# Template Ecosystem Services Report

|  |
| --- |
| The Ecosystem Services Report (ESR) is the primary document to describe the FSC Ecosystem Service(s) project. It will also contain all the information required for third parties to understand the impacts that have been demonstrated and the contextual information related to the forest management unit. Following the forest management evaluation, it will include a list of impacts that were validated or verified by the certification body.  The ESR is therefore a primary tool for providing transparency to the process and supporting communication to other parties about the impact that has been demonstrated. In some cases, it will be used to support promotion of FSC-certified forests with verified ecosystem services impacts; in other cases, the ESR may be all that is required to secure a benefit, such as a grant, an investment, or a payment from a beneficiary, such as a downstream water user.  The ESR shall be always completed in the online interface (FSC ES Registry). This template can be used to collect information offline, start drafting the report outside this online interface, overcome the period when the online report is not yet available or to review the required information. |

## Reported ES impacts

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of the certificate holder | | |  | | |
| FSC Licence code | | |  | | |
| Country | | |  | | |
| Region (if applicable) | | |  | | |
| Validity of FM certificate | | | Click or tap to enter a date. | | |
| Certificate type | | | Individual  Group  SLIMF  Community forest | | |
| Group member(s), when applicable | Management units (MU) included in the evaluation | SLIMF | Selected ES impacts per MU | | Selected outcome indicators per MU |
| \*insert additional lines as needed |  | Yes/No |  | |  |
|  |  | Yes/No |  | |  |
| Whether the impact is being validated or verified | | | Validated | Verified | |
| Forest biome | | | Boreal  Temperate  Tropical | | |
| Forest type | | | Primary forest  Managed natural forest  Plantation  Other (provide details) | | |
| Tenure management: | | | Community  Concession  Public/state  Indigenous People  Private  Low intensity | | |
| Tenure ownership: | | | Community  Public/state  Private  Indigenous | | |

## ES project area

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total size (in ha): |  |
| Boundaries provided through geospatial data or, if no geospatial data are available, the coordinates with latitude of site(s) and longitude of site(s). |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Step 1: Selected ecosystem service(s)** | |
| **1.1 The organization shall briefly describe the legal or customary right to receive payments for demonstrating positive impacts on the selected ecosystem service(s)**  *Describe relevant legislation relevant to the declared ecosystem service. This is particularly relevant in countries where forest managers have the right to harvest timber, but other services such as water and biodiversity are not included in their management rights. It is expected that the organization will provide a reference to the applicable law(s).*  *A law may not exist in the relevant jurisdiction. In this case, the organization is required to describe this situation.* | |
| **Findings:** | |
| **1.2 Does the project area overlaps with areas in which ES assets or claims are generated under external frameworks or standards:**  **YES** *(the below points a-f shall be completed)*  **NO** *(the below points a-f are not applicable)*  *In case the ES project area overlaps with other scheme generating ecosystem claims or assets such as from Carbon Crediting Schemes (e.g. VERRA, Gold Standard, Plan Vivo, America Carbon Registry, Climate Action Reserve, ART for REDD+ Transactions) or biodiversity credit schemes (e.g. Terrasos, Value Nature, VERRA, Plan Vivo Nature, Terrascape, Single.earth) or co-benefits that have been certified/ quantified under an external framework or standard such as: Verra’s Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standard - this have to be disclosed.* | |
| 1. external framework/ standard |  |
| 1. ecosystem services category covered by the external standard |  |
| 1. external project registration number |  |
| 1. link to external registry |  |
| 1. type of project (e.g. afforestation, reforestation and revegetation / improved forest management / reduced emissions from deforestation or forest degradation, biodiversity restoration or conservation, water quality improvement) |  |
| 1. justification of how ES impact(s) are distinct from ES assets or claims obtained under the external framework or standard (e.g. different ES category, different aspect of same ES category and/or different project period) |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Step 2: Description of the ecosystem service** | |
| **2.1 The past condition of the ecosystem service** | |
| 1. qualitative description of the ecosystem service; | **Findings:** |
| 1. legally, internationally, or FSC-related recognized concept of special features or outstanding values (e.g. Key Biodiversity Area, UNESCO World heritage site, IUCN Red List, High Conservation Values (HCV)); | **Findings:** |
| 1. major natural disturbance that affected or posed a major risk to the ecosystem service (e.g. wildfire, insect attack, windthrow); | **Findings:** |
| 1. human-induced pressures which have affected the ecosystem service (e.g. poaching, road construction/maintenance, controlled burning of undergrowth); | **Findings:** |
| 1. principal management objectives and forest management regime. | **Findings:** |
| **2.2 The current condition of the ecosystem service** (when different from above) | |
| 1. qualitative description of the ecosystem service; | **Findings:** |
| b) any legally, internationally, or FSC-related recognized concept of special features or outstanding values (e.g. Key Biodiversity Area, UNESCO World heritage site, IUCN Red List, High Conservation Values (HCV)); | **Findings:** |
| 1. principal management objectives and forest management regime (e.g., selective logging, clear felling, logging cycle, conservation); | **Findings:** |
| 1. specific management activities to maintain or enhance the ecosystem service. |  |
| **2.3 Areas within and outside of the management unit that contribute to the declared ecosystem service**  *Some examples of areas outside of the management unit are:*   * *Watershed services: upstream and/or downstream areas in a river, headwaters areas, wetlands, or water sources* * *Recreational services: areas outside the management unit that are key tourist attractions or protected areas and/or features adjacent to the management unit that can enhance its tourist value, such as a beautiful mountain or lake that can be seen from the management unit.* | |
| **Findings:** | |
| **2.4 Direct beneficiaries of the ecosystem service**  *The organization should describe only direct beneficiaries of the declared ecosystem service, such as communities whose drinking water is provided by the watershed service, human settlements that can benefit from a more stable soil, or local people working in the recreational services sector. Existing information from stakeholder consultations may be used to fulfil this clause.*  *End-users such as consumers or global beneficiaries of carbon mitigation should not be listed.* | |
| **Findings:** | |

