1st INTERNATIONAL FORESTRY & NATURE TOURISM E-CONGRESS "New Approaches and Trends in Forestry" November 25-27, 2020

1st INTERNATIONAL FORESTRY & NATURE TOURISM E-CONGRESS

"New Approaches and Trends in Forestry

NOVEMBER 25-27, 2020, KASTAMONU / TURKEY

PROCEEDING BOOK

KASTAMONU UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF FORESTRY
2020

1st INTERNATIONAL FORESTRY & NATURE TOURISM E-CONGRESS

"New Approaches and Trends in Forestry"

November 25-27, 2020, Kastamonu/TURKEY

PROCEEDING BOOK

KASTAMONU UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF FORESTRY
2020

Organized By

Kastamonu University
Faculty of Forestry

Honorary Chair: Prof. Dr. Ahmet Hamdi TOPAL (Rector)
Congress Chair: Prof. Dr. Ömer KÜÇÜK

Organization Committee

Dr. Alper BULUT, Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Alperen KAYMAKCI, Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Bahadır Çağrı BAYRAM, Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Çağrı OLGUN, Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Erol AKKUZU, Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Gonca Ece ÖZCAN, Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Mertcan KARADENİZ, Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Miraç AYDIN, Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Oytun Emre SAKICI, Kastamonu University, TURKEY
M.Sc. Abdullah UGIŞ, Kastamonu University, TURKEY
M.Sc. Büşra KALLECİ, Kastamonu University, TURKEY
M.Sc. Hakan AYDOĞAN, Kastamonu University, TURKEY
M.Sc. Senem GÜNEŞ ŞEN, Kastamonu University, TURKEY
M.Sc. Sevtap ERDOĞAN, Kastamonu University, TURKEY

Congress Secretariat

Dr. Alper BULUT, Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Önder TOR, Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Tutku ÜÇÜNCÜ, Kastamonu University, TURKEY

Scientific Committee

Dr. Nagihan SEKİ
Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Nurcan DEMİRCİOĞLU YİĞİT
Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Ömer KÜÇÜK
Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Önder TOR
Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Osman Emre ÖZKAN
Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Osman TOPAÇOĞLU
Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Oytun Emre SAKICI
Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Özkan EVCİN
Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Paulo FERNANDES
University of Trás-os-Montes and Alto Douro, PORTUGAL
Dr. Rahim ANŞİN
Karadeniz Technical University, TURKEY
Dr. Sabri ÜNAL
Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Sadık ÇAĞLAR
Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Saim ATEŞ
Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Salim HIZIROĞLU
Oklahoma State University, USA
Dr. Sedat KELEŞ
Çankırı Karatekin University, TURKEY
Dr. Seray ÖZDEN KELEŞ
Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Şeref KURT
Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Sezgin AYAN
Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Steve KELLEY
North Carolina State University, USA
Dr. Süleyman AKBULUT
İzmir Katip Çelebi University, TURKEY
Dr. Tayyibe ALTUNEL
Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Türker DÜNDAR
İstanbul University-Cerrahpasa, TURKEY
Dr. Tutku ÜÇÜNCÜ
Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Ümmü KARAGÖZ İŞLEYEN
Kastamonu University, TURKEY
Dr. Yılmaz ÇATAL
Isparta University of Applied Sciences, TURKEY
Dr. Yusuf SERENGİL
İstanbul University -Cerrahpasa, TURKEY

Supporting Organizations

Special thanks to:

Contact

Kastamonu University
Faculty of Forestry
37100, Kastamonu, TURKEY
Phone: +90 366 280 1702
Fax: +90 366 215 23 16
İnfont2020@kastamonu.edu.tr

1st INTERNATIONAL
FORESTRY & NATURE TOURISM
CONGRESS
"New Approaches and Trends in Forestry"
November 25-27, 2020, Kastamonu / TURKEY

Considerations on Forest Management Certification in Turkey as to FSC® (Forest Stewardship Council) Scheme

Ahmet SIVACIOĞLU

Kastamonu University, Faculty of Forestry, Department of Forest Engineering, Kastamonu, TURKEY
Corresponding Author: asivacioglu@kastamonu.edu.tr

Abstract

Aim of study: The aim of this study is to examine the Forest Management Certification projects which have been carried out in Turkey since 2010 as to the FSC system. Presently, 6.673.308 ha of forests certified in Turkey according to this system.

Area of study: This study based on the Forest Management Certification projects of Turkey as to the FSC system.

