2026

PACK4THEFUTURE:
METHODOLOGY AND ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The Pack4theFuture report is Canopy's first independent assessment of the world's 20 largest packaging paper producers. It evaluates each company on two critical dimensions:
1) Commitments and reporting to protect Ancient and Endangered Forests (AEF)
2) Progress toward Next Generation Solutions (NGS)

Scores are weighted across seven pillars, with the overall score expressed as a percentage.

To read the full report, please visit media.canopyplanet.org/Pack4TheFuture_Canopy_2026.pdf

DEVELOPING THE CRITERIA

The criteria for the Pack4TheFuture report was developed by Chronos Sustainability with input from Canopy, with an initial focus on policy and commitments, and reporting on fibre content. To ensure alignment with leading practice, the draft criteria were mapped against a range of established deforestation and forest-risk frameworks, including:

- The Common Methodology of the Accountability Framework initiative (AFi)
- Forest500, produced by Global Canopy
- The Zoological Society of London's SPOTT assessment for the Timber and Pulp sector
- Forestry and Paper sector metrics from the Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD)

A gap analysis identified areas where the original framework did not fully capture company performance. As a result, the report was expanded to include a more holistic assessment of company operations, moving beyond policy commitments to evaluate governance structures, target-setting, and performance reporting. The expanded assessment was piloted against a subset of companies; findings were used to refine both questions and scoring criteria. The final assessment criteria were uploaded onto ProBench, a benchmarking platform. The results are from the second iteration of the assessment criteria, following a targeted review with external experts and an internal review panel in Canopy.

REPORT STRUCTURE

The Pack4TheFuture report covers two sections with each section broken down into four core pillars. Each pillar assesses a different aspect of company reporting with points allocated to each pillar. The weighting for each section and pillar is based on the maturity of the sector's reporting on the topics. (Figure 1)

WEIGHTING

To accurately capture how companies progress from setting commitments to implementing, measuring, and reporting on them, the scoring structure emphasized governance infrastructure and performance reporting over policy commitments. For example, the Governance and Management and Performance Reporting pillars for Ancient and Endangered Forests together account for 55% of the total weighted score. This emphasis on what companies are doing over what companies are intending or promising ensures the assessment accurately reflects the material reality of the industry and its level of preparedness to address wood-fibre-related risks. By focusing on the world's 20 largest paper packaging producers, the report is able to provide an overview of the state of the industry as a whole as well as its collective risk to Ancient and Endangered Forests.

FIGURE 1

ANCIENT AND ENDANGERED FORESTS (85%)	
PILLAR	WEIGHTING
Policy and Commitments	15%
Governance and Management	25%
Targets	15%
Performance Reporting	30%

NEXT GENERATION SOLUTIONS (15%)	
PILLAR	WEIGHTING
Policy and Commitments	10%
Governance and Management	3%
Performance Reporting	2%

SCORING

The type of company operations is determined at the start of the assessment through a qualifying question: Does the company own or control any forestry operations/pulp plantations?
The total number of questions and the proportion of companies that were assessed on the additional questions is found in Figure 2. Companies with forest operations are expected to disclose additional details and are assessed on this with four additional questions relating to:

- Grievance Mechanisms
- Traceability to the Forest Management Unit level
- Area of Intact Forest Landscape

The complete list of questions, the rationale for the question, their explanation of how points are awarded and any explanatory notes, can be found below, in the section: Assessment Questions and Scoring. Final scores are a percentage of the total number of points available.

TIER STRUCTURE

Based on overall weighted percentage scores, companies were grouped into one of seven tiers (see Figure 3). The tiers provide a structured way to track sector progress and compare performance without ranking individual companies against each other.

REPORTING ON THE USE OF CERTIFICATION SCHEMES

For the policy and commitments questions, simply stating compliance with sustainable forest certification schemes that specifies any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).

FIGURE 2

OPERATION TYPE	NUMBER OF COMPANIES	NUMBER OF QUESTIONS
Owns or controls forest operations/plantations	14	36
Does not own or control forest operations/plantation	6	32

EVIDENCE CONSIDERED FOR THE ASSESSMENT

All evidence must be in the public domain and accessible on the company website and reported with the last two reporting cycles over the last two years, from date of assessment, in September 2025.
Assessors at Chronos Sustainability captured and noted where information was not easily accessible and is spread across multiple locations. This is not considered good practice, but it did not impact scores in this round of assessment.
Chronos Sustainability did not accept information from the following sources as evidence:

- News reports issued by a third party
- Social media posts (either from the company or a third party)
- Other third-party evidence
- CDP reports which are not published by the company themselves

FIGURE 3

TIER	DESCRIPTION	SCORE RANGE
TIER 1	The company has taken a leadership position in safeguarding Ancient and Endangered Forests and accelerating Next Generation Solutions	>85%
TIER 2	The company has made Ancient and Endangered Forests an integral part of its business strategy	70-85%
TIER 3	The company has an established approach to Ancient and Endangered Forests but there is more work to be done	53-70%
TIER 4	The company is taking some steps to safeguard Ancient and Endangered Forests but there is more work to be done	44-52%
TIER 5	The company is making early progress on policies and practices to safeguard Ancient and Endangered Forests	27-43%
TIER 6	Limited evidence of policies and/or practices to safeguard Ancient and Endangered Forests	10-26%
TIER 7	No evidence of safeguarding Ancient and Endangered Forests on the business agenda	<10%

KEY RESULTS ANALYSIS BY CHRONOS SUSTAINABILITY

PILLAR ANALYSIS

Figure 4 summarizes company average performance across both the Ancient and Endangered Forest section and the Next Gen Solutions section, including all seven pillars.

FIGURE 4

	AEF P1 POLICY	AEF P2 GOV.	AEF P3 TARGETS	AEF P4 PERF.	NGS P5 POLICY	NGS P6 GOV.	NGS P7 PERF.
SECTOR AVERAGE (%)	36%	40%	27%	41%	10%	18%	3%

GREEN ≥ 35%; AMBER 20-34%; RED < 20%.

ANCIENT AND ENDANGERED FORESTS ANALYSIS

PILLAR 1: Ancient and Endangered Forests Policy and Commitments (Weight: 15%)

The average score for Pillar 1 is 36%, with only two companies scoring zero. Scores range from 0% to 68%, with five of the top performers achieving above 50%. This suggests that while basic policy frameworks are more widely adopted than governance or reporting mechanisms, there is still significant variation.

PILLAR 2: Ancient and Endangered Forests Governance and Management (Weight: 25%)

Performance in Pillar 2 represents a quarter of overall scores. The company average score is 40%, but the range is extreme, from 0% (four companies) to 93%. Four companies score zero on governance, indicating no evidence of formal management responsibility for AEF risk.

