

Collated Minutes from Working Group Meetings 1-5



PEFC's Standard Revision TD V

Working Group Meeting nr 1

2021-03-23, Teams Notes

1. Opening of the meeting

Sture Karlsson, chairman of PEFC Sweden, opened the meeting.

2. Notification of notes from today's meeting

Hans Weslien, PEFC's standard revision secretariat, was elected meeting secretary.

3. Notes of those present

Participants were retrieved from the list in Teams and listed in appendix.

4. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved.

5. The Swedish procedure for the preparation of the PEFC standard

Sture described the basic starting points of the standards. For the revision work, he pointed out the importance of striving for simplicity, comprehensibility and functionality and that the purpose of changes should be to have an effect. Christina Lundgren, CEO and national secretary of Swedish PEFC, described the background to the PEFC standards, the links to the international PEFC standards and the PEFC certification scope and showed the good results obtained in independent international grading of the PEFC system.

Christina outlined how the revision work will be carried out, including the role of the working groups and the working group and the timetable for the revision process. The workflow is, greatly simplified: Proposals are produced by designated working groups (continued to be dealt with under item 9) and the Working group considers the proposals and decides on changes. Seminars aimed at incorporating new knowledge from research will be organised in conjunction with working group meetings. The process also includes hearings with authorities. In the Swedish procedure, developed

standards with changes made must be posted for public consultation on two occasions. In the final phase, the standards, following a decision by the Swedish PEFC Board, go to assessment internationally. The full workflow is described in "The Swedish procedure for the development of a Swedish PEFC standard" which has been sent out to the participants before the meeting and which can be read on the standard revision's website. Comments on the procedure can be submitted at any time during the process.

6. Election of the Chairman of the Working group

Mårten Larsson was elected. Mårten thanked him for the trust, introduced himself and took over the chairmanship of the meeting.

7. Election of the Working group's Board of Directors.

Elected members:

Lars Nilsson, Mellanskog
Anna Furness, Forest Contractors
PerArne Nordholts, Swedish Sawmills
Association
Anna Schyman, NYKS
Ylva Thorn-Andersen, Södra
skogsägarna
Magnus Lindberg, GS-facket
Maud Petri-Rådström, Gröna arbetsgivare

This is missing one member for forest-owning companies and one for primary industry. The working group decided to instruct Andreas Rastbäck (forest-owning company) and Magnus Norrby (primary industry) to propose members for each category and that the supplement with two members thereafter shall be determined by the Management Board of the Platform.

8. Presentation of the Secretariat of the Standard Revision

The secretariat consists of Christina Lundgren and Hans Weslien. Hans is employed half-time during the revision as a temporary reinforcement and has an office in Umeå.

9. Comments received and proposals for working groups

Christina presented the comments received and presented proposals to working groups. The Working group decided to set up these four working groups:

1. PEFC system and the structure of the standard
2. Production and environment
3. Social standard and Contractorial standard
4. Climate

The staffing of the groups is determined by the working group's board of directors. Registration for working groups must be made to Hans (hans.weslien@pefc.se) no later than March 30.

Babs Stuiver (Sveaskog) asked about the scope of the working groups' areas, mainly for the group with the area of social standard and Contractorial standard which contains a lot, perhaps a Delineation is needed. Christina replied that the areas are partly intertwined and that collaboration will be needed and that questions can be

sent between groups for the work to be effectively. Hans should be in all groups. Babs, meanwhile, brought up that the time before the general consultation is rather scarce. Christina agreed with that but pointed out that this first consultation is for the work to be transparent and that you then

Swedish PEFC ek för, www.pefc.se Postal address: 105 33 S tockholm | | Visiting address: Franzéng 6 | Phone: **0** 7 0 - 380 83 84 |

can post the changes you are relatively clear about and attach a list of additional issues that you are working on instead of rushing suggestions on all issues.

Kjell Andersson (Svebio) emphasized that biofuels in relation to future governing sustainability criteria are something that should be taken into account in the work.

10. Next meeting/meetings

The dates of the next two working group meetings were determined:

September 23 and November 24.

11. Any other business

No other questions.

12. Conclusion of the meeting

Sture wished everyone good luck with the continued work and it urged in this to think about achieving improvements through simplifications that make the standards more functional and easier to use.

Mårten stressed the importance of simplicity in terms of indicators. An indicator should be revisable and needs to be clear and simple.

Mårten thanked the participants and ended the meeting.

Annex: Notified organisations and participants

Notified organisations and participants

Notified organizations

BillerudKorsnäs
ECSkog AB
Föreningen Spillkråkan
Gröna Arbetsgivare
GS-facket
Holmen Skog
LRF Skogsägarna
Mellanskog
Metsä Forest Sverige AB
Norra Skog
NYKS
PanCert AB
SCA Skog
SE Certifiering AB/Skogsentreprenörerna
Skogscertifiering Prosilva AB
Skogssällskapets Förvaltning AB
Stiftens Egendomsförvaltningars
Förening
Stora Enso Skog
Sveaskog
Svenska Bioenergiföreningen (Svebio)
Svenska Trädbränsleföreningen
Svenskt Friluftsliv
Sveriges Allmänningsskogars Förbund
Sveriges Jordägareförbund
Sydved AB
Sågverkens Riksförbund
Södra skogsägarna ek förening
Umeå Kommun

Johanna Ydringer	BillerudKorsnäs
Per Eriksson	ECSkog AB
Ronnie Andersson	ECSkog AB
Sofie Petersson	ECSkog AB
Kerstin Dafnäs	Association Spillkråkan
Annelie Johansson	Association Spillkråkan
Maud Petri Rådström	Gröna arbetsgivare
Magnus Lindberg	GS
Jonathan Lundberg	GS
Sara Rindeskog	Holmen Forest
Andreas Rastbäck	Holmen Forest
Patrik Vendel	Intertek
Sofia Backéus	LRF Skogsägarna, Swedish Wood Fuel Association
Lars Nilsson	Mellanskog
Helena Lindén	Norra Skog
Olof Falkeström	Norra Skog
Johan Wiklund	Norra Skog
Stefan Holmberg	Norra Skog
Anna Schyman	NYKS
Tony Axelsson	PanCert AB
Mats Remsö	PanCert AB
PerArne Nordholts	PanCert AB, Sawmills National Association
Hanna Kankainen	SCA Forest
Hans Djurberg	SCA Forest
Anna Björk	SE Certification AB/Skogsentreprenörerna
Kolbjörn Kindströmer	SE Certifiering AB/Skogsentreprenörerna
Anneli Sandström	Forest Certification Prosilva AB
Martin Klenz-Tornow	Forest Certification Prosilva AB
Helene Larsson	Forest Certification Prosilva AB
Magnus Norrby	Forest Certification Prosilva AB, Sawmills Central Sweden
Staffan Mattsson	Skogssällskapets Förvaltning AB
Sofia Bäcklund	Stiftens Egendomsförvaltningars Förening
Thomas Karnestrand	Stiftens Egendomsförvaltningars Förening
Tina Westlund	Stiftens Egendomsförvaltningars Association
Erica Pershagen	Stora Enso Skog
Kevin Dahlberg	Stora Enso Skog
Babs Stuver	Sveaskog
Anders Hjerpe	Sveaskog
Kjell Andersson	Swedish Bioenergy Association (Svebio)
Eje Andersson	Svenskt friluftsliv
Nicklas Samils	Swedish Common Forests Association
Rickard Klingberg	Jordägarna
Gabriel Mörner	Jordägarna
Niklas Fogdestam	Sydved
Ylva Thorn-Andersen	Södra skogsägarna
Johan Sandberg	Umeå Municipality
Mårten	
Larsson Lisa	Swedish PEFC
Holmgren	
Sture Karlsson	Swedish PEFC
Christina Lundgren	Swedish PEFC
Thomas Löwenberg	Swedish PEFC
Hans Weslien	Swedish PEFC

PEFC's standard revision TD V
Working group meeting 2 2021-
09-23, Teams Minutes

1. Opening of the meeting

Mårten Larsson, chairman of the working group, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants.

2. Notification of notes from today's meeting

Hans Weslien, PEFC's standard revision secretariat, was elected meeting secretary.

3. Persons responsible for the approval of the Minutes

Anders Hjerpe and Helene Larsson were elected.

4. Notes of those present

Participants were pulled from the list in Teams and displayed in Appendix 1.

5. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved.

6. Confirmation of the Board of Directors and working groups

The composition of the board and working groups according to the pre-sent Excel file was confirmed.

7. The Swedish procedure for the development of the PEFC standard

Christina Lundgren, CEO and national secretary of Swedish PEFC, described the procedure. Comments are always welcome to the procedure and the ongoing process that can be followed at <https://pefc.se/vara-standarde r/standardrevision-2021-2022>. The timetable and organisation were reviewed and the documents were shown to form the basis of the working groups and the secretariat (Annex 2). To the remaining questions, it was pointed out that a point received about the possibility of chemical treatment of seedlings against weevil was missing from the documentation sent out before the meeting.

The task of the working group for the day was described:

- o Take part in the work of the working groups
- o Take part in research and current knowledge via Seminarrs
- o Make a decision to publish the material online in October (general consultation).

The public consultation was described as a first step in the process of transparency and opportunities to comment during the development of amendments. It is not a ready-made proposal to consider .

Christina described how national PEFC standards are linked to international PEFC reference standards and the main criteria contained in these.

8. Seminar: PEFC in the Nordic countries

Thomas Husum, PEFC Norway and Auvo Kaivola, PEFC Finland

Norge

Norway is slightly ahead of Sweden in the revision process and the public consultation is planned for the end of the year. Thomas described the Norwegian forest and forestry and the conditions for certification. All timber is in practice PEFC certified. Environmental organizations are involved in the process (WWF, Sabima) after 10 years "on the side line". Research organisations are involved as observers. ISO 14001 certification is the basic requirement for certification of groups. There is no particular Contractorial standard. In terms of biodiversity, consideration for capercaillie (game sites), birds of prey and owls is seen as particularly important and is clearly prominent in the population.

Eje asked regarding consideration for outdoor recreation. Thomas replied that there are wordings about this, but that they wish that forestry takes more account in practice through, among other things, the Swedish Forest Service. more selective chopping and less clear-cutting in outdoor areas, especially near settlements.

The best possible use of forests in terms of climate shall be sought, but taking into account biodiversity. Longer rotation times, measures to increase growth and more protected areas are seen as a pathway to more carbon sequestration.

Finland

Auvo presented the forest conditions in Finland and the main focus areas in the ongoing revision of the Finnish PEFC standard. With regard to carbon sequestration, there has been discussion of proposals to limit logging, that it should not increase, but this has not led to a proposal. Growth and wood extraction, forest health and sustainable use of biofuel were highlighted as the important elements regarding the climate role of forests. Foreign tree species do not exist on an industrial scale. Other focus areas are in the areas of biodiversity, protection of peatlands, water quality and Sami culture and reindeer husbandry (linked to biodiversity.) Auvo also highlighted digitalisation and new data collection technologies as important elements.

Anna Schyman asked about GMO material. Auvo clarified that use is currently not allowed according to the international PEFC standard, but that it is possible. may arise the need to obtain suitable rejuvenation material, as trees' own adaptation is slow in relation to today's climate change. When asked about equality and non-discrimination, Auvo replied that a lot has happened in Finnish society on that front in recent decades and that this could possibly be an explanation for the fact that there has not been a focus on this area in the revision work. (Note: Equality is one of the criteria of the international standard that all systems must deal with in some way.)

9. Seminar: Outdoor Recreation

Peter Fredman, Mid Sweden University

In Sweden, there is a clear policy for outdoor recreation with 10 goals, most recently evaluated in 2019. The goal of the outdoor policy is "to support people's opportunities to spend time in nature and practice outdoor activities where the right of public access is the basis for outdoor life." There is a lot of research done on what is considered an attractive forest. You know quite well and it's more a question of putting it into practice. The pandemic has meant that more people are staying in nature and also that experienced people are looking for more remote and less well-groomed places. The trend is that corrected places are more in demand and more and more organized events (events). Peter gave two book recommendations: *Plan for outdoor life* and *Outdoor life in change* and also referred to SLU for more knowledge. Questions were asked regarding what is an attractive forest and as a generalization, factors such as great depth of visibility, light input, tall trees, easy to walk in, mixed forest and deciduous elements. Questions were also asked about the pandemic's impact on outdoor habits and Peter replied that one can see a clear increase in outdoor activities especially for the group 16 – 24 years and that there are predominantly women among those who have started outdoor activities. Marten asked about links to sustainability and Peter replied that this is most clearly found through parts of research programs that deal with the impact on soil and water and how outdoor life can contribute.

10. Working Group 3 – Social and Contractorial Standard

Social standard (SWE 002, chapter 4)

Gender equality

Anna Schyman presented the amendment in the introductory paragraphs of the social standard (the approach) which includes an added paragraph "An equal and equal forest industry" and a change in the wording regarding the right of public access. Anna also showed the amendment in section 4.9.1 with requirements regarding equality and equality with reference to the Discrimination Act.

Eje Andersson presented proposed additions and changes regarding outdoor recreation (chapters 4 to 4.1.2) and commented that the wording with proposed changes gives a more positive tone and that it harmonizes well with the forest sector's goals.

4.7.2, workplace meetings (Anna Schyman)

From the working group there are two proposals, one to keep the current wording and a proposal to reduce the requirement from two workplace meetings per year to one per year. Participants were given a cooling-off period until the end of paragraph 10. The treatment of the issue is presented here.

Fredrik Sätter asked if it has been considered to have different levels of requirements depending on the number of employees. Per commented that the reason for lowering the requirement was that it has proved difficult to meet the requirement for two documented workplace meetings at companies with few employees. And that this leads to deviations that he said can be problematic to deal with. Martin considered

that nothing speaks for an improvement by lowering the requirement and sees no problem with the documentation.

The discussion ended and it was decided that both proposals be taken for future consultation.

4.7.3, performance appraisals (Anna Schyman)

The amendment is to use the term performance appraisals instead of performance reviews, to add requirements for appropriate documentation and the addition that employees have the right to individual conversations about so requested.

