**SCOPING PROPOSAL AND**

 **RISK ASSESSMENT**

**AMENDMENT ONE OF**

**JOINT AUSTRALIAN AND NEW ZEALAND FOREST MANAGEMENT STANDARD AS/NZS 4708:2021**

**February 2022**

## **Introduction**

This report outlines the scoping proposal and risk assessment for amendment one to Australian and New Zealand Standard AS/NZS 4708-2021 Sustainable Forest Management.

This proposal outlines factors to be considered in the amendment to AS/NZS 4708.

In particular, risks associated with the Standard have been considered and assessed under Section 7.

The proposal considers relevant factors and is consistent with the Standards Australia Standardisation Guidelines, SDAC Accreditation Rules and the PEFC Standard Setting Standard 2017.

The following factors have been considered.

* Do PEFC Standards Setting Requirements impact on the amendment?
* Alignment with the 2018 PEFC Meta-Standard.
* Any changes to the structure of a joint AS/NZS Committee, Chair, drafting leader and proportion of representatives from each Country.
* Any new potential nominating organisations.
* Impact on New Zealand.
* Format and structure of meetings and the ability to minimise costs using telecommunications.
* Timelines, milestones and completion dates.
* Funding and funding contributions.
* Risk factors and Risk Assessment for the development of a joint Australia/New Zealand Standard.
* Public comment process-Australia and New Zealand

### **How the PEFC Standards Setting Process Impacts on the Amendment**

As the proposed amendment is to align the conversion cut-off date with the 2018 PEFC Sustainable Forest Management (Meta-Standard), the proposed amendment is completely consistent with PEFC requirements.

The structure of the existing AS/NZS 4708 Standards Reference Committee (SRS) is aligned with requirements provided in PEFC ST 1001:2017-Standards Setting in regard to the representation and participation of key stakeholders.

The proposed amendment will not conflict with PEFC Standards setting requirements.

### **Alignment with the 2018 PEFC Meta-Standard**

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to better align AS/NZS 4708:2021 with the PEFC Meta-Standard for Sustainable Forest Management. There is no risk that the amendment would be misaligned with PEFC SFM requirements or cause difficulties for endorsement.

### **Structure of the Committee (Chair, Drafting Leader and portion of representative for Australia)**

The structure of the exiting AS/NZS 4708 Standards Reference Committee is outlined in **Table Two**.

### **TABLE TWO: EXISTING COMMITTEE STRUCTURE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **REPRESENTATION REQUIRED BY PEFC ST 1001:2017** | **REPRESENTATION** |
| Forest Owners/Managers | 4 |
| Business and Industry | 6 |
| Indigenous People | 2 |
| Non-Government Organisations | 4 |
| Scientific & Technical Community | 4 |
| Work & Trade Unions | 2 |
| Local Authorities | 2 |
| **TOTAL** | **24** |

In addition to the Committee members, there are 2 additional positions.

1. Chair – Dr Gordon Duff
2. Drafting Leader – Simon Dorries

The structure above complies with both PEFC and Standards Australia requirements for committee structures.

No changes are required.

### **Nominating Organisations**

**Table Three** below is a list of nominating organisations for each Stakeholder Group participating on the AS/NZ 4708 Standards Reference Committee.

**TABLE THREE-NOMINATING ORGANISATIONS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **NOMINATING ORGANISATION** | **STAKEHOLDER GROUP** **(PEFC ST 1001:2017)** |
| Chair | Dr Gordon Duff |
| AFPA | Business and Industry |
| AFPA | Business and Industry |
| AFG | Forest Grower |
| AACB | Business and Industry |
| IFA | Scientific and Technology Community |
| South East Timber Association  | Non-Govt Organisation |
| The University of Melbourne  | Scientific and Technology Community |
| CSIRO | Scientific and Technology Community |
| University of the Sunshine Coast | Scientific and Technology Community |
| The University of Tasmania | Scientific and Technology Community  |
| CFMEU | Workers and Trade Unions |
| National Timber Council Association | Local Authorities |
| National Retailers Association  | Business and Industry |
| Indigenous people representative  |  |
| Environmental Farmers Network | Non-Govt Organisation |
| NZFCA | Business and Industry |
| WPMA | Business and Industry |
| WPMA | Business and Industry  |
| NZ Forest Owners Association | Forest Grower |
| NZ Farm Forest Association | Forest Grower |
| NZ Forest Industries Contractors Association | Business and Industry |
| SCION | Scientific and Technology Community |
| NZ Institute of Forestry | Non-Govt Organisation |
| NZ Timber Industry federation | Business and Industry |
| NZ First Union  | Workers and Trade Unions |
| Federation of Maori Authorities | Indigenous |
| NZ Ministry of Primary Industries | Local Authorities |

All required Stakeholder groups are represented and no changes are required..

