

Policy

MTLAS P 2 CBR

2024-05-30

v05.00

Certification Body Requirements

MYANMAR FOREST CERTIFICATION COMMITTEE



Copyright notice

© MFCC 2024

This document is copyright-protected by MFCC. The document is freely and publicly available from the MFCC website or upon request.

No part of the document covered by the copyright may be changed or amended; reproduced or copied in any form or by any means for commercial purposes without the permission of MFCC.

Myanmar Forest Certification Committee (MFCC)

Forest Compound, Bayinnaung Road, West Gyogone,

Insein Township (11011), Yangon

Myanmar

Tel: +965 (0) 13644430

Fax: +965 (0) 13644431

Email: info@myanmarforestcertification.org

Website: www.mfcc.org.mm

Document name:	Certification Body Requirements
Reference number:	MTLAS P 2 v5.00 CBR/2024
Approved by:	MFCC
Issue date:	2018-08-01
Version date:	2024-05-30
Effective date:	2024-07-02
Transition date	2024-10-02

Contents

Contents.....	3
1 Policy Background.....	4
1.1 Introduction	4
1.2 Scope.....	4
1.3 Normative References	4
1.4 Definitions	4
2 Policy Standards.....	6
2.1 Certification Body Requirements.....	6
2.1.1 Organisational Requirements.....	6
2.1.2 Auditing Team	6
2.1.3 Resource Requirements.....	7
2.1.4 Management Systems.....	7
2.2 Auditing Processes	8
2.2.1 General	8
2.2.2 Audit Process Requirements.....	8
2.2.3 Certification Decision.....	8
2.2.4 Maintaining Certification	9
2.2.4.1 Surveillance	9
2.2.4.2 Granting Certification and Recertification	9
2.2.4.3 Certification Suspension, Withdrawal and Scope Reduction	9
2.2.5 Certification Changes and Transition	10
2.2.6 Certification Complaints, Appeals and Disputes.....	11
2.2.7 Documentation	11
2.2.7.1 Certificates.....	11
2.2.7.2 Records and Public Notifications	12
2.3 Non-Conformances.....	13
2.3.1 Non-Conformances and Observations (NCO) Coverage	13
2.3.2 NCO Information and Notification.....	13
2.3.3 NCO Procedures.....	13
2.3.4 Obtaining and Evaluating Corrective Action	13
2.3.5 Escalating Observations & Non-Conformances	14
3 Document History	15
4 Appendices.....	22
Annex 1: Provisional and Full Certification Body Notification	22
Annex 2: Determining Audit Time	23

1 Policy Background

1.1 Introduction

Myanmar Forest Certification Committee (MFCC) is the National Governing Body (NGB) of forest/timber certification schemes in Myanmar. Currently there are two schemes operating in Myanmar:

1. The Myanmar Timber Legality Assurance System (MTLAS);
2. The Myanmar Forest Certification Scheme (MFCS).

For Chain of Custody Standard (as part of MFCS), MFCC has adopted the PEFC ST 2002:2020: Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products – Requirements.

There are two policies (MFCS P2 ACR and MFCS P4 ACR (SFM and CoC) that covers Certification Body requirements in relation to MFCS. This policy specifies the organisational, accreditation, auditing and certifying related requirements and mechanisms for certification bodies assessing against MTLAS.

1.2 Scope

This policy is applicable to MFCC employees for evaluation and monitoring purposes, and to existing and potential Certification Bodies. The policy will also be referred to by Accreditation Bodies accrediting Certification Bodies against MTLAS.

1.3 Normative References

ISO/IEC 17065: 2012: Conformity Assessment - Requirements for Bodies Certifying Product, Processes and Services
 ISO/IEC 17011:2004, Conformity assessment -- General requirements for accreditation bodies accrediting conformity assessment bodies
 MFCC P 1 Implementation Arrangements
 MFCC P 4 Stakeholder engagement and Public Documents

1.4 Definitions

<i>Chain of Custody (CoC)</i>	Chain of custody is the path taken by raw materials from the forest to the consumer, including all successive stages of processing, transformation, manufacturing and distribution.
<i>PEFC Chain of Custody Standard</i>	PEFC ST 2002:2013: Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products - Requirements
<i>Consignment</i>	A quantity of goods. At the forest level this would be batch of logs. At the processing level, such as a sawmill, a consignment would be one or two containers of product.
<i>Entity</i>	In this policy entity refers to either a concession, a manufacturer (e.g. sawmill) or a third-party trader.
<i>IAF</i>	International Accreditation Forum. The IAF is the world association of Conformity Assessment Accreditation Bodies related to conformity assessment

in the fields of management systems, products, services, personnel and other similar programmes of conformity assessment.