|  |
| --- |
| **2.5 Description of how an FPIC agreement covers all management activities related to the ES project (when applicable).**   * *Have you identified Indigenous Peoples and/or traditional peoples within or around your MU?* * *Are there Indigenous Peoples and/or traditional peoples with rights to the forest land and/or the ecosystem services on the MU?* * *Does the implementation of management activities related to the ES project require Indigenous Peoples and/or traditional peoples to delegate control over such management activities to you?* * *Are there aspects not yest included in the FSC FM FPIC process?* * *Then you will need to obtain a binding agreement with Indigenous Peoples and/or traditional peoples through Free, Prior and Informed Consent.* |
| **Findings:** |
| **2.6 A summary of culturally appropriate engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities, related to the declared ecosystem service including ecosystem services access and use, and benefit sharing**  *Information about identified affected stakeholders (such as Indigenous people, local communities, traditional people or community forest). Description of the engagement including information about any meetings, agreements, consultations or other type of interaction.* |
| **Findings:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Step 3: Development of a theory of change and a risk management plan** | |
| **3.1 Additionality to be demonstrated:**  **Yes, due to overlap with other schemes or assets (as per 1.2 above)**  **Yes, voluntarily**  **No (the below table is not appliable)** | |
| **If answer above is YES, and you are willing to demonstrate the additionality of the ES project, following table shall be completed** | |
| 1. **go beyond legal requirements; and**   *Details about how the implemented management activity go beyond legal requirements as applicable in your country and jurisdiction (region, state, province). It may be that certain management activities are legally required to be undertaken but the degree of implementation is different from the best management practices you have implemented (e.g. buffer zone around water bodies, where legal requirement is 15 meters and you adopt 30 meters). In such case, specify the legal surplus (15 meters in the aforementioned example).* | **Findings:** |
| 1. **would not be feasible to implement without financial support from a sponsor.**   *Details about how the implemented activities are financially additional meaning that would not take place if the financial support did not take place. Information about financial overview of ES project costs, income from ecosystem services such as subsidies, nature or climate credits and claims or other PES) and justification that the financial contribution is needed to make the ES project viable.* | **Findings:** |

**Theory of change**

**Management activities (Clause 6.3.1)**

**Outputs**

**(Clause 6.3.2, SLIMF are not required to include the outputs in their theory of change)**

**Outcomes (Clause 6.3.3)**

**Impact**

**(Clause 6.1)**

## Example 1

*Outcome 2 (linked to Output 2)*

*Output 2*

*(linked to Activities 3 and 4)*

*Activity 3*

*Outcome 1 (linked to Output 1)*

*Output 1*

*(linked to Activities 1 and 2)*

*Impact selected from Annex B*

*Activity 1*

*Activity 2*

**Example 2 (SLIMF)**

*Activity 4*

*Outcome 1 (linked to Activities 1 and 2)*

*Outcome 2 (linked to Activity 3)*

*Impact selected from Annex B*

*Activity 1*

*Activity 2*

*Activity 3*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3.2 Identified actions to prevent and mitigate negative impacts of management activities contributing to the ES impact on other environmental values and on affected communities, and level of implementation for each.**  *Evaluation how the management activities mentioned in the theory of change above can negatively impact other environmental values or communities. (e.g. reduced harvesting rates can lead to increased harvesting rates in the nearby FMU)* | | | |
| **Risk management plan** | | | |
| **Threats to the ecosystem service(s), both induced by human activity and of natural origin within and outside of the MU.** | **Likelihood that a threat will materialize (indicated as low, medium, high);** | **Proposed mitigation measures;** | 1. **Monitoring activities.** |
| \*insert additional lines as needed |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Step 4: Selection of outcome indicators** | | |
| **Impact (From Annex B of ES procedure)** | ***For each proposed impact, the organization shall select one or more outcome indicators type (defined in Annex B of ES procedure – first column)*** | ***For each proposed impact, the organization shall select one or more outcome indicators (examples provided in Annex B of ES procedure – second column)*** |
| *Impact 1* | *Outcome indicator for Outcome 1 (selected from Annex B)*  *Link to the outcomes presented in the theory of change* | *Outcome indicator for Outcome 1 (selected from Annex B or an alternative outcome indicator)*  *Link to the outcomes presented in the theory of change* |
| *Impact 2* | *Outcome indicator (selected from Annex B)*  *Link to the outcomes presented in the theory of change* | *Outcome indicator for Outcome 1 (selected from Annex B or an alternative outcome indicator)*  *Link to the outcomes presented in the theory of change* |
| \*insert additional lines as needed |  |  |