Material and methods: In the study, FSC projects currently carried out were evaluated as material. In this study, certification projects in Turkey are examined, problems and their solutions are listed.

Main results: Not only the positive price contribution of the certification process to the wood producer General Forestry Directorate (GFD), but also the country-based contribution to the forest industry should be evaluated. It is not possible to return from the FSC certification process, and it is necessary to establish permanent quality systems in all centre and local forestry organizations. Instead of delegating the management and monitoring of the management of the process only to the Business Marketing Branch directorate, all branches should be involved in this process, management and monitoring should only be controlled by a chief engineer or branch whose job is the certification process. In the certification process, it is important for the top management to own the process and this process must be included in the scope of internal control. The decision on which certification process to use should definitely be agreed with the wood products buyers.

Highlights: In Turkish forestry, Forest Management Certification process must be accepted as an irreversible process, and more efficient system should be established accordingly.

Keywords: FSC, Forest Management Certification, Turkey

Introduction

The local public and other NGO's about forest and forestry reached sufficient strength to cause national and global concern in 1980s. Thus, some of the multilateral organizations like World Bank and FAO as well as national bilateral agencies, funded or managed numerous projects to improve forest management and protection. Also, some of initiatives such as the Tropical Forest Action Plan and the International Tropical Timber Organization were established to help improve the forestry sector in the tropics (Synott 2005). Throughout the 1980s and in the 1990s, forests became an increasingly important issue for the NGOs. Friends of the Earth started in the mid1980s with research linking UK timber companies with tropical deforestation (Dudley et al. 1995). Facing public concerns, manufacturers put labels on the products, claiming sustainability of their forest resources. For some of them, the situation became urgent in the late 1980s when journalists, the media and environmental NGOs started targeting retailers and their purchasing policies. In this case, many organizations and people contributed to the search for solutions. In a sense, all of them contributed to the eventual emergence of certification. Even the vigorous early criticisms of the certification idea contributed to success by identifying the key interests and needs of different groups. Up to the late 1980s, most national efforts to promote better forest management had concentrated on pressuring their own governments, foresters and loggers. Most of the bilateral and multilateral efforts in the tropics targeted the same groups. In contrast, three initiatives in northern countries developed the idea of using market forces to promote good forest management. They

focused on the traders and retailers in timber products, and proposed to encourage the preferential imports of tropical timber from identifiable well managed forests. These three early initiatives (Friends of the Earth-UK, The Ecological Trading Company- ETC, The Woodworkers Alliance for Rainforest Protection-WARP) led in a direct line to the launch of global accreditation and certification in their present form (Synott 2005). Besides, other initiatives like WWF-International developed its plans for a campaign to promote sustainable forest management, and to concentrate the international trade in the products of sustainably managed forests worldwide (Elliott 1991). By July 1991, WWF- UK had identified the potential role of an International Forest Monitoring Agency in helping to achieve this target. By May 1992, the target had "been broadened to cover the entire trade in wood and wood products worldwide" The 1995 Group, other Buyers Groups and the Global Forest & Trade Network were emerging (WWF-UK 1992). In mid-1990, The Nature Conservancy (TNC) made a study of the need for certification, and the potential for TNC itself to become involved as a certifier. They consulted organizations involved in certification, trade and forest conservation. Most of them were highly sceptical about the need for certification, and whether any credible form of tropical forest certification was possible. Shortly afterwards, The Homeland Foundation commissioned a study of the requirements for a credible certification system for forest products (Simeone 1990). The first group to launch itself into forest certification was Rainforest Alliance, a New York NGO with four years of experience in rainforest areas. During 1990, a program was developed for identifying "well-managed tropical woods", and evaluated logging concessions in Indonesia. In October, the launch of the Smart Wood certification program was announced. It was recognized the lack of "broadly accepted standards for particular tropical forest regions", and developed a simplified system based on 1) watershed stabilization, 2) sustained yield production, and 3) positive impact on wellbeing of local people. Operations that demonstrated a "strong operational commitment to these criteria will be classified as well-managed (Ussach 1990a). This was the first third-party certification of forest management. In November 1990, Ussach (1990b) circulated a draft Rainforest Alliance "Criteria for Evaluating the Sustainability of Tropical Logging Operations", which followed closely the recent ITTO Guidelines (ITTO 1990). These eventually evolved into the Smartwood standards. Rainforest Alliance confirmed that certification needed "independent third-party field evaluation" and, in due course, a broad agreement on the definition of "sustainable logging". Thus, the concepts of third party assessments and widely agreed standards formed part of the original concept. Meanwhile, this early version of certification concentrated attention and encouraged the attention of other certification initiatives. Green Cross Certification Co (1991), (later SCS) and the Institute of Sustainable Forestry (ISF 1991), both of California, drafted their forestry certification systems in March 1991; Soil Association entered certification discussions with WWF in May 1991, and SGS was started making its interest in the same period (Synott 2005). From January 1991, the Certification Working Group (CWG) took the initiative. Over the next year, most of the activities that led to the founding of FSC were associated with this group or its members. However, it remained quite informal, as a gradually expanding circulation list or forum, rather than a fixed membership. The first key event organized by the CWG was a Certification Meeting in San Francisco in April 1991 (Synott 2005) Rainforest Alliance and Scientific Certification Systems, and an explanation of the proposed International Forest Monitoring Agency. Much of the meeting was devoted to wide-ranging discussion of the concerns, expectations and questions about forest and wood certification, and to the contents of a Forest Stewardship Charter to which all certification groups could subscribe and adhere. The meeting also discussed the structure and governance of the organization that would monitor the certifiers for compliance. By now, it was clear that the new organization under consideration would not itself certify forests, but would be responsible for developing some sort of

