



FSC Controlled Wood risk assessment
FSC-CW-RA-015-RU V2-0
SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

INTERPRETATION OF ANNEX 2B OF THE STANDARD FOR COMPANY EVALUATION OF FSC
CONTROLLED WOOD FOR RUSSIAN FEDERATION
(FSC-STD-40-005-V-2.1)

Version: FSC-CW-RA-015-RU V2-0

Scope: Russian Federation

Approval date: 20 July 2015

Effective date: 20 July 2015

National Approval: FSC Russia, Board of Directors (October 16, 2014)

Standard Development Group: M. L. Karpachevskiy, R. Yu. Kurakin, D. Zh. Kutepov,
(alphabetically listed) A. V. Loginov, A. V. Nemchinova, S. Yu. Pautov,
N. E. Prokazin, O. V. Rogozina, M. P. Severenchuk,
A. A. Shegolev, L. A. Shevlyakova, A. A. Shorokhov,
N. V. Strakhova, T. O. Yanitskaya

International Approval FSC International Center: Policy and Standards Unit

Contact Person: Tatiana Yanitskaya

Email address: t.yanitskaya@ru.fsc.org

Summary of risk for the Russian Federation

Controlled Wood categories		Risk level
1	Illegally harvested wood	Unspecified
2	Wood harvested in violation of traditional and civil rights	Unspecified
3	Wood harvested in forests where high conservation values are threatened by management activities	Unspecified
4	Wood harvested in forests being converted to plantations or non-forest use	Low
5	Wood from forests in which genetically modified trees are planted	Low

INTRODUCTION

Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) allows using wood harvested in non-FSC certified forests in products marked as FSC Mixed. For this purpose, however, the enterprise shall guarantee that the source of noncertified material is not unacceptable according to FSC. FSC considers the following sources as unacceptable:

- A) Illegally harvested wood.
- B) Wood harvested from areas where traditional or civil rights are violated.
- C) Wood harvested from forests where management operations threaten the forests' high conservation values.
- D) Wood harvested from forests converted to plantations or other land uses.
- E) Wood from forests where genetically modified trees are being grown.

The enterprise may avoid using wood from unacceptable sources in three ways:

- 1) To purchase wood verified by an FSC accredited certification body as complying with FSC-STD-30-010 *FSC Controlled Wood standard for forest management enterprises*. This standard is intended for logging companies wishing to demonstrate that the wood harvested by them may be considered as controlled, i.e. containing no one of the above mentioned categories of unacceptable sources. The certificate validity may be checked at <http://www.fsc-info.org>.
- 2) To procure FSC controlled wood from suppliers with valid FSC CoC certificates covering the controlled wood. Such certificate must indicate the registration code of FSC controlled wood, the validity may be checked at <http://www.fsc-info.org>; and
- 3) To assess by itself the origin of wood for compliance with the requirements of FSC-STD-40-005 Standard for company evaluation of FSC Controlled Wood. This scenario is good for companies which may trace the origin of the wood procured.

For scenario 3, the company shall assess the risks of purchasing wood from unacceptable sources for all of its suppliers. According to FSC-STD-40-005, the certificate holder shall assess the risks of purchasing wood from unacceptable sources. The role of FSC accredited certification body is to assess and review the risk assessment performed by the company as to its technical sufficiency and adequacy.

FSC allows the accredited National Initiatives (offices) to interpret the requirements of FSC-STD-40-005 at the national level, assess the risk for certain categories of controlled wood purchased from the district of origin in question determining the low risk and unspecified risk areas. The risk assessments obtained make up the "National FSC Controlled Wood Risk Assessment." The corresponding explanations regarding the procedure for identifying risk areas as per FSC-STD-40-005 are provided in FSC-PRO-60-002 FSC Controlled Wood Risk Assessments by FSC accredited National Initiatives. Provided the accredited National Office follows the above procedure and FSC approval is obtained, the risk areas identified by the National Office for the district of origin become mandatory and shall be used by the companies to determine the risk for their suppliers from the said country/district of origin.

The "FSC Controlled Wood Risk Assessment for the Russian Federation" brought to your attention, has been developed by the Russian FSC National Office in order to help the companies to assess the risk of purchasing wood from unacceptable sources from their Russian suppliers according to FSC-STD-40-005. This document provides the national interpretation of the requirements of the standard and risk assessment for certain districts of origin of controlled wood.

This National Risk Assessment is based on the standard FSC-STD-40-005, the procedure for risk assessment by National Initiatives FSC-PRO-60-002 (FSC controlled wood risk designation by FSC accredited national initiatives), advices FSC ADV-40-016 EN, and methodological materials of FSC International Centre for Risk Assessment preparation.

Controlled Wood Risk Assessment

Category 1. Illegally harvested wood

District of origin¹ may be considered as low risk for illegally harvested wood² provided the following indicators are met:

Indicators	Possible sources of information ³	Evidence	Scale of assessment	Risk Assessment
1.1. Evidence of enforcement of logging related laws in the district is present.			National level	Unspecified risk
1.1a. The structures controlling illegal harvesting are in place.	Federal Sources: Federal Forestry Agency (Rosleskhoz) (http://www.rosleshoz.gov.ru) including forest use aerial and satellite imagery (http://www.rosleshoz.gov.ru/activity/audits); Ministry of Home Affairs of RF (http://www.mvd.ru). Greenpeace Russia Forest Forum (http://www.forestforum.ru). First Web Portal of Timber Industry (http://www.wood.ru/ru/lonews.html). WWF studies aimed to identify the causes and scale of illegal harvesting in certain Russian regions (http://www.wwf.ru/about/what_we_do/forests/illegal/). “Keep it legal!” (Country Guide. Practical guide for verifying timber origin	The state forest guard (total staff 20 thsd. persons; established by the subjects of the Russian Federation except in Moscow region where it is established by Rosleskhoz) is poorly staffed and does not enjoy all required authorities due to the lack of budgetary funding, a number of outstanding issues regarding legislation and organization. There are no systemic measures to address illegal logging including current systems for identification of illegal logging and punishment of the offenders.	National level	Unspecified risk

¹For the purpose of controlled wood risk assessment according to FSC-STD-40-005 ver. 2.1, the term “district” is understood as a geographical term describing a geographical scale of assessment. For controlled wood categories 1,2,4 and 5, the risk was first assessed at the national level, and for category 3 (HCVF) – at the ecoregional (international) level. For the last category, this means that the assessment is only made for HCVF of ecoregional or national importance. If Russia as a whole was not considered low risk for certain controlled wood category, the next level referred to the subject of the Russian federation as a district of origin (regional level). If the subject of the Russian Federation could not be considered low risk, the next level of risk assessment referred to the administrative district as a district of origin (municipal district or urban okrug within the region) or forestry enterprise (Lesnichestvo). If the administrative district (Lesnichestvo) could not be considered low risk, the company must implement its own verification program for the sources of controlled wood.

²This National Risk Assessment uses the definition of illegal logging based on the provisions of draft law No. 59491-5 “On Introducing Amendments to the Forest Code of the Russian Federation (submitted to the State Duma of the Russian Federation in May 2008) and a booklet of WWF and Stora Enso “Ensuring the legality of wood origin” 2008)(www.wwf.ru/data/publ/regions/arkh/forest2.pdf). Illegal logging should be understood as:

- cutting of timber without relevant permits (unauthorized cutting) (part 8 of art. 29 of the Forest Code of the Russian Federation) (without lease agreement and approved forest development project or standing forest sale contract or contract for forest guard, protection and regeneration works);
- cutting in the wrong forest plot or outside its boundaries (including cutting inside the lease areas without forest declaration); cutting in excess of the set volume (allowable volume of wood extraction) (part 4 of article 29 of the Forest Code of the Russian Federation); cutting earlier than at the cutting age (part 4 of article 29 of the Forest Code of the Russian Federation); cutting trees not allowed for harvest (for example, during sanitary cuttings or tending) or trees to be left including those which are prohibited for harvest (part 6 of article 29 of the Forest Code of the Russian Federation); or cutting after the issue of judicial orders suspending forest use (article 28 of the Forest Code of the Russian Federation).

³The sources of information are only given as an example. The contents of these sources have not been assessed by FSC. Companies may use other sources of information. The information provided by the state authorities and trade associations may not be considered independent and automatically credible.

Indicators	Possible sources of information ³	Evidence	Scale of assessment	Risk Assessment
	<p>legality, Russia. http://www.wwf.ru/resources/publ/book/409/ Information concerning cuttings with violations of protected areas regimes : Non-commercial Partnership “The Transparent World” (maps.transparentworld.ru/PA_monitor.html); Greenpeace Russia www.greenpeace.org/russia/ru/campaigns/90170). FSC National Initiative, FSC National Office (http://www.fsc.ru).</p> <p>Regional Sources: Information from regional forest authorities, authorities of environmental protection and nature management of the subjects of the Russian Federation: Regional information websites Websites of regional non-government environmental organizations</p>			
1.1b. Control bodies for Illegal logging are working effectively	The same as in 1.1a above	<p>The governmental authorities recognize that the effectiveness of control and supervision at the regional level is low: The number of identified forest crimes is insufficient, the response to the violations identified is poor (see www.rosleshoz.gov.ru/activity/illegal) The special plans for fight against illegal logging do not show effective implementation.</p>	National level	Unspecified risk
1.2a. The proof of existence of reliable and effective system of forest lease and issuing harvesting permits as well as other documents which can confirm the legality of harvest and sale	The same as in 1.1a above	<p>All forests are state or municipal property, so it is the government⁴ that grants forest use permits to logging companies. The legal status of some forest area categories is not certain, and harvesting there is illegal. The Forest Code (2006) does not contain provisions with regard to forest management in the areas which are municipal property⁵. There is an evidence of low level of forest management in such forests. The mass media cover the problem of corruption relating to forest lease auctions and placement of government orders for forest protection, guard and reproduction. Commercial harvest of quality wood, i.e. in fact, illegal harvest, is often performed under the guise of sanitation</p>	National level	Unspecified risk

⁴The main documents giving the right to harvest certain volume of wood are the lease agreement for the forest plot, or forest stand sales contract, or contract for forest guard, protection and regeneration (outside leased areas). Since 2009, for each leased area, the company is to develop a forest development project. The wood is harvested on lease areas on the basis of annual forest declarations specifying the locations and volumes of wood harvest.

⁵List of subjects of RF having defense and security forests and urban forests see Annex 1.

Indicators	Possible sources of information ³	Evidence	Scale of assessment	Risk Assessment
of timber in the region in question is presented.		or care cuts, especially in protected forests, SPNA and OZU. Effective control systems for recording harvested volumes and tracing the sources of origin are absent.		
1.2b. There is no proof of timber coming from radionuclide contaminated districts where commercial timber harvest is prohibited	The same as in 1.1a above, as well as: Russian Centre for Forest Protection /Radiation Monitoring of Forests (http://www.rcfh.ru/sfera/radiologicheskij/) Regulatory documents for radiation monitoring (http://www.rcfh.ru/sfera/radiologicheskij/normativnye/) Sanitary Rules SP 2.6.1.759-99. Acceptable levels of caesium-137 and strontium 90 in the forest products industry Atlas of Cesium Deposition on Europe after the Chernobyl Accident (1998). Annual governmental reports "On condition and protection of environment of the Russian Federation", section radiation situation (http://www.ecoindustry.ru/gosdoklad.html). Reshetov V.V., Smyslov A.A., Kharlamov M.G. Map showing various components of nuclear fuel cycle and radioactive contamination areas in Russia. M: Nevskgeologia, Plekhanov SPGI, 1996	Forest areas in some subjects of RF are located in the zone covered by Chernobyl radioactive trace (1986), East-Ural Radioactive Trace (PO Mayak, 1948-1967), and affected by nuclear weapon testing at the Semipalatinsk test site (1949-1962). According to regulatory documents (http://www.rcfh.ru/sfera/radiologicheskij/normativnye/), certain level of radionuclide contamination is a barrier for harvest, and the wood may pose threat to the health of loggers and buyers of wood ⁶ . Currently, we may not be sure that radionuclide-contaminated wood is prevented from entering supply chains.	Regional level	Unspecified risk: Subjects of RF as per Annex 2; the rest – low risk
1.3. There is little or no evidence or reporting of illegal harvesting in the district of origin	The same as in 1.1a above	Rosleskhoz of Russia recognizes that the problem is acute. According to Rosleskhoz, the volume of illegally harvested wood in Russia in 2009 is from 15-20mln m ³ (V.N. Maslyakov, presentation at the World Forest Congress, Prime-Tass: (http://www.prime-tass.ru/news/0/%7BC824EC66-92DB-4EF5-8127-36639D866862%7D.uif) to 25-30mln m ³ (A.I. Savinov, Rossiyskaya Gazeta; (http://www.rg.ru/2009/09/29/les.html), i.e. 9-19% of the total volume of harvest. According to Rosleskhoz statistics as of 01.11.2011, ground checks identified just 27.1 thsd cases of illegal logging in the country (1.3mln m ³ of illegally harvested timber were recovered (www.rosleshoz.gov.ru/media/appearance/57/Maslyakov_V.N._Sankt-Peterburg.pdf)). Independent expert assessments provide higher figures. Thus, Greenpeace Russia estimates the volume of harvested timber of unknown origin in Russia in 2009 (taking into account unauthor-	National level	Unspecified risk

⁶ The radionuclide-contaminated areas are areas where soil contains more than 1 Ci/km² of caesium-137 or 0,15 Ci/km² of strontium-90. Commercial timber harvest is prohibited if Cs¹³⁷ content in soil is 15-40 Ci/km²; and Sr⁹⁰ – above 3 Ci/km². If the level of radionuclide contamination exceeds 40 Ci/km², logging is only performed as part of preventive and rehabilitation operations aimed to preserve biological and enhance fire-resistance of forests (Order of Rosleskhoz No. 81 of 16.03.09 "Methodological recommendations for regulation of forestry operations in radionuclide-contaminated forests").