4.10, Forest competence and skills development (Per Eriksson)

Clarifications are proposed for the sections on protective drainage, ditch clearing and soil preparation (4.10.3 – 4.10.4). A major amendment is the new wording on the use of school classes and organisations with youth activities (4.10.9). It is also proposed to add calibration exercises for forest planners (4.11.5), to be carried out annually, and to the renewal of competence in nature value assessment (4.11.7) every five years.

Johanna Ydringer commented with a remark that the proposal regarding nature value assessment does not include annual calibration exercises as for forest planners and that it could possibly be added.

Regarding proposal 4.11.7, it was pointed out that the word conservation assessment is incorrectly used instead of nature value assessment.

Tomas Rahm discussed what calibration exercises for forest planners (4.11.5) include. Per replied that the group behind the proposal intended a delimitation to technical equipment for measurement but agreed that it could relate to much more, a calibration of the total knowledge for forest management planning.

SWE 003, The Contractorial Standard

Stefan Holmberg presented the proposal for adjusted wording in the introduction regarding different categories of Contractors. The amendment aims to make it clear that all contractors carrying out forest measures relevant to the compliance of the PEFC standard are covered.

4.3.4, reporting changes in activity (Stefan)

The proposal constitutes a new paragraph requiring the contractor to inform the umbrella organization when the business changes to direction or scope.

Fredrik Sätter asked if there is a need for a time limit for when the information should be provided. Stefan replied that this has been discussed but it was chosen not to set a time limit. Martin Klenz-Tornow added that through revisioning there will still be a check at least once a year.

Helena Lindén asked about how big a change it needs to be informed about. Kristoffer Englund clarified that it is changes in requirements that are crucial and took as an example that expanding with an employee can be of great importance if it is to go from zero to one employee.

4.3.9, reporting deviations (Stefan)

The proposal constitutes a new item regarding deviations from the standard that have arisen in the performance of assignments. Reporting must be made to the client.

4.6.1 – 4.6.2 Subcontractors (Stefan)

The basic requirement, that hired subcontractors must be PEFC certified or affiliated with a certified umbrella organization, lies in the current wording as second point (4.6.2) but is proposed now become the first item (4.6.1) with an addition that the main contractor has the responsibility to check that the hired subcontractor is PEFC certified.

4.7.5, preventive environmental requirements for soil damage (Stefan)

Since it has been considered within the working group that more needs to be done to avoid driving injuries, it is proposed to add a paragraph regarding this, that appropriate equipment (eg. load-bearing tapes, not digging at bare ground) and appropriate methodology should be used. The proposal clarifies this by referring to section 5.7 (Methods for protecting soil and water) of the forest standard. The proposal means, although not explicitly written, that performers must have the necessary competence in the field.

Per Eriksson commented that the problem of soil damage is one of the most important things for the forest industry to tackle and an area where requirements in the PEFC standard can play a decisive role.

11. Working Group 4 – Climate (Sofia Backéus)

Documentation from the climate group is included in the mailing for the working group meeting.

Sofia presented the working group. As a background, climate-related requirements were shown in the international PEFC standard (1003: 2018) with a focus on what has been added in this:

8.1.3 The standard requires that climate positive practices in management operations, such as green-house gas emission reductions and efficient use of resources shall be encouraged.

8.5.1 The standard requires that protective functions of forests for society, such as their potential role in erosion control, flood prevention, water purification, climate regulation, carbon sequestration and other regulating or supporting ecosystem services shall be maintained or enhanced.

Climate-related issues can also be found in collected data from organizations involved in the revision process.

The climate area spans several of the Swedish PEFC standards and the working group has not, like other working groups, had given standard parts to go through. The work has been structured into three subgroups with the following areas:

- o substitution, including biomass for energy
- o efficient use of resources
- o forest management

Within these, important sub-areas have been identified and worked on. Text proposals exist for the part substitution and biomass for energy, texts that are intended to be included in SWE 001. These were presented. Within the efficient use of resources and forest management, there are proposals for points to work on. Efficient use of resources (climate-positive practice):

- o Cross-cutting
- o Machine quality
- o Driving style and idling

- o Decarbonisation
- o Minimising skidding skars

Forest Management

- o High and stable production
- o Creating resilient forests
- o Adaptation to climate change

Quantification of carbon sequestration by forest holdings has been an issue that has been discussed but considered difficult to move forward but at present.

Anna Schyman raised the problem of conditions (legislation, supply of biofuels, etc.) is rapidly changing and that the standard will apply for five years. Sofia replied that it is a challenge and that it is important to formulate requirements taking this into account. Mårten commented that this is important and that there is an ongoing legislative process within the EU that needs to be taken into account while the standard should be able to stand.

PerArne Nordholts argued that the wording on substitution should also include climate-affecting materials that are not fossil.

Mårten addressed the quantification of soil carbon and problems surrounding this. Sofia commented that it is important to stick to things that are scientifically based, other things should not be included.

Sara Rindeskog wanted feedback from the consultation for guidance on which indicators should be worked on, what to put gunpowder on and not.

For further work, cooperation between the working groups is needed. Proposals regarding this were presented and commented on positively. The matter continued to be dealt with under paragraph 17.

Sofia asked about documentation regarding the treatment of climate issues in the Norwegian and Finnish revision. Christina undertook to demand this.

12. Seminar: The forest management plan of the future

Frederick Walter, Dianthus

Fredrik presented the company, its products and services. Much of the information needed in a forest management plan can be produced fully automatically. First, the traditional procedure of developing a forest management plan (to the point): You have boots, realscopes and altimeters, go out into the forest, take inventory departmentally and compile a plan in binder after which over time the plan becomes mossy. This is something you want to get away from in order for the plan to become a living document with greater accessibility for various stakeholders.

For the data collection of the future, new technology has been developed or is underway. It was shown a mechanical dog that can be equipped with sensors and run around and collect a lot of the data for which today an inventory is needed. Sensors on all kinds of machines are another possibility (already available today) and people who move in the forest for inventory can also be equipped with sensors.

Automated stock mapping can today be done by combining laser data, satellite images, soil moisture map from SLU and known property boundaries. Such a

detachment gives possession, average diameter, foundation area, tree height, boniness and an approximate age. Individual larger trees can be identified and it is also possible to get suggestions for appropriate action. Methods exist to identify and measure individual trees (drone, mobile phone). Currently, however, assessments in the forest are required to deal with natural values, ancient and cultural remains and areas of particular importance for outdoor life and recreation.

Eje asked about the time required to produce a forest management plan automatically for a property of 100 hectares. It takes "a few hours" according to Fredrik, but it is then precisely for the automatic part and that there is a need for supplementary inventory and assessments in the field.

13. Seminar: Alternative methods including continuity forestry

Johan Sonesson, Skogforsk

Johan initially described the five forest management systems clear-cutting, high-screen, edge cutting, hatch cutting and browsing. All of them are developed with the basic idea that the development of the forest should be something so close to predictable in order to know how much can be sustainably harvested. Forest management for increased complexity is covered in the book *A Critique of Silviculture*. More intensive forest management basically means more homogeneous forests, the extreme case is pure plantations. Conversely, over time, an unmanaged forest becomes increasingly varied. Clear-cutting is somewhere in between these extremes with the limitation of heterogeneity by felling trees at a relatively young age. Clear-cutting with general consideration is a step towards more complex forests and more powerful consideration gives increased complexity, but there is a limit to how far to reach with this forest management system and to go further something else is needed: hatch chopping, edge chopping, screens or scrolling. The term "Close to nature" is different from all the systems described above and involves making as little intervention as possible, just fell mature trees and leave the rest to the natural processes. For boreal conditions, Finnish researchers propose to mimic the natural processes through disturbances that provide a natural rejuvenation phase and younger forest (competitive phase), not just old forest, to also manage old forest, partly clear-cut, and to create variety through gaps, screens, etc.

In conclusion, Johan presented the question of whether more natural forests also provide more ecosystem services and replied that this is probably true but that one can also ask whether such forests provide what is needed in terms of people's needs incl. climate issue.

Fredrik Sätter asked about the Finnish researchers' proposed method and how it goes with the production. Johan replied that the method involves the management of older forests with relatively low growth and that you clearly lose in timber production. Johan added that with all natural rejuvenation opts out of refined seedlings and with this gets clearly lower growth (10 – 20%). Mårten asked how robust refined material is compared to natural. Johan replied that moving planting material according to recommendations is probably the best way to face climate change and also mentioned thoughts that exist about finding methods to use refined material in a clear-cut system.

Sture Karlsson asked about the risks of alternative forest management systems in terms of rejuvenation results and calamities. Johan responded with reference to a recent report (Peter Högberg et al.) that available nitrogen in the soil decreases with a more northerly location and thus the possibility of success with clear-cut methods. Rikard Klingberg asked if it is seen on the

nutritional issue in connection with alternative methods. Johan replied that the report (Högberg et al.) have results that are relevant and good to absorb .

14. Working Group 2 - Production and environment

Representatives of the working group reviewed the amendments in SWE 002 (the forest standard), chapters 3 and 5.

Game (Tomas Rahm) 3. 11

An addition is proposed so that the possibility for the forest owner to influence can be taken into account when carrying out a revision, as this depends on the size of the forest holding, etc.

3.12

It is proposed that the quality-assured methods be deleted and new text on grazing trees be added. (The concept of pasture-prone trees is taken to the standard's glossary.)

Landscape Ecology (Helena Lindén) 3. 13

The change is created as the current text has been considered unclear.

Prioritization of provisions (Fredrik Sätter)

5.1.3.

The term '*high nature value*' is proposed to be introduced (paragraph 1) on the grounds that key biotopes will not continue to be used for the corresponding areas .

Under point 2, in the current writing, there are *objects* with *natural* values, which is an accepted concept (SKS) and now it is proposed to supplement with the expression "areas *with* corresponding values " .

In order for the wording to be easily understandable, the reader needs to know that *objects* with *natural values* are a concept with specified meaning. It shall be ensured that this concept is included in the glossary of the standard (secretariat). There is an idea to have a special marking in standard text for used terms that are in the dictionary. Suggestions for better wording were welcomed.

Under item 3, it is proposed to supplement the area designated areas in the regional plan (from the county administrative board). Helena Lindén explained that this was intentionally put in point three so as not to be prioritized lower than other objects in the same point.

Conservation tree (Tomas Rahm)

5.3.3.

Additions are proposed to allow the felling of conservation trees when such is at risk of damaging ancient monuments or other cultural-historical remains, which is a synchronization with target images. It is also proposed to use the broader concept of overhead lines instead of power lines.

Deciduous stocks (Helena Lindén)

5.4.1.

An addition is proposed to aim for higher leaf admixture on lands where there is no prerequisite to achieve deciduous populations, something that is more common in northern parts of the country. (The word *described* should not be underlined.)

Dead wood (Tomas Rahm)

5.5.1 to 5.5.3 and 5.5.6

Changes proposed are to clarify and clarify.

Forest Management Plan

(Helene Larsson) SWE002.

Appendix 1

Proposed changes are comprehensive and developed to express technology-neutral requirements regarding how data is collected and information is provided and updated and with this open to both traditional plan on paper and digital variant with continuous updating. More about this can be found as a comment in the standard draft that is sent out before the working group meeting.

Work instruction (Helene Larsson)

Proposed changes include moving the appendix from SWE 004 to SWE 002 as Appendix 2. As for forest management plans, proposed changes are extensive and aimed at technology neutrality. The amendment is commented on in the standard draft sent for the Working group meeting.

Kolbjörn Kindströmer stated that it must be clear what should be included in a work instruction. Helene replied that the writing is to be able to adapt the information to what is relevant to the assignment.

Kolbjörn suggested specifying "in good time" what the parties had agreed on.

Magnus Lindberg argued that requirements that include expressions such as "work for" and "strive for", or similar, are problematic to revise from the outside and that requirements should be sharper. If one is afraid that a requirement is too high under certain conditions, it is better to set a lower requirement and apply it to everyone.

Hampus stated on the area of Gamelife, paragraph 3.11, that he was not satisfied with the new wording, that the proposed amendment does not make it easier to revise and that the text should remain as it is. Tomas Rahm replied that the intention of the change proposal was to be able to take better account of the conditions when revisioning. Lindberg pointed to the expression "work for" and considered it better to have demands that express actions to take.

Anneli Sandström wondered about the handling of questions received regarding reindeer husbandry. Fredrik replied that a subgroup within working group 2 has had this area on its table, but unfortunately the reindeer herding representative has not actively participated in the work. Only a few changes of the most editorial type have been discussed, no major issues.

Per Eriksson asked about the concept of key biotopes and its continued use. Fredrik Sätter replied that the term will remain because objects classified as such will to remain as such even if no new objects with the designation are added.

Kolbjörn stated regarding work instructions that introduced new technology must work, the Contractor may not have it, and that this happens sometimes. Not only can you come up with new technology, but it requires effort. Tomas Rahm commented that parties need to agree on the technology that will be used.

15. Working Group 1 – Systems and structure (Anneli Sandström)

The composition of the working group was presented. The working group's area is within the standards SWE 001, SWE 004 and SWE 005 and was described as the system's whole, division of roles and responsibilities and to take into account requirements in the international standard.

The division of roles between actors was described.

Anneli presented the amendments regarding:

SWE005

Requirements for the competence of the revisionor, 5.1

Presumed large deviation of another actor, 6.1.1. Purpose and conduct of the revision, 6.1 – 6.1.2

SWE004

Signing and signing of contracts, 4.3.1.1 – 2 and 4.5.1.1 – 2

Umbrella organization information to group members during contract period, 4.3.1.4 and 4.5.1.4 Accounting of group members on the umbrella organization's website, 4.3.3.5 and 4.5.1.9 Handling of major deviations in the case of multiple umbrella organisations involved 4.3.1.10 – 11 Responsibility of group members to notify major deviation from other umbrella organisation; 4.4.1.13

Umbrella organisations sampling, 4.3.2.5

Handling of unresolved minor deviations,

Appendix 1 Grounds for termination,

Appendix 1

Withdrawal period for reconnection after termination, Appendix 1

Obligation for certified to notify changes in its operations, 4.4.3.2 and 4.6.1.3

Planting assignments to school classes and organizations with foreign activities 3.2.1.9 and 4.4.1.7 (also in SWE 002, 4.10.9)

Sara Rindeskog asked if the waiting period for reconnection applies to contractors. Anneli replied that the amendment only applies to forest owners, that this was considered sufficient to meet the requirements of the international standard and that an application in general would in principle, impose a business ban on Contractors who are excluded.