Major Non-Conformity

The absence of, or failure to implement and maintain, one or more requirements (of a Standard), that may result in a systemic risk to the function and effectiveness of the system and/or effects confidence in the client organisation's claims on certified raw material.

Note: A major non-conformity may be an individual non-conformity or a number of minor but related non-conformities, that when considered in total are judged to constitute a major non-conformity.

MFCC

Myanmar Forest Certification Committee

MFCS

Myanmar Forest Certification Scheme. MFCS is contained in a range of documents including MFCC policies, Standard Operating Procedures, other supporting system documentation, and the MFCS Forest Certification Standard.

Minor Non-Conformity

A single failure to fulfil the requirements of the Standard that may result in no systemic risk to the function and effectiveness of the system and/or effects confidence in the supplier's claims on certified raw material.

MTLAS

MTLAS is contained in a range of documents including MFCC policies, Standard Operating Procedures, other supporting system documentation, and the MTLAS Timber Legality Standard.

MFCC Employee

In this policy an MFCC employee can refer to full and part time employees, consultants and sub-contractors and volunteers.

NCO

Non-conformance and observations. A non-conformance is said to occur when a policy or practice is observed that goes contrary to the requirements of, in this case, MFCC (MTLAS and MFCS) documented policy and procedural requirements.

Operator

In this policy the operator is any entity operating in the supply chain. This could be the system, a manufacturer (such as a sawmill) or a trader.

Supply Chain

The supply chain encompasses all activities associated with the flow and transformation of goods from the raw materials stage through to the end user.

2 Policy Standards

2.1 Certification Body Requirements

2.1.1 Organisational Requirements

MFCC is committed to ensuring that auditing against MTLAS is carried out to the highest international standards by independent and impartial third-party certification bodies. Certification bodies cannot be involved in the standard setting process as governing or decision-making body, or in the forest management and are independent of the certified entity. MFCC will require all certification bodies that audit against MTLAS to achieve accreditation.

Certification Bodies auditing compliance to MTLAS shall achieve accreditation against ISO/IEC 17065: 2012: Conformity Assessment - Requirements for Bodies Certifying Product, Processes and Services (hereafter ISO/IEC 17065).

Accreditation can only be issued by an Accreditation Body that is a member of the International Accreditation Forum (IAF) and that complies with ISO/IEC 17011:2004.

The Myanmar Government has a Department of Research and Innovation (DRI) that has accreditation capabilities, and international accreditation cooperation agreements. However, DRI is still seeking IAF recognition, and needs to develop a process for the accreditation of MTLAS. Ultimately, DRI will be able to accredit Certification Bodies against the required Standards, but until this time MFCC will operate a two phased approach:

1. An interim Phase I, whereby MFCC will 'notify' Certification Bodies¹, before accreditation by an IAF recognised body;
2. Certification Bodies in Phase II will have achieved required ISO accreditation.

In Phase I, any Certification Body auditing against MTLAS must demonstrate a commitment towards developing a system that is compatible with applicable ISO Standards/Guidelines within three² years of MFCC notification. Associated plans must include indicators and be made freely available for MFCC monitoring and evaluation.

Commitment requirements are listed in Annex 1.

2.1.2 Auditing Team

The Certification Body will arrange its own auditing team and related training and development based upon:

- MFCC minimum requirements as outlined in this policy;
- Minimum requirements as prescribed by the applicable ISO Standard (as in section 2.1.1 above);
- Auditing demand.

ISO Standard and Guideline requirements for auditors are:

Scheme/System	Standard/Guideline	Reference/Section
MTLAS	ISO/IEC 17065: 2012	6

In addition to the minimum requirements outlined in this policy and applicable Standards, audit team members must complete MFCC's audit training. Certification Bodies can also specify their own requirements in their

¹ MFCC is NOT an accreditation body. In Phase I however, MFCC will be responsible for "notifying" certification Bodies and assessing Certification Body compliance to MFCC Standards, and monitoring Certification Body compliance to agreed commitments. Any implication that MFCC has accreditation capabilities and/or qualifications is neither intended nor valid.