Indicators	Possible sources of information ³	Evidence	Scale of assessment	Risk Assessment
		<p>ized cutting and harvesting timber in excess of the permitted volume) as 40mln m³. The most probable estimate of the volume of timber harvested illegally or with gross violations of the legislation in force (sanitation cuttings in healthy forests, removal of best trees under the pretext of forest stand care, cuttings in violation of SPNA or OZU management regime) is 90mln m³ (http://www.forestforum.ru/info/lh-tomsk.pdf)</p> <p>In certain subjects of RF (for example, Nenets, Chukotka and Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrugs, Magadan Oblast, republics of Tyva and Kalmykia, Kamchatskiy Krai), commercial harvest of wood is very small, and, consequently, there is no illegal harvest on industrial scale.</p>		
1.4. There is a low perception of corruption with relation to granting harvesting permits and other related areas of law enforcement			National level	Unspecified risk
1.4a. There is a low perception of corruption with relation to granting harvesting permits and other related areas of law enforcement	<p>Federal Sources: Anti-Corruption Research and Initiative Center “Transparency International Russia” (http://www.transparency.org.ru/proj_index.asp); http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi/2009/cpi_2009_table Russian Public Opinion Research Center (http://wciom.ru/novosti/press-vypuski/press-vypusk/single/10707.html); Anti-Corruption Committee (com-cor.ru/node/864); FSC National Office, FSC National Initiative (www.fsc.ru); Website of Timber Industry of Russia (www.timberindustry.ru/?tag=korrupciya); First Web Portal of Timber Industry (www.wood.ru/ru/lonews.html); Ministry of Home Affairs of the Russian Federation (www.mvd.ru); Greenpeace Russia Forest Forum (www.forestforum.ru). World Bank, indicators of public management quality (info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.asp)</p>	<p>According to the 2011 data, the corruption perception index made by Transparency International was very low (2.4). D.A. Medvedev identified the corruption problem as one of the top problems in RF. The National Anti-Corruption Program is under development, the relevant structures are being created to fight the corruption. In 2007, Sergey Ivanov, the vice-premier of the government said that the forest industry is one of the most corrupted industries in Russia, especially in the area of cross-border trade in round wood.</p> <p>According to the Investment Climate Surveys in different countries performed by the World Bank (www.worldbank.org), in Russia, forest industry is the second after food industry in terms of statements regarding the importance of bribery. According to indicators of public management quality of the World Bank, Russia has a low rating regarding, for example, corruption control, compliance with law, effectiveness of the government</p>	National level	Unspecified risk
1.4b. There are serious conflicts with relation to granting harvesting permits and other	<p>The same as in 1.1a above, as well as:</p> <p>Regional Sources: Regional information websites Websites of regional non-government environmental or-</p>	<p>There are serious conflicts with relation to granting harvesting permits and other related law enforcement areas identified during interviews with stakeholders which may indicate to the potential signs of corruption and violation of the law. There are multiple examples of such conflicts between timber producers, on the</p>	National level	Unspecified risk

Indicators	Possible sources of information ³	Evidence	Scale of assessment	Risk Assessment
related areas of law enforcement identified during interviews with stakeholders	ganizations	one part, and non-governmental organizations and/or groups of indigenous peoples and/or local population		

Final risk assessment for category 1 “Illegally harvested wood” - unspecified risk at the national level

Category 2. Wood harvested from areas where traditional or civil rights are violated

The district of origin may be considered low risk in relation to the violation of traditional, civil and collective rights when all the following indicators are present:

Indicators	Possible sources of information	Evidence	Scale of assessment	Risk Assessment
2.1. There is no UN Security Council ban on timber exports from Russia	United Nations Organization (www.un.org/russian/)	There is no UN Security Council ban on timber exports from Russia: United Nations Organization	National level	Low risk
2.2. The area of Russia is not designated as a source of conflict ⁷ timber (e.g. USAID Type 1 conflict timber)	Global Witness (http://www.globalwitness.org library); US Agency for International Development (http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNACT462.pdf); ETFRN News 43-44/05, http://www.etfrn.org/ETFRN/newsletter/news4344/articles/1_8_Lundberg.pdf	Russia is not designated as a source of conflict wood at the international level	National level	Low risk
2.3. There is no evidence of child labor or violation of ILO Fundamental Principles and Rights at work taking place in forest areas in the district concerned			National level	Unspecified risk Komi Republic: see Annex 8 (normative)
2.3a. There is no evidence of violation of freedom of association and collective bargaining	Federal Sources: ILO Subregional Office for Eastern Europe and Central Asia (www.ilo.ru); Trade Union of Forestry Workers of the Russian Federation (www.roslesprof.ru); Federal Service for Labour and Employment of the Russian Federation (www.rostrud.info); Federal Forestry Agency of the Russian Federation (www.rosleshoz.gov.ru); All-Russian Industrial Association of Employers "Union of Timber Producers and Exporters of Russia"	The observation of the workers' freedom of association (establishment and, subject only to the rules of the organization concerned, joining organizations of their own choosing without previous authorization of the employer) and the right of bargaining with the employer is guaranteed by: The Labor Code of the Russian Federation, Federal Industrial Tariff Agreement for forestry of the Russian Federation (between Trade Union of Forestry Workers of the Russian Federation (Roslesprofsoyuz), Federal Forestry Agency, federal Service for Supervision in the Sphere of Nature Use, Ministry of Natural Resources of the	National level	Unspecified risk

⁷According to Global Witness, this is "wood the trade in which leads to an armed conflict and threatens national or regional security."

⁸In Russia, the legal system is aimed to ensure the observation of rights and freedoms of citizens provided by the law. The key role in this process is given to the state authorities and judiciary. The Labour Code of RF and related by-laws in general comply with the requirements of the International Labour Organization (ILO). The customs and traditions (traditional rights of people in FSC interpretation) which became the norms of the customary law may have the force of the law. FSC assumes that the choice of the level of compliance of the rules of customary or civil law during risk assessment must be based on the international interpretation of risk acceptability.

Indicators	Possible sources of information	Evidence	Scale of assessment	Risk Assessment
	<p>Environmental problems of the Russian forest sector and ways to address them. M: Publishing House MCoEC, 2001, 44 p. www.forest.ru/rus/publications/how/index.html; Table 4).</p> <p>Regional Sources: Regional information websites Websites of regional non-government environmental organizations</p>	<p>Russian Federation); the Federal Industrial Tariff Agreement for Forest Industry of the Russian Federation (between Roslesprofsoyuz, All-Russian Industrial Association of Employers "Union of Timber Producers and Exporters of Russia" and the Ministry of Industry and Energy of the Russian Federation (or similar).</p> <p>According to Roslesprofsoyuz data as of 31 December 2011, approx. 11% of all timber producers had no collective bargaining agreements, there are cases when the requirements of such agreements were not met. Up to 10 acute labor conflicts are observed in Russia every year. ILO expressed its concern to the Government of the Russian Federation referring to complaints relating to the compliance with the requirements of Convention 87, in particular, "numerous violations of trade union rights in practice, including denial of registration of trade unions, interference by the authorities in internal trade union affairs, harassment of trade union leaders, and restrictions on the rights to strike" (Observation (CEACR) - adopted 2010, published 100th ILC session (2011), http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100_COMMENT_ID:2329270, as well as Direct Request (CEACR) - adopted 2011, published 101st ILC session (2012), http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100_COMMENT_ID:2698661:NO), and Convention 98, in particular "numerous violations of trade union rights in practice, including acts of anti-union discrimination and interference by employers in trade union internal affairs". (http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100_COMMENT_ID:2698948:NO)</p>		
2.3b. There is no evidence of violations of the rights of prisoners of corrective labour institutions during wood harvest	<p>Regional information websites Websites of non-governmental human rights organizations (http://www.goscontrol.ru/showDoc/id/6_1, http://www.prpc.ru/law_org/list3.shtml, http://www.prpc.ru/law_org/list.shtml, http://www.prpc.ru/law_org/perm_01.shtml)</p>	<p>Institution of the Main Directorate of the Federal Penitentiary Service of the Ministry of Justice of Russia (corrective labour institutions) may lease forest areas for the purpose of wood harvest. The Labour Code of RF does not consider the labor of prisoners as forced labour. However, pursuant to Penal Execution Code (Chapter 14, art. 6): "The convicted are not allowed to cease work to resolve labour conflicts." Therefore, the prisoners may not always bargain properly the working conditions and size of wages as per ILO. ILO expressed its concern to the Government of the Russian Federation regarding the compli-</p>	National level	Unspecified risk Komi Republic: see Annex 8 (normative)

Indicators	Possible sources of information	Evidence	Scale of assessment	Risk Assessment
		ance with the requirements of Convention 29, stating, in particular, that "all requirements of labor legislation are met and the working conditions for prisoners are assimilated to free employment relationships, but the committee notes that, according to the law, there is no requirement for informed consent of prisoners in case of work for private enterprises" (Direct Request (CEACR) - adopted 2010, published 100th ILC session (2011))		
2.3c. There is no evidence of child labor use	The same as 2.3a	Russia ratified ILO Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention (1999) in 2003. There is no evidence of wide use of child labor in the forestry industry (Rights of children in the Russian Federation: law and practice / Analytical Bulletin of the Council of Federation of the federal Assembly of RF. 2003. No.3 (196); http://www.budgetrf.ru/Publications/Magazines/VestnikSF/2003/vestniksf196-03/excel/vestniksf196-03080.xls (Table 5). Illegal child labor use is not a common practice in the forestry industry of Russia	National level	Low risk
2.3d. There is no evidence of discrimination in the area of employment and occupation	The same as in 2.3a above, as well as: Gelbras V.G. Chinese realities in Russia. M., 2011. Vitkovskaya G.S. Illegal migration in Russia: status and counteraction policy // Illegal immigration / International migration of population: Russia and Contemporary World. M., 2002, Issue 9, p. 14	Russian labour laws prohibit any forms of discrimination in the area of employment and occupation. According to the report of the Federation of independent trade unions of Russia "On the status of women working at enterprises of the forestry and timber industries of RF and acts of trade unions" dated 07.12.2004: "Women are discriminated in terms of remuneration, during recruitment, carrier making and other forms of discrimination against women." The share of women in Roslesprofsoyuz is 34.4%. Although the problem of women discrimination is nor resolved completely, Roslesprofsoyuz does not consider it as acute. The problem of discrimination of migrants at work is more acute. In Amur Oblast, the timber is harvested by the Koreans under the special agreement between the Government of the Russian Federation and North Korea; Chinese workers are widely used in Siberia and Far East (0.4-1 mln people: Gelbras, 2001; www.km.ru/magazin/view.asp?id=F5F580B03F844EADA4577B7F30C20600 ; www.smoney.ru/article.shtml?2007/03/12/2433 , including those involved in illegal logging (www.strana-oz.ru/?numid=19&article=911#s5 ; Vitkovskaya, 2002)	Regional level	Unspecified risk: subjects of RF as per Annex 3. The remaining subjects of RF - low risk
2.4. There are recognized and equitable pro-	FSC National Initiative, FSC National Office (http://www.fsc.ru/). Local self-government authorities;	The violation of a number of traditional and civil rights in forestry work in Russia is quite possible. Although, the forest law in force requires the protection of the rights of citizens, it lacks the	National level	Unspecified risk