Per Eriksson asked the proposal regarding the treatment of uncorrected minor deviations applies to contractors and, if so, the deadline for remediation. Anneli replied that it applies to all group members and there is no specified deadline for these particular cases, that this is the umbrella organization's routines.

Johanna Ydringer asked about sampling within forest owner umbrellas, that at least 25 percent should be taken at random. Anneli clarified that it is believed that 25 percent of the total number to be withdrawn should be chosen randomly.

Fredrik Sätter asked about the limit *a price base amount* that is set for the participation of school classes and organizations with youth activities. Anneli replied that the limit in the proposal is set based on an assessment of what may be appropriately limited scope. It was clarified by later question that the amount limit is per client. Fredrik asked about larger forest owners and their opportunities to have several assignments in different places.

Anneli went on to present the following ongoing and upcoming issues:

- o Certificates of logging organizations, clarification of what is covered, information in certificates and their searchability
- o Glossary of definitions
- o Update of introductory texts in SWE 001 on Swedish forests, legislation, etc.
- o International requirements elements according to High Level

Structure (HLS)

- o ISO 14001 requirements for umbrella organizations (or not)
- o Possibility for forest owners to share the certification among several umbrella organizations
- o The system's entirety and interface between actors, etc.

Fredrik asked about the certifier's (external auditor) audit of umbrella organizations' internal audits (SWE 005, 6.1.2), if for such an appointment must be booked with the external auditor when internal audit is to be carried out. Anneli replied that it does not need to be done for everyone but for a number of the internal audits.

16. Decision on initial consultation

Decisions:

Updated standards with marked amendments, the list of remaining items and today's adjusted minutes will be published online in October for comments.

Comments: The climate group would like guidance on which proposals and issues to work on further.

17. Decisions regarding continued work

Decisions:

The working groups continue to work on planned issues.

The secretariat and group chairmen propose a model for how climate issues are further integrated into existing groups

- o taking into account the guidance provided by the consultation
- o with broad representation and stakeholders represented.

Comments and questions

Christina added that the online material will also contain instructions on how to submit comments.

Mårten commented that the process is running well and has led to well-worked proposals.

Hampus Blomstrand asked if proposals for points where there has been disagreement should also be included in the consultation. Christina replied yes, that this can be done as this consultation does not require the working group to stand behind the proposals made. The decision on consultation means that the documentation produced is considered sufficient for the process to now continue with a first opportunity to submit comments. A formal public consultation of a more finished standard proposal will come later in the process.

Fredrik Sätter asked the question of how it should be made known that documentation is laid out for consultation. Christina replied that the PEFC office should send clear signals about this.

18. The meeting ended

Mårten thanked the secretariat, working groups, meeting participants and speakers and concluded the meeting.

Secretary: Hans Weslien

Adjusted by e-mail by: Helene Larsson Anders Hjerpe Mårten Larsson

Deltagare

Anders Ehrenström	Sydved
Andreas Rastbäck	Holmen Forest
Anna Schyman	NYKS
Anneli Sandström	Prosilva
Annelie Johansson	Association Spillkråkan
Christina Lundgren	Swedish PEFC
Ebbe Lindberg	SEC and Skogsentreprenörerna
Eje Andersson	Svenskt friluftsliv
Elin Sunesdotter	LRF Skogsägarna
Erica Pershagen	Stora Enso Skog
Erika Alm	Stora Enso Skog
Fredrik sets	the Diocese's Property Administrations Association
Hampus Blomstrand	Stora Enso Skog
Hans Weslien	Swedish PEFC
Helena Lindén	Norra Skog
Helene Larsson	Prosilva
Jessica Nordin	South
Joacim Ingelsson	Swedish Orienteering Federation
Johanna Ydringer	BillerudKorsnäs
Jonathan Lundberg	GS-union
Karin Ewelönn	GS-union
Kolbjörn Kindströmer	SEC and Skogsentreprenörerna
Kristoffer Englund	GS-union
Lars Nilsson	Mellanskog
Lisa Holmgren	Swedish PEFC
Magnus Lindberg	GS-union
Malin M. Johansson	Stora Enso Skog
Martin Klenz-Tornow	Prosilva
Mats Remsö	Pancert
Mats-Erik Larsson	SEC and Skogsentreprenörerna
Maud Petri Rådström	Gröna arbetsgivare
Morgen Yngvesson	SCA Forest
Mårten Larsson	Chairman of the Working group
Nicklas Samils	Swedish Association of Rural Forests
Niklas Fogdestam	Sydved
Per Eriksson	ECSkog
PerArne Nordholt's	Såg i Syd
Rickard Klingberg	Jordägarna
Ronnie Andersson	ECSkog
Sara Karlsson	Norra Skog
Sara Rindeskog	Holmen Forest
Sebastian Lindqvist	SEC and Skogsentreprenörerna
Sofia Backéus	LRF Skogsägarna
Sofie Petersson	ECSkog
Sophia Bergkvist	SEC and Skogsentreprenörerna
Staffan Mattsson	Skogssällskapet
Stefan Holmberg	Norra Skog
Sture Karlsson	Swedish PEFC, Chairman
Thomas Löwenberg	Swedish PEFC
Tomas Johansson	Stiftens Egendomsförvaltningars Association
Tomas Rahm	Södra
Tony Axelsson	Såg i Syd
Ulf Silvander	Svenskt friluftsliv
Åsa Öhman	Mellanskog

Material from task forces and the secretariat

PEFC SWE 002 to task force2 2021-09-3

PEFC SWE 003 to Working group 2 2021-09-23

PEFC SWE 004 to Working group 2 2021-09-23

PEFC SWE 005 to Working group 2 2021-09-23

Basis climate group

Board Working groups Organizations PEFC standard revision 2021-09-23

Remaining issues working group 2 2021-09-23

:

PEFC Standard Revision TD V

Working group meeting 3 2021-11-24, at. 09 – 16, Teams Minutes

1. Opening of the meeting

Mårten Larsson, chairman of the working group, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants.

2. Notification of notes from today's meeting

Hans Weslien, PEFC's standard revision secretariat, was elected meeting secretary.

3. Persons for approval of the Minutes

Per Eriksson and Anna Schyman were elected.

4. Notes of those present

Participants were pulled from the list in Teams and displayed in Appendix 1.

5. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved.

6. The procedure – Schedule and other information

Christina Lundgren described the procedure and purpose of the working group meeting.

The standard revision process and the written procedure can be found on the PEFC website and comments on the procedure and process are welcome.

There have been about 170 comments from the general consultation, quite a few to the climate working group and fairly evenly distributed among the other working groups. The working groups have reviewed all the comments received. Some comments have been made without action, then with justification for this. Others have led to action in the form of new or adjusted amendments. Some are meant to be considered and work for this is underway.

The working groups have reviewed all the comments thoroughly, and under some time pressure. Well done, Christina thought.

The working group's task for this meeting:

- Take part in research and current knowledge via Seminars
- Take note of the comments received and the working groups' handling
- Take part in further work in the working groups.

The basis for the meeting (sent out in connection with the notice):

- Standard draft for SWE 002 (forest standard) and for SWE 003

(contractor standard) with the amendments that went to the general consultation in October and some subsequent amendments.

- Chapter 6, Revision from SWE 005 with amendments.
- EXCEL file with all comments received with note of processing, Appendix 2.

7. Working Group 2 – Production and environment

Christina presented the composition of the group. Subsequently, the standard draft for SWE 002, chapters 3 and 5, was reviewed. Representatives of the working group commented on the added amendments in this document:

5.1.5. Disposal of other wooded land

5.3.1. Natural value trees and special purpose overcrowding

5.5.3. That trees that have been actively damaged may be counted as dead wood

Annex 1, Forest Management Management Plan – Appendix on updating in the event of changes in PEFC requirements

Appendix 2, Work instruction – regarding information on map, is distinguished (that position should be indicated).

Anneli Sandström asked regarding the forest management plan if the new standard proposal contains new PEFC requirements to take into account in future plan updates. Helene Larsson replied that there are some proposals that affect the forest management plan.

Questions for further discussion

Concepts regarding nature values - Key biotope, stocks of key biotope quality, corresponding values, high nature values Rickard Klingberg

Rickard mentioned, with reference to PEFC's consultation response to the forest inquiry, that PEFC is not dependent on the key biotope concept or the method for nature value assessment used and that it. Therefore, it may be strange to have the concept of a key biotope in the standard. He suggested that the requirement should be expressed as first setting aside areas with the highest natural values, at least 5% of the area, secondarily possible developable natural values and thirdly share with social values. This is still discussed in the working group and Rickard has discussed the proposal to SCA (who asked the question in the consultation).

Stefan Holmberg supported the reasoning. Tomas Rahm was also positive but asked if the group had discussed whether the minimum requirement of 5% should also apply to properties with a high proportion of high nature values. Rickard replied that one way to deal with such cases is that what is beyond 5% is seen as society's commitment with the possibility of redemption when such areas are considered valuable enough for this. Christina commented, speaking of the key biotope concept, that the rule (2 years of council room) that exists today for ev. Redemption is linked to registered key biotopes and that this rule may therefore need to be reviewed. Anneli pondered the application when several different methods of

nature value assessment are used on the same property. Rickard replied that he will take the issue with him in the continued work.

Eje Andersson asked if the at least 5% to be set aside can include social values (exv. an electric light trail) and Rickard replied that it is possible (social values can be set aside if natural values are missing).

Other care methods Babs Stuiver

The group will update wordings on other management methods and it will be clarified that PEFC requirements apply regardless of the form of use. The Swedish Forest Agency has recently come up with a new definition of clear-cut that should be taken into account.

Control methods Tomas Rahm

Comments from the consultation are that the ban should remain in place under the 2019 decision. Dropping the ban that is now in force is not positive in terms of confidence in the PEFC system. But there is also the point of view that there should be opportunities to use chemical treatment of seedlings in extreme situations. Most important is considered to be to have the possibility of finishing where mechanical protection has not worked. Finishing is a measure that needs to be put in place within one or a few days when there has been a problem, so if the intervention requires a special decision, such a able to be taken very quickly. The ban today applies to the chemical treatment of seedlings. In continued work, regulation is also looked at more generally, including other chemical control.

Perarne Nordholts considered a ban or not to be an important policy issue for PEFC. The issue includes users' handling of chemicals and a ban would lead to some production losses and correspondingly lost carbon sequestration. One question for Tomas was whether there are follow-ups that highlight the consequences of the ban that exists. Tomas replied that there are results from follow-ups from several years with the result about 75% survival after 3 years as an average but it is not possible based on this say something about the degree to which a ban has had an impact.

3.11 Game Hampus Blomstrand

An expanded development group will continue to work to try to reach a consensus and will involve the forestry Gamelife group.

Information and consideration regarding species Helena Lindén

The view received from the consultation is that information about known red-listed species should be collected and taken into account in forest management planning and tract planning. The subgroup has begun to look at the issue. To some extent, this is present in the nature value assessment today, but a clearer wording may perhaps be needed.

5.4.1 Deciduous trees Helene Larsson

According to the point of view of the consultation, the change publisher needs to be clarified, the wording can be perceived as contradictory. The subgroup looks at this further.

Production and climate issues

Babs Stuiver commented regarding the production issues that the work continues and will be done in collaboration with the climate group.

Other

Mårten asked if there are criteria and methods for assessing social values. Richard replied he was not familiar with such methods and that the subgroup that looks at the question of priorities for provisions takes the question with it. Babs commented that the target images exist as benchmarks. (Note to the minutes of the PEFC Office: In order for social values to be counted as voluntary provision in the PEFC standard, the area must be identified in the forest management plan based on high utilization rates, high experience qualities and good accessibility and reachability.)

8. Presentation – Foreign labour Anna-Lena Norberg, Stop cheating

A study of the construction market in the EU showed that at least 3/4 of foreign-registered companies violate laws and agreements in some way. Cheating is also widespread in other industries, even in other sectors in healthcare.

The cheating applies to salary, working hours, taxes, social security contributions, insurance, pension and reporting to the posting register.

For review, various parameters can be compared:

Number of workers in the posting register Number of workers registered in the Fora
Number of annual employees in the annual report Turnover in different countries
(share in Sweden) Number of annual workers in the posting register Salary in
annual report
Salary reported to Fora

Then make analysis based on current legislation and agreements. There are a lot of rules to consider, not just Swedish. Larger companies may have an expert, smaller companies should hire help.

The Posting Register is a register with the Swedish Work Environment Authority where all foreign-registered companies are required by law to report their employees working in Sweden. A company that hires a foreign-registered company that has not made this registration may face a fine, if reporting to the Swedish Work Environment Authority is not made within three days.

One way to cheat is to give low pay plus tax-free statutory allowance ("the Baltic cheating variant"). However, the new Posting of Workers Directive has begun to bring changes.

The "fake Contractor variant" exists in several European countries, the biggest problem is in Slovakia. There, there are high social security contributions (47.8%), which means that workers are not hired but forced to start their own business (involuntary Contractorship). In Slovakia, it is illegal to hire self-employed under employment-like conditions, but this is happening to a significant extent. It is widespread in other countries as well, forced by high social security contributions. Occurrence in Sweden

can be checked by comparing the number of employees according to annual reports with the number according to the posting register.

Anna-Lena pointed out what applies in the case of so-called. permanent establishment: That activities lasting three months within a period of three years are normally considered to be permanent establishments, meaning that the company becomes "swept up" and As a result, among other things, that tax is to be paid in Sweden.

In Sweden, there are several hundred thousand "guest workers" according to the Swedish Tax Agency's estimate. It is cheaper to hire them than to hire Swedish labor for whom it becomes more difficult to get work, which means that more subsidies need to be given and hence higher taxes.

Anders Hjerpe asked about how much supplier review is done in the construction industry and was told that it is coming more and more through demands from banks.

Fredrik Sätter asked about access to the posting register and received an answer that it is available on the internet but that it is also possible to order extracts from the Swedish Work Environment Authority and such an extract is available as an EXCEL file (which may require some work, Anna-Lena's company may be hired).