² Commitment period can be extended one year per time under the extraordinary situation but not more than three times.

recruitment process to ensure audit team members are competent, and able to report and communicate precisely and effectively.

Auditors

The minimum auditor personnel a Certification Body shall have at their disposal is:

- One qualified Lead Auditor
- One qualified Auditor
- One decision maker (see 2.2.3)

Lead Auditor

A Certification Body shall have at least one Lead Auditor. Lead Auditors at a minimum must:

- have a Bachelor's Degree in Forestry³ or other relevant discipline with at least 3 years of experience in forest management and/or the timber industry manufacturing supply chains;
- have completed at least 2 audits, 1 of which one is as Lead Auditor⁴.

Auditor

A Certification Body shall have at least one auditor. Auditors at a minimum must:

- have a Bachelor's Degree in Forestry or related discipline with at least 1 years of experience in forest management and/or the timber industry manufacturing supply chains;
- have completed at least 1 audit and/or completed MFCC participatory audit training.

2.1.3 Resource Requirements

The Certification Body is responsible for ensuring there are adequate auditing resources and plans in accordance to the requirements of applicable ISO accreditation demands.

Resource allocation will allow for the continuation and potential expansion of services, and to ensure the required expertise in the certification decision process.

Certification Bodies must formally incorporate audit resource planning (both financial and human) and contingency planning⁵ into strategic planning and management review processes.

Formal discussion and planning must take place at least once a year.

2.1.4 Management Systems

Certification Bodies will develop their own Standard Operating Procedures and related management systems according to the scheme/system requirements in ISO/IEC 17065: 2012 (section 8):

³Tertiary qualifications in forestry must cover the economic, social and environmental impact of forest management.

⁴ Participation and assessment in an MFCC practical auditing training will be equivalent of 1 audit requirement;

⁵ To ensure as far as possible that auditing demand can be met in consideration of scenarios with any potential impediments to meet demand (such as unusually long term absence of auditing staff or dismissal of staff).

2.2 Auditing Processes

2.2.1 General

A Certification Body site visit may combine any number of objectives at the discretion of the certification body. A single visit for example may be used to carry out an annual surveillance audit and be combined with other audits and activities such as auditing progress against NCOs.

Where audit objectives and/or activities are combined or integrated, this will never adversely impact on the objectives of the audit criteria or the audit obligations.

Certification bodies can raise NCOs as a result of any of the audit mechanisms.

For all entities that are audited for both forest management, Chain of Custody, the verification process consists of the following elements (except for consignment based audits for MTLAS):

- Full assessment audits every five years;
- Review of progress against NCOs;
- Annual Surveillance Audits

2.2.2 Audit Process Requirements

The process for audits includes:

- Pre-certification activities;
- Audit planning;
- Initial certification;
- Conducting audits;

These activities will be conducted in accordance with ISO/IEC 17065: 2012.

Calculation of auditing times for forests will be made in according to Annex 2 of this policy.

2.2.3 Certification Decision

Decisions and authority with respect to certification (granting, recertifying, suspending, and withdrawing certificates) lies with the certification body. The final certification authority cannot be delegated to an outside body such as contractors or subcontractors in anyway whatsoever.

Certification decisions will be conducted in accordance with ISO/IEC 17065: 2012.

Certification Bodies are free to seek external guidance and advice on certification decisions. However, any external consultant(s) involved in the certification decision process, along with their qualifications, scope and limitations of their input, must be identified and agreed by the Certification Body senior management.

The consultant must also have been inducted and familiarised with the requirements of MTLAS.

A Certification Body shall officially nominate and identify one senior management employee as the final Certification Decision Maker. The decision on certification shall be made by a representative who did not participate in the audit. The decision shall be based on the written audit report.

The Certification Decision Maker will at a minimum:

- have at least five years' experience in forestry sector certification assessments;
- have demonstrated complete understanding of all key MTLAS requirements.

In cases where a certificate is out of date, the Certification Body can continue to certify product from consignments of timber that were delivered from a forest source during the certified period.

2.2.4 Maintaining Certification

In addition to regular audit process results and findings, certification bodies will ensure that information from external parties is acceptable as audit evidence.