The strongest individual questions within this section, and those with the highest correlation to overall score, include Question 2.7 on grievance mechanisms (very high correlation), Question 2.2 on risk assessment (high correlation), and Question 2.5b on supplier education (high correlation). **Companies that score well on grievance mechanisms are overwhelmingly also those performing well overall, suggesting that formalized accountability systems are a hallmark of companies taking a strategic approach to AEF.**

PILLAR 3: Ancient and Endangered Forests Targets (Weight: 15%)

Pillar 3 has the lowest average score among the four AEF sections at 27%, with six companies scoring zero. **This represents a critical gap: companies may have policies and even governance structures in place, yet fail to translate these into timebound, quantitative targets.** Only one company achieved above 75% in this section (77%), and only four companies exceeded 50%.

This gap has a downstream consequence. The correlation between Pillar 3 (Targets) and Pillar 4 (Reporting) is quite strong, indicating that companies without formal targets are substantially less likely to produce the performance data required to score well in the highest-weighted section.

PILLAR 4: Ancient and Endangered Forests Performance Reporting (Weight: 30%)

Pillar 4 carries the highest weighting in the report (30%) and has a company average of 41%. The range spans from 0% to 97%, the highest single-section score. Only two companies scored zero on Pillar 4, meaning most companies are publishing some form of performance data, though the depth and quality vary enormously.

CROSS-PILLAR INSIGHTS

Figure 5 provides a summary of the analysis of inter-pillar relationships in Section 1 (Ancient and Endangered Forests) and reveals a logical progression in how sustainability commitments mature into operational performance.

FIGURE 5: Strength of correlation between pillars

SECTION PAIRING	INTERPRETATION
Pillar 1 (Policy) → Pillar 2 (Governance)	Strong correlation: Policy commitments predict governance investment.
Pillar 1 (Policy) → Pillar 3 (Targets)	Moderate correlation: Policy alone does not guarantee target-setting.
Pillar 2 (Governance) → Pillar 4 (Reporting)	Strong correlation: Governance structures enable quality reporting.
Pillar 3 (Targets) → Pillar 4 (Reporting)	Strong correlation: Targets are necessary precursors to progress reporting.

These correlations indicate a maturity pipeline effect: Companies that invest in governance structures are significantly more likely to produce credible performance reporting, and companies with formal targets are substantially more likely to demonstrate measurable progress. The weakest link is the Policy to Targets transition, indicating that having a no-deforestation commitment does not reliably translate into timebound quantitative target.

Question 3.1 on (deforestation targets very high correlation) and Question 4.6 on HCV forest reporting (high correlation) are among the most strongly correlated individual questions with overall scores, confirming that transparent, credible reporting on complex indicators is a defining characteristic of leading companies.

KEY QUESTION ANALYSIS

Individual question-level analysis can identify which specific indicators are most strongly associated with overall performance. Table 6 outlines the top five questions.

TABLE 6: Top five questions by correlation strength with overall performance

Q	QUESTION	CORRELATION STRENGTH
Q2.7	Does the company have a formalised and publicly available grievance mechanism covering its own operations?	Very strong
Q3.1	Does the company publish a timebound, quantitative target for no deforestation/no conversion?	Very strong
Q4.6	Does the company report on actions and outcomes to protect and enhance HCV forest?	Very strong
Q4.8	Does the company report on grievances raised, responses and resolutions?	Strong
Q2.2	Does the company conduct a regular risk assessment covering deforestation and human rights risks?	Strong

A notable pattern emerged: Questions most connected to overall performance are concentrated in Governance and Reporting, not in Policy. This reinforces the conclusion that companies differentiate themselves through operational rigour rather than the breadth of their policy language. Specifically, grievance mechanisms (Q2.7), risk assessments (Q2.2), and progress-reporting on HCV and grievances (Q4.6, Q4.8) are strong markers of overall leadership.

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS AND SCORING

SECTION 1: ANCIENT AND ENDANGERED FORESTS

Ancient and Endangered Forests: Policy and Commitments

QUESTION 1.1

Does the company have a published policy statement (or equivalent) or stated commitment to no deforestation and no forest conversion?

RATIONALE

A critical component of a policy to eliminate the use of Ancient and Endangered Forests (AEFs) is a commitment to no deforestation and no conversion throughout a company's supply chain. Most companies do not use the term "Ancient and Endangered Forests (AEFs)" in their forest policies. Companies may use different definitions of deforestation and conversion, leading to divergences in the types of activities and extraction they permit and their understanding of which of these may cause harm. For example, a commitment to no conversion or deforestation left undefined may not capture "degradation" resulting from intensive extraction from primary forests, which results in the degradation of AEFs. Therefore, it is necessary to understand if a company's definition of deforestation is consistent with the consensus-based definition adopted by the Accountability Framework initiative (AFi).

The AFi defines deforestation as the "Loss of natural forest as a result of: (i) conversion to agriculture or other non-forest land use; (ii) conversion to a tree plantation; or (iii) severe and sustained degradation."

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

No evidence of a published policy statement (or equivalent) or stated commitment to no deforestation and no conversion.	0
The company has a broad commitment to no deforestation and no conversion, the scope of which is not clear or is limited to certain geographies and/or operations.	3
The company has a commitment to no deforestation and no conversion, the scope of which is universal across all geographies and operations. However, the company does not define deforestation in a way which aligns with the Accountability Framework initiative (AFi).	5
The company has a clear commitment to no deforestation and no conversion, the scope of which is universal across all geographies and operations. The company clearly defines deforestation in a way which aligns with the Accountability Framework initiative (AFi).	10

QUESTION 1.1 (CONTINUED)

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- The assessment does not differentiate between companies that publish stand-alone no deforestation policies and companies that incorporate no deforestation into wider responsible sourcing or sustainability policies or codes of practice.
- The commitment can be made within associated policy documents such as a Supplier Code of Conduct, Annual Reports, Sustainability Reports or on the company website.
- The supporting information should ideally be easily accessible and not spread across multiple locations. Where this is not the case, the assessor should request this be adhered to in future reporting. It does not impact the score for this question at present.
- A commitment to certification alone is not enough to score points for this question. Simply stating compliance with a certification scheme is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position. The only exception to this is if the company explicitly states it will prohibit fibre from sources defined as unacceptable by the Forest Stewardship Council's (FSC) Controlled Wood Standard, this is considered a broad commitment to no deforestation and no conversion, and they can be awarded three points.
- Any reference to the level and type of certification used to ensure no deforestation and no conversion commitment within the supply chain is not assessed in this question.
- If companies define deforestation as "no conversion to agriculture or plantation", it might not capture conversion of primary to secondary forests, e.g., clearcut logging that is replaced by "planted" forests (not plantations) or left to naturally regenerate, which results in the degradation of AEFs. It might also not capture selective logging which again results in the degradation of AEFs. Therefore, to be awarded 10 points companies must make explicit reference of degradation in order for their definition to align with Canopy and AFi.
- Assessors should use the Glossary for definitions of conversion, deforestation, and degradation to guide assessment.