standard. A report of the meeting referred to the birth of "an umbrella certification watchdog/standards organization, tentatively called the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) (Simeone 1991).

Concerned about accelerating deforestation, environmental degradation and social exclusion, a group of timber users, traders and representatives of environmental and human rights organizations met in California in 1990. The timeline of FSC started with this meeting. This diverse group highlighted the need for a system that could credibly identify well-managed forests as the sources of responsibly produced wood products. The concept of FSC and the name were coined at this meeting. Some of the purposes of FSC had defined as; to promote an adequate management of forests, providing the assistance required to achieve an environmentally appropriate and economically viable exploitation of natural resources, avoiding deterioration or affectation of such resources, of the ecosystems, or of the surrounding communities; to promote a viable management of the forest resources and a forestry production that preserves the environment; to promote the Principles and Criteria of responsible management of the world's forests through the development of the forest management standards and a voluntary accreditation program. The FSC Principles and Criteria were first published in 1994. They were amended in 1996, 1999 and 2001. A comprehensive review commenced in 2009, which resulted in major revisions to the wording – although not the substance – of the Principles and Criteria being proposed in 2011 (URL 1; FSC, 2007). All ten principles and criteria must be applied in any forest management unit before it can receive FSC certification. The Principles & Criteria apply to all forest types and to all areas within the management unit included in the scope of the certificate. The P&C are applicable worldwide and relevant to forest areas and different ecosystems, as well as cultural, political and legal systems. This means that they are not specific to any particular country or region (FSC, 2009). The FSC Principles and Criteria for Forest Stewardship provide an internationally recognized standard for responsible forest management. However, any international standard for forest management needs to be adapted at the national or sub-national level in order to reflect the diverse legal, social and geographical conditions of forests in different parts of the world. The FSC Principles and Criteria therefore require the addition of indicators that are adapted to national or subnational conditions in order to be implemented at the forest management unit (FMU) level. The FSC Principles and Criteria together with a set of such indicators accredited by FSC constitute an FSC Forest Stewardship Standard. In areas in which there is not yet an FSC accredited Forest Stewardship Standard certification bodies may therefore carry out certification according to their own 'generic' standards, adapted to account for the local conditions in the country or region in which they are to be used with input from local stakeholders. The process of local adaptation of the certification body's generic standard is not designed to be a substitute for the process for developing an FSC regional, national or subnational Forest Stewardship Standard. Nevertheless it allows examples of forest certification in a country. Such examples can be useful tools for explaining and demonstrating the potential benefits as well as the limits of forest certification. Finally, the discussion and consultation surrounding the development and implementation of a locally adapted standard can act as a catalyst for the longer and more complex process of developing an FSC Forest Stewardship Standard based on national debate and support (FSC, 2009).

It is the most important goal of forestry to benefit from the wood products offered by forests and other services whose importance is increasing day by day, by ensuring that future generations will benefit from it in a sustainable way. This goal is briefly expressed as sustainability in forestry. Today, it becomes important to examine and certify sustainability in terms of internationally accepted standards (Sıvacıoğlu, 2013).

