Training on the FSC National Indicator Development for Malaysia
Crystal Crown Hotel, Petaling Jaya
5th September 2011

Target audience:
1. Mr. Anthony Sebastian, Chairman
2. Ms. Jayashree Kanniah, Secretariat

Core Drafters
3. Dr. Sanath Kumaran, ENVIROLOGIC
4. Ms. Kanitha Krishnasamy, TRAFFIC SEA
5. Mr. Lim Si Siew, Grassroots
6. Mr. Thomas Jalong, JOAS
7. Mr. Tan Chin Tong
8. Mr. Edmund Gan, SFI

Trainer: Mr. Fon. Gordian Fanso, FSC Policy Manager

Objective of the training:
- To uplift the credibility of the core drafters in developing the FSC National Standards.

1.0 Training Session
Mr. Gordian started by giving a quick background about FSC, its chamber-based approach, impact, the compliance mechanism, the hierarchy of principles and criteria, and each definitions in detail. He then introduced the team to the working structure and purpose of the Policy and Standards Unit (PSU). He explained the role of PSU team in the National Standards development process. This is merely from the acceptance of the application for developing the Standards, providing technical guidance, training provisions, monitoring the process and progress as well as recommending the final draft to the PSU and FSC Board.

Mr. Gordian indicated that as the working group goes through each criterion, there might be a need to mark each criterion on its relevant application to large/small/community forest or whether it applies to all. Mr Tan queried on the definition of small and large. Mr Gordian explained about the existing small and low intensity managed forests (SLIMF) guidance.

Mr Gordian continued to explain about the hierarchy of the principles, criteria, indicators and verifiers. He stated that if certain criterion is not applicable to Malaysia, there is a need to develop a clear explanation and should be attached to the Standards. This goes the same, when there is a need to include new criteria. He also advised the working group to include advisory notes and interpretation notes to the Standards, if the need arise. The participants were divided into group for an exercise of developing good indicators.

Mr Gordian continued the session by demonstrating the selection of critical elements in a criterion and its importance in order to develop a good indicator. He informed that each indicator should address each critical element. Mr Gordian mentioned that these are among the requirements in the final draft that the PSU team will be reviewing during the final submission. Ms. Jaya queried if whether there is a requirement to send the drafts to the PSU team before any public consultations. Mr Gordian mentioned that there are no such requirements. But he would be happy to look through our National draft before the final submission.
The participants again were divided into group for an exercise of unwrapping the critical elements in the criterion, then developing indicators for each critical element. In reviewing the output of each team, Mr. Gordian reminded the participants that verifiers are not necessarily numbered. He also commented on the way that the indicators are phrased and the need for consistency. He emphasised on the mandatory usage of the word ‘shall’. He also requested to avoid words that are subjective. He explained that these are the requirements of the ISEAL. The Chair then alerted the participants to think about nominating an editor among the SDG members and a focal point for better coordination, within the next two days.

Mr. Gordian then reminded the group to always make sure that the indicator is auditable. He summarized that an indicator should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and tangible. He mentioned that if an indicator is not clear, then there is a need to discuss it over and over again.

Mr Gordian then moved to the following topic, ‘Stakeholders identification and analyses. He explained the importance of recognizing stakeholders, their involvement and shared scenarios of disagreements. He elaborated on the core values when stakeholders take an active part in this process. These values are mutual understanding, full participation, inclusive solution and shared responsibilities. He also clarified about the decision making process. He elaborated on the dynamics of reaching a decision point through divergent and convergent thinking. This was followed by two scenario-based exercises on reaching an agreed decision. Upon hearing the outputs of each team, he summarized that each decision making process involves approaches, skill and techniques. With that, the training session was concluded.

2.0 Recommendations
Mr Gordian recommends the Secretariat to always ensure that the working group is working on the latest draft of the FSC P&C.

3.0 Follow ups
Mr Gordian will share the small and low intensity managed forests (SLIMF) guidance with the working group.

Chair requested Mr. Gordian to review our National draft before the field testing. Mr. Gordian accepted this request.

4.0 Closing and Acknowledgement
The participants and the Chair expressed their deepest appreciation to Mr. Gordian and FSC for conducting this training. The Chair indicated that this training is an advantage, noting its approaches, topics and content. The Chair then stated that the knowledge obtained from this training session, will be put to immediate use during the following days of the SDG meeting.

The session was adjourned at 6.00 p.m.