QUESTION 1.2

Does the company's no deforestation/no conversion commitment specify a cut-off date no later than 1994?

RATIONALE

A cut-off date is the date after which deforestation or conversion renders a given area or production unit non-compliant with no-deforestation or no-conversion policies, commitments, targets, or other obligations.
The cut-off date of 1994 is consistent with that established by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), which represents a multi-stakeholder process and is considered by Canopy to be the only credible and rigorous certification system for forestry. As other certification schemes and the EU Deforestation Regulation (EUDR) adopt a cut-off date of 2020, partial points may be awarded to companies which specify this date.

As noted by the AFi's Operational Guidance on Cut-off Dates: "Clarity on cut-off dates is essential for enabling companies to establish precise, actionable, and monitorable commitments related to deforestation-free and conversion-free supply chains. At least as important, cut-off dates can send market signals — and ideally help establish sector wide norms — that curtail land speculation, deforestation, and conversion in frontier areas."

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

The company does not specify a cut-off date.	0
The company specifies a cut-off date of 2020.	3
The company specifies a cut-off date between 1994 and 2019. OR The company specifies a cut-off date of 1994. However, the scope of the company's commitment is limited to certain geographies and/or operations.	5
The company specifies a cut-off date of 1994 or earlier. The scope of the commitment is universal across all geographies and/or operations.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Five points may be awarded for a staggered approach to a cut-off date of 1994 across geographies/operations OR if the company specifies a cut-off date between 1994 and 2020.
- Simply stating compliance with FSC or PEFC that specifies their own cut-off date is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated cut-off date.

QUESTION 1.3

Does the company have a stated commitment within a published policy statement (or equivalent) to prohibit sourcing from Primary Forests and Intact Forest Landscapes (IFLs)?

RATIONALE

Primary forests and Intact Forest Landscapes represent critical ecological values encompassed within the definition of Ancient and Endangered Forests (AEFs). Companies will need to acknowledge the unique qualities of these forest types and commit to prohibit sourcing from them as part of their commitment to protecting AEFs.

Canopy acknowledges that primary forests and Intact Forest Landscapes are a subset of AEFs. However, companies should demonstrate an understanding of the particular importance of these ecosystems, which are widely recognized as functionally irreplaceable, through a defined commitment that can be monitored and reported against.

As there is a wide range of related terminology used to describe primary forests, Intact Forest Landscapes, or forests with related characteristics, it is also necessary that the company includes a definition of their chosen term to enable an assessment of consistency against generally accepted definitions of primary forests and Intact Forest Landscapes (e.g. those provided by the IUCN, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO).

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

The company does not appear to address primary forests or Intact Forest Landscapes (IFLs) (or an equivalent term) within its reporting.	0
The company acknowledges primary forests/Intact Forest Landscapes (IFLs)/areas under a related term with a functionally equivalent definition. However, the company does not prohibit sourcing from these landscapes.	3
The company acknowledges the unique importance of primary forests/Intact Forest Landscapes (IFLs)/areas under a related term with a functionally equivalent definition, and commits to maintain and enhance these landscapes.	5
The company has a clear commitment to prohibit sourcing from all primary forests/Intact Forest Landscapes (IFLs)/areas under a related term with a functionally equivalent definition. The scope of the commitment is universal across all geographies and/or operations.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Where companies are not using the terminology of primary forest or Intact Forest Landscapes, they must provide a definition that is functionally equivalent to Canopy's definition.
- Companies with a commitment which is undefined in terms of scope or limited to certain specified geographies and/or operations are not able to score more than five points.
- Please refer to the Glossary for definitions of Intact Forest Landscapes (IFLs) and Primary Forests.

QUESTION 1.4

Does the company have a stated commitment within a published policy statement (or equivalent) to prohibit sourcing from High Conservation Value (HCV) Forests?

RATIONALE

Areas that qualify as High Conservation Value (HCV) forests meet Canopy's definition of Ancient and Endangered Forests (AEFs). To effectively protect AEFs, companies must therefore prohibit sourcing from HCV forests.

According to the HCV Resource Network: "The HCV Approach is a 20-year methodology that pragmatically identifies and protects High Conservation Values (HCVs) from the impacts of land-use change. It is globally applicable, works across a wide range of scales (large landscapes or jurisdictions, farms, plantations, management units, smallholdings), ecosystems (from forests to grasslands and aquatic systems) and productive systems."

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

The company does not appear to address HCVs (or an equivalent term) within its reporting.	0
The company acknowledges the importance of at least one or more HVCs and states a commitment to avoid the destruction of HCVs. However, the company provides no further information on restrictions when sourcing from these areas.	3
The company has a commitment to protect and manage all HCVs and lists the conditions under which sourcing from these areas is permitted. However, the company does not completely prohibit sourcing from these areas.	5
The company has a clear commitment to prohibit sourcing from all HCVs unless or until adequate conservation safeguards are in place, as defined by the Wye River Principles. The scope of this commitment is universal across all geographies and/or operations.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- To score three points companies need to describe the protection and management of at least one individual attribute of HCVs such as endangered species or ecosystems, critical ecosystem service provision or sites of religious significance. Assessors should refer to the Glossary for the description of the attributes of HCVs as provided in the FSC Principles and Criteria for Forest Stewardship.
- To score 10 points, companies must clearly describe the adequate conservation safeguards that are in place, as defined by the Wye River Principles.
- Adequate conservation safeguards as defined in the Wye River Principles: “Establishment of a representative protected area system acceptable to all concerned stakeholders including conservation organizations that results from either a multi-stakeholder conservation planning process, or a conservation design process carried out by scientists. In addition, control of illegal logging, and independent third-party certified forest management (FSC or equivalent) are required as adequate conservation safeguards.”

QUESTION 1.5

Does the company have a stated commitment within a published policy statement (or equivalent) to ensure that Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) is secured from Indigenous Peoples (IPs) and Local Communities (LCs) for any activity in its operations/supply chains that may affect their rights, lands, resources, territories, livelihoods, or food security?

RATIONALE

Access to Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) enables Indigenous Peoples (IPs) and Local Communities (LCs) with rights to land to give or withhold their consent to forestry activities which may affect them. As this fosters collective decision making, social equity, and sustainable forest management, it is therefore considered best practice.