Indicators	Possible sources of information	Evidence	Scale of assessment	Risk Assessment
cesses ⁹ in place to resolve conflicts of substantial magnitude pertaining to traditional rights including use rights, cultural interests or traditional cultural identity ¹⁰ in the district concerned		mechanisms for local communities and public involvement in forest management and taking decisions significant for the population. The population has no rights and opportunities to prevent or suspend the acts leading to the violation of their rights for the favourable environment or deprivation of vitally important forest resources. The law does not establish mechanisms and procedures for recording the opinion of the local population, indigenous peoples and public organizations during the development of regulatory and normative acts; taking decisions on the transfer of forest area on lease/for use and conclusion of forest lease agreements or forest sale agreement; the development of Forest Plan of the subject of the Russian Federation, forestry regulations of lesnichestvos and forest development projects for the leased forest areas. A special case is the violation of traditional rights of citizens during management operations in forests having particular importance for the population with the purposes not related to the forest management but nevertheless requiring forest cutting or conversion to other land uses. The building of railroads and hard-surface automobile roads, pipelines, as well as constructions of industrial, residential and sports and recreational facilities brings protests on the part of the populations. As an example, we may refer to conflicts on the construction of speedway Moscow-Saint-Petersburg through Khimki Forest, the plans for construction of Central Ring Automobile Road in the Moscow region, construction of infrastructural facilities for Sochi 2014 Olympics in Sochi and its surroundings.		
2.5. There is no evidence of violation of the ILO Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples ¹¹ taking place in the forest areas in the district concerned:			National level	Unspecified risk

⁹The process which offers effective security tools and/or which is not characterized by deep structural imbalance or internal inconsistency. Examples: negotiations over land use, legal procedures, court proceedings.

¹⁰Indigenous peoples, workers, communities and governmental institutions in the area accept and approve the existing procedure for addressing and resolving the said issues; communities and/or indigenous peoples recognized that the use of legal systems or other governmental institutions may reduce any adverse impacts of wood harvest.

¹¹The new FSC definition of indigenous peoples (adapted from publications of United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous, Factsheet. Who are indigenous peoples, October 2007; United Nations Development Group. Guidelines on Indigenous Peoples' Issues. United Nations 2009, United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 13 September 2007): peoples and groups of people which are identified or characterized with the following: the fundamental feature or criterion – self-identification at the individual level and recognition by the community as a member; historic succession from pre-colonial and/or pre-settlement communities; strong links with the area and its natural resources; special social, economic or political systems; individual language, culture and beliefs; being non-dominant groups of the society; ability to maintain and reproduce the environment of their ancestors and systems as individuals and communities.

Indicators	Possible sources of information	Evidence	Scale of assessment	Risk Assessment
				Komi Republic: see Annex 8 (normative)
2.5a. There is no data about indigenous small-numbered peoples and tribal peoples living in the area	<p>The same as in 2.4, as well as: RAIPON (http://www.raipon.org, http://www.csipn.ru) and its regional associations, regional and local ethnological and/or historical institutions, educational and cultural institutions. Records of ongoing or completed negotiations on the land use right, decisions of the authorities, court judgments. Turaev V.A., Sulyandziga R.V., Sulyandziga P.V., Bocharnikov V.N. Encyclopaedia of indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North, Siberia and Far East of the Russian Federation. Series: Library of indigenous peoples of the North, M, 2005. 464 p. Sulyandziga R.V., Kudryashova D.A., Sulyandziga P.V. Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North, Siberia and Far East of the Russian Federation. Survey of current status. M: 2003. 142 p. Regional information websites “List of lands serving as traditional environments and places of economic activities of indigenous small-numbered peoples of the Russian Federation” approved by the Order of the Government of the Russian Federation dated May 8, 2009 No. 631-p, Law of Republic of Dagestan No. 3 of 12.02.2003 “On Territory Densely Inhabited by Indigenous Small-Numbered Peoples of Republic of Dagestan” dated 30.01.2003</p>	<p>ILO Convention No. 169 is not ratified by Russia. According to the Russian law, the special rights in the area of traditional land use cover only the indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North, Siberia and Far East. The Russian law on indigenous peoples does not cover bigger (having more than 50 thsd people) indigenous peoples and titular nations of republics and autonomous districts making the part of RF. Some small-numbered ethnic groups identifying themselves as indigenous peoples were not added to the above lists either. The national FSC standard provides a vague definition of term “indigenous peoples.”¹² Indigenous peoples that meet the requirements of ILO C169 are located in the following subjects of RF: national districts inhabited by indigenous small-numbered peoples as per “List of lands serving as traditional environments and places of economic activities of indigenous small-numbered peoples of the Russian Federation” dated May 8, 2009 No. 631-p, law of Republic of Dagestan No. 3 of 12.02.2003, and Abazinskiy district of Karachay-Cherkess Republic and the whole of: Udmurt Republic, Pskov, Leningrad and Chelyabinsk regions where such districts were not identified irrespective of the availability indigenous small-numbered peoples. The whole area of Arkhangelsk Oblast and Republic of Komi where Pomors and Komi-Izhem people live which qualify for the status of indigenous small-numbered peoples. All other national republics and autonomous districts (entire area). List of the subjects of the Russian Federation where indigenous peoples complying with criteria of ILO C No.169 live is in Annex 4 (informative). But their presence in other subjects of RF is possible as well.</p>	National level	<p>Unspecified risk</p> <p>Komi Republic: see Annex 8 (normative)</p>
2.5b. There is	The same as 2.5a	The issue of indigenous peoples has not been settled yet at the	National	Unspecified risk

¹²Here, the term “indigenous peoples” is understood widely and applied to any group identifying itself as an indigenous community, including indigenous small-numbered peoples; individual ethnic communities (for example, local Buryat, Karel, Komi, Yakut, Tyva communities and other titular nations of republics and autonomous districts of the Russian Federation); groups of Russian old-timers (Pomors, Starovers, Kossacks); any other groups having specific culture and self-identification.

Indicators	Possible sources of information	Evidence	Scale of assessment	Risk Assessment
no evidence of violation of ILO Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples		legislative and law enforcement levels. The rights of indigenous peoples are often violated. The facts of disregard (non-recognition) of rights and cultural values of indigenous small-numbered peoples, tribal peoples or communities of followers of traditional religions, as well as conflicts with indigenous small-numbered peoples and tribal peoples are possible (see also 2.4)	level	

Final risk assessment for category 2 “Wood harvested with violation of traditional or civil rights” - unspecified risk at the national level

Category 3. Wood harvested in forests where high conservation values are threatened by management activities

The forest district may be considered low risk in relation to threat to high conservation values if:

- a) indicator 3.1 is met; or b) indicator 3.2 eliminates (or greatly mitigates) the threat posed to the district of origin by non-compliance with 3.1

Note: In case of acute disputes with stakeholders (NGOs) regarding HCVF 3.1a-3.1h, wood from such HCVF shall not be purchased until the written agreement has been concluded with such NGOs. Wood consignments from districts where HCVF 3.1a-3.1g are observed, shall not contain trees included in the Red List Books of RF or subject of RF as well as Caucasian fir, and for 3.1h – tree species specific for the said types of ecosystems: late-successional species from forests with inclusion of Manchurian fir; ash, oak, maple – from European Russia; spruce, fir and aspen (with diameter at least 80 cm) – from chernovaya taiga, Korean cedar pine. For HCVF 3.1c, 3.1e-3.1h, no purchase of wood from forests outside leased areas; no wood from areas where there are acute disputes with the stakeholders regarding creation of SPNA or the conservation of their value: for example, Sochi National Park, Utrish Reserve.

Indicators	Possible sources of information	Evidence	Scale of assessment	Risk Assessment
3.1. Forest management activities at the relevant level (eco-region, sub-eco-region) do not threaten eco-regionally significant high conservation value forests ¹³ .			Regional	Unspecified risk Komi Republic: see Annex 8 (normative)
3.1a. Forest district is not included into the ecoregion (sub-ecoregion) from The Global 200 of WWF	Yanitskaya T. Practical guide for the identification of high conservation value forests in Russia / World Wild Fund for Nature (WWF). M., 2008. 136 p. www.nationalgeographic.com/wildworld/profiles/g200_index.htm Olson D.M., Dinerstein E. The Global 200: A representation approach to conserving the Earth's most biologically valuable ecoregions // Conservation Biology, №12, 1998, pp. 502-515.	WWF Global 200 of are territories included into the map of global ecoregions. WWF Global 200 are 233 ecoregions in the world most valuable for biodiversity conservation. The conservation of biodiversity in these ecoregions will ensure the conservation of 95% of the biodiversity of the Earth. In 2008, WWF approved a new program (WWF Global Programme Framework) selecting 35 ecoregions out of 233 which are threatened most, these including Arctic.	Regional level	Unspecified risk in subjects of RF having WWF Global 200 ecoregions as per Annex 6. The remaining subjects of RF - low risk Komi Republic: see Annex 8 (normative)
3.1b. The forest district is not included into "Caucasus" biodiversity hotspot	Yanitskaya T. Practical guide for the identification of high conservation value forests in Russia / World Wild Fund for Nature (WWF). M., 2008. 136 p. www.conservation.org www.biodiversityhotspots.org	The concept of biodiversity hotspots was proposed to identify areas which are crucial for the conservation of biodiversity on a global scale, especially for conservation of endemism spots. 34 areas were identified each of them having at least 1,500 endemic plant species (http://www.biodiversityhotspots.org/Pages/default.aspx). Russia has only one such area – the Caucasus. It stretches over the territory of several countries. The number of endemic species approaches 1,600. The ongoing economic and political crises in the region are conducive to timber cutting for firewood and illegal logging.	Regional level	Unspecified risk in subject of RF included in the "Caucasus" biodiversity hotspot as per Annex 6. The remaining subjects of RF - low risk
3.1c. The forest	Yanitskaya T. Practical guide for the identification of high	Intact forest landscapes are continuous natural areas within the	Regional	Unspecified risk in sub-

¹³ The presence and threats to HCVF at least with international or national importance shall be assessed.

