tree Farmers must own at least 10 acres of forestland, implement a written forest management plan, and follow ATFS standards and guidelines.^{xi}</p>	<p>Standards of Sustainability For Forest Certification, Including Performance Measures and Field Indicators Adopted December, 2002</p>	<p>ATFS is a no cost membership organization. All members receive one complimentary copy of <i>Tree Farmer</i>, <i>The Practical Guide to Sustainable Forestry</i> magazine and invitations to conventions, field days, meetings, seminars and the opportunity to participate in ATFS grassroots policy efforts.^{vi}</p>	<p>The ATFS is a program of the American Forest Foundation a national nonprofit organization that works for healthy forests, quality environmental education and to help people make informed decisions about our communities and our world.ⁱ</p>
<p>There are 10 Principles and 57 Criteria that address legal issues, indigenous rights, labor rights, multiple benefits, and environmental impacts surrounding forest management.^{xii}</p>	<p>Lake States – Central Hardwoods Forest Management Standard</p>	<p>FSC is a membership association open to a wide range of organizations and individuals representing social, economic and environmental interests. Membership consists of 3 chambers: Economic, Social, and Environmental. Members participate in the development of standards, election of the Board of directors and voting on decisions that will guide the direction of the organization.^{vi}</p>	<p>The FSC is an independent, non-profit based in Bonn, Germany, that provides standard setting, trademark assurance and accreditation services for companies and organizations interested in responsible forestry. FSC's governance structure requires an equal balance in power between its environmental, social and economic chambers. iii</p>
<p>ISO 14000 is primarily concerned with "environmental management". This means what the organization does to minimize harmful effects on the environment caused by its activities and to continually improve its environmental performance. ii</p>	<p>ISO 14001:1996 – Environmental Management Systems – Specifications with Guidance for Use</p>	<p>Membership of ISO is open to national standards institutes or similar organizations most representative of standardization in their country (one member in each country). ISO also has two categories of membership for countries with fewer resources. ii</p>	<p>ISO is a network of the national standards institutes of 146 countries, on the basis of one member per country, with a Central Secretariat in Geneva, Switzerland, that coordinates the system. ISO is a non-governmental organization: its members are not delegations of national governments.^{iv}</p>
<p>118 core indicators must be met for a successful third party certification.^{xiii}</p>	<p>SFI Standards (SFIS); SFI Verification/Certification Principles and Procedures (SFI-V/CPP)</p>	<p>Participation in the SFI program is a condition of membership for AF&PA. Since 1994, AF&PA has asked 17 members to leave the association for failing to meet the SFI Standard. viii The AF&PA has four membership categories. ix In 1998, the SFI program was opened to companies, landowners, and organizations outside of AF&PA® membership. x</p>	<p>The SFI Program is overseen by the Sustainable Forestry Board (SFB), a 501(c)3 organization. The SFB has fifteen members with a balanced array of interests -- one-third representing SFI Program Participants; one-third from the conservation & environmental community; and one-third from the broader forestry community.^v</p>