The right to FPIC is articulated in the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and in the Accountability Framework initiative's (AFi) Operational Guidance on Free, Prior and Informed Consent. Company policies should follow this well-established guidance.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

The company does not appear to address FPIC within its reporting.	0
The company has a broad commitment to source in respect of Indigenous Peoples (IPs) or Local Communities (LCs), but does not define FPIC or the scope of the commitment.	3
The company has a clear commitment to ensure that FPIC has been secured for any activity in its operations/supply chain which may affect the rights, lands, resources, territories, livelihoods, or food security of Indigenous Peoples (IPs) and Local Communities (LCs). However, the company does not define FPIC, or defines it in a way which does not acknowledge redress and is therefore only partially aligned with the UNDRIP.	5
The company has a clear commitment to ensure that FPIC has been secured for any activity in its operations/supply chain which may affect the rights, lands, resources, territories, livelihoods, or food security of Indigenous Peoples (IPs) and Local Communities (LCs). This commitment covers both IPs and LCs. The company also defines FPIC in a way which aligns with the UNDRIP (including (a) the right to redress when FPIC has not been secured and (b) the right to self-determination to obtain FPIC prior to new activities).	10

QUESTION 1.5 (CONTINUED)

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Company statements about human rights and avoiding forced labour, slavery, or debt bondage alone are not sufficient to score points for this question. These are generally applied to the company at large and do not function in the same way as the commitment to ensure FPIC is upheld on land owned or controlled by the company.
- Canopy's language on FPIC is compatible with the UNDRIP and Accountability Framework initiative language. The UNDRIP and the AFi requires that FPIC is secured prior to new activities and UNDRIP acknowledges the right to redress. The AFi acknowledges the inclusion of Local Communities and their right to FPIC.
- Companies with a commitment to FPIC which is limited to either IPs OR LCs should not be awarded more than three points.
- Companies with a commitment to UNDRIP without explicit inclusion of Local Communities can be awarded five points.
- For ten points companies should have a clear commitment to UNDRIP which includes Local Communities. If they do not specify UNDRIP it should be clear that companies acknowledge the right to redress, which includes resolving disputes on lands acquired through acquisition and mergers.
- Please refer to the Glossary for the AFi's and UNDRIP's definitions of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC).

QUESTION 1.6

Does the company have a stated commitment within a published policy statement (or equivalent) to prohibit the sourcing of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs)?

RATIONALE

Many conservation schemes, including the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), have prohibited the use of genetically modified trees, based on concerns about the associated environmental and ecological risks. These include biodiversity loss, gene flow, the potential for creating new weeds or pests, and the displacement of native species (FAO). As Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) may therefore present risks to Ancient and Endangered Forests (AEFs), to effectively protect these forests, companies must prohibit sourcing GMOs.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

The company does not appear to address the issue of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) within its reporting.	0
The company has a commitment to avoid sourcing Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs). However, the scope of this commitment is not clear or is limited to certain geographies and/or operations.	3
The company has a commitment to avoid sourcing Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) which is universal across all geographies and/or operations. However, the company does not completely prohibit sourcing GMOs.	5
The company has a clear commitment to prohibit the sourcing of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs). The scope of this commitment is universal across all geographies and/or operations.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Please refer to the Glossary for a definition of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs).
- Statements which suggest that sourcing GMOs is "unacceptable" or "screened out of supply chains" are acceptable for five or three points depending on the scope of the commitment.
- A commitment to certification alone is not enough to score points for this question. Simply stating compliance with a certification scheme is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position.

Ancient and Endangered Forests: Policy and Commitments

QUESTION 1.7

Does the company state a preference for virgin fibre content derived from responsibly managed forests which have been certified to the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification system?

RATIONALE

Canopy prioritizes Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification due to its use and thorough integration of the High Conservation Value (HCV) concept. Canopy also considers the FSC Forest Stewardship Standard to be the only standard which is globally consistent, outcome-oriented, effective in identifying and excluding controversial companies, and robust enough to ensure the maintenance of social and ecological values in forests appropriate for management and timber extraction (outside of Ancient and Endangered Forests). Therefore, companies are expected to state a preference for fibres which are derived from FSC certified forests.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

The company does not state a preference for certified fibre.	0
The company has a stated preference to purchasing/producing certified fibre and all schemes are considered equal by the company.	3
The company has a stated preference to purchasing/producing FSC certified fibre and prioritises FSC certification above other certification schemes. However, the scope of this preference is limited to certain geographies and/or operations.	5
The company has a stated preference to purchasing/producing FSC certified fibre and prioritises FSC certification above other certification schemes. The scope of this preference is universal across all geographies and/or operations.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Companies which state a preference for certified fibre and list multiple preferred certification schemes including FSC may be awarded three points. Stating a general preference for certified fibre does not qualify for points.
- Companies which demonstrate a preference for FSC by reporting that at least 80% of their total operational volumes are FSC fibre certified without stating an explicit commitment to a preference for FSC, are also eligible for full points. This includes FSC 100%, FSC Mix, and FSC Controlled Wood. Reporting against the number of operations that are FSC Chain of Custody certified is not sufficient for points. In this instance assessors should include a comment encouraging the company to make a public commitment to FSC fibre certification.
- Forest fibre from Russia and Belarus is considered conflict fibre and has lost its FSC certifications. Canopy realizes the implications of this is that no fibre from Russia or Belarus should be entering packaging paper supply chains.

QUESTION 1.8

Does the company have a stated commitment within a published policy statement (or equivalent) to maximize recycled materials in its packaging paper?

RATIONALE

The utilization of recycled fibre is an effective strategy which can be used by companies to eliminate the use of Ancient and Endangered Forest (AEFs) in paper packaging production. Sourcing recycled fibre reduces overall pressure on forests, freshwater systems and the climate, especially when post-consumer waste is used.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

The company does not appear to address the issue of using recycled inputs within its reporting.	0
The company has a broad commitment to maximize the use of recycled materials.	3
The company has a commitment to maximize the use of recycled materials. However, the scope of this commitment is limited to certain specified geographies or the operational scope does not include packaging paper.	5
The company has a commitment to maximize the use of recycled materials. The scope of this commitment is universal across all geographies and operations.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Companies may use terms such as 'recycled' or 'recovered' fibres. It should be clear they are referring to recycling fibres regardless of the term used rather than describing increasing the efficient use of fibres within their production operations.
- References to 'fibre optimization' are not sufficient for points as this is considered efficient use of fibre unless it is clear they are describing optimizing the number of times a fibre can be recycled.
- Companies which make an aggregated commitment in the context of a circular economy commitment to, for example, 'maximise the use of recycled, recyclable, renewable, reusable and compostable packaging' may be awarded three points. However, it must be clear that maximising the use of recycled fibre is part of the commitment. General commitments towards Circular Economy do not receive points.
- To be awarded maximum points where a company manufactures additional products beyond packaging paper, it must be clear that the scope of their commitment includes packaging paper or is universal for their operations and geographies.