Indicators	Possible sources of information	Evidence	Scale of assessment	Risk Assessment
district is not included or does not contain intact forest landscapes	<p>conservation value forests in Russia / World Wild Fund for Nature (WWF). M., 2008. 136 p. www.globalforestwatch.org, www.intactforests.org hcvf.net/eng/search/russia_ifl.html</p> <p>Aksenov D.E., Dobrynin D.V., Dubinin M.YU. et al. Atlas of Russia's intact forest landscapes. M.: MSoES; Washington; Publishing House World Resources Institute, 2003. 186 p.</p> <p>Yaroshenko A.Yu., Potapov P.V., Turubanova S.A. Intact-forest landscapes of European North of Russia. M.: Greenpeace Russia, 2001. 75 c.</p>	<p>forestland of more than 50 thou ha, without permanent settlements, utilities and communications and not affected by intensive management activities. Their special value is their ability to ensure sustainable existence of populations of most endemic species, natural dynamics at various scales as well as long-term self-subsistence of all properties and functions of the forest in general. In Russia, such areas are identified by the Global Forest Watch (www.intactforests.org)</p>	level	<p>jects of RF, having IFL as per Annex 6. The remaining subjects of RF - low risk</p> <p>Komi Republic: see Annex 8 (normative)</p>
3.1d. The forest district is not included in the IUCN world centre of plant diversity	<p>Yanitskaya T. Practical guide for the identification of high conservation value forests in Russia / World Wild Fund for Nature (WWF). M., 2008. 136 p. www.iucn.org</p> <p>IUCN. 1987. Centres of Plant Diversity: A Guide and Strategy for their Conservation. IUCN Threatened Plans Unit, Kew, Richmond, U.K.</p> <p>Centres of plant diversity: A guide and strategy for their conservation. Vol. 1, Europe, Africa, South West Asia and the Middle East / edited by S.D. David, V.H. Heywood and A.C. Hamilton WWF, IUCN, 1994. 354 p.</p> <p>Centres of plant diversity: A guide and strategy for their conservation, Vol. 2. Asia, Australasia and the Pacific / Edited by S. D. Davis, V. H. Heywood & A. C. Hamilton. WWF and IUCN, IUCN Publications, University of Cambridge. 1995. 578 p.</p>	<p>Identification of world centres of plant diversity (CPD) is a joint project of WWF and IUCN. CPD are areas of global botanical value which are the first priority for protection. These areas are extremely rich in species or have many endemic species. In general, about 250 centres have been identified. The four of them are located in Russia: Western Caucasus, Altai-Sayans, the south of Far East and Chukotka (the last refers to CPD of grass ecosystems and therefore is not included in this assessment). The remaining 3 centres coincide with the area of WWF Global 200 ecoregions</p>	Regional level	<p>Unspecified risk in subjects of RF, having CPD as per Annex 6. The remaining subjects of RF - low risk</p>
3.1e. The forest district does not contain important bird areas	<p>Yanitskaya T. Practical guide for the identification of high conservation value forests in Russia / World Wild Fund for Nature (WWF). M., 2008. 136 p. www.rbcu.ru/programs/IBA/</p> <p>Important bird areas of Russia. V.1. Important Bird Areas of International Significance in European Russia / Author T.V. Sviridova, ed. by T.V. Sviridova and V.A. Zubakin. M.: Russian Bird Conservation Union, 2000. 702 p.</p> <p>Important bird areas of Russia. V. 2. Important Bird Areas of International Significance in Western Siberia \ Ed. by S.A. Bukreev. Moscow: Russian Bird Conservation Union, 2006. 336 p.</p> <p>Important bird areas of Russia. V. 3. Important Bird Areas of</p>	<p>IBA of international significance, Russian IBA and IBA of regional significance are the parts of land and water surface most valuable for birds – nesting, moulting, wintering places and resting places on migration routes. In general, the identification of IBAR is completed. IBAR have been identified in all subjects of RF (www.birdlife.org/datazone/site)</p>	National level	<p>Unspecified risk</p> <p>Komi Republic – low risk: see Annex 8 (normative)</p>

Indicators	Possible sources of information	Evidence	Scale of assessment	Risk Assessment
	<p>International Significance in Caucasian Eco-region / Ed. by S.A.Bukreev, G.S. Dzhamirzoev. Moscow: Russian Bird Conservation Union, 2009. 302 p.</p> <p>Important Bird Areas in Asia. Key Sites for Conservation Series / Chan S., Crosby M.J., Islam M.Z. and Tordoff A.W. (eds.) Cambridge: Birdlife, Birdlife Conservation Series 13, 2004. 297 p.</p> <p>Important Bird Areas in Europe: Priority Sites for Conservation / Eds. Heath M.F., Evans M.I. 2 vols. Cambridge: Birdlife, Birdlife Conservation Ser. 8, 2000. 866 p. (vol. 1), 791 p. (vol. 2)</p>			
<p>3.1f. The forest district has no wetlands of international importance</p>	<p>Yanitskaya T. Practical guide for the identification of high conservation value forests in Russia / World Wild Fund for Nature (WWF). M., 2008. 136 p. www.wetlands.org/ramsar.wetlands.org/ The wetlands included into the Ramsar prospective List of Wetlands // Wetlands of Russia. Vol.3 / Ed. by V.G. Krivenko. M.: Wetlands International Global Ser., No. 3, 2000. 490 p. Wetlands of International Importance // Wetlands of Russia. Vol.1 / Ed. by V.G. Krivenko. M.: Wetlands International Global Ser., No. 47, 2008. 256 p.</p>	<p>Under Ramsar Convention, 35 wetland areas have been identified in Russia. However, the inventory of wetlands in Russia is far from being complete. The “List of sites recommended for adding to the list of wetlands protected by Ramsar Convention” now contains 166 sites which are to be considered as the sites having high conservation values. There is some information that a number of wetlands are indirectly threatened by forest use</p>	<p>Regional level</p>	<p>Unspecified risk in subjects of RF, having wetlands as per Annex 6. For Komi Republic, see Annex 8 (normative). The remaining subjects of RF low risk</p>
<p>3.1g. The forest district has no rare forest ecosystems</p>	<p>Yanitskaya T. Practical guide for the identification of high conservation value forests in Russia / World Wild Fund for Nature (WWF). M., 2008. 136 p. Aksenov D.E., Dubinin M.Yu., Karpachevskiy M.L. et al. Mapping high conservation value forests of Primorskiy Krai, Russian Far East. Categories important for preservation of flora and vegetation. Vladivostok-M.: Publishing House MSoES, 2006. 186 p. Krestov P.V., Verkholat V.P. Rare plant communities of Primorye and Priamurye. Vladivostok, 2003. 200 p.</p>	<p>Rare ecosystems are ecosystems occupying an insignificant aggregate area at the regional or global scale for different reasons. There are no generally accepted criteria for such sites, and there is no national list of such ecosystems in Russia at the moment. The following list of ecosystems which are considered as rare at the national level, is proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – forests with Manchurian fir in Primorskiy Krai; – in European Russia, old-growth polydominant broadleaf forests (mature and overmature forests with at least four of the following noble hardwood species: oak, ash, linden, elm, Norway maple, field maple, sycamore maple); – in European Russia, old-growth oak forests (overmature oak-dominated forests (4 and more units per 10 in stand composition)); – In European Russia and Western Siberia, old-growth (overmature) spruce-fir-linden forests and spruce-fir forests with inclusions of lime; 	<p>Regional level</p>	<p>Unspecified risk in subjects of RF, having rare forest ecosystems as per Annex 7. The remaining subjects of RF low risk</p>

Indicators	Possible sources of information	Evidence	Scale of assessment	Risk Assessment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – in all regions of Siberia – old-growth chernevaya taiga (overmature fir-aspen tall-herb forests with nemoral relic herbs); – in the regions of the Far East, Korean pine forests 		
3.1h. The forest district does not belong to important plant areas	http://www.plantlife.org/ Important plant areas of Altai-Sayan Ecoregion: experience of identification. Novosibirsk: Publishing House SO RAN, 2009. 272 p.	Identification of important plant areas is the initiative of Plantlife international non-government organization. Important plant areas are natural areas of special importance for the conservation of plant diversity. In Russia, important plant areas have been identified and mapped in Altai-Sayan region (Altai Krai, Kemerovo Oblast, Republic of Altai, Republic of Khakassia and republic of Tyva) (Important plant areas..., 2009). For other regions data are absent.	Regional level	Unspecified risk
3.2. A strong system of protection (effective protected areas and legislation) is in place that ensures survival of the HCVFs in the ecoregion.	FSC National initiatives (offices), contact information at www.fsc.org . SPNA information: oopt.info , www.zapoved.ru Forest management authorities in subjects of RF. Plans for development of federal and regional SPNA, territorial development schemes for regions. Secretariat of the Convention of Biological Diversity. www.biodiv.org/world/parties.asp and www.biodiv.org/reports/list.aspx?type=for www.govindicators.org	According to FSC explanation, the assessment of HCVF conservation system shall be based on the assessment of effectiveness of law enforcement in the country performed by the World Bank (Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) project). The system is considered strong if its effectiveness of law enforcement is at least 75%. According to WGI project, the effectiveness of law enforcement in Russia varies from 10 to 25%, i.e. the system may not be considered strong. The system of the territory assessed is considered strong if there is a strong support from the national or regional stakeholders. Most big Russian NGOs (WWF, Greenpeace) think that SPNA system in Russia is underdeveloped and not effective. There are serious threats to the sites recorded as World Natural Heritage Sites (Western Caucasus, Golden Mountains of Altai, Baikal).	National level	Unspecified risk

Final risk assessment for category “3. Wood harvested in forests where high conservation values are threatened by management activities” – unspecified risk at the national level.

Category 4. Wood harvested from forests converted to plantations or other land uses

4. The district of origin may be considered low risk in relation to conversion of forest to plantations or non-forest uses¹⁴ when the following indicators are present:

Indicators	Possible sources of information	Evidence	Scale of assessment	Risk Assessment
4.1. There is no net loss and no significant rate of loss (> 0.5% per year) ¹⁵ of natural forests and other naturally wooded ecosystems especially high conservation value forests taking place in the eco-region in question	Forest inventory data of Rosleskhoz are available at www.rosleshoz.ru . FAO State of the World's Forests 2007 report (FAO. State of the World's Forests. Rome, 2007, www.fao.org/docrep/009/a0773e/a0773e00.htm)	In general, the forest area in Russia remains the same, although according to the FAO report, the forest area in Russia reduced by 180 thsd ha from 2000 to 2010 (0,02% on average per year) (State of world's forest's report 2011. FAO: Rome, 2011; http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i2000e/i2000e00.htm). Urbanization processes around the largest metropolitan agglomerations lead to the reduction of the area of natural and semi-natural forests and forest fragmentation as a result of house, motorways and railways building; however, these, in general, still did not become critical. Thus, the risk of reduction of natural and semi-natural forests for the Russian Federation may be considered low.	National level	Low risk
4.2. The wood was not harvested in forest plots where plantations ¹⁶ were created afterwards		According to FAO (2005; www.fao.org/forestry/32041/en/), in Russia, forest plantations occupied 17mln ha or 2.1% of the total forest area. However, these figures refer to Russian forest cultures which are not aimed to speed up wood growing and, therefore, may not be classified as plantations ¹⁷ . During 1981-1997, 36 thsd ha of plantation forest cultures, mainly spruce, were established in 13 regions of Russia as an experiment (Krasnogorskaya I. Present and future of forest plantations // LesPromInform, No.3, 2005, p. 46-47, No forest plantations were created since that. Forest seed plantations and forest nurseries are used exclusively for growing seedlings. As of 2011, there are no cases of creating industrial plantations on the lease forest areas.	National level	Low risk

Final risk assessment for category “4. Wood harvested from forests converted to plantations or other land uses” – low risk at the national level.

¹⁴ Covers only the problem of creating plantations instead of natural forests or conversion of natural forests to other land uses which do not ensure forest cover conservation in the long run.

¹⁵ Admissible rate of reduction (less than 0,5%) may be clarified based on the additional information.

¹⁶ Plantations are artificial stands created with the purpose of accelerated growing of tree and bush species with pre-set properties of the finished product.

¹⁷In Russia, forest cultures and natural stands in similar conditions and similar economic purpose have the same cutting age (maturity age) which is, as a rule, at least 50-60 years for deciduous species (for aspen and poplar – 40-50 years) and at least 80 years for conifers (www.rosleshoz.gov.ru/docs/leshoz/34). Pesticides and fertilizers are used very rarely. For forest cultures, typically only local species are used. Low intensity of soil preparation and absence of care ensure the maintenance of natural elements of the forest environment.

Category 5. Wood from forests where genetically modified trees are being grown

The district of origin may be considered low risk in relation to wood from genetically modified trees¹⁸ when one of the following indicators is complied with:

Indicators	Possible sources of information	Evidence	Scale of assessment	Risk Assessment
5.1a. There is no commercial use of genetically modified trees in forestry in the country or district concerned or 5.1b. Licenses are required for commercial use of GM trees and there are no licenses for commercial use or 5.1c. It is forbidden to use GM trees commercially in the country concerned	EI-Lakany M.H Are genetically modified trees a threat to forests? Unasyva, vol. 55, 2004, http://www.fao.org/docrep/007/y5507e/y5507e14.htm	According to the report of FAO (FAO Preliminary review of biotechnology in forestry, including genetic modification. Forest Genetic Resources Working Paper FGR/59E. Forest Resources Development Service, Forest Resources Division. Rome, 2011; www.fao.org/docrep/008/ae574e/AE574E00.htm), at present it is only China that uses GM-trees (black poplar (<i>Populus nigra</i>)) on industrial scale. Russia is not mentioned as a country where field tests of GM-trees are performed in forestry. No works relating to the use of GM-trees in forestry purposes are carried out in Russia. Pursuant to the Federal Law “On State Regulation in the Area of Genetic Engineering” dated July 5, 1996 No. 86-FZ (as amended on 12.07.2000) and Federal Law “On Sanitary and Epidemiological Welfare of the Population” dated March 12, 1999, the products obtained using genetic engineering methods require mandatory standardization, certification and registration. According to the data of All-national Association of Genetic Safety, there is no one tree species among transgenic cultures registered in Russia (www.oagb.ru/lib.php?txt_id=5996). No one positive state ecological expert review has been issued confirming the biological safety and permitting the release of GM-organisms into the environment. The right to plant GM-plants as an experiment in Russia is only granted to research institutions with licensed trial plots which are to comply with a number of requirements to biological safety, in particular, the isolation of tested organisms.	National level	Low risk

Final risk assessment for category “5. Wood from forests where genetically modified trees are being grown” – low risk at the national level.