### **Impact on New Zealand**

New Zealand committee members have confirmed that forest conversion ceased well before 2007 and adoption of the proposed amendment will have no impact on New Zealand forest growers.

AFPA contacted a number of New Zealand Stakeholders when developing the project proposal. Stakeholders responding did not oppose the amendment.

### **Format and Structure of Meetings and the ability to minimise costs using Telecommunications**

It is anticipated that two meetings will be required to process the amendment.

Meeting One will include the kick off meeting, review and agreement of the revised text and an agreement to take the draft to public comment.

Meeting Two will include the review of public comment and agreement (or otherwise) to ballot the finalised draft.

To minimise cost and as the proposed changes to AS/NZS 4708 are very minimal and clearly understood, meetings will be held using telecommunications. The proposed meeting schedule is provided in **Table Four**.

### **TABLE FOUR: PROPOSED MEETING FORMATS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MEETING NUMBER** | **FORMAT** |
| No. 1 – Kick off Meeting-Agreement on text and public comment | Teleconference |
| No. 2 – Review of Public Comments an agreement on Ballot | Teleconference |

### **Timelines, Milestones and Completion Dates**

**Table Five** outlines the proposed timelines.

### **TABLE FIVE: PROPOSED AMENDMENT DEVELOPMENT TIMELINES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ACTIVITY** | **DUE DATE** |
| Approval of project by Responsible Wood Board | March 2022 |
| Meeting No. 1 | April 2022 |
| Public Comment | April-July 2022 |
| Meeting No. 2 | August 2022 |
| Ballot | September 2022 |
| Approval by Responsible Wood Board | October 2022 |
| Publishing | October 2022 |

### **Estimated Costs**

The costs of processing the proposed amendment are minimal and mostly involve Responsible Wood staff time.

The Chair of the AS/NZS 4708 Standards Reference Committee has agreed to complete this revision at no cost.

The estimate costs are provided following.

### **Estimated Development Costs**

1. Consulting Fees (Chair and Secretary) Nil
2. Consulting fees (Conservation Biologist) $500
3. Meeting Costs Nil
4. Travel Costs $Nil
5. Advertising (Public Comment) $200

**TOTAL: $700**

### **Risks**

Developing this amendment is not without risk. Detailed following **(Table Six)** is an assessment of the identified risks and an assessment of their potential impact.

### **TABLE SIX: RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RISK** | **LIKELIHOOD** | **IMPACT** | **COMMENT AND MITIGATION MEASURES** |
| 1. The positions of Australia and New Zealand committee members on the propose amendment differ to the extent they cannot be reconciled.
 | Low | Low | It is acceptable in a Joint Standard to list Country specific requirements e.g. “For application in New Zealand………applies”.If necessary, the amended cut-off date could only apply in Australia. |
| 1. Public Comment feedback makes requests for changes that are unobtainable or unrealistic in either Country (e.g. alignment with FSC cut-off dates)
 | Low | Low | Unrealistic requests will certainly be rejected by the Committee. |
| 1. Excessive Delays
 | Low | Low | The proposed amendment is well defined and is essentially a change in cut-off date from 2007 to 2010. The amendment will impact on a small area of plantation forest.AS/NZS 4708:2021 has been published ensuring that milestones for PEFC endorsement have been achieved.While delays may impact directly on forest managers with plantations developed after 2007, the impact on the wider industry and on Responsible Wood will be minimal. |
| 1. Financial Risk
 | Low | Low | There is minimal likelihood of excessive costs. |
| 1. Reputational Risk
 | Moderate | Low | There is moderate risk that environmental organisations would view the proposal negatively and attempt to discredit the Responsible Wood Scheme.However, the beneficiaries of this amendment are severely disadvantaged and considering the small area that could by impacted by the amendment it is considered unlikely that attacks would be forthcoming. |

### **Publishing**

Publishing agreements with Standards Australia permit Responsible Wood to make AS/NZS 4708:2021 available free of charge.

This agreement includes the Standard and any subsequent amendments. There are no publishing restrictions, and the amendment can be made available on the Responsible Wood website and the revised text will be included in an updated AS/NZS 4708.
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