QUESTION 1.9

Does the company have a stated commitment within a published policy statement (or equivalent) to reduce fibre content through product design?

RATIONALE

Through innovative design, companies can reduce the demand for paper packaging material, taking the pressure supply chains for wood fibre and therefore off the world's AEFs. Designing products that are lighter weight and use less fibre demonstrates a commitment to reduce pressure on the world's forests and reduce the pressures created by the volume of waste generated by the packaging.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

The company does not appear to address reducing fibre content through product design within its reporting.	0
The company acknowledges the need to reduce fibre content or develop light weight design products. However, the company does not have a formal commitment to reducing fibre content through product design and does not provide examples of how it is doing this.	3
The company has a commitment to reducing fibre content through product design.	5
The company has a commitment to reduce fibre content through product design and provides examples of products it has brought to market with reduced fibre content or lighter weight design.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Companies may be awarded full points if they have a commitment to reduce fibre content through product design and provide an example of bringing products to market with reduced fibre content or lighter weight design.
- Companies with a commitment to reduce fibre content through product design, without an example of bringing products to market with reduced fibre content/lighter weight design may be awarded five points.
- Companies which bring a product to market with reduced fibre content/lighter weight design but do not have a clear commitment to reduce fibre content do not receive points for this question as it needs to be clear that the intention of bringing the product to market was to reduce pressure on forests through reduced fibre use.
- Companies which acknowledge the need to reduce fibre use/develop light weight design products without a formal commitment to do so or examples of how they are doing this may be awarded three points.
- The geographical and operational scope of company commitments are not assessed in this question.

QUESTION 2.1 A

Has the company assigned day-to-day operational management responsibility for deforestation and/or conversion?

RATIONALE

When looking at the management of no deforestation and/or no conversion, both oversight and implementation responsibilities are important. Oversight is necessary to ensure that senior management is aware of the business implications of deforestation and/or conversion and is prepared to intervene when needed (e.g., if there are tensions between the organization's policy/commitments and other business objectives). However, it is often the case that those charged with oversight know relatively little about the specific details of how to effectively manage deforestation and/or conversion. It is, therefore, important that there are individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the company's deforestation and/or conversion policies and commitments are implemented and effectively managed.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 5

No evidence of day-to-day operational management responsibility for deforestation and/or conversion.	0
The company has assigned day-to-day operational management responsibility for deforestation and/or conversion.	5

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- The two sub-questions are scored separately (i.e., companies could score five points for publishing details of who is responsible for deforestation and/or conversion on a day-to-day basis and five points for publishing details of senior management responsibility for overseeing their deforestation and/or conversion policy or commitments).

Part A:

- For the purposes of scoring on day-to-day responsibility, the question is not looking for named individuals, but evidence of roles with responsibility for no deforestation and/or no conversion (e.g., a statement that this is the responsibility of a dedicated technical or sourcing manager, or a statement that responsibility is divided among a number of functions, with information on the various roles and responsibilities).
- Companies are not required to explicitly mention the direct management of no deforestation and no conversion as a governance issue to be awarded points. Companies which outline the broad day-to-day management responsibility for a Forest Policy/Fibre Procurement Policy (or other similar policies) which contains a commitment to no deforestation/no conversion, would also be acceptable for points.

QUESTION 2.1 B

Has the company assigned board or senior management responsibility for deforestation and/or conversion?

RATIONALE

When looking at the management of no deforestation and/or no conversion, both oversight and implementation responsibilities are important. Oversight is necessary to ensure that senior management is aware of the business implications of deforestation and/or conversion and is prepared to intervene when needed (e.g., if there are tensions between the organization's policy/commitments and other business objectives). However, it is often the case that those charged with oversight know relatively little about the specific details of how to effectively manage deforestation and/or conversion. It is, therefore, important that there are individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the company's deforestation and/or conversion policies and commitments are implemented and effectively managed.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 5

No evidence of board or senior management oversight of deforestation and/or conversion.	0
The company has published details of how the board or senior management oversee the issues of deforestation and/or conversion.	5

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- The two sub-questions are scored separately (i.e., companies could score five points for publishing details of who is responsible for deforestation and/or conversion on a day-to-day basis and five points for publishing details of senior management responsibility for overseeing their deforestation and/or conversion policy or commitments).

Part B:

- For the management oversight sub-question, we recognise that companies may assign responsibility to a named senior person or that no deforestation and/or conversion may form part of the remit of a wider sustainability, CSR or sourcing committee. Therefore, five points are awarded if the company provides a clear account of board or senior management oversight.
- General information on the management or oversight of CSR or sustainability is only credited if it is clear that this includes deforestation and/or conversion.

QUESTION 2.2

Does the company conduct a regular risk assessment which covers deforestation, conversion, and the associated human rights risks?

RATIONALE

Regular risk assessments allow companies to quickly and effectively identify, prevent and mitigate potential harms which may arise both in their own operations and/or supply chain. A risk assessment which covers deforestation, conversion and the associated human rights risks therefore acts as a management tool, allowing companies to identify and respond to risks which may affect Ancient and Endangered Forests (AEFs).

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

No evidence of a company risk assessment which covers deforestation, conversion, and the associated human rights risks.	0
The company reports that it conducts a risk assessment for all operations and geographies. However, the company does not outline how it responds to the outcomes of this.	3
The company reports that it conducts a risk assessment for all operations and geographies, alongside a description of how it responds to the outcomes of this.	5
The company reports that it conducts a risk assessment for all operations and geographies, alongside a description of how it responds to the outcomes of this AND the company also outlines the frequency of these assessments/processes.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Risk assessments may include supplier surveys, audits (both internal or by third parties), use of independent consultation, etc. The risk assessment can be against delivery of fibre procurement policy/forest management policy which states a commitment to no deforestation.
- If the company states that it has conducted or is the process of conducting a process to demonstrate compliance with EUDR with no further information or description of the process, is not awarded any points.
- FSC Controlled Wood is evidence of a risk assessment process. Companies which state that 100% of forest fibre procured meets the FSC Controlled Wood standard or that they are 100% FSC forest fibre certified may be awarded three or five points depending on scope and response.
- Companies may only be awarded maximum points if they also state the assessments are conducted at least every two years.

QUESTION 2.3

Does the company conduct an assessment to ensure that no illegal logging exists within its own operations or supply chains?