¹⁸ Genetically modified trees are organisms modified as a result of introduction of one or several isolated genes using genetic engineering methods. The genes are often taken from other species.

ANNEXES

Annex 1 (informative). List of the subjects of the Russian Federation where there are defense and security forests and municipal forests (controlled wood indicator 1.2b)

Region	Defense and security forests	Municipal forests
Republic of Adygeya	+	+
Republic of Altai		+
Republic of Bashkortostan	+	+
Republic of Buryatia	+	+
Kabardino-Balkar Republic	+	
Republic of Dagestan		+
Republic of Kalmykia		+
Karachay-Cherkess Republic		+
Republic of Karelia	+	+
Republic of Komi	+	+
Republic of Mari El	+	+
Republic of Mordovia		+
Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)		+
Republic of North Ossetia-Alania		+
Republic of Tatarstan	+	+
Republic of Tyva		+
Udmurt Republic	+	+
Republic of Khakassia		+
Chuvash Republic		+
Altai Krai	+	+
Zabaikalskii Krai	+	+
Kamchatskiy Krai	+	+
Krasnodarskiy Krai	+	+
Krasnoyarskiy Krai	+	+
Permskiy Krai	+	+
Primorskiy Krai	+	+
Stavropolskiy Krai	+	

Region	Defense and security forests	Municipal forests
Khabarovskiy Krai	+	+
Amur Oblast		+
Arkhangelsk Oblast	+	+
Astrakhan Oblast		+
Belgorod Oblast	+	+
Bryansk Oblast		+
Vladimir Oblast	+	
Volgograd Oblast	+	+
Vologda Oblast	+	+
Voronezh Oblast	+	
Ivanovo Oblast	+	+
Irkutsk Oblast	+	
Kaliningrad Oblast	+	+
Kaluga Oblast	+	+
Kemerovo Oblast	+	+
Kirov Oblast	+	+
Kostroma Oblast	+	+
Kurgan Oblast	+	+
Kursk Oblast	+	+
Leningrad Oblast	+	+
Lipetsk Oblast	+	+
Magadan Oblast		+
Moscow Oblast	+	+
Murmansk Oblast	+	+
Nizhny Novgorod Oblast	+	+
Novgorod Oblast	+	+
Novosibirsk Oblast	+	+
Omsk Oblast	+	+
Orenburg Oblast	+	+
Orel Oblast	+	+
Penza Oblast	+	
Pskov Oblast	+	+

Region	Defense and security forests	Municipal forests
Rostov Oblast		+
Ryazan Oblast	+	+
Samara Oblast		+
Saratov Oblast	+	+
Sakhalin Oblast	+	+
Sverdlovsk Oblast	+	+
Smolensk Oblast	+	+
Tambov Oblast	+	+
Tver Oblast	+	
Tomsk Oblast	+	+
Tula Oblast	+	+
Tyumen Oblast		+
Ulyanovsk Oblast	+	+
Chelyabinsk Oblast	+	+
Yaroslavl Oblast	+	
Jewish Autonomous Oblast		+
Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug		+

Annex 2 (normative). List of the subjects of the Russian Federation with forest areas which suffered severely from Chernobyl radioactive trace (1986) and East-Ural Radioactive Trace (PO Mayak, 1948-1967) and nuclear weapon testing at the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site (1949-1962) (controlled wood indicator 1.2a)

The reasons for heavy nuclear pollution in Russia are the accidents at Mayak production association, Chernobyl NPS and nuclear weapon testing at the Semipalatinsk test site. In 1949-1956, 1957 and 1967, about 23.5 thousand sq km of the area of Ural region suffered from radioactive contamination. 119 thsd hectares of land were withdrawn from use. The Chernobyl NPS accident which occurred April 26, 1986, led to the contamination of an area of more than 56 thsd sq km which is now the part of the Russian Federation including approximately 2mln hectares of cropland and 1mln hectares of forestland. The population of Altai Krai and Republic of Altai was exposed to radiation as a result of nuclear weapon testing at the Semipalatinsk test site in 1949-1962.

According to the federal target program titled "Overcoming the consequences of radiation accidents for the period until 2010" approved by the Order of the Government of the Russian Federation, No. 637 of August 29, 2001 (as amended by Order of the Government of RF No. 793 of 22.12.2006 and No. 865 of 12.12.2007), the regions which suffered most from the aftereffects of radiation catastrophes and accidents were Bryansk, Kaluga, Kurgan, Orel, Sverdlovsk, Tula, Chelyabinsk Oblasts, Republic of Altai and Altai Krai.

The radionuclide-contaminated areas are areas where soil contains more than 1 Ci/km² of caesium-137 or 0,15 Ci/km² of strontium-90. Commercial timber harvest is prohibited if Cs¹³⁷ content in soil is 15-40 Ci/km²; and Sr⁹⁰ – above 3 Ci/km². If the level of radionuclide contamination exceeds 40 Ci/km², logging is only performed as part of preventive and rehabilitation operations aimed to preserve biological and enhance fire-resistance of forests (Order of Rosleskhoz No. 81 of 16.03.09 "Methodological recommendations for regulation of forestry operations in radionuclide-contaminated forests").

Based on the above FTP and the report of A.S. Kotov (director of TsZL Of Kaluga Region, the subsidiary of FGU Roslesozaschita) "Results of the second study of radiation absorption in soils in 2008 in the radionuclide-contaminated forests in the subjects of the Russian Federation" (<http://www.rcfh.ru/sfera/radiologicheskij/publikacii/doklad/>), the subject of RF characterized as unspecified risk for radionuclide contamination are:

1. Altai Krai
2. Republic of Altai
3. Bryansk Oblast
4. Kaluga Oblast
5. Kurgan Oblast
6. Sverdlovsk Oblast
7. Tula Oblast
8. Chelyabinsk Oblast

Annex 3 (normative). List of the subjects of the Russian Federation where the risk of discrimination in the area of labor and employment when using migrant workers for timber harvesting is high (controlled wood indicator 2.3b)

1. Amur Oblast
2. Republic of Buryatia
3. Jewish Autonomous Oblast
4. Zabaikalskii Krai
5. Irkutsk Oblast
6. Krasnoyarskiy Krai
7. Primorskiy Krai

8. Tomsk Oblast
9. Khabarovskiy Krai

Annex 4 (informative). List of the subjects of the Russian Federation where indigenous peoples complying with criteria of ILO C No.169 live (controlled wood indicator 2.5a)

1. Republic of Adygeya
2. Republic of Altai
3. Republic of Bashkortostan
4. Republic of Buryatia
5. Republic of Dagestan
6. Republic of Ingushetia
7. Kabardino-Balkar Republic
8. Karachay-Cherkess Republic
9. Republic of Kalmykia
10. Republic of Karelia
11. Republic of Komi
12. Republic of Mari El
13. Republic of Mordovia
14. Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)
15. Republic of North Ossetia-Alania
16. Republic of Tatarstan
17. Republic of Tyva
18. Udmurt Republic
19. Chechen Republic
20. Republic of Khakassia
21. Chuvash Republic
22. Altai Krai (municipal entities as per Annex 5)
23. Zabaikalskii Krai (municipal entities as per Annex 5)
24. Krasnoyarskiy Krai (municipal entities as per Annex 5)
25. Kamchatskiy Krai
26. Primorskiy Krai (municipal entities as per Annex 5)
27. Khabarovskiy Krai (municipal entities as per Annex 5)
28. Amur Oblast (municipal entities as per Annex 5)
29. Arkhangelsk Oblast
30. Vologda Oblast (municipal entities as per Annex 5)
31. Irkutsk Oblast (municipal entities as per Annex 5)
32. Kemerovo Oblast (municipal entities as per Annex 5)
33. Leningrad Oblast
34. Murmansk Oblast (municipal entities as per Annex 5)
35. Magadan Oblast (municipal entities as per Annex 5)
36. Sakhalin Oblast (municipal entities as per Annex 5)
37. Sverdlovsk Oblast (municipal entities as per Annex 5)
38. Tomsk Oblast (municipal entities as per Annex 5)
39. Tyumen Oblast (municipal entities as per Annex 5)
40. Chelyabinsk Oblast
41. Nenets Autonomous Okrug
42. Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug – Yugra (municipal entities as per Annex 5)
43. Chukotka Autonomous Okrug

Annex 5 (informative). List of lands serving as traditional environments and places of economic activities of indigenous small-numbered peoples of the Russian Federation approved by the Order of the Government of the Russian Federation dated May 8, 2009 No. 631-p* (controlled wood indicator 2.5a)

Subject of the Russian Federation	Administrative districts
Republic of Altai	Kosh-Agach municipal district
	Mayminsky municipal district (Kyzyl-Ozekskoye, Birulinskoye rural settlements)
	Turochaksky municipal district
	Ulagansky municipal district
	Choysky municipal district
Republic of Buryatia	Barguzinsky municipal district (Barguzinskoye, Suvinskoye, Yubileynoye rural settlements)
	Bauntovsky Evenkiysky municipal district
	Zakamensky municipal district (ulus Myla of Mylinskoye rural settlement)
	Kurumkansky municipal district (rural settlements Dyren (evenk) Ulyukhan (evenk), Kurumkan)
	Muysky municipal district (rural settlement: Muyskaya rural administration)
	Okinsky municipal district
	Severo-Baykalsky municipal district
Republic of Karelia	Pronezhsky municipal district (Shokshinskoye veps, Sheltozerskoye veps, Ryboretskoye veps rural settlements)
Republic of Komi	Vorkuta Urban Okrug
	Inta Urban Okrug (except Inta city)
	Usinsk Urban Okrug (except Usinsk city)
	Izhemsky municipal district
	Ust-Tsilemsky municipal district
Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)	Abyyskiy municipal district (ulus) (village Kebergene of Maiyarskiy national rural settlement (nasleg))
	Aldanskiy municipal district (ulus) (villages Khatystyr and Ugayan of Belletskoye rural settlement (nasleg), village Kutana of Anaminskoye rural settlement (nasleg))
	Allaikhovskiy municipal district (ulus) (village Olenegorsk of Yukagirskoye rural settlement (nasleg), village Nychalakh Byyangnyrskoye rural settlement (nasleg), village Chkalov of Berelekhskoye rural settlement (nasleg), village Russkoye Ustye of Russko-Ustyinskoye rural settlement (nasleg), village Oyotung of Oyotungskoye rural settlement (nasleg))
	Anabarskiy municipal district (ulus) (village Saskylakh of Saskylakhskoye rural settlement (nasleg), village Yuryung-Khaya of Yuryung-Khainskoye rural settlement (nasleg))
	Bulunskiy municipal district (ulus) (village Bykovskiy, village Kyusyur of Bulunskiy rural settlement (nasleg), village Namy of Borogonskiy rural settlement (nasleg), village Naiba of Khara-Ulakhskiy rural settlement (nasleg), village Taimylyr of Tyumetinskiy rural settlement (nasleg), village Siktyakh of Siktyakhskiy rural settlement (nasleg), village Ust-Olenek Ystannakhskiy rural settlement (nasleg))
	Verkhnekolymskiy municipal district (ulus) (village Nelemnoye of Nelemnskiy rural settlement (nasleg), village Utay and Verkhnekolymsk of Verkhnekolumskiy rural settlement (nasleg), village Usun-Kyuel of Arylakhskiy rural settlement (nasleg))
	Zhiganskiy municipal district (ulus) (village Zhigansk, village Kystatyam of Lenskiy rural settlement (nasleg), village Bakhynay of Lindinskiy rural settlement (nasleg), village Bestyakh of Bestyakhskiy rural settlement (nasleg))
	Kobyayskiy municipal district (ulus) (village Sebyan-Kyuel of Lamynkhinskiy rural settlement (nasleg), village Segyan-Kyuel of Kirovskiy rural settlement (nasleg))
	Mirinskiy municipal district (ulus) (village Syuldykyar of Sadynskiy national rural settlement (nasleg))
	Momskiy municipal district (ulus) (village Sasyr of Ulakhan-Chistaiskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village Kulun-Yelbyut of Chy-