2.2.4.1 Surveillance

Surveillance audits shall be conducted at least once a calendar year, except in recertification full assessment years. The date of the first surveillance audit following initial certification shall not be more than 12 months from the certification decision date. Frequency and timing of surveillance audits can be adjusted to accommodate factors such as seasons.

Surveillance audits will comply with the following base requirements ISO/IEC 17065: 2012 (section 7.9):

Whilst the scopes will be the same, surveillance audits can be (and normally are) less rigorous than at full assessment audits.

The Certification Body shall develop surveillance activities to ensure representative areas and functions covered by the applicable requirements of MFCC Standards are monitored for effectiveness and continual improvement on a regular basis.

2.2.4.2 Granting Certification and Recertification

Audits that result in zero non-conformances will normally receive a recommendation by the Certification Body for granting certification or recertification.

Where there are only minor non-conformances a client will normally receive a recommendation for certification (or recertification) by the Certification Body upon acceptable review of proposed corrective actions and closure schedule(s).

If the certification audit results in one or more major non-conformances, then the Certification Body will normally recommend that a re-audit be done prior to issuing initial certification.

In the case of a recertification audit resulting in one or more major non-conformances, the client has up to three months from the date of the final NCO report to implement the necessary corrective action and have the re-audit conducted.

In the case of re-audits, the Certification Body will determine any changes in scope, and/or methodology and inform the auditee accordingly. If the re-audit does not occur within the 3 months or the non-conformance(s) is not sufficiently addressed, the client's certification is put on suspension.

2.2.4.3 Certification Suspension, Withdrawal and Scope Reduction

The Certification Body shall have a policy and documented procedure(s) for suspension, withdrawal or reduction of the scope of certification, and will specify the subsequent actions by the certification body.

Whilst a certificate is suspended no certification will be issued for product originating from these sources, and certification issuance can only restart once certification status becomes valid.

In case of certificate suspension, the period of suspension cannot exceed twelve months⁶. Failure to resolve the causes of the suspension within this 12-month period will result in certificate withdrawal.

Examples of when certificate suspension may be invoked include (but are not confined to):

- non-conformance with MFCC system requirements;
- a major non-conformance has not been closed or sufficiently addressed within the agreed time period;
- failure to finalise invoiced fees within 60 days of notification;
- where continuance of operational activity becomes illegal;
- where question of legal status becomes contentious and/or unresolved.

Suspension shall be confirmed by the Certification Body and will indicate the conditions under which the suspension will be removed, and the procedures and policy for appeal. Written acknowledgement (an email will suffice) from the suspended entity must be received.

The Certification Body will also amend accordingly all relevant public notifications of any certification.

In cases where an appeal is lodged the suspension will remain affective until the appeal/dispute is closed or the suspension is lifted.

When a certificate is suspended, the entity will:

- not promote their MFCC certification for the period of the suspension;
- work actively with the Certification Body to remedy the cause of suspension.

At completion of (or before) the suspension period, the Certification Body shall:

- remove the suspension and notify the enterprise and inform MFCC accordingly;
- in exceptional circumstances, and in compliance with other MFCC policies, extend the timeframe for compliance; or
- withdraw certification if the specified conditions are not fulfilled.

Certification bodies will comply with the relevant sections of ISO/IEC 17065: 2012 (section 7.11)

2.2.5 Certification Changes and Transition

When MFCC introduces new or revised requirements that affect the client, the Certification Body shall ensure these changes are communicated to all clients. The Certification Body shall verify implementation and take actions required by MFCC.

The Certification Body shall consider other changes affecting certification, including changes initiated by the client, and shall decide upon the appropriate action.

A transitional period for compliance will be specified, where applicable, following new requirements contained in MFCC Standards and/or policies. The Certification Body shall be responsible for communicating transitional timeframes and any related compliance information to the relevant partners within 5 working days.

⁶(NOTE: Extensions are possible in exceptional circumstances at the discretion of the Certification Body senior management ensuring any extension is compliant with other MFCC policies.

As a general guideline:

- for significant changes such as transition to a new version of MTLAS, a 12 month transition timeframe is required. In some cases however significant changes require immediate effect;
- for less significant changes a 2 or 3 month period is generally acceptable (with 3 months preferred) with implementation to be determined at the next scheduled assessment.