RATIONALE

Ensuring that no illegal logging exists within a company's operation or supply chain protects both the company and the supply chain from fines and restrictions to operations. It is an essential component of risk management. Companies need to demonstrate they conduct assessments to ensure no illegal logging exists within their operations or supply chains and they abide by all local, national, and international laws and legal frameworks.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

No evidence of an assessment which covers illegal logging.	0
The company describes the process through which it assesses the legal compliance but the scope of this process is limited to certain geographies or operations.	3
The company describes the process through which it assesses the legal compliance of its operations and supply chain. These processes are applied universally across all geographies and operations.	5
The company describes the process through which it assesses the legal compliance of its operations and supply chain, and outlines the frequency in which it does so. These processes are applied universally across all geographies and/or operations.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Companies should not be awarded points for simply stating that all their operations/supply chains comply with all applicable laws without a description of the process to ensure legality of supply/no illegal logging in their supply chains.
- The use of FSC Controlled Wood is considered a process to assess legal compliance within operations and supply chains.
- Companies may only be awarded maximum points if they also state the assessments are conducted at least every two years.
- The process that the companies describe should include a statement that they abide by all local, national and international laws and legal frameworks. Assessors should capture this information.

QUESTION 2.4

Does the company provide employee training which covers deforestation, conversion, and the associated human rights risks?

RATIONALE

The effective implementation of a policy relies on a strong understanding of policy-relevant issues amongst employees who are responsible for overseeing it. Incorporating deforestation, conversion and the associated human rights risks into employee training can therefore encourage rigorous internal implementation of policies relating to Ancient and Endangered Forests (AEFs).

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

No evidence of employee training covering deforestation, conversion and the associated human rights risks.	0
The company provides training to employees which covers deforestation, conversion and the associated human rights risks.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Companies are only awarded 10 points if the training provided is aimed at employees and if it is explicitly related to reducing the risk of deforestation and/or conversion and/or the associated human rights risks.
- Evidence of training on topics which may be related to deforestation/conversion/associated human rights risks (e.g., HCVs, human-wildlife conflict, fire management, chain of custody, illegal logging, FPIC, support for IPLCs etc) is acceptable for points.
- References to training on forest management broadly are not sufficient for points as this could encompass other topics (e.g., harvesting practices) which are not directly related to the implementation of a no deforestation policy.
- This question does not address the quality of the training provided, the manner in which skills or competencies are assessed, the number of employees receiving training or the number of hours of training provided.

QUESTION 2.5 A

Does the company describe how it implements its policy through its supply chain via contractual obligations and action against non-compliance?

RATIONALE

Many of the business risks and opportunities associated with Ancient and Endangered Forests (AEFs) relate to companies' supply chains. Companies have the ability to influence their suppliers' performance both formally (e.g., through contracts) and informally (e.g., through capacity building and education).

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

No evidence that deforestation and/or conversion are covered within contractual obligations for suppliers.	0
The company covers deforestation and/or conversion of native habitat within contractual obligations for some suppliers (in certain geographies and/or operations). However, the company does not state the actions it will take to ensure compliance against these obligations.	3
The company covers deforestation and/or conversion of native habitat within contractual obligations for all suppliers (across all geographies and/or operations). However, the company does not state the actions it will take to ensure supplier compliance against these obligations.	5
The company covers deforestation and/or conversion of native habitat within contractual obligations for all suppliers (across all geographies and/or operations). The company also commits to re-evaluate supplier relationships or to engage non-compliant suppliers.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- In some cases, companies might have or reference "grievance trackers" where they list non-compliant suppliers and actions taken. Some companies have publicly available documents that explain supplier engagement overall, and this may provide some guidance or insight. Sometimes this is not a standalone statement but is stated through the particular wording of the commitment/policy in question.
- The term no deforestation/no conversion does not need to be explicitly mentioned within contractual agreements to award points. However, the company must explicitly reference the policy/document where its no deforestation/no conversion commitment is contained, within contractual obligations for suppliers. For instance, companies may be awarded points if, within supplier contracts, they reference the requirements of their Procurement/Forest Management Policy (or similar), if such policies contain a commitment to no deforestation/no conversion.
- Companies are awarded maximum points for evidence that they both incorporate deforestation and/or conversion into contractual obligations for suppliers (across all geographies and/or operations) and commit to re-evaluate supplier relationships/engage suppliers to ensure compliance where policy requirements are not met.
- Companies may receive five points for incorporating deforestation and/or conversion into contractual obligations for suppliers (across all geographies and/or operations) and stating that it requires suppliers to be compliant, without outlining the specific actions it will take to ensure this.
- Companies which incorporate deforestation and/or conversion into contractual obligations for suppliers limited to certain geographies and/or operations may be awarded three points.

QUESTION 2.5 B

Does the company describe how it implements its policy through its supply chain by providing support and/or education to suppliers?

RATIONALE

Many of the business risks and opportunities associated with Ancient and Endangered Forests (AEFs) relate to companies' supply chains. Companies have the ability to influence their suppliers' performance both formally (e.g., through contracts) and informally (e.g., through capacity building and education).

SCORING

MAX SCORE 5

No evidence of policy-related support or education for suppliers.	0
The company provides technical assistance and/or education to suppliers on issues relevant to its policy. However, the company does not publish case studies/examples/comprehensive reporting on this.	3
The company provides technical assistance and/or education to suppliers on issues relevant to its policy and publishes at least one case study/example/comprehensive reporting on this.	5

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Examples of supplier education and support may take different forms, for example the development of improvement plans or the provision of supplier training on FSC certification and the management of HCVs.
- Evidence of training/engagement on topics which may be related to the forest-relevant issues (e.g., human-wildlife conflict, fire management, chain of custody, illegal logging, FPIC, support for s etc) is acceptable for points.
- Maximum points are awarded to companies that publish case studies/examples/a comprehensive description of their approach.
- Companies which report that they provide technical assistance and/or education to suppliers on policy relevant issues without publishing examples/case studies/comprehensive reporting, may receive three points.
- Companies should not be awarded points for a general description of their support to suppliers on general supply chain issues, unless it is clear that this also covers the relevant forest-related issues.
- Companies are not assessed on the number or proportion of suppliers receiving this support and/or education.

QUESTION 2.6

Does the company assess its suppliers on their commitment to Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC)?

RATIONALE

Access to Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) enables Indigenous Peoples (IPs) and Local Communities (LCs) with rights to land to give or withhold their consent to forestry activities which may affect them. As this fosters collective decision making, social equity and sustainable forest management, it is therefore considered best practice.

Companies have the ability to influence their suppliers' performance by assessing them on their commitments to relevant issues. Packaging paper manufacturers should therefore actively assess whether their suppliers have a commitment to FPIC and describe how they assess suppliers on this issue.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

No evidence that the company assesses its suppliers on their commitments to Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC).	0
The company reports that it assesses its suppliers on their commitments to Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC). However, the company does not describe how it assesses suppliers on this.	5
The company reports that it assesses its suppliers on their commitments to Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) and provides a description of how it does so.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Company statements about human rights and avoiding forced labour, slavery or debt bondage alone are not sufficient to score points for this question. These are generally applied to the company at large and do not function in the same way as the commitment to engage one's fibre suppliers to ensure FPIC is upheld.
- Companies may be awarded maximum points if they both assess suppliers on their commitment to FPIC and describe how they do so.
- Companies which report that they assess suppliers on their commitment to FPIC without a description of how they do so, may be awarded five points.