Martin Klenz-Tornow asked if there is any link collection to help check possible cheating in connection with revisions of Contractorial companies and Anna-Lena replied that she can help him with this.

Magnus Lindberg mentioned that many foreign workers are not EU citizens, the majority of seasonal workers (especially those who set the plane) are Ukrainians or Thais and are missing in the posting register. They can be employed by a Swedish Contractorial company. He also said that collective bargaining is bad in the forestry sector. Anna-Lena commented that the requirement for registration in the posting register also applies to workers from third countries.

Anneli Sandström asked if it is important for compliance with the regulations, what kind of foreign and domestic labor it is at a company. Ann-Lena replied that Swedish companies have found pure discrimination based on nationality (the construction industry). Anneli also asked about what is being done at the authority level and if there are gaps that may need to be focused on PEFC within its revision and review. Anna-Lena replied that there is a lot that needs to be done and, regarding authorities, that her company works with support materials for the Procurement Authority for the area of construction and civil engineering. Magnus Lindberg filled in that the Procurement Authority, in collaboration with Gröna arbetsgivare and GS, has prepared support and instructions for the procurement of forest services.

9. Working Group 3 – Social and Contractorial Standard

Anna Schyman presented the composition of the group. Subsequently, the standard draft for SWE 002, Chapter 4 and SWE 003 was reviewed. Representatives of the

working group Showed and commented on the added amendments to these documents and ongoing issues.

SWE002

Added amendments

Chapter 4, introduction – Adjustment of previous amendments, abridged text.

4.1 Taking into account social values, recreation and outdoor recreation - Adjustment of previous amendments, shortened clarified text.

Babs Stuiver brought up the used expression dialogue and its meaning and wondered if this was so good in the context as there are many unidentified concerned. Joacim Ingelsson said that it does not mean dialogue with individual practitioners, but e.g. organizations representing them, that the chosen word is good. Babs saw risk of different interpretation and unintended expectations and wanted it to be thought about further. Eje continued to welcome dialogue () and Anna Schyman welcomed Babs to participate in the working group's continued work. Eje added that dialogue and other terms regarding communication are intended to be included in the standard's glossary.

4.6.1 Insurance – Addendum regarding liability insurance and occupational injury.

4.7.2 Workplace meetings – The working group has agreed on a new proposal based on the two previous ones.

4.7.3 Performance appraisals – Text in previous proposals for individual performance appraisals is deleted.

4.10.9 Competence - Addendum on management and supervision in the use of school classes and organisations with ungdom activities.

Fredrik Sätter asked about the proposed amount limit a price base amount that is linked to the hiring of school classes and organizations with youth activities. Christina replied that it is an ongoing issue within working group 1 due to comments received.

Ongoing questiona

4.4.1 Proposal that business agreements should be designed according to ABSE Anna Schyman A subgroup is appointed to work with requirements regarding business agreements.

SWE003

Added amendments

4.3.5, revisionor's access to documentation, etc.

4.7.3, lubricant requirements.

Tomas Rahm raised the idea of applying certain lubricant requirements also to forest owners (who are self-employed are exempt from certain requirements of the contractor standard) and that this could be something to look at more. Perhaps there are low-hanging fruits for reduced environmental impact, eg. requirements for vegetable saw chain oil.

4.8.2, dangerous goods packaging .

Ongoing issues

Chapter 3, introduction – Contractorial categories Per Eriksson and Martin Klenz-Tornow

In the amendment to the consultation, a fourth category was added "Other contractor". On this it was submitted that this may be problematic because the categories form the basis for internal audit (sampling frequency) and that the group can be very small . Work is being done on a proposal with three categories, the fourth of which incorporates the three existing ones.

Other

4.7.5. Preventive environmental requirements (preventing soil damage during drifting)

Anna Schyman Morgen Yngvesson

The point of view is that this paragraph (new) with reference to the forest standard (5.7.5) is unnecessary. Based on the importance of the issue, the Working Group considers that a reference is appropriate.

10. Presentation – Soil carbon balance Peter Högberg, SLU

Peter has worked with nitrogen metabolism and carbon turnover in forest ecosystems for almost 40 years. His presentation is partly based on new results that will come in a report from the Swedish Forest Agency. He said that today there is a lot of discussion in the area and probably some confusion and that it is important that you are clear about what it is you are talking about. if so that it is not misunderstood.

Peter's presentation, Carbon balance of managed and uncultivated forests, began with a description of the balance between the uptake of CO₂ by photosynthesis and the release through tree respiration and degradation of organic matter. A large part of the uptake is counteracted by the emission, but in total over time there is a net uptake in our forests but much less than the total uptake by photosynthesis. At night, it is predominantly respiration and in experiments (Svartberget) an increased content of CO₂ in the atmosphere at 85 m altitude at night has been found. It even swings over the year. The variations over days and years are much greater than the global trend, which is an increase of 2–3 ppm per year. Great variation over the year is associated with northern location (Alaska great variation, near the equator very small).

Forests in the northern hemisphere are significant carbon sinks, but does forest management matter – Are managed forests weaker carbon sinks than unused ones?

Peter showed a correlation, according to data for 1990 – 2017 within an IBFRA project, between forest management intensity (share of carbon stock harvested per year) and share of the area that burns per year. In Sweden and Finland, where 1.5% of the

carbon stock is harvested annually, a very small proportion of the forest burned per year: 0.01 and 0.01 respectively. 0.003%. In Alaska, Canada and Russia with 0– 0.3% annual harvest of the carbon stock, 0.5– 0.6% of the forest land burned per year.

Before the forest gained industrial value (c. 1850), fires were much more common, about 1% of the area per year according to estimates made (central Fennoscandia). Now in Sweden it is close to zero (0.01% as above). Peter commented that through the media you can get the impression that there is more fire.

Peter further highlighted the importance of different farming intensity for the carbon stores in trees over time. For Sweden, Finland and Norway with high consumption intensity, the carbon stock has clearly increased during the period 1990 – 2017. For Canada and Russia with lower milling intensity, a slight increase appeared for the same period. For Alaska with minimal milling intensity, coal stocks decreased (results with data to 2008). The answer from the study is that more intense Farming leads to greater carbon storage in trees and this also counted after extraction through felling. The extraction through harvesting also enables carbon storage in forest products and that forest products can replace emission-intensive products. The uncultivated forest loses large amounts of carbon through fires, both from the trees and from the ground.

The next issue addressed was carbon losses from the ground during clear-cutting. In clear-cutting, the forest goes from being a carbon sink to being a source but this does not necessarily mean that soil carbon is lost to a significant extent, Carbon source becomes the trees' uptake of CO₂ becomes drastically smaller and in a short time it is a lot of accumulated plant material that decomposes. Large losses of soil carbon are known mainly from warmer and more humid ecosystems, tropical forests, etc. For Sweden, through a nationwide land inventory, there is very extensive data that shows that there is a certain storage of carbon in the soil, together all forests over time. When asked about possibly reduction of soil carbon after 100 years, Peter replied that one cannot state such of the results from the land inventory, but the basic message is that there are not so big changes over time in most of the Swedish forest land.

The soil system gets more carbon because the forests grow better. The carbon storage in the soil after the last ice age has been about 7 kg per hectare per year. Today, the level is 100 kg per hectare on mineral soil. For trees and land together, carbon sequestration is about 400 kg per hectare per year in managed boreal forests. However, if peatland is drained, there is significant release from the ground of methane and nitrous oxide, which for the greenhouse effect is significantly worse than CO₂.

Browse was the dominant management in Sweden until before 1950 but has been replaced by rotational forestry. The area of forest aged 0–50 years and the timber stock has increased sharply between 1955 and 2017. A large part of the growth and increase in the wood supply during the period has been in the younger forest. It is the growth that provides carbon sequestration. Trees and land are carbon stores.

In Sweden and Finland, there has been discussion about whether rotational forestry should be replaced by continuous cover forestry. In both countries, direct comparisons (experiments on the same land) show approximately 20% lower production in blasted forests. On nutrient-rich peatlands, however, browsing may be better in terms of greenhouse effect due to the release of methane and nitrous oxide from the ground.

Peter showed examples of results from models for timber production when browsing and considered that the results are at unreasonably high levels and urged attention to what results were presented based on, empirical data or models based on assumptions, and avsejades with the fact that in today's polarized debate there is too little discussion about why one considers oneself to know what you think you know! Sara Rindeskog turned this question to Peter (why he thinks he knows...) and Peter replied that this is the question one as an expert in a field must always ask oneself in order to be able to push the boundaries of knowledge and that in these times are important to nurture science and brought up the so-called. The Dunning-Kruger effect.

Jessica Nordin asked how much of the coal supply burns up in different countries. For that area, Peter recommended an essay by Lena Gustafsson et al. (Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research 2019) about the "Västmanland fire". In this there are estimates of carbon stores and how much disappeared and that was a lot. However, fires are variable. Lighter ground fires consume mainly parts of the marten stock, while so-called "marten fires" are consumed. Gigafires often are peak fires that kill many trees and burn off the marten layer completely. Nevertheless, there is a very big difference in the effect of fires on the carbon balance depending on the intensity of use.

Peter added that the reduction of fires from about 1850 associated with transitioning more intensive forestry is well documented. Recommended essay: Wallenius, T. in Silva Fennica 2011.

Per Eriksson asked if there are also measurements regarding biodiversity for the period of strongly increased growth (1950-). Peter replied that others within SLU work in that area and that there are results for certain parameters from the National Forest Inventory (eg. amount of dead wood, tree species and proportion of old forest). Rikard Klingberg commented, with reference to Dag Lindgren (SLU), that a large part of the disappearance of species can be linked to the cessation of forest grazing and less to the transition to tract farming. Rickard asked about how quickly a transition to not using the forest would lead to more fires and got an answer, among other things, a. that the resources available for fighting fires are of great importance.

Eje asked about today's debate about forests and the level of knowledge in this and what SLU is doing to reach out with knowledge. Peter replied that there are future platforms ("Future Forests") that function as arenas where different points of view come forward and are discussed and that it is important to have a substantial internal discussion but also a discussion that reaches out to the community.

Under the item below (11) came another question to Peter. Hans Weslien asked for a comment on a claim heard in the debate: That clear-felling leads to the death of mycorrhizal in the ground and that this seriously impairs for the conditions of new

trees on the same soil. Peter replied that this is not true: Much of the mycelium dies but parts survive. The dying off provides nutrients (nitrogen) to the soil which makes the new trees grow much better and gradually the mycelium grows and new mycorrhiza is established on the new trees.

11. Working Group 4 - Climate Sofia Backéus

From the general consultation, there have been relatively few comments. Sofia showed these (the Excel file with received feedback) with a note about the working group's handling and described the intended way of working for collaboration with other working groups.

Among the comments received during the consultation was that climate issues should be dealt with at the government level. Sofia commented on this by saying that the international PEFC standard has requirements that the climate issue be handled. Otherwise, the comments received support what was presented at the previous working group meeting.

Cooperation with other working groups is initiated through the participation of representatives from the climate group in the meetings of other working groups.

Mr Morgen told Working Group 3, the social and Contractorial standards sections, that it is good that the climate group is joining the work on these parts to weave in their views. Anneli Sandström was also responsible for working group 1, part system and structure. She added that it is important to have a good basis for the standard's direction regarding the climate issue.

Stefan Holmberg believed that it needs to be emphasized the importance of forest management and increasing production and that it is important to get sufficiently clear wordings in the standard that support this. The most important effort is to ensure that the forest grows even more. Sofia replied that the working group has this as a starting point and sees this as important and sees opportunities for reconciliation.

Gert mentioned that an important part is to clarify the system view you start from – the forest ecosystem and long rotation times, not exv. individual logging – as well as substitution effects such as "difficult nut" with varying views from different camps about how large these are. Anna Schyman mentioned that PEFC can make important contributions through information to the public for better understanding.

Sture Karlsson mentioned that PEFC in Sweden and the Nordic countries have pushed to include climate as a parameter in the standard and it is important to work seriously for to get this parameter into different standard parts by working from a scientific basis and clarifying the starting points.

The working group supported the climate group's continued working methods in order to include and take into account climate aspects in other working groups' parts of the standard.

12. Working Group 1 – Systems and structure Anneli Sandström

12.1. Action on the basis of comments received

Anneli Sandström showed the measures that the working group intends to take based on the points of view received.

- Comments received on definitions are included as a basis for updating the definition list in the portal document SWE 001. (A substandard that was not included in the general consultation.)
- Order of standard requirements and repetition of the same requirement elements in several sub-standards reviewed.
- Suggestions or comments on wording (e.g. Appendix 1 Deviation management group members). The review is based on the proposals received.
- The proposal that forest owner umbrellas should report affiliated forest owner certificates on their website left without action. (The proposal for the consultation was that this requirement be introduced in SWE 004 for group certification of logging organizations and contractors.)
- Some comments concern standard requirements that have arisen from changes in international requirements that must be dealt with in the Swedish standard and these comments are therefore in most cases left without action.
- The supplement concerning the use of school classes and organisations with youth activities has received positive feedback but there are comments about the proposed limitations in scope and type of action, that they are too restrictive. These comments are under consideration.
- Questions and comments regarding external audit of group certificates are taken into account and wording reviewed. The working group's proposals are dealt with under item 12.3.

12.2 Answers to questions received

Anneli showed a table with comments/questions and the group's answers to these (excerpt from the EXCEL file sent as a basis for the working group meeting).

Johanna Ydringer raised the issue of self-monitoring (SWE 004, 4.5.1.10), about being able to request various verifications in the follow-up. Per Eriksson (EC Forest's Contractor umbrella) said that verifications are reviewed within the sample of contractors visited. Sophia Bergkvist (The Forest Contractors' Certification Umbrella) responded similarly. Martin Klenz-Tornow (Forest Certification Prosilva) added that deficiencies according to survey responses are followed by targeted follow-up and that last year they introduced collecting certain verifications of high relevance in the context of self-monitoring. It was found that the issue may be appropriate to develop in the context of PEFC's contractor certification meetings.