Subject of the Russian Federation	Administrative districts
	<p>balakhskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village Chumpu-Kytyl of Tebyulekhskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village Buor-Sysy of Indigirskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village Khonuu of Momskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village Sobolokh of Sobolokhskiy rural settlement (nasleg))</p> <p>Nerungrinskiy municipal district (ulus) (village lengra of lengrinskiy rural settlement (nasleg)), Nyzhnekolymskiy municipal district (ulus) (village Andryushkino of Olerinskiy rural settlement (nasleg), village Kolymskoye of Khalarchinskiy rural settlement (nasleg), village Pokhodok of Pokhodskiy rural settlement (nasleg))</p> <p>Olekminskiy municipal district (ulus) (villages Tokko and Uolbut of Zharkhanskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village Tyanya of Tyanskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village Kudu-Kyuel of Kindigirskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village of Byas-Kyuel of Charinskiy national rural settlement (nasleg))</p> <p>Omyakonskiy municipal district (ulus) (village Tomtor II of Borogonskiy rural settlement (nasleg), village Orto-Balagan of Sordonnokhskiy rural settlement (nasleg), village Yuchugey of Yuchugeiskiy rural settlement (nasleg))</p> <p>Olenekskiy municipal district (ulus) (village Olenek of Olenekskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village Kharyyalakh of Kirbeiskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village Zhilinda of Zhilindinskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village Eyik of Shologonskiy national rural settlement (nasleg))</p> <p>Srednekolumskiy municipal district (ulus) (villages Berezovka and Urodan of Berezovskiy national (nomadic) rural settlement (nasleg))</p> <p>Tomponskiy municipal district (ulus) (village Topolinoye of Tomponskiy rural settlement (nasleg))</p> <p>Ust-Mayskiy municipal district (ulus) (village Kyuptyy of Kyupskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village Ezhantsy of Ezhanskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), villages Petropavlovsk and Troitsk of Petropavlovskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village Tumul of Kyupskiy national rural settlement (nasleg))</p> <p>Ust-Yanskiy municipal district (ulus) (village Khayyr of Omoloyskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village Tumat of Tumatskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village Sayylyk of Silyannyakhskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village Kazachye of Kazachinskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village Ust-Yansk of Ust-Yanskiy national rural settlement (nasleg), village Yukagir of Yukagirskiy national (nomadic) rural settlement (nasleg), village Yandi of Yandinskiy national rural settlement (nasleg))</p> <p>Eveno-Bytantayskiy municipal district (ulus) (village Batagay-Alyta of Tyugesirskiy rural settlement (nasleg), village Kustur of Nizhnebytantayskiy rural settlement (nasleg), village Dyargalakh of Verkhnebytantayskiy rural settlement (nasleg))</p> <p>Verkhoyanskiy municipal district (ulus) (village Ulakhan-Kyuel of Tabalakhskiy rural settlement (nasleg))</p>
Republic of Tyva	<p>Mongun-Taiginskiy municipal district (kuzhuun) (rural settlements (sumons) Mogen-Burenskiy, Toolailyg)</p> <p>Tere-Kholskiy municipal district (kuzhuun) (rural settlements (sumons) Shynaanskiy, Kargynskiy, Balyktygskiy, Emi)</p> <p>Todzhinskiy municipal district (kuzhuun) (rural settlements (sumons) Azasskiy, lyskiy, Systyg-Khemskiy, Chazylarskiy)</p> <p>Erzinskiy municipal district (kuzhuun) (rural settlement (sumon) Bai-Dagskiy)</p>
Republic of Khakassia	<p>Askizskiy municipal district (rural settlements Biskamzhinskiy possovet, Balyksinskiy selsovet)</p> <p>Tashtypskiy municipal district (rural settlements Anchulskiy, Maturskiy selsovets)</p>
Altai Krai	<p>Biyskiy Urban Okrug (settlement Nagorny)</p> <p>Krasnogorskiy municipal district</p> <p>Soltonskiy municipal district</p>
Zabaikalskii Krai	<p>Kalarskiy municipal district (village Kust-Kemda of Charskoye rural settlement, village Chapo-Ologo of Chapo-Ologskoye rural settlement, village Nelyaty of Kuandinskoye rural settlements, village Sredny Kalar of inter-settlement area of the municipal district)</p>
Krasnoyarskiy Krai	<p>Tungiro-Olekminskiy municipal district (village Tupik of rural settlement)</p> <p>Tupikskoye, village Zarechnoye of Zarechenskoye rural settlements, village Moklakan, Srednyaya Olekma, Gulya of inter-settlement area of the municipal district)</p> <p>Tungokochenskiy municipal district (village Verkh-Usugli of Verkh-Usuglinskoye rural settlement, village Tungokochen of</p>

Subject of the Russian Federation	Administrative districts
	Tungokochenskoye rural settlement, village Ust-Karenga of Ust-Karenginskoye rural settlement, villages Zelenoye Ozero, Yumurchen, Krasny Yar in the inter-settlement area of the municipal district)
	Turukhanskiy municipal district
	Tyukhtetskiy municipal district (rural settlement Chindatskiy selsovet)
	Evenkiyskiy municipal district
Kamchatskiy Krai	Viluchinskiy Urban Okrug
	Urban Okrug of settlement Palana
	Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy Urban Okrug
	Aleutskiy municipal district
	Bystrinskiy municipal district
	Elizovskiy municipal district
	Karaginskiy municipal district
	Milkovskiy municipal district
	Olyutorskiy municipal district
	Penzhinskiy municipal district
	Tigilskiy municipal district
	Sobolevskiy municipal district
	Ust-Bolsheretskiy municipal district
	Ust-Kamchatskiy municipal district
Primorskiy Krai	Krasnoarmeyskiy municipal district
	Lazovskiy municipal district
	Olginskiy municipal district
	Pozharskiy municipal district
	Terneyskiy municipal district
Khabarovskiy Krai	Urban Okrug of Khabarovsk
	Urban Okrug of Komsomolsk-on-Amur
	Amurskiy municipal district
	Bikinskiy municipal district
	Ayano-Mayskiy municipal district
	Baninskiy municipal district
	Berkhnebureinskiy municipal district
	Vyazemskiy municipal district
	Komsomolskiy municipal district
	Municipal district Lazo
	Nanayskiy municipal district
	Nikolayevskiy municipal district
	Okhotskiy municipal district
	Municipal district after Polina Osipenko
Sovetsko-Gavanskiy municipal district	
Solnechniy municipal district	

Subject of the Russian Federation	Administrative districts
	Tuguro-Chumikansky municipal district
	Ulchsky municipal district
	Khabarovskiy municipal district
Amur Oblast	Zeyskiy municipal district (rural settlement Bomnasky selsovet)
	Mazanovskiy municipal district (rural settlement Mayskiy selsovet)
	Selemdzhinskiy municipal district (rural settlement Ivanovskiy selsovet)
	Tyndinskiy municipal district (rural settlements Nyukzhinskiy, Pervomayskiy and Ust-Nyukzhinskiy selsovet)
Vologda Oblast	Babaevskiy municipal district (Kuyskoye national veps rural settlement, Pyazhozerskoye rural settlement)
	Vytegorskiy municipal district (Oshtinskoye rural settlement)
Irkutsk Oblast	Kazachinsko-Lenskiy municipal district (Kazachinskoye, Magistralninskoye rural settlements and inter-settlement areas of the municipal district)
	Katangskiy municipal district
	Kachugskiy municipal district (Vershino-Tuturskoye rural settlements)
	Kirenskiy municipal district (Alexeevskoye, Kirenskoye, Petropavlovskoye rural settlements)
	Mamsko-Chuyskiy municipal district (Gorno-Chuyskoye, Lugovskoye, Mamskoye and Sogdiondonskoye rural settlements)
	Nizhneudinskiy municipal district (Verkhnegutarskoye, Nerkhinskoye and Tofalarskoye rural settlements)
	Ust-Kutsky municipal district (Rucheyskoye rural settlement and inter-settlement areas of the municipal district)
	Bodaybinskiy municipal district (Zhuinskoye rural settlement)
Kemerovo Oblast	Belovskiy Urban Okrug (village Zarechnoye)
	Belovskiy municipal district (village Novobachaty of Novobachatskoye rural settlement, villages Bekovo, Chelukhoevo, village Verkhovskaya of Bekovskoye rural settlement)
	Guryevskiy municipal district (village Shanda of Razdolnoye rural settlement)
	Mezhdurechenskiy Urban Okrug (settlements Ilyinka, Luzhba, Orton, Sliven, Studyeny Ples, Teba, Trekhrechy, Uchas)
	Novokuznetskiy Urban Okrug
	Novokuznetskiy municipal district (settlement Staroabashevo of Atamanovskoye rural settlement, settlement Berezovaya Griva, village Bezrukovo of Bezrukovskoye rural settlement, settlement Verkh-Kinerki of Kostenkovskoye rural settlement, settlements Kuzedeevo, Ust-Tala, Shartonka of Kusdeevskoye rural settlement, settlement Taylep of Kurtukovskoye rural settlement, settlement Krasny Kaltan of Orlovskoye rural settlement, village Sary-Chumysh of Sary-Chumyshskoye rural settlement, villages Kruglenkoye, Sidorovo of Sidorovskoye rural settlement, village Uchul of Sosnovskoye rural settlement)
	Tashtagolskiy municipal district (settlement Tenesh of Kazskoye urban settlement, settlements Tarlashka, Turla, Ust-Urush of Spasskoye urban settlement, settlements Blizhniy Kezek, Verkhniy Anzas, Dalniy Kezek, Za-Mrassu, Parushka, Sredniy Chiley, Suyeta, Ust-Anzas, Chazy-Buk of Sheregoshskoye urban settlement, settlements Amzas, Bazancha, Kalary, Karagol, Kondoma, Tsentralny Razyezd 538 km of Kalarskoye rural settlement, settlements Altamash, Gabovsk, Chushla of Kourinskoye rural settlement, settlements Bolshoy Labysh, Verkhniy Taymet, Verkh-Kochura, Kamzas, Karbalyk, Kluchevoy, Maly Labysh, Mrassu, Sayzak, Sokusha, Chulesh of Kyzyl-Shorskoye rural settlement, settlements Verkhnyaya Aleksandrovka, Ust-Azas (Shortaiga), Belka, Verkhniy Bugzas, Sredniy Bugzas, Dzhelsay, Ust-Kabyrza, Ust-Karagol, Ust-Kezes, Verkhniye Kichi, Nizhniye Kichi, Sredniye Kichi, Ust-Pyzas, Srednyaya Purla, Kantus, Kolkhozny Karchit, Novy, Verkhniy Nymzas, Nizhniy Nymzas, Parlagol, Saraset, Senzas, Taska, Uzungol, Elbeza, Anzas, Chilisu-Anzas, Verkhniy Alzac, Nizhniy Alzac of Ust-Kabyrzinskoye rural settlement)
	Myskovskiy municipal district (settlements Chuvashka, Toz, Kazas, Borodino, Kolchezas, Chuazas, Ust-Mras)
Leningrad Oblast	Podporozhskiy municipal district (Voznesenskoye urban settlement, Vinnitskoye rural settlement)
	Boksitogorskiy municipal district (Radogoschinskoye rural settlement)