Material and Methods

As the material of the study, FSC Forest Management certification projects, carried out in Turkey, are used. According to the raised

non-compliances and field observations in these project works, opinions on forest certification were expressed.

Results and Discussion

In Turkey, the forest certification started in 2010, together with pre-assessment of Aladağ FMU (Forest Management Unit) on 25-26 May 2010, based on FSC system. Presently, 6.673.308 ha of forest area certified under 13 projects (URL-2). In these projects, 79 FDD (Forest District Directorate) and 690 FMU have been certified under 12 FRDs (Forest Regional Directorate). The certified area (app. 6.7 million ha) constitutes 30% of the total forest area (22.3 million ha), 53% of the productive forest area (12.7 million ha) of Turkey. In other words, this means that 30% of total FDDs and 34% of total FMUs are certified. 7 of the existing projects are in the 2nd period and 6 of them are in the 1st period of the certification (Table 1).

Table 1. Ongoing FSC Forest Management Certification projects in Turkey.

FRD	FDD	Total Forest (ha)	First Issue	Second Issue
Bolu	Aladağ (1 FMU)	8.991	4.10.2011	8.11.2016
Bolu	Aladağ, Bolu, Gerede, Seben (4 FDDs, 41 FMUs)	287.394	17.04.2014	17.04.2019
Muğla	Overall (12 FDDs, 104 FMUs)	1.152.360	12.12.2012	21.11.2018
Kastamonu	Daday, Araç, Ayancık, Tosya,Taşköprü (5 FDDs, 54 FMUs)	374.039	5.04.2013	5.04.2018
Zonguldak	Karabük, Yenice (2 FDDs, 25 FMUs)	173.897	21.03.2013	16.04.2018
Bursa	İnegöl, Keles, Yalova (3 FDDs, 27 FMUs)	149.323	7.03.2014	7.03.2019
İstanbul	Kırklareli, Demirköy, Vize (3 FDDs, 35 FMUs)	257.744	18.03.2014	18.03.2019
Balıkesir	Overall (9 FDDs, 88 FMUs)	676.210	29.01.2020	
Çanakkale	Overall (9 FDDs, 74 FMUs)	572.992	13.05.2020	
Antalya	Overall (13 FDDs, 73 FMUs)	1.174.414	8.11.2019	
Adana	Overall (9 FDDs, 88 FMUs)	734.710	29.03.2019	
Mersin	Overall (8 FDDs, 66 FMUs)	833.261	6.02.2020	
Konya	Karaman, Ermenek (2 FDDs, 14 FMUs)	277.973		
Total	79 FDDs, 690 FMUs	6.673.308		

First of all, at the beginning of the FSC forest management certification process, there was a perception that, as in some other historical forestry projects, it will be tried for a certain period of time and the certification process will be stopped later. However, this process differs from other historical forestry processes. The only wood producer in Turkey is the General Directorate of Forestry (GFD). Private forest rate in Turkey is less than a degree to be taken into account in the share of raw wood producing. Therefore, imported wood is the only competitor to wood raw material produced by GFD.

The current situation in Turkey, there are 747 institutions and organizations certified as to FSC-CoC (Chain of Custody) standards. In order for these organizations to sell their products as certified, the used raw material must be FSC certified. Also, it is not possible to process the raw wood certified in terms of other certification systems by the FSC-CoC certified organization and to market the product as FSC certified. For this reason, GFD, the leading wood raw material producer, must continuously supply FSC certified raw wood, which is the demand of these organizations. Otherwise, these organizations will have to meet their raw material needs with imports, which will have a negative effect on the current account deficit of country economy.

Since the certification process is considered as a temporary process, there are difficulties in internalizing it by the local foresters. The fact that this is an irreversible system must first be accepted by the forestry system. This will only be possible with a top management approach. Top management's ownership of the process contributes to its permanence. However, it is extremely important to establish a structure responsible

for the management and monitoring of the certification process.

The management of the FSC certification process is planned to be carried out under the responsibility of the Business and Marketing Branch Directorate (BMBD) in the local organization, since the Certification Branch Directorate in GFD is affiliated with the Business and Marketing Department. However, the FSC process is not just a business and marketing process, it is a quality management system where the management system is audited. Another reason why the process is considered together with business marketing is a completely erroneous perception, such as the high expectation of positive contribution to the pricing of the raw wood products. This misperception of the FSC process has led to the result that other branch offices do not attach sufficient importance to the process. The fact that other branches do not have enough ownership of the process creates an obstacle to the full formation of the system.