At times implementation may need to be established prior to the next scheduled assessment (either by a special onsite or offsite assessment).

2.2.6 Certification Complaints, Appeals and Disputes

In the case where an appeal, complaint or dispute is made regarding aspects of the Certification process, MFCC will never act as an arbitrator or get involved in any disputes whatsoever. Nor will MFCC respond to any complaints or appeals with regards certification decisions.

The Certification Body shall have sole responsibility for handling such issues in accordance to their own policies and procedures.

Certification bodies will ensure compliance to ISO/IEC 17065: 2012 (section 7.13).

2.2.7 Documentation

2.2.7.1 Certificates

Certificates are issued after the first audit and extended/withdrawn/suspended after successive audits. Certification can also be withdrawn/suspended following any of the various auditing requirements (such as annual surveillance audits).

MTLAS Certificates will display the following information at a minimum:

MTLAS Certificate
Certification registration code incorporating unique client reference code;
Name and address of the operator;
Entity registration number;
Scope and Principles under which the operator was verified (Forest Operations and/or CoC);
Species;
Date of initial certification;
Date of certificate validity;
Signature of the certification decision maker;
Details on MTLAS document system accessibility, certificate registers and applicable disclaimers
Product name – quantity, volume
Extraction agency;
Administrative district/township;
Extraction year(s);
Registration details of associated certificate (forest);
Delivery order(s);
Product;
Bill of lading reference;

2.2.7.2 Records and Public Notifications

Certification Bodies must maintain records and ensure public notifications in compliance with ISO/IEC 17065: 2012 (section 4.6, 7.12).

MFCC maintains a number of publicly available documents. In instances where certificates are withdrawn or suspended (or reinstated) the Certification Body must inform MFCC within three working days of the change in status (including scope and validity).

Certification bodies must also comply with the applicable requirements in Policy 4 Stakeholder Engagement and Public Documents.

2.3 Non-Conformances

2.3.1 Non-Conformances and Observations (NCO) Coverage

Certification Bodies evaluate and rate NCOs against the following approved source requirements:

- MTLAS;
- MTLAS P 1 MFCC Trademark Usage.

Before issuing an NCO, any non-conformance is classified as either major, minor or as an observation.

2.3.2 NCO Information and Notification

A Certification Body will be responsible for ensuring that entities to be audited are fully informed about:

- the purpose of NCOs;
- the different variety of NCOs;
- Certification Body expectations with regards the corrective action process;
- the procedures and related deadlines for issuing, evaluating and closing NCOs;
- related complaints and appeals processes.

If a non-conformance or observation is raised during a field audit, the client must be notified during the Audit Closing Meeting.

2.3.3 NCO Procedures

A Certification Body shall prepare and follow its own procedures and related documents and ensure such guidelines and policies comply to this policy and clauses applicable in ISO/IEC 17065: 2012.

In addition to any Standard specific requirements, these procedures must cover at a minimum:

- raising, evaluating and closing NCOs;
- notifying clients of observations and non-conformances;
- escalating non-conformances and observations;
- specifying who has the authority within the Certification Body for issuing and closing non-conformances;
- the process for approving proposed corrective actions and specifying who has the authority for such decisions;
- reporting and recording.

2.3.4 Obtaining and Evaluating Corrective Action

The client will provide the Certification Body with a proposed corrective action plan that includes deadlines, within a maximum of 25 working days following notification. Once approved the Certification Body must notify the client how the corrective action will be evaluated.

Evaluation of corrective progress will be carried out according to the following guidelines:

1. Minor/observations⁷ - a maximum of 1 year following submission of the corrective action plan or at the next audit (whichever is the earlier);
2. Major - must be verified within at least 3 months after the corrective plan.

⁷ Note that an observation may not specify a deadline. However it may be escalated if it has not been adequately addressed since the previous assessment. It's at the discretion of the auditor whether to upgrade such observations into a non-conformance.

2.3.5 Escalating Observations & Non-Conformances

In principle, any NCO should be escalated if:

1. the client has not submitted proposed corrective actions within 25-day deadline (see 2.3.4);
2. corrective actions have not been effectively implemented.

Minor non-conformances must be escalated to major non-conformances. A major non-conformance that has not been closed will result in certificate suspension⁸. Entities can however request an extension.

⁸ Entities can, with a rationale, request an extension at the discretion of the certification body.

