

Summary points of CPET Reference Board Meeting 11/05/2006

Attendees:

Bob Andrew, Defra

Katharine Thoday, Defra

Claire Treliving, Defra

Neil Judd, ProForest (CPET)

Kate Bottrill, ProForest (CPET)

Joyce Lam, ProForest (CPET)

Beatrix Richards, WWF UK

Saskia Ozinga, FERN

Andy Roby, TTF

Martin Gale, Confor

Category A Assessment Criteria Review

CPET's brief was to retain the assessment criteria as originally drafted, unless there were compelling reasons to make changes, and clarify the guidance on interpretation and scoring.

Criteria 1.1.1 to 1.1.4 Content of standards for legal compliance

Minimal changes had been suggested to tighten and clarify wording. In 1.1.2 a text change from 'law and codes of practice' to 'legal requirements' was agreed.

Criteria 1.2.3 to 1.2.6 Content of standards for sustainable variant

Minimal changes to ensure the criteria are consistent and clear had been proposed. In 1.2.1 removal of the bullet points from the criteria section to the guidance section and inclusion of examples was agreed.

In 1.2.2 it was agreed that there needed to be an addition to clarify the points system, specifically how to score a 2.

In 1.2.3 the proposal to change "should ensure" to 'must seek to ensure' was thought to be a weakening of the criterion. It was agreed that this should revert back to the original text.

Criteria 1.3.1 to 1.3.3 Standard Setting Process

In 1.3.2 the proposal had been to remove the word 'balanced' from the criterion because some had thought it difficult to quantify (and therefore difficult to achieve), especially in situations where stakeholders were not split into social, environmental and economic interest categories. This was linked to 1.3.3 where the proposal was to remove the 1st bullet point which dealt with vetoing the standard setting process and to expand the guidance. It was agreed that 1.3.2 directly affected 1.3.3 and greater clarification was necessary. The Board agreed that balanced representation should be retained as the objective for 1.3.2. The Board also agreed that, while the process should ensure that representatives of all three interest groups had an opportunity to participate, either by invitation or self-nomination, it would be

unreasonable to expect a scheme to abort the process if one of those groups opted not to take part. This could be clarified in the guidance to 1.3.3

Criteria 2.1 to 2.6 Certification

The proposal for Criteria 2.1 was to make it a must to conform to ISO or equivalent and to move the ISO explanatory notes from the criterion to the guidance. The Board commented that the entire guidance section from 2.2 to 2.6 was more about explaining the criteria than offering guidance on scoring. New text was required to give guidance on scoring. In criteria 2.5 it was agreed that there needed to be further clarification of what was meant by 'publicly available' results. It was suggested that results published on a website should score 2 points whereas hard copies of reports sent within 2 weeks of request should score only 1 point.

Criteria 3.1 Accreditation

The permitted link between a standard setting body and an accreditation body was now clarified by adding a reference to ISO 17011:2004 and a checklist at Annex 3 to see if the organisation, systems and procedures are consistent with ISO requirements in this respect.

Criteria 4.1 to 4.6 Chain of Custody

ISO standards had been updated and the criteria and guidance clarified. In 4.2 it was agreed that the criterion text be changed to - 'final *certified* product' - and the guidance should make clear that a scheme either passes or fails; partial compliance with a score of 1 not being an option.

For ease of understanding the former criteria 4.3 and 4.4 had been merged to form new criteria 4.3 and the former 4.5 and 4.6 had been merged to form a new criterion 4.4. It had also been made clear that new criteria 4.5 and 4.6 also count towards the overall score when assessing schemes. These changes were agreed.

A.O.B

Timings were agreed for publication of the revised Category A Assessment document. CPET would finalise the agreed changes and forward to Board members by 15.05.06 for any further comment by 19.05.06. The finalised document would be submitted to Defra by 22.05.06 for final clearance before publication at the end of May 2006. Schemes would be given notice and an announcement made 30 days prior to commencement of the reviews.

The review would look at (a) changes made to any schemes since the original assessment in November 2004 and (b) evidence related to system implementation.

It was agreed that criteria were needed to determine what evidence of system implementation should be taken into consideration and what should not be allowed. The methodology already noted that evidence must be related to a specific criterion and must be objective and verifiable but it was felt that further clarification would be useful. CPET will look into providing a template and possible examples.

The final report on the review would include unattributed comments and evidence allowed for consideration.

Next meeting

Scheduled for 18 July 2006

Defra – May 2006