12.3 SWE005, 6.2.1 External audit of group certificates

The need for changes comes from international requirements that clarify the focus on the work of the umbrella organization (own administration and group members) and review of the internal audit.

The working group has been based on a preparatory work initiated by the PEFC Board, which, among other things, has been carried out. was made following discussions at international level on a reference standard for certification organisations and potentially greatly increased sampling.

The working group's proposal is aimed at increasing the focus on the work of the umbrella and management systems for a more efficient external audit. In the proposal presented, part of the selection for the external revision of members shall be of those who have undergone internal audit in the previous year and otherwise be the observations of the external auditor (as "fly on the wall") during the performance of internal audits of group members. Sub-items describing the different orientations of these two parts were presented and commented on.

Niklas Fogdestam stated that in the presented proposal for changes there seems to be an accusation that it does not work well today, which he thinks it does, and asked about where flaws are considered to exist. Anneli replied that she sees that the current SWE 005 lacks the management that the external auditor would get with the proposed changes and has too much focus on the samples and meant that the proposed should not be seen as an accusation but that through these there will be a more targeted review of the work of the umbrella.

Anna Kolmert Boström also believed that today it is a good review through external audit and had a view on the sample of internal audits made last year, that there will be little cake on cake, and that it would give more to look at something new and as possible. could be done remotely.

Erika Pershagen felt that more detailed examination is going in the wrong direction, against the pursuit of a simple standard.

Lars Nilsson stressed the importance of efficiency in the revision system so that there is no more temporalfoxing.

12.4 Ongoing and upcoming issues

One ongoing work concerns the issue that all forestry activities within a logging organization should be covered by the certificate.

The portal document SWE 001 needs to be updated regarding statistics, legislation and possibly forest policy. This will be done later on schedule.

If a forest holding can be certified through several umbrella organizations Requirements regarding logging organizations' internal audit. Work in progress. Requirement elements linked to High Level Structure (HLS) according to international requirements. Work for adaptation is ongoing and the various parts within this were shown.

3. Next meeting

Working group meeting 4 is set for March 17 and is scheduled as a physical meeting. The purpose of the meeting is to decide on standard proposals for public consultation.

Christina presented a proposed plan until the next working group meeting:

- The working groups continue and complete their work
- Material to the secretariat by 28 February
- Mailing to the working group March 3 .

In order to succeed with the assignment, it was emphasized collaboration between groups for climate issues and that the proposals that are developed are anchored in the participants' organizations.

The Working group decided on this proposal.

14. The meeting ended

Mårten thanked the participants and ended the meeting.

Deltagare PEFC working groupmöte 3 2021-11-24

Anders Hjerpe	Sveaskog
Anna-Lena Norberg	Stoppafusket
Anna Kolmert Boström	Stora Enso Skog
Anna Schyman	NYKS
Anneli Sandström	Prosilva
Annelie Johansson	Föreningen Spillkråkan
Babs Stuiver	Sveaskog
Christina Lundgren	Svenska PEFC
Ebbe Lindberg	SEC och Skogsentreprenörerna
Eje Andersson	Svenskt Friluftsliv
Elin Sunesdotter	LRF Skogsägarna
Erica Pershagen	Stora Enso Skog
Erika Alm	Stora Enso Skog
Fredrik Sätter	Stiftens Egendomsförvaltningars Förening
Gert Adolfsson	Stiftens Egendomsförvaltningars Förening
Hampus Blomstrand	Stora Enso Skog
Hans Weslien	Svenska PEFC
Helena Lindén	Norra skog
Helene Larsson	Prosilva
Jessica Nordin	Södra
Joacim Ingelsson	Svenska orienteringsförbundet
Johanna Ydringer	BillerudKorsnäs
Jonathan Lundberg	GS-facket
Jessica von Lienen	GS-facket
Lars Nilsson	Mellanskog
Lisa Holmgren	Svenska PEFC

Magnus Lindberg	GS-facket
Malin M. Johansson	Stora Enso Skog
Martin Klenz-Tornow	Prosilva
Mats Remsö	Pancert
Mats-Erik Larsson	SEC och Skogsentreprenörerna
Morgen Yngvesson	SCA Skog
Mårten Larsson	Working groupets ordförande
Nicklas Samils	Sveriges Allmänningsskogars Förbund
Niklas Fogdestam	Sydved
Per Eriksson	ECSkog
PerArne Nordholts	Såg i syd
Peter Högberg	SLU
Rickard Klingberg	Sveriges Jordägareförbund
Ronnie Andersson	ECSkog
Sara Karlsson	Norra skog
Sara Rindeskog	Holmen Skog
Sofia Backéus	LRF Skogsägarna
Sofia Bäcklund	Stiftens Egendomsförvaltningars Förening

Sofie Petersson
Sophia Bergkvist
Staffan Mattsson
Stefan Holmberg
Sture Karlsson
Thomas Löwenberg
Tomas Johansson
Tomas Rahm
Ylva Thorn-Andersen

ECSkog
SEC och Skogsentreprenörerna
Skogssällskapet
Norra skog
Svenska PEFC, ordförande
Svenska PEFC
Stiftens Egendomsförvaltningars Förening
Södra
Södra

1. Opening of the meeting

Mårten Larsson, chairman of the working group, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants.

2. Notification of notes from today's meeting

Hans Weslien, PEFC's standard revision secretariat, was elected meeting secretary.

3. Persons responsible for the approval of the Minutes

Hanna Kankainen and Martin Klenz-Tornow were elected.

4.

Participants

see

Appendix

1.

5. Approval of the agenda

After Mårten's review of the agenda, this was approved.

6. The procedure – Schedule and other information

Christina Lundgren described how the work with the standard revision is structured and the task for today's meeting – to decide on public consultation. She also mentioned that the standard revision can be followed on the PEFC website and that comments on procedure and process are always welcome.

7. Climate – intro

Sofia Backéus informed about the climate group's work and the areas in which proposals have been developed. The amendments are presented under item 9 per sub-standard (SWE 001-004).

8. Presentation, biodiversity Per Simonsson

See Appendix 2.

9. Proposals from the working groups

SWE 001 Swedish PEFC's certification system for sustainable forestry

Working Group 4 (Climate)

Sofia Backéus presented the climate group's proposal with additions on climate benefit in the introduction, definition of the climate benefit of the forest and the completely new part under chapter 7 : 7.2 The Swedish forest's climate benefit.

Questions and comments

Göran Örlander asked if they had considered inserting text about Bio-CCS. Sofia replied that it could be done.

Anneli Sandström asked what had been the most difficult in the climate group's work and Sofia replied that one difficulty had been to get a definition of the forest's climate benefit and another that get to a writing at an appropriate level of detail.

Anna Schyman mentioned that other products and services from the forest in addition to timber could be included, that it may be something to think about for the next revision, and pointed out that the indication of references would need to be reviewed and harmonised.

Göran Örlander mentioned that security in fuel supply could be included and that the proportion of Sweden's energy that comes from biofuel can be emphasized (the proposal states the total in TWh from biofuel).

Working Group 1 (Systems and Structure)

List of definitions (Annex to SWE 001)

Anneli Sandström presented proposals for *logging* organization (adjustment), forestry *activities* (to replace "forestry organization") and *group member* (new).

SWE 002, Chapter 3 Forest management standard

Working Group 4 (Climate)

The proposals come from the climate group and are discussed together with working group 2 (Production and environment). Sofia Backéus made suggestions for the introductory text of Chapter 3 and for sections 3.2.2 concerning production-enhancing measures, 3.3 Rejuvenation and 3.9 Shoe health .

Working Group 2 (Production and environment)

XX Research

The need for writing about research exists through international PEFC requirements. Göran Örlander showed the group's proposal, which partly establishes that PEFC believes that research and knowledge are an important basis for sustainable forestry and also clarifies that Deviations from the standard may be made in connection with research. The location of the writing in the standard is not determined.

Questions and points of view

Magnus Lindberg from the GS union considered that the expression "works for" is not appropriate to use in a requirement element as this will then be difficult to revise. The expression can be used in preamble if this is followed by more specified requirements.

Anneli Sandström wondered if the requirement element (x.x.x) could use an expression other than "concerned by (research)", which she considered too vague.

3.5 Other care methods

Fredrik Sätter showed and commented on the proposals for 3.5 and 3.5.1.

The proposal for writing in XX Research, provides a link to science and proven experience and in the proposal for 3.5.1 there is that methods should be adapted to

the state and provide the conditions for long-term use, sustainable production and take into account the natural, cultural and social values of the forest. It is also made clear that the requirements of the forest standard apply regardless of the management method.

Questions and comments

Gisela Björse from Sveaskog asked what is meant "well proven" in the preamble text (3.5) and how it should be assessed in an revision whether the requirement is met or not. She also pointed out that "well proven" is used with varying meanings, more or less carefully, depending on the context and that alternative methods are also used must maintain a certain rigor regarding "well proven".

3.7. Control methods

Tomas Rahm showed and commented on the proposal.

Questions and comments

Ola Kårén from SCA asked whether the PEFC standard's ban on chemical treatment also applies to activities in nurseries, for example. treatment against fungus. Tomas Rahm answered no, the PEFC standard refers to forest land.

SWE 002, Chapter 5 Environmental standard

Working Group 2 (Production and environment)

Preamble and 5.1 Provisions for environmental purposes

Helena Lindén showed and commented on the proposals. For the preamble, the proposal was slightly adjusted from what was sent out for the working group meeting, amended as follows: "Forest owners shall work to maintain or enhance the biological the diversity of the landscape through good environmental consideration in forest measures and conservation provisions according to this standard. Nature conservation provisions **and environmental considerations** in addition to the requirements of this standard can be seen as a **social responsibility of society** where the forest owner in dialogue with the authorities should seek a long-term solution."

Questions and comments

Regarding the proposed deletion of 5.1.6, Ola Kårén from SCA stated that he would like to see the possibility / requirement (with, among other things, that the state be given two years' council room) to some extent remains, albeit in a rewritten form. He believed that the requirement has acted as a means of exerting pressure and fulfilled a function.

Anneli Sandström from Prosilva asked if it was correctly understood that the order of priority for voluntary provisions has changed and received an affirmative answer.

5.4.1. Deciduous stocks

Helena Lindén presented proposals regarding increased leaf share at the property level for properties with poorer conditions for leaf-dominated holdings.

Questions and comments

Anneli Sandström from Prosilva asked about the reason why "wet ground" is now available in addition to "fresh and moist soil" regarding deciduous populations. Helena replied that it is also on wet ground that you can have a large proportion of leaves. Anneli's interpretation of today's standard was that "5 % of the area of healthy and moist land" indicates the *calculation* of the area that should exist and that you can already credit the area of wet soil with leaf dominance to meet the required area. With that interpretation, the amendment means that a larger area of leaf dominance is required than in today's standard.

5.3 Natural value trees/Development trees
Fredrik Sätter presented the proposal.

Questions and comments

Sofia Backéus from LRF Skogsägarna raised the issue of the proposed supplement regarding stands with older coarse main strains where it is intended to produce suitable qualities for eg. building conservation and where the proposal is that 10 natural value trees should be left when felling and that the purpose of the stand should be stated in the forest management plan. Sofia felt that it is a good and understandable idea but that the writing risks becoming counterproductive and confusing because forest owners must be able to choose to harvest later (=older, coarser) without having to specify any specific purpose of this "over-maintenance". This even without proposed addition. LRF intends to write a comment on this in the consultation.

Fredrik commented that the wording refers to a special type of stock that should have a special purpose.

The structure of the forest standard

Christina Lundgren presented a proposal with the merger of the parts chapter 3 Forest management standard and Chapter 5 Environmental standard and the background to this. The proposal was included in the mailing for the working group meeting.

BESLUT:

- *Working Group 2 and the Secretariat were given the task of introducing a new structure for: Forest standard for the next working group meeting (autumn 2022)*
- *The proposal for a new structure is not taken to the public consultation.*

SWE 002, Chapter 4 Social standard

Working Group 4 (Climate)

The proposal comes from the climate group and has been discussed together with working group 3 (Social standard and Contractorial standard). Sara Rindeskog showed the proposal to introduce requirements for competence in efficient driving styles (4.10.7) and commented on this by saying that it is not complete regarding how the competence requirement should be able to fulfilled. (The issue of competence was further addressed under item 10.)

Questions and comments

When asked why soil preparation has not been included, Sara replied that harvesters and forwarders account for the largest share of emissions and that the focus has therefore been on these. There was a view that the wording could be read as meaning that only those who drive harvesters or forwarders should have the competency.

Fredrik Sätter asked about how the competence can be shown and Sara replied that it is intended that requirements fulfillment will be linked to completed training. Fredrik questioned the introduction of requirements when there is not a solution in place to accommodate it.

Working Group 3 (Social Standard and Contractorial Standard)

4.1 Taking into account social values, recreation and outdoor recreation

Eje Andersson, who was part of the subgroup that worked on the proposals in this area, described the latest changes as densification and clarification of previous wordings based on received comments. The proposal for 4.1.1 is reworded and addresses *social values* (former *recreation and outdoor recreation*).

Eje raised two issues with bearing on the area: the Mistra project in the area of sports, outdoor life and the environment and the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency's new "Guidance for events in nature".

Questions and comments

Göran Örlander asked if the concept of social values is defined and was told that it is not in the PEFC standard's definition list, but there is "social consideration". Eje commented that the Swedish Forest Agency has a definition of social values.

Sara Rindeskog from Holmen asked if the expanded wording with the concept of social values (4.1.1) means that reindeer husbandry is included. Eje replied that reindeer husbandry is included in the above-mentioned guidance from the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency. Elin Sunesdotter from LRF believed that reindeer husbandry, as it is a nutrition, should not be linked to this requirement element and suggested that the original wording "recreation and outdoor recreation" are allowed to stand. Christina Lundgren pointed out that reindeer husbandry is under its own chapters in the PEFC standard.

Göran Örlander asked if commercial activity had been up during the development of proposals. Anna Schyman replied that there has been a lot of discussion, but the working group's proposals have avoided posting the text about different types of activities. Goran said it would go too far if it was opened up to commercial activity. Ulf Silvander from Svenskt friluftsliv pointed out that things that fit within the right of public access are one thing and what falls outside this another that must be dealt with in special order.