**Step 5: Chosen methodologies**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Management unit** | **Outcome indicator (from table under step 4 above)** | **Methodology used** | | **Methodology from FSC-GUI-30-006 (yes/no)** | **Justification when different methodologies are used in different management units** |
| \*insert additional lines as needed |  |  | | Choose an item. |  |
|  |  |  | | Choose an item. |  |
| **If methodology used is not taken from FSC-GUI-30-006,** | | | | | |
| **The methodology is suitable for the local context and the outcome indicator to be measured** | | | *Brief justification:*  *The organization is not required to fill out this section if it has chosen a methodology from FSC-GUI-30-006.* | | |
| **The methodology is credible, based on best available information (e.g. there are publications that support the use of the methodology; it has been validated through**  **previous use; it has been endorsed by experts)** | | | *Brief justification:*  *The organization is not required to fill out this section if it has chosen a methodology from FSC-GUI-30-006.* | | |
| **The methodology is objective and replicable,**  **i.e. it yields similar results when applied by different observers in the same site under similar conditions** | | | *Brief justification:*  *The organization is not required to fill out this section if it has chosen a methodology from FSC-GUI–30–006.* | | |
| **A description of the collection and analysis of data, including:** | | | | | |
| 1. **description of the methodology that was used;** | | | **Findings:** | | |
| 1. **the data sources that were used;** | | | **Findings:** | | |
| 1. **sampling methods, including frequency and/or intensity;** | | | **Findings:** | | |
| 1. **any equipment used to measure the outcome indicator(s);** | | | **Findings:** | | |
| 1. **assumptions (e.g., default values, conversion factors used, extrapolation from proxies, calculation assumptions);** | | | **Findings:** | | |
| 1. **a summary of any data analyses performed.** | | | **Findings:** | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Step 6: Measured value(s) of outcome indicator(s)** | | | | | | | |
| **To measure the value of the impact at least one present value and one baseline value shall be provided** | | | | | | | |
| **Impact** | **Outcome indicator** | **Unit of measurement** | **Date of measurement (month/year)** | | **Baseline value of the outcome indicator** | **Present value of the outcome indicator** | **Required result (difference between baseline and present value considering the conservatives)** |
| *Impact 1* | *Selected outcome indicator(s)* |  |  | | *Record the baseline value* | *Record the present value of the outcome indicator* |  |
| \*insert additional lines as needed |  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| **Identified sources of uncertainty in the measurement and explanation how they are mitigated.** | | | | **Findings:** | | | |
| **For Organizations managing SLIMF or CF, indicate if the measurements are based on secondary data.** | | | | **Yes**  **No** | | | |
| **If the data used to measure the present value is older than 5 years, a justification of the applicability of the data.** | | | | **Findings:** | | | |
| **If the data used to measure the baseline value is older than 10 years, a justification of the applicability of the data.** | | | | **Findings:** | | | |
| **If baseline value is based on a reference value, justification of how the chosen reference value is adequate for comparison against the present value in the MU(s), considering: geographic location (e.g. national or regional reference);**   * **legal and political situation;** * **forest ecology;** * **land characteristics;** * **land use and management history; and** * **other relevant factors, such as proximity to infrastructure** | | | | **Findings:** | | | |
| **Only for ES2 carbon sequestration and storage:** | | | | | | | |
| **Carbon pools included in the measurement of the present value and the baseline value.**  *Please indicate the carbon pools included in the measurement (e.g. aboveground biomass, litter, deadwood, belowground biomass and soil organic carbon)* | | | | **Findings:** | | | |
| **Explanation of how ES Project is not negatively affecting carbon pools excluded from measurement.**  *Consider the 5 carbon pools (aboveground biomass, litter, deadwood, belowground biomass and soil organic carbon) and for the carbon pool excluded from the measurement provide justification that the project activities does not have negative impact on carbon storage and sequestration.* | | | | **Findings:** | | | |
| **For validated ES impacts, indicate the intended verifiable target for each outcome indicator** | | | | | | | |
| **Provide documented plan, including an intended verifiable target, personnel and financial resources, to conform with the applicable requirements of this procedure** | | | | | | | |
| **Findings:** | | | | | | | |
| *Outcome indicator* | | *Unit of verifiable target* | | | *Value of verifiable target* | | |
| *Outcome indicator 1* | | *Unit* | | | *Provide value of intended verifiable target* | | |
| *Outcome indicator 2* | | *Unit* | | | *Provide value of intended verifiable target* | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Step 7: Statements of results** |
| **Additional information to present the result, related to the “required result” value above. Including justification that the reported value was not overestimated, and how reported result conforms with the required result for the outcome indicator.** |
| **Finding:** |