3 Document History

Date of Amendment:	Version	Approval date:	Requested by:	Nature of Change	Approved by:
2019-07-01	2.00	2019-11-29	MFCC	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MFCC P5 CBR is changed into MTLAS P 2 CBR. 2. Changed MFCC website from (www.mfcc.com.mm) to (www.mfcc.org.mm). 3. Changed (Date, issue date, effective date) into (issue date, version date and effective date) 4. At section 1.1 Introduction, deleted second paragraph (The objective.....) <p>Added the sentences that “For the Chain of Custody Standard, MFCC has also adopted the PEFC ST 2002:2013: Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products – Requirements.</p> <p>There is a second policy (MFCS P3 CBR) that covers Certification Body requirements in relation to MFCS. This policy specifies the organisational, accreditation, auditing and certifying related requirements and mechanisms for certification bodies assessing against MTLAS.”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Section1.3 Normative Reference added more normative references. 6. Section 1.4 Definitions, PEFC Chain of Custody Standard, Major Non-conformity and Minor Non-conformity definitions are added. 7. At section 2.1.1 Organisational Requirements, first paragraph added the sentences that.... <p>” Certification bodies cannot be involved in the standard setting process as governing or decision making body, or in the forest management and are independent of the certified entity. MFCC</p>	MFCC

				<p>will require all certification bodies that audit against MTLAS to achieve accreditation. Accreditation can only be issued by an accreditation body that is a member of the International Accreditation Forum (IAF) and that complies with ISO/IEC 17011:2004.</p> <p>Principles, general and structural requirements of certification bodies are specified in the applicable ISO Standard(s). Certification bodies will comply with the following requirements.</p> <p>8. At section 2.1.1 Organisational Requirements, first paragraph, second sentence has a little change for the compliance with MTLAS P 2 CBR policy.</p> <p>9. As it is a MTLAS P 2 CBR policy, all MFCS words removed.</p> <p>10. 2.1.2 Auditing team added a point that “Minimum requirements as prescribed by the applicable ISO Standard (as in section 2.1.1 above)”.</p> <p>11. 2.1.2 Auditing team, minimum Certification Body has ...” removed one technical reviewer and replaced one decision maker” and added the information “ISO standard and guidance requirements for auditors.”</p> <p>12. 2.1.2 Auditing Team added “Auditors requirements”, Lead Auditor and auditor requirement have slightly changed and removed Trainee auditor requirements”.</p> <p>13. Section 2.1.3 Training and Development is removed.</p> <p>14. Section 2.1.4 Management Systems is added.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>“Certification Bodies will develop their own Standard Operating Procedures and related management systems according to the scheme/system requirements.....”.</p> <p>15. From 2.2.1 Introduction is changed into 2.2.1 General, and 2.2.1 merged with 2.2.2 Audit Frequency and Type, “For all entities.....annual surveillance audit.”</p> <p>16. Section 2.2.2. Audit Frequency and Type, second paragraph, “Surveillance audits.....” is put as 2.2.4.1 version 2.00 CBR.</p> <p>17. Section 2.2.2 Audit Frequency and Type is changed into 2.2.2 Audit Process Requirements.</p> <p>18. 2.2.3 Audit Procedures is removed.</p> <p>19. 2.2.4 Transitional Timeframes is changed into 2.2.5 Certification Changes and Transition and added sentences that...” When MFCC introduces new or revised requirements that affect the client, the Certification Body shall ensure these changes are communicated to all clients. The Certification Body shall verify implementation and take actions required by MFCC.</p> <p>The Certification Body will consider other changes affecting certification, including changes initiated by the client, and shall decide upon the appropriate action.</p> <p>20. Section 2.3.1 NCO Coverage, first point removed MFCS standard word.</p> <p>21. 2.3.3 Certification Body Procedures and Documents changed into “2.3.3 NCO Procedures” and first paragraph added the sentence “the clauses applicable in the ISO standards.”</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>22. 2.3.5 Escalating Observations & Non-Conformances deleted the third paragraph “The Certification Body is responsible.....conformances.”</p> <p>23. 2.4.1 Certification Authority is changed into “2.2.3 Certification Decision” and added a sentence “Certification decisions will be conducted in accordance to the relevant Standard and/or Guideline”. And then “2.4.7 Out of Date Forest Management Unit Certification “is merged section 2.2.3 Certification Decision version 2 CBR.</p> <p>24. Section 2.2.4 Maintaining Certification is added.</p> <p>25. 2.4.2 MFCC Certification is changed into “2.2.7 Documentation” and separated into 2.2.7.1 Certificates and 2.2.7.2 Records and Public Notification.</p> <p>26. 2.4.2 MFCC Certification, second paragraph is changed into “2.2.7.1 Certificates” and the certificate of verification of an entity display has changed.</p> <p>27. Section 2.2.7.2 Records and Public Notifications added.</p> <p>28. From “2.4.3 Granting Certification and Recertification” changed into “2.2.4.2 Granting Certification and Recertification”.</p> <p>29. From “2.4.4 Certification Suspension” changed into “2.2.4.3 Certification Suspension, Withdraw and Scope Reduction”.</p> <p>30. Section 2.4.5 Certification Withdraw section is removed.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>31. 2.4.6 Certification Complaints, Appeals and Disputes changed into 2.2.6 Certification Complaints. Appeals and Disputes.</p> <p>32. Annex 1: Provisional and Full Certification Notification, first paragraph is a little changed.” MFCC will require all certification bodies that audit against MTLAS to achieve the applicable accreditation. For MTLAS sawmill operations this will be against ISO/IEC 17065: 2012: Conformity Assessment - Requirements for Bodies Certifying Product, Processes and Services (hereafter ISO/IEC 17065) for forest operations comply with ISO 19011:2011, Guidelines for auditing management systems (hereafter ISO/IEC 19011).”</p> <p>33. Annex 2: Determining Audit time, fourth paragraph “The minimum day” added one sentence “On-site audit duration excludes travel time”.</p>	
2020-02-01	3.00	2020-07-10	MFCC	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MTLAS P 2 CBR policy is changed into as a concerned with ISO/IEC 17065 only policy. 2. Section 1.1: Third paragraph; “for the chain of custody standard” sentence added a phrase “used for MFCS”. 3. At Normative References, Deleted ISO/IEC 17021-1 Conformity assessment. 4. Section 2.1.1 Second Paragraph; the previous version is separated that MTLAS principle 1-4 for ISO/IEC 17021-1 and MTLAS principle 5-6 for ISO/IEC 17065. This v 3.00 is changed that all MTLAS P 1-6 is concerned with ISO/IEC 17065 only. Paragraph (4) and table are deleted. 5. 2.1.2 Auditing Team; ISO standard and Guideline Requirements for auditors table is changed that “MTLAS P 1-6 ; ISO/IEC 17065:2012 ;Reference 6”. 	MFCC