QUESTION 2.7

Does the company have a formalized and publicly available grievance mechanism in place which covers its operations?

RATIONALE

Grievance mechanisms ensure that stakeholders which are adversely affected by a company's operations can raise complaints and seek redress. Companies which should therefore have a formal grievance mechanism in place and make this publicly available to ensure accessibility and transparency.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

No evidence of a formalized and publicly accessible grievance mechanism.	0
The company has a formalized grievance mechanism in place which covers its operations. However, the grievance mechanism is not publicly available.	5
The company has a publicly available, formalized grievance mechanism in place which covers its operations.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- This question only applies to companies that own or control forestry operations / pulp plantations.
- Please refer to the Glossary for a definition of grievance mechanisms.
- To be considered publicly available, and therefore to score full points, the grievance mechanism must:
    i. Be available to both internal and external stakeholders.
    ii. Be available for download or clearly available on a webpage.
    iii. Outline the method of contacting the company or a third party who handles grievances on behalf of the company. Ideally this should be a free telephone number, postal address or email address.
- Mechanisms which are only available to employees should not be awarded points.
- Companies which report on a grievance mechanism which does not fulfil the above criteria, and is therefore not considered publicly available, may be awarded five points.
- Companies which state that they are developing a grievance mechanism are not awarded any points.

QUESTION 2.8

Does the company assess its suppliers on whether or not they have a formalized and publicly available grievance mechanism in place?

RATIONALE

Grievance mechanisms ensure that stakeholders which are adversely affected by a company's operations are able to raise complaints and seek redress. Whilst packaging paper manufacturers might not directly own or manage all sources of fibre supply, they do have the ability to influence their suppliers' performance. Packaging paper manufacturers should therefore actively assess whether their suppliers have a formalized and accessible grievance mechanisms in place, and describe how they assess suppliers on this issue.

SCORING MAX SCORE 5

No evidence that the company assesses its suppliers on a publicly available grievance mechanism.	0
The company requires its suppliers to have a publicly available grievance mechanism. However, it does not describe how it assesses suppliers.	3
The company requires its suppliers to have a publicly available grievance mechanism and describes how it assesses suppliers on whether the mechanism is in place.	5

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Please refer to the Glossary for a definition of grievance mechanisms.

Ancient and Endangered Forests: Targets

QUESTION 3.1

Does the company publish a timebound, quantitative target to achieve no deforestation and/or no conversion in its supply chain?

RATIONALE

Targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of the targets. Therefore, in addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to develop timebound, quantitative and measurable targets on issues relating to the protection of Ancient and Endangered Forests (AEFs).

SCORING MAX SCORE 10

No published targets.	0
The company has a timebound target. However, the geographical and/or operational scope of the target is not clear.	3
The company has a quantitative and timebound target. However, the scope of the target is limited to specified geographies and/or operations.	5
The company has a quantitative and timebound target, or demonstrates evidence of achievement, which is universal across all geographies and operations.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- The target must be against a commitment to achieve no deforestation and no conversion.
- To score five or ten points for this question, the company must report a numerical target. This may be a volume, percentage or proportion.
- For three points the target can be qualitative using terms for example ‘all’ or ‘our entire fibre supply’.
- To receive ten points the target date should be no later than two years after target submissions and should be for 100% deforestation-free and conversion-free supply.
- Evidence of achievement is considered to be 100% FSC fibre certified for FSC 100% (FSC FM), in combination with FSC Controlled Wood (FSC CW) and FSC Mix.
- Companies are not awarded points for reporting against percentages of certified supply in absence of a no deforestation and no conversion target. Reporting against volume of certified supply is assessed in question 4.2.

Ancient and Endangered Forests: Targets

QUESTION 3.2

Does the company publish a timebound, quantitative target for the use of Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certified fibre?

RATIONALE

Targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of the targets. Therefore, in addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to develop timebound, quantitative and measurable targets on issues relating to the protection of Ancient and Endangered Forests (AEFs).

SCORING MAX SCORE 10

No published targets.	0
The company has a quantitative and timebound target for the use of FSC certified fibre. However, the scope of the target is not clear.	3
The company has a quantitative, timebound target for the use of FSC certified fibre. However, the scope is limited to specified geographies and/or operations.	5
The company has a quantitative, timebound target for the use of FSC certified fibre, or demonstrates evidence of achievement. The scope of the target is universal across all geographies and operations.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Companies which publish an aggregated target for achieving FSC certified fibre supply, alongside other certification schemes (e.g."% which is FSC, PEFC or SFI certified") are eligible for three points.
- Companies which publish a qualitative timebound target to achieve FSC certified fibre supply may also be awarded three points.
- Companies must state the target is for the use or purchase of FSC 100%, FSC Mix, or FSC Recycled. A target to achieve FSC Chain of Custody certification for operations does not count for points.
- Evidence of achievement is considered to be 100% FSC fibre certified for FSC 100% (FSC FM), in combination with FSC Controlled Wood (FSC CW) and FSC Mix.

Ancient and Endangered Forests: Targets

QUESTION 3.3

Does the company publish a timebound, quantitative target for maximizing the use of recycled materials?

RATIONALE

Targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of the targets. Therefore, in addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to develop timebound, quantitative and measurable targets on issues relating to the protection of Ancient and Endangered Forests (AEFs).

SCORING MAX SCORE 10

No published targets.	0
The company has a quantitative and timebound aggregated target.	3
The company has a quantitative and timebound target. However, the scope of the target is limited to specified geographies and/or operations.	5
The company has a quantitative and timebound target, or demonstrates evidence of achievement, which is universal across all geographies and/or operations.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- References to 'fibre optimisation' are not sufficient for points.
- Targets may be expressed in various ways, for example, giving preference to paper/packaging with high-recycled content or encouraging its suppliers to continuously improve and expand the availability of recycled content in papers/packaging.
- Companies may be awarded three points for targets which include increasing recycled fibre content within a wider target to increase recycled and recyclable fibre. This could be represented as a circular economy target.
- Companies may be awarded three points if the target is qualitative using terms such as 'all' or 'our entire fibre supply'.
- To receive ten points the target date should be no later than two years after target submissions and should be for a universal minimum threshold of 50% recycled content.

QUESTION 4.1

Does the company report on progress against its target for achieving no deforestation and/or no conversion?