4.4.1, signing of business agreements

At the meeting, they were missing from Working Group 3 that drafted the proposal. Mr Weslien mentioned that the proposal had been discussed at two working group meetings and that discussions fr. a. touched the point about work instructions. Anna Schyman presented the proposal.

Questions and comments

Gisela Björse from Sveaskog thought that there was an unclear wording in the text before the bullet point: Applies to the last sentence and the following points both business agreement client–contractor and Contractor–subcontractor or just the latter? That could be misinterpreted.

Kevin Dahlberg from Stora Enso thought that the wording with colons at the end of the sentence for the bullet point layout makes it unclear and that it needs to be better specified what means requirements regarding the term of the contract, extension and notification obligation. Erica Pershagen from Stora Enso pointed to liability time as problematic and noted that not everyone uses ABSE.

Anneli Sandström, Forest Certification Prosilva sent a reminder that the requirement also applies in the situation where a forest owner hires another forest owner.

Tomas Rahm asked about the scope of the requirement, in what situations all parts must be included.

Göran Örlander pointed out that the term "signed agreement" should be used, as in amendments for other standard parts, instead of "written agreement".

4.12.2, requirements regarding self-employed people's own equipment and machines Anna Schyman presented the proposal.

Questions and comments

Johanna Ydringer from Billerudkorsnäs wondered if this wording is clear enough to make it clear that it is not a question of the forest owner having to go and buy a new machine. Erica Pershagen from Stora Enso saw the wording "as far as technically possible" as questionable. Anna Schyman replied that wording can be reviewed and may need to be made clearer.

SWE 003 Contractor Standard

Working Group 4 (Climate)

4.7.6, Requirements for engines

The proposal comes from the climate group and has been discussed together with working group 3 (Social standard and Contractorial standard). Ronnie Andersson presented the proposal that harvesters' and forwarders' engines should meet at least step 1 according to current EU rules. These rules include requirements for marking indicating the stage (age) of the engine, which makes the requirement repairable.

Questions and comments

It was asked about what step 1 means we ask about age and Ronnie answered step 1 came into effect in 1999. Christina Lundgren commented that it is a low set requirement that most people today meet.

Working Group 1 (Systems and Structure)

4.3

Amendments from Working Group 1 have been introduced. With these, the section is limited to group-certified contractors. Requirements for direct certification are processed under SWE 004.

4.3.2.

A new requirement element regarding reporting deviations from work instructions is proposed. Sophia Bergkvist presented this.

Questions and comments

Göran Örlander asked about the stage at which the reporting should be done, before or after the implementation, and considered that a clarification on this would be appropriate. Christina Lundgren said that the group discussed this and concluded that the degree of urgency depends on the type of deviation /deviation.

Working Group 3 (Social Standard and Contractorial Standard)

Chapter 3, Categories of Contractors

Martin Klenz-Tornow presented the proposal where additions have been made under item 3 regarding planning contractors to become more comprehensive.

Questions and comments

Sara Rindeskog asked about follow-up (eg. plant counting) is included in the category of planning contractor. Martin replied that the term "follow-up" could be added but that he sees it as already included under the concept of "inventory".

Tomas Rahm asked a control question about internal revision not being included in the concept. (Which it doesn't).

4.4.2. Forest management and 4.7. Preventive environmental requirements

Anna Schyman showed proposals for adjustments (other word choice) for harmonization with forestsstandarden.

4.5.4, concerning the client's responsibility for geographically dispersed activities

Christina Lundgren recapitulated the discussions that have taken place regarding this requirement and regarding the standard and foreign labor in general. The requirement for the client, to ensure that the contractor and/or his employees have good living conditions for the season during the assignment period, has been raised and discussed in the working group and resulted in no change being proposed. (Note: The responsibility is therefore proposed to remain with both the contractor and the client).

4.9.1. Hazardous waste

Anna Schyman showed and commented on an addition prompted an additional requirement from the authority for registration.

SWE 004 Swedish PEFC's requirements for direct certification and certification in grupp

Working Group 4 (Climate)

3.2.10, calculation of emissions

Erika Alm presented the publisher, which aims to gain knowledge about the current situation and the basis for the organization to set goals.

Questions and comments

Comments on the proposed wording are that the required key figure should be per cubic meter of timber (eg. for not being able to derive volumes and other business sensitive information). It had also been suggested that the non-fossil fuels be removed from the requirement. Sara Rindeskog, Holmen pointed out that one of the points of the requirement is then missed, namely efficiency. Tomas Rahm believed that it is good to include the non-fossil to make it more visible and for comparisons.

Elin Sunesdotter asked if consideration had been given to including soil preparation. Erika Alm replied that it was deliberately chosen to focus on the large items of thinning and final felling in this situation. It was pointed out that it is possible to misunderstand the wording "logging organizations and forest owners with more than 50,000 ha" as meaning that "more than 50,000 ha" also refers to a slice of logging organizations. The intention is that all logging organisations will be covered. Göran Örlander pointed out that almost all companies make this type of calculation and that emissions from drifting are a small part of the total carbon balance for forestry. At the same time, Göran emphasized that it is still important and should be done.

Sofia Bäcklund, Church of Sweden, wondered if it could be complex and include double counting if several different logging organizations and contractors are hired.

Working Group 1 (Systems and Structure)

Åsa Öhman presented proposals linked to forest owners' land holdings.

3.2.2.1.

The amendment for direct certification specifies that certification is based on "uniform ownership" (the same wording applies to group members).

4.3.2.4.

This is an added requirement element aimed at umbrella organizations regarding control to ensure that all properties with uniform ownership are subject to certification (which can then be divided on various certificates both directly and group certified).

Questions and comments

Tomas Rahm asked about how umbrella organizations' control should be done. Anneli replied that the umbrella organization has to form its own routines for this.

A discussion ensued as to whether the stated intention is sufficiently clear and whether "uniform ownership" would need to be specified.

3. Direct certification

Anneli Sandström described redeployments with basic requirements for all actors gathered in one section (3.1).

3.2.1.7, use of school classes and organisations with youth activities

Mrs Bergkvist presented the amendment, which was adjusted on the basis of comments during the general consultation on the forest measures concerned (now not limited to planting) and the limit for scope per client per year.

Questions and comments

Ulf Silvander from Svenskt friluftsliv believed that "meet the requirements for municipal or state support for youth activities" should be deleted as it varies how municipal / state support is interpreted and that this restriction risks excluding organisations that should reasonably be covered. Magnus Lindberg, the GS union, questioned whether the wording really excludes the hiring of adults as the demand is directed at the organization.

It was found that the customer can be anything from a larger company / logging organization to an individual forest owner.

New management structure

Anneli Sandström talked about the changes proposed to meet the requirements of the international PEFC standard (HLS structure). These include a completely new wording in Appendix 2 Requirements for certified organizations' management systems. It is further proposed to remove the requirement for ISO 14,000 certification for umbrella organizations.

Anneli showed the working group's proposal in Appendix 1 regarding external views (in today's standard "external observation").

SWE 005 Swedish PEFC requirements for certification organizations

Working Group 1 (Systems and Structure)

Erica Pershagen presented an amendment under section 6.1 Revision, which was adjusted based on comments at the general consultation.

6.1.2. Implementation in group certification

In comparison with previous amendments, the focus is more on the purpose, the specification of what samples should consist of is removed.

Mrs Erica referred to the other amendments that have been tabled, a requirement element concerning competence requirements for external auditors (5.1) and adjustments concerning references.

10. Competence in efficient driving methods and skills supply in general

In connection with the creation of the proposal regarding competence for efficient driving methods (SWE 002, 4.10.7), it has been a question of how competence according to this requirement can be met and need to review the whole in terms of the range and direction of education. Christina Lundgren and Anna Schyman presented a proposal for both parts' handling.

DECISION

Assignments are given to a subgroup of working group 3 to:

- *manage competence for the proposed requirement for efficient driving style*
- *review the whole regarding competence and course requirements*
- *have a dialogue with SYN and the Skötselskolan in the work.*

Organizations in the working group can suggest participants to Anna Schyman or Christina Lundgren.

The work can be ongoing during the time of public consultation.

11. Decision on public consultation

The handling of the comments received and comments on the working groups' proposals was discussed. The Chairman asked the Working group if the proposal could be published for public consultation, to which the Working group replied with yes.

DECISION:

The standard proposal submitted to the working group is taken for public consultation together with the views and comments of the working group meeting. The views and comments of the Working group meeting are conveyed through notes in the minutes of the Working group meeting.

12. Any other business

Sture Karlsson addressed how the standard handles the need for disconnection of requirements, e.g.

regarding engines and training, in connection with disturbances such as extensive calamities, or pandemic. Christina Lundgren replied that exceptions to requirements are dealt with in the standard part SWE 001.

Note: Excerpt from chapter 9 Exemption PEFC SWE 001: "Any exceptions to the requirements of the Swedish PEFC standard shall be examined by the PEFC Board of Directors. Derogations may be granted only in special circumstances which seriously impede the application of the standard. Decided exceptions must be stated on the Swedish PEFC's website (www.pefc.se). "

13. Next meeting

A Doodle will be sent for working group meeting 5 in the latter part of September.

14. The meeting ended

Mårten thanked the participants and ended the meeting.

PEFC working group meeting 2022-03-17

Participants

Martin Klenz-Tornow	Forest Certification Prosilva
Erica Pershagen	Stora Enso Skog
Johanna Ydringer	Billerudkorsnäs
Sophia Bergkvist	SEC and Skogsentreprenörerna
Helena Lindén	Norra Skog
Göran Örlander	Swedish PEFC
Erika Alm	Stora Enso Skog
Tomas Rahm	Södra
Gisela Björse	Sveaskog
Elin Sunesdotter	LRF Skogsägarna
Sofia Backéus	LRF Skogsägarna
Magnus Lindberg	GS-union
Jonathan Lundberg	GS-union
Fredrik Sätter	Stiftens egendomsförvaltningars förening
Helene Larsson	Forest Certification Prosilva
Sara Rindeskog	Holmen
Anna Schyman	NYKS
Mårten Larsson	chairman working group
Hanna Kankainen	SCA Forest
Anneli Sandström	Forest Certification Prosilva
Ebbe Lindberg	SEC and Skogsentreprenörerna
Ronnie Andersson	EC Forest
Anna Kolmert Boström	Stora Enso Skog
Martin Carlsson	SCA Forest
Ulf Silvander	Svenskt friluftsliv
Ylva Thorn-Andersen	Södra
Per Simonsson	
Maud Petri Rådström	Gröna arbetsgivare
Lisa Holmgren	Swedish PEFC
Thomas Löwenberg	Swedish PEFC
Bella Lindbrandt	Swedish PEFC
Christina Lundgren	Swedish PEFC
Via link	
Åsa	Mellanskog
Öhman	
Ola Kårén	SCA Forest
Marie Wickberg	Middle Forest
Gert	AdolfsonStiftens egendomsförvaltningars förening
Sofia Bäcklund	Stiftens egendomsförvaltningars förening
Anders Hjerpe	Sveaskog e.m.
Morgen Yngvesson	SCA Forest
Niklas Fogdestam	Sydved
Kevin Dahlberg	Stora Enso Skog

Hampus Blomstrand	Stora Enso Skog
Kerstin Dafsnäs	Spillkråkan
Eje Andersson	Svenskt friluftsliv
Nicklas Samils	Swedish Common Forests Association
Mats Remsö	Pancert
Stefan Holmberg	Norra Skog
Sofie Petersson	ECSkog
Per Eriksson	ECSkog f.m.
Hampus Blomstrand	Stora Enso Skog
Dag Åkesson	Stiftens egendomsförvaltningars förening
Hans Weslien	Swedish PEFC
Sture Karlsson	Chairman of Swedish PEFC e.m.
Annelie Johansson	Spillkråkan
Erik Lind	Stora Enso Skog
Haidi Anderson	The Waste Crow
Mats-Erik Larsson	SEC and Skogsentreprenörerna

Seminar: Biodiversity (10.30 – 11.15)

The Seminar Per Simonsson is a biologist and has worked for 16 years at the County Administrative Board in Härnösand with forest issues and was from 1992 to 2017 conservation manager at SCA Skog. He has a PhD at SLU with a thesis on the extent and emergence of nature conservation in Sweden and is now retired working 25% with consulting assignments. Together with Mats Hannerz, he has written the report Forest biodiversity – on species, environmental work and statistics (Skogsindustrierna 2020). In this, much of what is current today in the forest debate is highlighted and this is the reason that Per was asked to participate in the working group meeting to contribute with new knowledge. The following is a summary of Per's Seminar.

Biodiversity, the concept of

Biodiversity is a complex concept, which actually encompasses all life on Earth. The area is often treated with a focus only on species, but it also includes ecosystems with natural processes and genetic diversity within species. Examples of the latter that there should be a certain minimum number of wolves in Sweden and that some wolf individuals are judged genetically more valuable. An example of the ecosystem level is the protection of montane forests.

The term is extensive and complex and is used with different meanings, which can be a reason for not "reaching each other" in discussions.

Human impact

Virtually everything we humans do affects biodiversity. Examples of strong influences are agriculture for which forests have been transformed and that forests do not burn to the extent that is natural. In Sweden, there are about 30,000 forest-living species and the national environmental goal includes that "Nature types and naturally occurring species linked to the forest landscape shall have favorable conservation status and sufficient genetic variation", an impossible goal to live up to.

How are the species in the forest doing?

On the whole, there is very little follow-up. It is best for the species group of birds where you have a fairly good grasp of the development over time. From the environmental target follow-up for nesting birds in the forest (2002–2020), the results are "largely unchanged number ... there are some negative signs". A negative trend is for species tied to dead wood. Per mentioned pine titan and its demands for decaying birch stumps for its nest construction, as well as the patch, the decrease in which could be due to warmer climates.

For mammals including predators, there is a clear positive trend.

Development of important structures

Through the National Forest Inventory, the development of the amount of old forest, dead wood, coarse deciduous trees and deciduous dominated forest is monitored. For all these parameters there is a clear positive trend from about 1990. The size of the clearing has been greatly reduced. Reduced occurrence of berries, narrow-leaved grasses and reindeer lichen are negative trends linked to the fact that forests are becoming denser. Over time, it will become an increasingly "bipartisan" forest landscape with production forests and protected areas.