				<p>6. Section 2.1.4, First sentence added “in ISO/IEC 17065:2012 (section 8). Deleted ISO table.</p> <p>7. Section 2.2.2, second paragraph, sentence “These activities” added ISO/IEC 17065: 2012 and deleted “relevant ISO or PEFC Standard phrase and ISO table”.</p> <p>8. 2.2.3 Certification Decision; Second paragraph, deleted “to the relevant Standard and/or Guideline” and ISO table and Add “ to ISO/IEC 17065:2012” .</p> <p>9. 2.2.4.1 Surveillance, second paragraph (Surveillance audits will.....) add ISO/IEC 17065:2012 (section 7.9). Deleted ISO table.</p> <p>11.2.2.4.3 Penultimate Paragraph (Certification Bodies will comply....) deleted word “of the applicable ISO” and ISO table and added “of ISO/IEC 17065:2012 (Section 7.11).</p> <p>12. Section 2.2.6, Penultimate Paragraph (Certification bodies will ensure.....) deleted word “to the following ISO requirements” and added ISO/IEC 17065:2012 (Section 7.13). Deleted ISO table.</p> <p>13. Section 2.2.7.2, First paragraph, deleted word “the following requirements” and added ISO/IEC 17065:2012 (section 4.6,7.12). Deleted ISO table.</p> <p>14. Section (2.3.3 NCO Procedure); First paragraph, second sentence deleted word (in the ISO standard and bullet point ISO/IEC 17021-1).</p>	
2020-10-06	4.00	2020-11-02	MFCC	<p>1. At page 6; Section 2.1.1, Organisational Requirements, penultimate paragraph, change accreditation time frame (from two years to three years)</p>	MFCC
2023-12-01	5.00	2024-05-30	MFCC Project Management Team	<p>1. Section (1.1: Introduction), At last paragraph, first sentence, added “MFCS P4 ACR (SFM and CoC)”</p>	MFCC