Giving the management of the process to only one branch office is an obstacle to an efficient system. For this reason, it would be beneficial to authorize a chief engineer under the command of the Regional Directorate in the management of the process, or to establish a branch management responsible only for this process. Thus, the process will be better managed and the problems faced by the local organization in creating a process system will be solved easily. In addition, an effective monitoring will be possible only through the unit / person dealing with this process.

The FSC certification process must be included in the scope of internal audit. Branch directorates within the scope of FRD in accordance with the circular numbered 4919, check the FDDs twice a year regarding their work and responsibility areas, and request the correction of deficiencies. Performing these internal controls regarding the FSC process will make a positive contribution to the formation of the system.

Turkey is located in efforts towards use other certification systems. Currently, 221,089,214 ha area is certified according to the FSC system and there are 44,518 CoC certified organizations (URL-2). Which certification system to use depends entirely on the marketing portfolio of wood products buyers. For this reason, the certification system to be used should be revealed by surveys to be made to wood buyers, and the road map should be determined accordingly. In this way, directing the certification systems by the wood producer institution without receiving the demands of the wood products buyers will cause problems in the future. Because the system with which the raw wood is certified can only be passed through the CoC certification system of that system and marketed. Wood material certified according to FSC and other systems cannot be changed and used by the other system. Organizations that will use the raw wood of other certificate system must have the CoC certificate of this system. Since these changes will be shaped according to the marketing portfolio of the buyers and will cause changes, it is absolutely necessary to ask the buyers of wood products.

The importance of NWFP certification is increasing day by day in terms of entering new markets. Currently, the FSC certificate covers wood products produced in the region. In case of NWFP certification, standards regarding these should be established. It is therefore beneficial to initiate certification processes for potential NWFPs.

Conclusion

Not only the positive price contribution of the certification process to the wood producer GFD, but also the country-based contribution to the forest industry should be evaluated.

It is not possible to return from the FSC certification process, and it is necessary to establish permanent quality systems in all centre and local forestry organizations.

Instead of delegating the management and monitoring of the management of the process only to the Business Marketing Branch directorate, all branches should be involved in this process, management and monitoring should only be controlled by a chief engineer or branch whose job is the certification process.

In the certification process, it is important for the top management to own the process and this process must be included in the scope of internal control. The decision on which certification process to use should definitely be agreed with the wood products buyers.

References

Dudley, N., J.-P. Jeanrenaud & Sullivan, F. (1995). Bad Harvest? The Timber Trade and the Degradation of the World's Forests. London, Earthscan. 204p.

Elliott, C. (1991). Sustainable forest management by 1995.

FSC, (2007). Strengthening Forest Conservation, Communities and Markets The Global Strategy of The Forest Stewardship Council, 13p.

FSC, (2009). Structure, content and local adaptation of Generic Forest Stewardship Standards FSC-STD-20-002 (V3-0) EN.

ITTO (1990). ITTO Guidelines for the sustainable management of natural tropical forests. ITTO Technical Series 5. Yokohama, ITTO. 18p.

ISF (1991). Criteria for Pacific Certified Ecological Forest Products, draft: March 19, 1991. Report, Institute of Sustainable Forestry.

URL-1. https://ic.fsc.org/our-history.17.htm (01.08.2020)

URL-2. https://info.fsc.org/ (10.10.2020)

Ussach, I. (1990a). Circular letter to Wood Product Professionals, 16 October 1990.

Ussach, I. (1990b). Letter to Bob Simeone, Sylvania Forestry Services, 13 November 1990.

Sıvacıoğlu, A. (2013). Evaluation of Forest Management Certification Projects in Turkey in terms of Silviculture, International Caucasian Forestry Symposium, Proceedings, 227-231.

Simeone, R. (1990). Base issues document for the development of a sustainable forest products certification process. Draft, prepared for the Homeland Foundation. 1 September. 16p.

Simeone, R. (1991). A report on the Certification Working Group Meeting. Report for the Homeland Foundation.

Synnott, T. (2005). Some notes on the early years of FSC.http://www.fsc.org/fileadmin/ webdata /public/document_center/publications/Noteson_the_early_years_of_FSC_by_Tim_Synnott.pdf

WWF-UK, (1992). WWF-UK position paper on certification and FSC.