Subject of the Russian Federation	Administrative districts
	Lodeynopolskiy municipal district (Alekhovschinskoye rural settlement)
	Tikhvinskiy municipal district (Pashozerskoye rural settlement)
Murmansk Oblast	Urban Okrug Kovdorskiy district
	Kolskiy municipal district
	Lovozerkiy municipal district
	Terskiy municipal district
Magadan Oblast	Olskiy municipal district
	Omsukchanskiy municipal district (urban settlement Omsukchan, village Merenga of the inter-settlement area of the municipal district)
	Severo-Evenskiy municipal district
	Srednekanskiy municipal district (urban settlement Seymchan, rural settlement Kolymskoye)
	Tenkinskiy municipal district (village Orotuk of the inter-settlement area of the municipal district)
	Khasynskiy municipal district (urban settlement Palatka)
Sakhalin Oblast	Urban Okrug Aleksandrovsk-Sakhalinskiy district
	Urban Okrug Noglikiy district
	Urban Okrug Okhinskiy district
	Urban Okrug Poronayskiy district
	Urban Okrug Smirnykhovskiy district (village Buyukly)
	Urban Okrug Tymovskiy district
	Urban Okrug of Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk city
Sverdlovsk Oblast	Ivdelskiy Urban Okrug
Tomsk Oblast	Urban Okrug Strezhevoy
	Aleksandrovskiy municipal district
	Berkhneketskiy municipal district
	Kargasokskiy municipal district
	Kolpashevskiy municipal district
	Molchanovskiy municipal district
	Parabelskiy municipal district
	Teguldetskiy municipal district
Tyumen Oblast	Uvatskiy municipal district
Nenets Autonomous Okrug	Municipal district Zapolyarny district (except urban settlement Iskateley workers' settlement)
Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug - Yugra	Beloyarskiy municipal district (urban settlement Beloyarskiy, urban settlements Verkhnekazymskiy, Kazym, Lykhma, Polnovat, Sorum, Sosnovka, the inter-settlement area of the municipal district)
	Berezovskiy municipal district (urban settlements: Berezovo, Igrim, rural settlements: Saranpaul, Pripolyarny, Svetly, Khulimsunt, the inter-settlement area of the municipal district)
	Kondinskiy municipal district (urban settlements: Kondinskoye, Mortka, rural settlements: Leushi, Mulymya, Shugur, Bolchary, Polovinka, the inter-settlement area of the municipal district)
	Nefteyuganskiy municipal district (rural settlements: Salym, Cheuskino, Lempino, the inter-settlement area of the municipal district)
	Nizhnevartovskiy municipal district (urban settlement: Novoagansk, rural settlements: Agan, Laryak, Vakhovsk, the inter-settlement area of the municipal district)
	Oktyabrskiy municipal district (urban settlement: Oktyabrskoye, rural settlements: Maly Atlym, Peregrebnoye, Sherkaly, the inter-

Subject of the Russian Federation	Administrative districts
	settlement area of the municipal district)
	Sovetskiy municipal district (settlement Timkapaul of urban settlement Tayezhny)
	Surgutskiy municipal district (urban settlement: Lyantor, rural settlements: Solnechny, Russkinskaya, Sytomino, Nyzhnesortymskiy, Ugut, Ult-Yagun, the inter-settlement area of the municipal district)
	Khanty-Mansi municipal district (rural settlements: Vykatnoy, Gornopravdinsk, Kedrovyy, Krasnoleninskiy, Kyshik, Lugovskoy, Seliyarovo, Sibirskiy, Sogom, Tsyngaly, Shapsha, village Nyalinskoye and settlement Pyryakh of rural settlement Nyalinskoye, the inter-settlement area of the municipal district)
Chukotka Autonomous Okrug	Urban Okrug Anadyr
	Tsentralny municipal district
	Bilibinskiy municipal district
	Vostochny municipal district
	Providenskiy municipal district
	Chaunskiy municipal district
	Chukotskiy municipal district
Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Okrug	Urban Okrug Salekhard
	Krasnoselkupskiy municipal district
	Nadymskiy municipal district
	Priuralskiy municipal district
	Purovskiy municipal district
	Tazovskiy municipal district
	Shuryshkarskiy municipal district
	Yamalskiy municipal district

* For certain indigenous small-numbered peoples, the traditional places of living and economic activity have not been identified for some reasons, for example, for Abazin people (Abazinskiy district of Karachay-Cherkess Republic), Besermyan people - Udmurt Republic, Izhor and Vodi - Leningrad Oblast, Setu - Pskov Oblast.

Annex 6 (normative). Some HCVF types in the subjects of the Russian Federation (controlled wood sub-indicators 3.1a-3.1d, 3.1f, 3.1h)

RF subject	Global 200 Ecoregions	The Caucasus biodiversity hotspot	Intact forest landscapes	World centres of plant diversity	Wetlands	Important plant areas*
Republic of Adygeya	+	+	+	+		
Republic of Altai	+		+	+		+
Republic of Bashkortostan	+		+			
Republic of Buryatia	+		+	+	+	
Republic of Dagestan	+	+		+	+	
Republic of Ingushetia	+	+		+		
Kabardino-Balkar Republic	+	+	+	+		
Karachay-Cherkess Republic	+	+	+	+	+	
Republic of Karelia	+		+		+	
Republic of Kalmykia					+	
Republic of Komi	+		+		+	
Republic of Mari El						
Republic of Mordovia						
Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)	+		+		+	
Republic of North Ossetia-Alania	+	+	+	+		
Republic of Tatarstan					+	
Republic of Tyva	+		+	+	+	+
Udmurt Republic						
Republic of Khakassia	+		+	+	+	+
Chechen Republic	+			+		
Chuvash Republic						
Altai Krai	+		+	+	+	+
Zabaikalskii Krai	+		+			
Kamchatskiy Krai	+		+		+	
Krasnodarskiy Krai	+	+	+	+	+	
Krasnoyarskiy Krai	+		+	+	+	
Permskiy Krai	+		+			
Primorskiy Krai	+		+	+	+	
Stavropolskiy Krai	+	+			+	
Khabarovskiy Krai	+		+	+	+	
Amur Oblast	+		+			
Arkhangelsk Oblast	+		+			
Astrakhan Oblast					+	
Belgorod Oblast						
Bryansk Oblast					+	
Vladimir Oblast					+	
Volgograd Oblast					+	
Vologda Oblast			+		+	

RF subject	Global 200 Ecoregions	The Caucasus biodiversity hotspot	Intact forest landscapes	World centres of plant diversity	Wetlands	Important plant areas*
Voronezh Oblast						
Ivanovo Oblast					+	
Irkutsk Oblast	+		+			
Kaliningrad Oblast						
Kaluga Oblast						
Kemerovo Oblast	+		+	+		+
Kirov Oblast			+			
Kostroma Oblast						
Kurgan Oblast						
Kursk Oblast						
Leningrad Oblast					+	
Lipetsk Oblast					+	
Magadan Oblast	+				+	
Moscow Oblast					+	
Murmansk Oblast	+		+		+	
Nizhny Novgorod Oblast					+	
Novgorod Oblast			+		+	
Novosibirsk Oblast	+		+		+	
Omsk Oblast			+		+	
Orenburg Oblast					+	
Orel Oblast						
Penza Oblast						
Pskov Oblast			+		+	
Rostov Oblast		+			+	
Ryazan Oblast						
Samara Oblast						
Saratov Oblast						
Sakhalin Oblast	+		+		+	
Sverdlovsk Oblast	+		+			
Smolensk Oblast						
Tambov Oblast						
Tver Oblast					+	
Tomsk Oblast			+		+	
Tula Oblast						
Tyumen Oblast			+		+	
Ulyanovsk Oblast						
Chelyabinsk Oblast	+					
Yaroslavl Oblast					+	
Jewish Autonomous Oblast	+		+			

RF subject	Global 200 Ecoregions	The Caucasus biodiversity hotspot	Intact forest landscapes	World centres of plant diversity	Wetlands	Important plant areas*
Nenets Autonomous Okrug	+		+		+	
Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug	+		+		+	
Chukotka Autonomous Okrug	+				+	

* The important plant areas are specified for those subject of the Russian Federation where they have been identified.

** To the south of Kuma-Manych Depression

Annex 7 (normative). Rare forest ecosystems in the subjects of the Russian federation (controlled wood sub-indicator 3.1g)

RF subject	Forests with Manchurian fir	Polydominant broadleaf forests	Oak forests	Spruce-fir-linden forests and spruce-fir forests with inclusion of linden	Chernovaya taiga	Korean pine forests
Republic of Adygeya		+	+			
Republic of Altai					+	
Republic of Bashkortostan				+		
Republic of Buryatia						
Republic of Dagestan		+	+			
Republic of Ingushetia		+	+			
Kabardino-Balkar Republic		+	+			
Karachay-Cherkess Republic		+	+			
Republic of Karelia						
Republic of Kalmykia						
Republic of Komi						
Republic of Mari El			+	+		
Republic of Mordovia		+	+			
Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)						
Republic of North Ossetia-Alania		+	+			
Republic of Tatarstan			+			
Republic of Tyva						
Udmurt Republic			+	+		
Republic of Khakassia					+	
Chechen Republic		+	+			
Chuvash Republic		+	+			
Altai Krai				+	+	
Zabaikalskii Krai						
Kamchatskiy Krai						
Krasnodarskiy Krai		+	+			
Krasnoyarskiy Krai						
Permskiy Krai				+		
Primorskiy Krai	+					+
Stavropolskiy Krai		+	+			
Khabarovskiy Krai						+
Amur Oblast						
Arkhangelsk Oblast				+		
Astrakhan Oblast						
Belgorod Oblast		+	+			
Bryansk Oblast		+	+			
Vladimir Oblast		+	+			

RF subject	Forests with Manchurian fir	Polydominant broadleaf forests	Oak forests	Spruce-fir-linden forests and spruce-fir forests with inclusion of linden	Chernovaya taiga	Korean pine forests
Vologograd Oblast		+	+			
Vologda Oblast			+	+		
Voronezh Oblast		+	+			
Ivanovo Oblast		+	+			
Irkutsk Oblast						
Kaliningrad Oblast						
Kaluga Oblast		+	+			
Kemerovo Oblast				+	+	
Kirov Oblast			+	+		
Kostroma Oblast		+	+	+		
Kurgan Oblast				+		
Kursk Oblast		+	+			
Leningrad Oblast		+	+			
Lipetsk Oblast		+	+			
Magadan Oblast						
Moscow Oblast		+	+			
Murmansk Oblast						
Nizhny Novgorod Oblast		+	+	+		
Novgorod Oblast		+	+			
Novosibirsk Oblast					+	
Omsk Oblast						
Orenburg Oblast						
Orel Oblast		+	+			
Penza Oblast		+	+			
Pskov Oblast		+	+			
Rostov Oblast		+	+			
Ryazan Oblast		+	+			
Samara Oblast			+			
Saratov Oblast		+	+			
Sakhalin Oblast						
Sverdlovsk Oblast				+		
Smolensk Oblast		+	+			
Tambov Oblast		+	+			
Tver Oblast		+	+			
Tomsk Oblast				+		
Tula Oblast		+	+			
Tyumen Oblast				+		
Ulyanovsk Oblast			+			

RF subject	Forests with Manchurian fir	Polydominant broadleaf forests	Oak forests	Spruce-fir-linden forests and spruce-fir forests with inclusion of linden	Chernaya taiga	Korean pine forests
Chelyabinsk Oblast				+		
Yaroslavl Oblast		+	+			
Jewish Autonomous Oblast						+
Nenets Autonomous Okrug						
Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug				+		
Chukotka Autonomous Okrug						

Annex 8 (normative, regional). Additional requirements for FSC controlled wood risk assessment for the Komi Republic.

These requirements were developed by the Komi Regional Working Group composed of A.V. Konyukhov, D.Zh. Kutepov, A.V. Loginov, D.A. Popov, Ye.A. Poroshin, Ye.A. Popova, V.T. Semyashkina, K.S. Serditov, N.V. Shcherbinina and T.O. Yanitskaya (coordinator on behalf of the FSC National Office) and S.Yu. Pautov (technical expert).

The regional-level controlled wood risk assessment for the Komi Republic was conducted in order to specify risk designations in the National Controlled Wood Risk Assessment (NCWRA) at the level of an administrative region. Risks were assessed for those indicators of the NCWRA whose scope of assessment was “regional” and only for which risks were designated as “unspecified”. The risk assessment was conducted at the level of state forest management units (lesnichestvos, SFMU) of the Komi Republic. In addition, the following other land categories which contain forests were included in the scope of assessment: lands of federal-level protected nature areas (Pechoro-Ilych Zapovednik and Yugyd-Va National Park), lands for defense and security (Voennoe polyarnoe lesnichestvo of the Ministry of Defence); lands of populated areas, where urban forests are present (towns of Syktyvkar, Ukhta and Pechora); uninventoried lands for agricultural purposes; lands of Ukhtinckiy uchebno-opytny leskhov of the Ministry of Education; as well as lands of State Land Reserve, despite the fact that no commercial harvesting occurs on these areas. Since the regional risk assessment confirmed risk designation as “unspecified” for the majority of indicators of the National Risk Assessment (NRA), tables below contain only indicators, which have risk designations different than in the NRA.