The Red List and endangered species

The Red List is a valuable compilation of knowledge but is sometimes used incorrectly, for example in Dagens Nyheter, which has made the interpretation that 5000 Swedish forest species are at risk of extinction, this with reference to SLU's species data bank. The Red List is not a list of species that are dying out. It has several subgroups with different conservation statuses, from "lack of knowledge" to "critically endangered" and to forest species

also includes species that do not live in but have been observed in forests at some point, such as the mountain owl. Among endangered/near threatened "forest species" are those that are not affected forestry. The classification also works so that a newly discovered species falls into the category of endangered as well as species that is only found in one or few places and even if it is within protected area.

The state of play according to reporting regarding the EU's Habitats Directive

Sweden reports every 6 years, no later than 2019, on the fulfillment of targets for 15 different forest habitats. Only mountain birch forest and forest-bearing bog get the "green light". Sweden has set a goal of 4.3 million hectares of "western taiga" that will be or could become natural forest (20% of pre-industrial area). Today there are 2.1 million ha of this habitat type.

According to its own reporting, Sweden is poorly placed compared to other European countries. In Germany, for example, the United States has not yet been able to do so. 87% of the forest area is good conservation status, the share for Sweden is 8%. The differences between countries depend to a large extent on the countries' own specifications.

Protected forest

Sweden is often shown as among the worst in terms of the proportion of protected forest. However, the differences between countries depend a lot on how the individual countries have chosen to report. In terms of the area of "strict" protection, Sweden is in second place in Europe after Finland.

Sweden's environmental goals – Living forests

The goals are "visionary" and impossible to achieve as they are written. It is specified that *all* species must have viable populations and that endangered species must have recovered.

The importance of nature considerations for red-listed species

With good consideration for nature, in the right place, 90% of the red-listed species can survive. It is important to have larger contiguous protected areas.

Why are there such different descriptions of the state of the day?

In response to this, it was brought up that it is a very broad definition of biodiversity, that there are different values and special interests and that it is argued through "cherry picking". Both sides may be right based on their demarcations.

Summary image:

- There is no mass extinction in Swedish forests. Species may have disappeared locally and regionally.
- The Red List needs to be de-dramatised. It is a source of knowledge, not a measure of value.
- Many species survive with the left but not all, there are more area-intensive species.
- The "new forest" will have a mix of old and new as nature considerations grow into. We will have an ecological network together with set aside conservation areas.
- But forests with high conservation values that should be preserved are still being felled.

1. Opening of the meeting

Mårten Larsson, chairman of the working group, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants.

Mårten explained the purpose of the meeting and the outcome of the meeting:

Objective: To decide to approve the draft new certification standard for submission to the PEFC Board of Directors.

Objective: To present how the views from the public consultation have been handled by the working groups and give the working group participants the opportunity to discuss this.

Decision meeting with a high degree of formality around the decisions

- PEFC's approach is to resolve issues by consensus.
Decisions are made by acclamation.
- After each working group's review, this part of the meeting is completed. Possibly Outstanding issues are "put on hold" for final discussion before a decision.
- Finally, the question will be asked whether the meeting can decide that the standard should be submitted to the Swedish PEFC Board for further consideration. (SWE 001 may need to be supplemented during the international process).
- If any issue needs to be addressed further, the workflow is that a joint group is given the task of working further for a solution.
The mission is formulated at this working group meeting.

2. Notification of notes from today's meeting

Hans Weslien, PEFC's standard revision secretariat, was elected meeting secretary.

3.. Persons for approval of the Minutes

Erica Pershagen and Sebastian Lindqvist were elected.

4.

Participants

see Appendix

1.

5. Approval of the agenda The agenda was presented and approved.

6. The procedure – Schedule and other information

Christina Lundgren described how the work with the standard revision is structured and the task for today's meeting – that the working group will make a decision regarding the developed proposal for a standard. She also mentioned continued management internationally and that the standard revision can be followed on PEFC's website and that comments on procedure and process are always welcome.

Provided that the working group meeting adopts the developed proposal for a standard, the next step is consideration by the Swedish PEFC Board, which can decide whether to forward the proposal to international PEFCs. An international approval can be expected in January 2024 with a transition period of one year.

From the public consultation April – May 2022, approximately 250 comments were received. The working groups' treatment of these is presented in the standard proposals for the working group meeting as proposed changes to the text that has gone to the public consultation and / or the Excel file "Handling of comments from public consultation working group 5 2022-10-06". The working groups' accounts can be found under items 7 to 9 and 11 below.

Christina presented the conducted hearing with authorities on September 5. There were comments mainly on Chapter 7 of SWE 002 and some led to amendments.

Proposals for writing in chapter 7 of SWE 001 have been available for comments 1–15 September and comments were received from five organizations. Additions may also be needed during the international process.

7. Working Group 4 – Climate

Sofia Backéus presented the task force's suggested amendment for SWE 001 – SWE 004

Sofia Backéus presented the working group's amendments in SWE 001–SWE 004.

SWE001 7.1 Added text on growth reduction

"Growth has increased sharply in the country's forests since the mid-1950s. However, in recent years, a decreasing trend can be observed. The main reasons for this decrease cannot be identified with certainty without deeper analysis."

At this text is posted a comment that new SKA in October will be monitored for possible. correction.

7.2 New heading "Climate and forestry"

The text is adjusted based on comments received and additions have been introduced regarding Bio-CCS and Bio-CCU.

7.2.4 Added section on the impact of climate change on forestry

This proposal was added after comments at the hearing with authorities.

7.3. Additions under forest policy objectives

A proposal to clarify the Swedish model.

SWE002

"The goal of Swedish PEFC's certification system is to develop active and responsible forestry with a good balance between production, the environment, **climate benefits** and social interests."

Climate benefit is defined in SWE 001, Appendix B.

3.2, on production-enhancing measures

In the proposal there is the addition "Production-enhancing measures should be considered if it is judged to have a positive impact on climate benefit" and the example of ditch cleaning replaced by the use of refined rejuvenation material

SWE 003

Additions including climate benefit first in the introduction The same introductory sentence as in SWE 002 (above).

3.2, on production-enhancing measures

I

SWE004

3.2.1.10 and 4.4.1.16, calculation of fossil carbon dioxide emissions Proposal, added requirement:

A basis for systematic work to reduce fossil carbon dioxide emissions is knowledge of the current situation. Harvesting organizations must therefore establish goals and action plans for reduced climate impact and establish an annual calculation of fossil carbon dioxide emissions from harvested harvesting. The calculation shall include the total fossil emissions from harvesters and forwarders from own machines and from contractors hired by the organization. The organisation shall establish its own documented procedure for the emission calculation. The procedure shall include the calculation model as well as any stencils and assumptions.



The working group's amendments and other handling of comments from the public consultation were adopted by the Working group.

8. Working Group 2 – Production and environment

Göran Örländer first showed previously dealt with issues and then presented the new structure for SWE 002 in which the chapters Forest Management Standard (3) and Environmental Standard (5) are combined to one, as decided at the previous working group meeting.

Amendments in SWE 002 were presented (numbered according to the current structure).

2.1 Accessibility and more information

Proposal with update and expanded text about where information is located as well as a clarifying addition about target images:

PEFC sees the target images and the PEFC standard as two different tools in sustainable forestry. The objectives for good environmental consideration provide valuable knowledge and guidance in the planning and implementation of forest measures, but are not designed as revisionable requirements but should be seen only as a guide and knowledge base.

2.2 Research

Proposal to amend the proposal that went to the public consultation:

Forestry based on science and proven experience is fundamental to PEFC. ~~PEFC works for forestry based on science and proven experience.~~ Scientific findings change with new knowledge and collaboration with research and education is encouraged.

Where PEFC-certified forestry **is included** in ~~the relevant~~ research linked to a university, college or research institute or carried out in line with the adaptive forest management **model/ adaptive forestry**, deviations from the standard can be made. - ~~Applicable legislation shall be complied with.~~

Göran commented that the proposal entails a certain tightening of previous proposals and that adaptive forest management is the name from SLU and SKS and that adaptive forestry is a name within Forest research and therefore added.

3.5 Forest management methods

Proposal to use the term forest management system in title and text.

5.3 Natural value

trees/development trees

Suggested appendices to preamble text:

PEFC is positive about the possibility of also applying longer rotation times to production stocks, e.g. with the aim of producing special timber qualities, for social reasons or according to the wishes of the forest owner.

Addition to the requirement element 5.1.3 :

For trees and groups of trees that have achieved natural value tree characteristics in production stands but have been transferred for a specific purpose, for example for special timber qualities or social values, the objectives and purpose are stated in the forest management plan.

These additions are aimed, inter alia, at: to facilitate the maintenance and production of timber with specific characteristics.

The standard proposal also includes two new exceptions where felling of natural value trees can be permitted (5.3.3). Sofia Bäcklund thought that it would be good to have guidance on situations when a natural value tree may be felled due to making forestry measures more difficult (. Babs Stuver replied that the subgroup working on the issue chose not to put in examples as it was judged that there could be an unwanted lock-in to those listed and said that in revisioning it becomes a question of having a justification that you can stand for. Fredrik Sätter pointed out that the current requirements (in 5.3.3) include that the felled tree should be left as fresh dead wood.

5.4 Deciduous trees

The amendment means that the area share of 5% deciduous stocks should refer to 5% of the area of fresh and moist soil, i.e. that wet soil should not be included in this calculation - and a determination that stands of all soil moisture classes may be included in order to achieve 5 % deciduous dominated stocks.

(It was pointed out that wet woodland is incorrectly included in the writing in the Excel sheet and should be corrected by the secretariat.)

5.6 Trenching

Proposals for new preamble text and moving text to requirement elements (5.6.3 and 5.6.4) as well as clarification regarding consultation, with shall instead of should.

Annex 1 Forest management plan

Proposal for clarification with "changing natural values" instead of "newly added nature value registrations".

Mårten asked if there were any further comments regarding the proposed wording on the target images. Eje Andersson commented that it is important for forestry that the target images are applied as intended, not least when it comes to the consideration of outdoor life.

The working group's amendments and other handling of comments from the public consultation were adopted by the Working group.

9. Working Group 3 – Social Standard and Contractorial Standard

Anna Schyman began by showing previously dealt with issues and then presented the amendments to the law.

Amendments in SWE 002

4.1. Taking into account social values of recreation and outdoor recreation

the addition of and the **conditions of the forest owner** in the first paragraph **and the public** in the second paragraph;

Sofia Backéus believed that the wording "The forest owner protects and nurtures." The beginning of the second paragraph (a proposal for the public consultation) is a bit problematic as it unilaterally points to the role of forest owners.

4.1.1 Amendment to the proposal for public consultation

Return to original wording:

... which is of great importance for recreation and outdoor recreation...

It was found necessary to ensure that this formulation is used in other parts of the standard (deviation in SWE 002, 5.1 Provisions for environmental purposes). Christina suggested that proposals be developed through the working group for affected parts and taken to the working group's board for confirmation. The proposal was approved.

4.4.1, on business agreements

The amendment is that "signed in writing" is replaced by "signed and signed" and text is partially rearranged for greater clarity, without changing the meaning.

4.5.4 and 4.5.5

Sharing of 4.5.4 to clarify the requirement regarding the client.

4.6.1.1, insurance for enterprises without employees

The proposal was discussed and it was decided to correct this by changing "companies without employees, sole proprietorships," to "Contractors without employees."

4.7.2, workplace meetings

Reworded to clarify. (The requirement that risk assessment and work environment issues be included in at least one workplace meeting per year applies regardless of the number of workplace meetings per year.)

4.10 Competence and 4.11 Skills development

At the working group meeting on March 17, it was decided that a special group would review these parts. This included:

Kalle Brammås,
Mellanskog Erik Berglund,
Mellanskog Kevin
Dahlberg, Stora Enso Per
Eriksson, EC Skog
Mats-Erik Larsson, Forest Contractors
Anna Schyman, NYKS
Christina Lundgren, PEFC

The task of the group was to:

- o manage competence for the proposed requirement regarding efficient driving styles
- o review the whole regarding competence and course requirements
- o have a dialogue with SYN and the Care School in the work.

Work has led to several pieces of amendments within sections 4.10 and 4.11.

4.10, Preamble

Anna showed the proposal and Maud Petri Rådström commented and tabled two amendments in the first paragraph that were both adopted by the Working group - an addition (underlined below) and a deletion (crossed out):

For concretization of the standard's competence requirements, please refer to SYN (Forestry Professional Board) or to industry representatives appointed by PEFC. SYN is a joint cooperation body that promotes skills supply and skills development in-practical forestry.

The Working group also adopted the corresponding additions in the second paragraph (consequential amendment, underlined below):

Staff who plan, lead or carry out forestry work and in their role have a significant influence on how the measures are implemented in the forest must have the necessary competence in the work in accordance with the standard. For any additional professional categories, requirements for competence can be specified by Swedish PEFC in collaboration with SYN or another PEFC appointed

industry representatives. Staff who carry out forestry work must **also** have good knowledge of PEFC's tooth card.

When asked by Anneli Sandström about the meaning of "parts/courses", Christina Lundgren replied that the wording is designed to provide flexibility in terms of how competence can catered for. Per Eriksson added that the idea is that competence requirements should not be able to satisfy only through a specific course, but also through a composition of courses or course parts.

4.10.1 – 4.10.3

Amendments for the same wording 'in accordance with SYN or equivalent'.

4.10.6

Deletion of "idling"

It was proposed and adopted by the Working group to correct the proposal by deleting the "and" after the first point.

4.10.9 (10), hiring of school classes, etc.

Deletion of "the certified forest owner or other" and the addition of a reference to section of SWE 004.

4.11 Skills development, preamble

Amendments:

Competence development should focus on updates and news, but also highlight topics where deficiencies have been identified, locally or generally, e.g. via revisions or otherwise.

Competence development can be obtained via courses according to SYN or equivalent and must take place at specified intervals or via ongoing training sessions with corresponding content during the per ioden.