Accredited Auditors	Auditor Accreditation	Standards Setting
<p>An accredited natural resource manager who has completed ATFS's required training for certifying forested properties and is eligible to inspect properties conducts ATFS inspections.^{xx}</p>	<p>The American Tree Farm System (ATFS) has conducted six Lead Auditor Training courses, resulting in more than 80 accredited lead auditors. These auditors are now available to conduct third-party audits of ATFS Group Organizations.^{xvii}</p>	<p>AFF has sole ownership of its Standards of Sustainability for Forest Certification. On a five-year interval an independent standards review panel will be seated and charged with reviewing and recommending modifications to the Standards.^{xiv}</p>
<p>There are 14 FSC-Accredited Certifiers. List available at: http://www.fscus.org/certifiers/</p>	<p>FSC operates an accreditation program which is in charge of providing accreditation services to certification bodies and National Initiatives. The accreditation program is based on international standards.^{xviii}</p>	<p>The FSC International Center sets the framework for the development and maintenance of international, national and sub-national FSC standards. FSC is committed to complying with the ISEAL Code of Good Practice for Setting Social and Environmental Standards.^{xv}</p>
<p>ISO Directory of ISO 9000 & ISO 14000 accreditation & certification bodies is available online: http://www.iso.org/iso/en/info/ISODirectory/intro.html</p>	<p>Accreditation bodies have been set up in a number of countries to evaluate the competence of certification bodies. An accreditation body will accredit (approve) a conformity assessment body as competent to carry out ISO 9000 or ISO 14000 certification in specific business sectors. XIX</p>	<p>ISO standards are developed by technical committees comprised of experts on loan from the industrial, technical and business sectors which have asked for the standards and which subsequently put them to use.ⁱⁱ</p>
<p>There are 16 SFI Third Party Certifiers. List available at: http://www.aboutsfi.org/thirdparty.htm</p>	<p>Only auditing firms that meet certification and training standards set by the American National Standards Institute and the Registrars Accreditation Board may verify conformance to the SFI Standard. v</p>	<p>Responsibilities for management and implementation of the SFI program are divided among a number of "houses of government". The "Legislative Branch" (The Sustainable Forestry Board) has sole responsibility for development of the SFI Standard including enhancements and interpretation.^{XVI}</p>

Information compiled by Dovetail, Partners, Inc., September 2004. All information gathered from publicly available information from each program.

ⁱ http://www.treefarmssystem.org/cms/pages/69_1.html

ⁱⁱ <http://www.iso.org/iso/en/iso9000-14000/index.html>

ⁱⁱⁱ <http://www.fsc.org/fsc/about>

^{iv} <http://www.iso.org/iso/en/aboutiso/introduction/index.html>

^v <http://www.aboutsfi.org/index.htm>

^{vi} http://www.treefarmssystem.org/cms/pages/19_2.html

^{vii} http://www.fsc.org/fsc/getting_involved/become_member

^{viii} <http://www.aboutsfi.org/about.asp>

^{ix} http://www.afandpa.org/Content/NavigationMenu/About_AFandPA/Membership/Membership.htm

^x http://www.afandpa.org/Content/NavigationMenu/About_AFandPA/Membership/SFI_Licensing_Membership/SFI_Licensing_Membership.htm

^{xi} http://65.109.144.60/cms/test/26_34.html

^{xii} http://www.fscus.org/standards_criteria/

^{xiii} http://www.afandpa.org/Content/NavigationMenu/Environment_and_Recycling/SFI/The_SFI_Standard/SFI_Certification.htm

^{xiv} http://www.treefarmssystem.org/cms/pages/26_21.html

^{xv} http://www.fsc.org/fsc/how_fsc_works/policy_standards

^{xvi} <http://www.aboutsfi.org/committees.htm>

^{xvii} <http://www.treefarmssystem.org/cms/pages/40.html>

^{xviii} http://www.fsc.org/fsc/how_fsc_works/accreditation

^{xix} <http://www.iso.org/iso/en/info/ISODirectory/intro.html#>

^{xx} http://65.109.144.60/cms/test/26_34.html

This report was prepared by
DOVETAIL PARTNERS, INC.

*Dovetail Partners is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporation
whose core mission is to assist in the development of
increased trade in products from responsible sources.*

FOR MORE INFORMATION OR TO
REQUEST ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THIS

REPORT, CONTACT US AT:

INFO@DOVETAILINC.ORG

WWW.DOVETAILINC.ORG

651-762-4007

© 2004 Dovetail Partners, Inc.

This Dovetail Report is made possible through the
generous support of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund,
the Laird Norton Endowment Foundation and the
McKnight Foundation.



DOVETAIL PARTNERS, INC.

4801 N. Highway 61, Suite 108

White Bear Lake, MN 55110

Phone: 651-762-4007

Fax: 651-762-9642

www.dovetailinc.org