Indicators	Possible sources of information	Evidences	Scope of assessment	Risk assessment
2.3. There is no evidence of child labor or violation of ILO Fundamental Principles and Rights at work taking place in forest areas in the district concerned:			National level	Unspecified risk
2.3b. There is no evidence of violations of the rights of prisoners of corrective labour institutions during	http://gis.rkomi.ru/GisViewer/Index/-2147483636/62.44318252.608748_7	In the Komi Republic, institutions of the Main Directorate of the Federal Penitentiary Service of the Ministry of Justice of Russia (GUFSIN) hold forest concessions in four SFMU/ lesnichestvos (Mezhdurechenskoe, Aikinskoe, Zheleznodorozhnoe and Ukhtinskoe): FBU OIK No. 33 Komi Republic GUFSIN, FBU OIK No.37 Komi Republic GUFSIN, FBU OIK No.44 Komi Republic GUFSIN, FKU KP No. 32 Komi Republic GUFSIN, FKU KP No. 47 Komi Republic GUFSIN and FKU OIK No. 51 Komi Republic GUFSIN. No evidence could be provided that these institutions observe prisoners' rights to bargain on working conditions and size of wages as per ILO Conven-	Komi Republic	Unspecified risk for listed lesnichestvos ¹⁹ . Low risk for remaining areas

¹⁹ Here and further down see the list in the Column *Evidences*, all risk designations also see in Table 1 Summary table of risks with respect to controlled wood for lesnichestvos of the Komi Republic.

Indicators	Possible sources of information	Evidences	Scope of assessment	Risk assessment
wood harvest		<p>tion 29. Prisoners of GUF SIN institutions do not perform work in forestry in lesnichestvos, where GUF SIN institutions do not hold concessions. Therefore there is no violation of labour rights relevant for prisoners.</p> <p>The unspecified risk for the indicator 2.3 was originally designated due to the risk related to labour of prisoners. In Komi Region, prisoners cease their work only in the mentioned 4 lesnichestvos, therefore there is low risk for other areas.</p> <p>In Mezhdurechenskoe, Aikinskoe, Zheleznodorozhnoe and Ukhtinskoe SFMU the risk is unspecified. The rest of areas are designated as districts of low risk</p>		
2.5. There is no evidence of violation of the ILO Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples taking place in the forest areas in the district concerned:			National level	Unspecified risk
2.5a. There is no data about indigenous small-numbered peoples and tribal peoples living in the area	http://www.finnougr.ru/life/index.php?SECTION_ID=225 http://finugor.ru/node/17020	<p>Ethnic Komi living in the Komi Republic identify themselves as indigenous peoples. However, the majority of them perform the same lifestyle as the rest of the people in the Komi Republic. Only Izhma Komi preserved traditional lifestyles and maintain traditional nature use practices (reindeer herding). Their communities are united into public organization Izvatas. Izhma Komi also lay claim to the status of minor indigenous people. Therefore, SFMU, where Izhma Komi still use nature in traditional way (Izhemskoe, Kadzheromskoe, Pechorskoe, Usinskoe and Ust-Tsilimskoe) were designated as unspecified risk. The rest of areas are designated as low risk regarding this indicator, due to the fact that in these areas indigenous peoples do not perform traditional nature use practices. Although the indicator focusses on presence of IP, the risk conclusion has been made taking into account the risk of violation of IP' rights, according to the indicator 2.5, as well as existing differences between definition of Indigenous Peoples according to the FSC and the definition used nationally.</p>	Komi Republic	Unspecified risk for listed lesnichestvos Low risk for remaining areas
3.1. Forest management activities at the relevant level (eco-region, sub-eco-region) do not threaten eco-regionally significant high conservation value forests:			Regional	Differentiated for Komi region (see below)
3.1a. and 3.2 Forest district is not included into the ecoregion (subecoregion) from The Global 200 of WWF	http://wwf.panda.org/about_our_earth/ecoregions/maps/	<p>Part of the Komi Republic lies within the WWF Global 2000 ecoregion (Ural Mountains Taiga). In the Komi Republic almost all area of the Ural Mountains Taiga ecoregion lies within federal-level protected nature areas Pechoro-Ilych Zapovednik and Yugyd-Va National Park (this land is managed and controlled by State Ministry of Nature Resources, dedicated protective staff is administering management of these areas and no commercial harvesting occurs in both of them).</p> <p>However, the detailed analysis of the WWF's Global Ecoregion location showed that this ecoregion also extends over parts of eastern SFMU of the Komi neighboring the Ural mountains. With this respect the risk is designated as unspecified for: Vuktylskoe, Komsomolskoe, Pechorskoe, Pechoro-Ilychskoe, Pruptskoe and Ust-Nemskoe SFMU. The rest of areas are designated as low risk regarding this indicator.</p>	Komi Republic	Unspecified risk for the Global 200 eco-region, in listed lesnichestvos. Low risk for remaining areas
3.1c. and 3.2 The forest dis-	Yanitskaya T. Practical guide for the identification	Several tracts of intact forest landscapes (IFL) were identified in the Komi Republic. Some of such tracts (in Koygoroskoe and Priluzskoe lesnichestvos) are included in a candidate protected	Komi Republic	Unspecified risk for the

Indicators	Possible sources of information	Evidences	Scope of assessment	Risk assessment
<p>district is not included or does not contain intact forest landscapes</p>	<p>of high conservation value forests in Russia / World Wild Fund for Nature (WWF). M., 2008. 136 p. www.globalforestwatch.org, www.intactforests.org hcvf.net/eng/search/russia_ifl.html Aksenov D.E., Dobrynin D.V., Dubinin M.YU. et al. Atlas of Russia's intact forest landscapes. M.: MSOES; Washington; Publishing House World Resources Institute, 2003. 186 p. Yaroshenko A.Yu., Potapov P.V., Turbanova S.A. Intactforest landscapes of European North of Russia. M.: Greenpeace Russia, 2001. 75 c. Pristine forest of the Komi Republic http://silvertaiga.ru/page/167/ http://www.silvertaiga.ru/page/154/ http://www.silvertaiga.ru/news/260/</p>	<p>nature area (federal level of protection). This area was included into the "Concept of Federal Protected Areas Development by 2020" approved by Russian President Vladimir Putin in 2011 (Order # 2322-p issued on 22/12/2011). According to this regulation, It cannot be given for lease, there is no logging, thinning, planting, road building and other threatening management activities. Other areas are already included in the area of federal-level protected nature areas Pechoro-Ilych Zapovednik and Yugyd-Va National Park.</p> <p>Therefore, there are no threats to HCVF in these areas. However, still there are threats to remaining intact forest landscapes located in lesnichestvos of northern, eastern and western Komi. Low risk designations were assigned to areas where IFL are absent or such forest are included in official programs on preservation of high conservation attributes in the form of protected nature areas. SFMU designated as unspecified risk are the following: Vuktylskoe, Yertomskoe, Zheleznodorozhnoe, Izhemskoe, Kadzheromskoe, Komsomolskoe, Letskoe, Pechoro-Ilychskoe, Pechorskoe, Troitsko-Pechorskoe, Udorskoe, Ukhtinskoe, Ust-Tsilemskoe, Meshchurskoe, Mezhdurechenskoe and Usinskoe. The rest of areas are designated as low risk regarding this indicator</p>		<p>listed lesnichestvos (HCV present, but their protection is not effective)</p> <p>Low risk for remaining areas (HCV are present, and their protection is effective)</p>
<p>3.1e and 3.2. The forest district does not contain important bird areas</p>	<p>http://www.rbcu.ru/programs/93/3717/</p>	<p>There are three Birdlife' important bird areas in the Komi Republic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KO-001 Pechoro-Ilych Zapovednik (EU-RU038); • KO-002 Yugyd-Va National Park (EU-RU039); • KO-003 Sysola Valley (EU-RU040). <p>The first two areas are reliably protected within federal-level protected nature areas. The IBA Sysola Valley is located on unwooded lands and protective forests along the Sysola. Therefore, there is no threats to this type HCVF in the Komi Republic</p>	<p>Komi Republic</p>	<p>Low risk (HCV are present, and their protection is effective)</p>
<p>3.1f and 3.2.</p>	<p>http://russia.wetlands.org/</p>	<p>In the "Shadow" list of Ramsar wetlands there is only one area within the forested part of the</p>	<p>Komi Re-</p>	<p>Low risk</p>

Indicators	Possible sources of information	Evidences	Scope of assessment	Risk assessment
<p>The forest district has no wetlands of international importance</p>	<p>Home/WetlandsofRussia/tabid/608/language/ru-RU/Default.aspx</p>	<p>Komi Republic. This is the Shapkina and Yersa Interfluve – a system of palsa and raised bogs and aapa mires with abundant rivers and lakes located in Ust-Tsilemskiy Municipal district, 50 km southeastward of the settlement of Novyy Bor with bog nature reserve Okean.</p> <p>This area it is surrounded by forest areas which cannot be given for forest lease according to Komi Forest Plan (the main document for regional forestry planning for coming 10 years), meaning no forest management activities occur there. Therefore there are no threats to HCV.</p> <p>In addition, two areas in the Komi Republic were selected to nominate to the “Shadow list” list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usinskoe Bog, Usinskiy Municipal district, 1,5 km southward of the town of Usink, area of 140 thou ha, regional-level complex nature reserve; • Martyushevskoe Bog, Troitsko-Pechorskiy Municipal District, 9 thou ha, regional-level nature reserve. <p>These candidate Ramsar wetlands in the Komi Republic are located on unwooded lands in tundra zone where there are no forest management activities and no threats exist to HCV of this type.</p>	<p>public</p>	<p>(HCV are present, and their protection is effective due to lack of forest management activities)</p>

Table 1. Summary of controlled wood risk assessment for SFMU of the Komi Republic (“+” means unspecified risk, “ ” means low risk)

No.	Indicator Lesnichestvo, SFMU	Area, thou ha	2.3b. Violation of prisoners' rights	2.5a Presence of indigenous peoples	3.1a. WWF Global 200 Ecoregion	3.1c. Intact forest land- scapes
1.	Aikinskoe	390,4	+			
2.	Vuktylskoe	1306,9			+	+
3.	Yertomskoe	1109,2				+
4.	Zheleznodorozhnoe	1445,4	+			+
5.	Izhemskoe	1754,5		+		+
6.	Kadzheromskoe	1295,4		+		+
7.	Kazhimskoe	408,8				
8.	Koigorodskoe	619,7				
9.	Komsomolskoe	1134,2			+	+
10.	Kortkerosskoe	475,9				
11.	Letskoe	426,4				+
12.	Pechoro-Ilychskoe	1179,6			+	+
13.	Pechorskoe	4256,8		+	+	+
14.	Pomozdinskoe	680,9				
15.	Priluzskoe	810,2				
16.	Sosnogorskoe	1618,5				
17.	Storozhevskoe	835,9				
18.	Syktvydinskoe	478,9				
19.	Syktvykarskoe	198,6				
20.	Sysolskoe	579,2				
21.	Troitsko-Pechorskoe	951,4				+
22.	Udorskoe	1475,2				+
23.	Ust-Kulomskoe	425,2				
24.	Ust-Nemskoe	1001,2			+	
25.	Ukhtinskoe	1280,1	+			+
26.	Ust-Tsilemskoe	4037,1		+		+
27.	Meshchurskoe	1162,7				+
28.	Mezhdurechenskoe	958,4	+			+
29.	Usinskoe	2990,5		+		+
30.	Pruptskoe	483,1			+	
31.	Lokchimskoe	405,7				

32.	Chernamskoe	83,6				
33.	Pechoro-Ilych Zapovednik	721,3				
34	Yugyd-Va National Park	1891,7				
35.	Other territories (urban forests, lands of defense and security, land for agricultural purposes, lands of state land reserve etc.)	43,7				
	Total by all territories	38916,3	+	+	+	+