The wording in the first paragraph refers, inter alia, to: to give focus on news and get less of rehearsals. Per Eriksson clarified that "specified intervals" (second paragraph) refers to the interval specified in requirement elements and that the second paragraph does not refer to action in deviation management after an revision (revisions are given as an example), that "deficiencies" in the first paragraph refer to observation about training needs more generally. The wording in the second paragraph intends to open up for ongoing training sessions as an option for fulfilling competence requirements.

Maud recommended Swedish forest validation.

Correction as below for the first paragraph (Competence development should focus on...) proposed and adopted by the working group:

- o "shortcomings" are changed to "areas of development"
- o "revisions" are changed to "an overall assessment of revisions"
- o s tycket is added last in the preamble.

4.11.2 – 4.11.5 and 4.11.7

Abbreviated wording and "renewed" replaced by "updated".

4.11.5

Deletion of requirements regarding calibration exercises.

4.12 Family business

The previous proposal in 4.12.2 has been moved to the preamble and modified to:

When technically possible and cost-reasonable, self-employed forest owners are recommended, for their own equipment and machines, to meet the applicable requirements of the PEFC SWE 003 Contractor Standard, Chapter 4.7.

After discussion, the Working group adopted to substantiate this text in the proposal for 4.12.

4.12.2

Only requirements regarding saw chain lubrication remain from previous proposals.

Amendments in SWE 003

Chapter 3, Categories of Contractors

Martin Klenz-Tornow presented the proposal to exempt simpler forest inventories from the Contractor requirements.

4.4.2.

Deletion of requirements regarding calibration and adjustment of technical equipment and measurement methods.

4.10.2

Martin Klenz-Tornow presented the proposal, an addendum on what should be included in decontamination equipment. Ebbe Lindberg wanted to write that sawdust is not an acceptable absorbent. Martin proposed a supplement with two examples, Absol and Zugol in parentheses after absorbents, which the working group assumed.

10. Presentation – gender equality in the forest sector, Susanne Öberg

A summary is given as Appendix 2.

11. Continuation Working Group 3 – Social Standard and Contractorial Standard, continued. Remaining comments notified:

Consideration of proposals from Stora Enso Skog, Sydved and Billerud Korsnäs for SWE 003, 4.7.5, soil damage prevention, from Sara Waern

The proposal was to harmonize the wording with that in SWE 002, 5.7.5. The working group has considered the point of view (documented in the minutes of the working group, but not included in the Excel sheet) and decided to keep the wording that has gone to the public consultation as it is. The working group considered that the same choice of words is better and decided on a correction in SWE 003 according to the proposal from Stora Enso Skog, Sydved and Billerud Korsnäs.

- SWE002 5.7.5 Appropriate methodology and techniques shall be used to prevent driving injuries in the event of:
drifting, especially where transport crosses watercourses.
- SWE003 4.7.5. ~~The equipment and methodology needed to prevent soil damage~~
~~When driving should be used.~~ **Appropriate methodology and technology shall be used to prevent driving injuries during drifting, especially where transport crosses watercourses.**
Actions shall be planned and carried out in accordance with:
applicable requirements of *PEFC SWE 002 Forestry Standard*, section 5.7.

Viewpoint on writing about business agreements in SWE 002, 4.4.1, from Anneli Sandström
Anneli said that the proposal for the requirement for the content of the agreement is too extensive, detailed and with too advanced tasks for individual forest owners.

After discussion, in which several advocated simplification and several considered that the proposed requirement has appropriate content, it was decided to keep the proposed wording. When asked by Mårten, no one was in favour of appointing a working group for continued work.

Requirements regarding hydraulic oil in SWE 003, 4.7.2, from Mats Remsö

Mats considered that there are few cases when it can be demonstrated from only information in the safety data sheet that requirements are met. Martin Klenz-Tornow said that it is not a problem, the safety data sheet used is compared with an approved product's safety data sheet.

The Working group decided to correct the wording with the deletion of "based on the information in the safety data sheet".

The amendments with corrections adopted by the Working group and other consideration of comments received were adopted by the Working group.

12. Working Group 1 – Systems and structure

Anneli Sandström initially presented the areas and issues that the working group has worked on during the standard revision.

Amendments

An addendum on the evaluation of the standard revision process in SWE 001 Added to Appendix D:

9. Evaluation

Swedish PEFC will evaluate the revision process. In the evaluation, participating organisations shall have the opportunity to provide input through, for example, the following means: a survey. The evaluation shall be available for the next revision of the standard.

This means that all participants will have the opportunity to give feedback on the process.

Definition of uniform ownership in SWE 001 Included in Appendix B.

Deviation from work instructions in SWE 003, 4.5.1. Anneli showed the proposal, reworded and moved.

Use of school classes and organizations with youth activities in SWE 004, 3.2.1.7 and 4.4.1.7.

Anneli showed the proposal. The maximum amount of three price base amounts was considered by several to be too restrictive.

The Working group decided to correct the proposal by deleting the sentence of the limitation to three price base amounts.

13. Decision on standard proposals

The Chairman asked whether the Working group could approve the standard proposal, including the working group meeting corrections, for submission to the PEFC Board for further consideration. The working group answered yes to the question. The Chairman asked the Working group whether this decision can be considered to have been taken by consensus and the Working group replied in the affirmative to this as well.

14. Other

business No
other business.

15. Conclusion of the meeting

The Chairman of the Board of Swedish PEFC, Sture Karlsson, thanked the working group and everyone who has worked on the standard proposal from PEFC's side. Anneli, Anna, Göran and Sofia (chairmen of the task forces), Mårten, the chairman of the working group and Hans (secretary) were thanked with flowers, backpack applause.

Mårten thanked the participants and ended the meeting.

Appendix 1.

Participants Swedish PEFC working group meeting 5 2022-10-06

Anna Kolmert Boström	Stora Enso Skog	
Anna Schyman	Nyks	
Anneli Johansson	Spillkråkan	Teams
Anneli Sandström	Skogscertifiering Prosilva	
Babs Stuiver	Sveaskog	
Bella Lindbrandt	Svenska PEFC	
Christina Lundgren	Svenska PEFC	Teams
Ebbe Lindberg	SEC och Skogsentreprenörerna	
Eje Andersson	Svenskt Friluftsliv	Teams
Elin Sunesdotter	LRF Skogsägarna	
Emelie Åslin	ECSkog	Teams

Erica Pershagen	Stora Enso Skog	
	Stiftens Egendomsförvaltningars	
Fredrik Sätter	Förening	Teams
	Stiftens Egendomsförvaltningars	
Gert Adolfsson	Förening	Teams
Göran Örlander	Svenska PEFC	
Hampus Blomstrand	Stora Enso Skog	Teams
Hans Weslien	Svenska PEFC	
Jonathan Lundberg	GS-facket	Teams
Josefine Åhrman	Svenskt Friluftsliv	
Kevin Dahlberg	Stora Enso Skog	
Kristoffer Englund	GS-facket	Teams
Lars Stenberg	SCA Skog	Teams
Lisa Holmgren	Svenska PEFC	Teams
Marie Wikberg	Mellanskog	Teams
Martin Klenz-Tornow	Skogscertifiering Prosilva	Teams
Mats Remsö	Pancert	Teams
Maud Petri Rådström	Gröna arbetsgivare	
Mårten Larsson	forumets ordförande	
Nicklas Samils	Sveriges Allmänningsskogars förbund	Teams
Olof Falkeström	Norra Skog	Teams
Per Eriksson	ECSkog	
Perarne Nordholts	Pancert -ca kl. 14	Teams
Rickard Klingberg	Sveriges Jordägareförbund	Teams
Sara Waern	Billerud Korsnäs	Teams
Sebastian Lindqvist	SEC och Skogsentreprenörerna	
Sofia Backéus	LRF Skogsägarna	
	Stiftens Egendomsförvaltningars	
Sofia Bäcklund	Förening	Teams
Sture Karlsson	Svenska PEFC, ordförande Svenska PEFC	
Teresa Leifsdotter	Holmen Skog	
Thomas Löwenberg	Svenska PEFC	
	Stiftens Egendomsförvaltningars	
Tomas Johansson	Förening	Teams

Södra, whose representative was unable to attend has announced after the working group that they too support the working group's proposal.

Appendix 2 Gender equality in the forest industry, Susanne Öberg

Susanne works as a consultant focusing on gender equality, mainly in the forest sector. Information about her activities can be found on susanneoberg.com. She manages the project *Gender equality in the forest industry*. The project is the forest industry's joint effort to strengthen the attractiveness of forests from a gender perspective. The project, which is owned by the County Administrative Board of Västernorrland and will run until spring 2023, aims to create the conditions for a long-term, competitive, sustainable and profitable forest industry where women and men should have the same opportunities to own and manage forests and to work in or run companies.

In the forest industry in Sweden, 89% are now men. The proportion of women has decreased in recent years.

In addition to the County Administrative Board and the Region, the following organizations are participating in the project: Biometria, Holmen Skog, Höglandssågen, LRF, Metsä Board, Mondi Dynäs, Norra Skog, Nätraälven Skog, Rundvirke Skog, SCA Skog, Skogsentreprenörerna, Skogssällskapet, Svenska Skogsplantor, Timmerkörarna, Örnfrakt, NYKS, Skogsstyrelsen, Naturbruksgymnasiet Skedom, Processum, MIUN, SLU and GS-facket .

The project is financed half by Region Västernorrland and half by the forest actors.

Susanne emphasized the importance that the entire chain "plant to plank" is covered. Gender issues are important to everyone but can be easy to see as someone else's problem. It doesn't get any better when you pass the ball between different parts. It is not enough that some part is good, as an example was mentioned that you can be good in upper secondary education but that students out on internships can get badly treated.

The project is geared to :

- Design measures of a strategic nature that will lead to the work on gender equality in the forestry sector will move on to the next step when a real and lasting change occurs and where the change work has an impact.
- Be courageous in the design of goals and interventions.
- Identify and manage resistance.
- Focus on the norms that associate forest knowledge and competence with men and masculinity.

One meaning of gender equality is that the proportion of women and men in a group is 40/60 or more even. But the important and crucial thing is attitudes, norms, values and ideals and the gender distribution while the proportion of women and men is the effect.

In mapping standards in the forest industry, the project has come up with these:

- Be physically strong, practical and energetic
- Fear of showing vulnerability and asking for help
- Seek competition, win and strive to be successful

- Conflict drive
- Great focus on traditionally male-coded hobbies.

Svensk lagstiftning

Görs aktiva åtgärder i företaget för att:

skapa ett arbetsklimat som är inkluderande och fritt från trakasserier, sexuella trakasserier och repressalier för alla anställda oavsett kön, könsöverskridande identitet eller uttryck, etnisk tillhörighet, religion eller annan trosuppfattning, funktionsnedsättning, sexuell läggning eller ålder?

Görs aktiva åtgärder i företaget för att:

anpassa arbetsmoment, utrustning, hjälpmedel, skyddshandskar, skyddskläder, skyddsskor m.m och möjliggöra för att undvika arbetsskador för de anställda (oavsett styrka eller storlek på kroppar)?

Görs aktiva åtgärder i företaget för att:

följa upp och vid behov åtgärda brister i arbetsklimatet?

Görs aktiva åtgärder i företaget för att:

följa upp och vid behov åtgärda brister i arbetsmiljön?

Har företaget en positiv inställning till att erbjuda praktikplats/anställning till sökanden oavsett kön, könsöverskridande identitet eller uttryck, etnisk tillhörighet, religion eller annan trosuppfattning, funktionsnedsättning, sexuell läggning eller ålder.

Important parts of leadership are inclusion, that all competencies are used, developing empathic abilities and cooperation. It's very much a question of how to be with other people including how men are with men, not just how men are with women.

The project also includes the development of criteria for gender-sensitive procurements and agreements on services. Both clients and contractors have participated in this work (Holmen Skog, SCA Skog, Norra Skog, the Swedish Forest Agency and the Swedish Forest Contractors). The starting point has been Swedish legislation.

An upcoming step in the project is the development of a web education and it will be looked at how knowledge can be obtained through established educations and also at getting into gender equality in certification.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE WORKING GROUP

Anna Schyman mentioned that things are looking good in terms of how the proportion of women has developed in the forestry educations at SLU and at Linnaeus University and that recruitment has also increased. But it's a problem that women don't stay in the industry. She asked about what is important to get women to stay. Susanne replied that one is an important issue that the industry needs to address but believed that it is the leadership that needs to change but also that it is important that all employees take responsibility for how gender equality and inclusion are implemented within their own work area. She also mentioned that gender equality competence could be included in certification.

Elin Sunesdotter mentioned that it looks different in different parts of the industry and that you need to look at parts separately and identify problems where they belong. Susanne also held but believed that it is important to look at what you can learn from each other from part to part.

Maud Petri Rådström believed that there is a lack of the upper secondary school perspective and the Contractors in the discussions in the work that is being done. There is some being done within SYN (Maud mentioned that there is a report). There are schools that succeed better with recruitment and it is looked at what is done there to succeed better, but also important is the

question of how the workplaces are done attractive for both women and men. Maud also highlighted the importance of dialogue about how we treat and treat each other, how we talk to each other, attitudes and norms, and how work is organized to: fit more categories.

Göran Örlander mentioned Gamelife management (which has been raised by Susanne as a difficult area). Göran also saw the area as problematic, an administration that does not work. Susanne pointed to conflict drive as a cause and that it is almost exclusively about relationships. Göran thought that it would be good more research and facts in the area and a description of what it actually looks like.

Mårten Larsson asked about what Susanne sees as the most important parts of leadership. Susanne brought up looking more to the people not only to the production - it is people who should be led, to take advantage of people's full skills and abilities, to ask for help also as a leader and to have a leadership that is much closer to people, to catch in and hear instead of "pushing to" and co-work.

Rickard Klingberg mentioned that it is possible to ensure gender equality within NGOs, but that it is possible to ensure that requires 3-4 times more women to be asked. Susanne replied that regarding meeting culture (times) and that women take greater responsibility at home are contributing factors.

Rickard also asked about what it is that makes women not attracted to practical jobs in the forest such as driving a machine or other things, the purely physical is with today's technical solutions not so heavy. He himself addressed shift work, loneliness, work trips and long days. Susanne commented that women's greater responsibility for the home is also behind it and pointed out that it is also a problem to recruit men.