				<p>2. Section (2.1.1: Organisational Requirements), commitment period of CB's accreditation "three year" mentioned at foot note "Commitment period can be extended one year per time under the extraordinary situation but not more than three times".</p> <p>3. Section (2.2.7.1: Certificates), the previous version, there were two MTLAS certificate: Forest Management certificate and Consignment certificate. Based on our stakeholder's comments and suggestions and lesson learnt of other NGB countries, Now, there is only one MTLAS certificate by combining of forest management and consignment certificates).</p>	

4 Appendices

Annex 1: Provisional and Full Certification Body Notification

MFCC will require all certification bodies that audit against MTLAS to achieve the applicable accreditation. For MTLAS sawmill operations this will be against ISO/IEC 17065: 2012: Conformity Assessment - Requirements for Bodies Certifying Product, Processes and Services (hereafter ISO/IEC 17065) for forest operations comply with ISO 19011:2011, Guidelines for auditing management systems (hereafter ISO/IEC 19011).

Provisional Notification

At a minimum, prior to MFCC provisional notification, the Certification Body shall:

1. be a legal, independent registered organisation;
2. demonstrate, beyond a reasonable doubt, to MFCC, that the applicant is not involved in any way in the process and decision making for MFCC Standard setting, and that the applicant will operate impartially.

Full MFCC Notification

Following MFCC provisional notification of certification bodies, and for final notification prior to commencing any audits, the Certification Body shall meet the minimum requirements for the auditing team and auditors as described above.

In addition, certification bodies must ensure the following requirements are met:

1. Sign a Service Agreement with MFCC, that, amongst other requirements, agrees to give MFCC periodic access to monitor progress, outlines the consequences of NCOs and the terms and conditions for withdrawal of MFCC recognition;
2. Complete, satisfactorily, relevant training as required by MFCC;
3. Finalise audit preparation requirements. This includes a summary of auditors, Standard Operating Procedures for MFCC Standard assessment(s), supporting audit procedural documentation (e.g. checklists, forms and various report templates), and auditor training and development plans;
4. Finalise a policy commitment to create and implement a system that is compatible with the ISO Standards required. This policy must contain an associated work plan that will be agreed with MFCC before full Certification Body notification;
5. Finalise guiding principle policy documents and their associated forms⁹ – at a minimum these will include Impartiality and Conflict of Interest, Anti-Corruption, Confidentiality;
6. Finalise a Complaints, Appeals and Disputes process;
7. Finalise Corrective and Preventative Action procedures and associated documentation for dealing with MFCC NCOs (i.e. MFCC [and later Accreditation Body] to certification body);
8. Finalise auditee NCO procedures and related documentation (i.e. Certification Body to client)

⁹ Impartiality and Conflict of Interest, Confidentiality, and Anti-Corruption policies must have an associated declaration (of understanding) form signed by relevant employees. Other forms would need signing if applicable – for instance if an employee recognises a conflict of interest s/he would need to complete a disclosure form.
MTLAS P 2 v5.00 CBR/2024

Annex 2: Determining Audit Time

Table 1 illustrates the minimum on-site audit duration (in days). This includes the main audit events but does not include time needed for preparation, travel and report writing.

The minimum on-site duration has been developed to provide sufficient time under normal circumstances to adequately carry out auditing against MTLAS requirements.

Additional days may be needed to conduct post-audit follow-up activities, such as verification of NCO closure or addressing any contentious issues.

Timings are calculated based on an audit team of 2 members.

Management Unit (ha)	Full Assessment	Surveillance	Recertification
Natural Forest			
< 50,000	4	3	4
50,000 < 150,000	6	4	6
150,000 < 300,000	8	5	8
> 150,000	10	8	10
Plantation Forest			
< 5,000	3	2	3
5,000 < 10,000	4	3	4
> 10,000	5	4	5

The minimum time for on-site Chain of Custody audit for wood processing mills and third party traders would be one half man day. On-site audit duration excludes travel time.

Note: Minimum on-site audit duration for conduct of assessments may be increased with justification, given the complexity or issues identified in the respective management unit.