RATIONALE

Regular public reporting against targets allows companies to demonstrate progress on an issue and remain accountable for the delivery of their commitments and policies. Companies which set a target to achieve no deforestation and/or no conversion in their own operations and supply chains should therefore publicly report on progress against this target.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

The company does not report this information.	0
The company reports that less than 50% of its total operational volume is deforestation-free and conversion-free.	3
The company reports that between 50% and 75% of its total operational volume is deforestation-free and conversion-free.	5
The company reports that between 76% and 100% of its total operational volume is deforestation-free and conversion-free.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- For consistency, this question should be assessing the same evidence used as for question 3.1 on no deforestation/no conversion targets.
- Qualitative reporting is not sufficient for points.
- Companies can only score points for this question if they are reporting against a clear target. Stating volumes of fibre certified in absence of a clear target is not sufficient to score points on this question.
- The scope of the reporting should be clear. It should be clear that the reporting is against total operational volumes. Figures should be broken down between own operations and purchased fibre when relevant.
- Where the scope is not clear, no points are awarded.
- The system used to verify the reporting is not assessed in this question.

QUESTION 4.2

Does the company report the percentage of its fibre produced, sourced or used which have been third party verified as deforestation and/or conversion free?

RATIONALE

Third party verification improves the credibility and reliability of a company reporting its no deforestation/no conversion data. Companies which report quantitatively the percentage of the fibre produced, sourced or used as deforestation-free and conversion-free should therefore clarify the scope of the reporting which is third party verified and the name of the verification system.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

The company does not report this information or there is no evidence that this reported information is third party verified. OR Whilst some reported volumes/proportions have been third party verified, the scope of this reporting is not clear. OR Whilst some reported volumes/proportions have been third party verified; this data is more than three years old.	0
Less than 50% of total operational volumes reported as deforestation-free and conversion-free are third party verified.	3
Between 50% and 75% of total operational volumes reported as deforestation-free and conversion-free (within the company's two most recent reporting cycles) are third party verified.	5
Between 76% and 100% of total operational volumes reported as deforestation-free and conversion-free (within the company's two most recent reporting cycles) are third party verified.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- This is not linked to 4.1 or a no deforestation and / or no conversion commitment.
- Qualitative reporting is not sufficient for points.
- Companies do not have to link this reporting back to a no deforestation or no conversion commitment to score points.
- Only FSC 100%, FSC Mix, and FSC Controlled Wood are considered as third-party verification of no deforestation / no conversion data reporting.
- FSC Chain of Custody certification is not considered as third-party verification of no deforestation/no conversion data reporting.
- The scope of the reporting should be clear. It should be clear that the reporting is against total operational volumes. Figures should be broken down between own operations and purchased fibre when relevant.
- Where the scope is not clear, no points are awarded.

QUESTION 4.3

Does the company report the total percentage of fibre (direct and indirect) which is traceable to the level of the Forest Management Unit (FMU)?

RATIONALE

Traceability is an important tool for a company to ensure transparency and compliance in their operations or supply chain with their no deforestation/no conversion commitments. It is important that companies are able to demonstrate they have their own internal traceability system so they can trace wood/fibre to the level of the forest management unit to ensure full traceability of their operations. Regular public reporting allows companies to demonstrate progress on an issue and remain accountable for the delivery of their commitments and policies.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

The company does not report this information.	0
The company provides some reporting on sourcing locations to the Forest Management Unit (FMU) level.	3
The company reports less than 50% of total fibre is traceable to the level of the Forest Management Unit (FMU).	5
The company reports that between 50% and 100% of total fibre is traceable to the level of the Forest Management Unit (FMU).	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- This question only applies to companies that own or control forestry operations / pulp plantations.
- This question is looking for evidence of transparency of location of operations for the companies.
- Companies can be awarded three points by providing evidence with either a list of the certification certificates for the Forest Management Units or the names of the FMUs without providing a breakdown of percentages.
- Companies that report on percentages of fibre supply traceable without clarifying the breakdown between direct and indirect operations can be awarded three points.
- The assessor should capture any information which lists location of supply without any percentages or volumes attached.

QUESTION 4.4

Does the company report the total percentage of fibre (direct and indirect) which is traceable to the level of the processing facility?

RATIONALE

Traceability is an important tool for a company to ensure transparency and compliance in their operations or supply chain with their deforestation-free and conversion-free commitments. It is important that companies are able to demonstrate they have their own internal traceability system so they can trace fibre to at least the level of the fibre processing facility. Regular public reporting allows companies to demonstrate progress on an issue and remain accountable for the delivery of their commitments and policies.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

The company does not report this information.	0
The company reports 100% of fibre traceable to the country of origin.	3
The company reports less than 50% of total fibre which is traceable to the level of the sourcing area or pulp mill.	5
The company reports between 50% and 100% of fibre which is traceable to the level of the sourcing area or pulp mill.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Sourcing area is the geographically defined area such as the state/province/county/region/jurisdiction that is below the country level.
- Companies that report on percentages of fibre supply traceable without clarifying the breakdown between direct and indirect operations can be awarded three points.
- The assessor should capture any information which lists location of supply without any volumes attached.

QUESTION 4.5

Does the company report the area of Intact Forest Landscape (IFL) found within all its operations?

RATIONALE

Primary forests and Intact Forest Landscapes represent critical ecological values encompassed within the definition of Ancient and Endangered Forests (AEFs). Companies that have made a commitment to prohibit sourcing as part of their commitment to protecting AEFs and have scored points for question 1.3 can disclose the area of Intact Forest Landscape within their operations to evidence reporting against this commitment.

The information required to evidence this question is a replication of the Zoological Society of London's SPOTT expectations for disclosure on Intact Forest Landscapes by forest product producers. The ZSL SPOTT tool assesses 100 timber and pulp producers, processors and traders on their public disclosure.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

The company does not report this information.	0
The company reports the area of Intact Forest Landscape (IFL) found within all its operations. However, this reporting is either between two and five years old or does not cover the company's known scope of its operations, or contains contradictory figures which are published from the same time period (i.e., same year).	5
The company reports the area of Intact Forest Landscape (IFL) found within all its operations. This reporting has been produced within the last two years.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- This question only applies to companies that own or control forest operations.
- These criteria are duplicated from ZSL SPOTT Timber and Pulp assessment question 21.
- The company would not score any points if the data is over five years old, is undated or the figures provided aggregates are set aside by the company and its suppliers.
- Reported figures for IFL need to be cross referenced across different reporting platforms by the company including Annual Reports and Sustainability reports. Contradictory figures are those which deviate from each other by more than 5%. For example, if the Annual Report states 20,178 ha planted and the Sustainability Report states a figure which is 1,008 ha more or less than 20,178, then these are deemed contradictory figures.

QUESTION 4.6

Does the company report on the actions and outcomes it takes to protect and enhance High Conservation Value (HCV) forest?

RATIONALE

Regular public reporting allows companies to demonstrate progress on an issue and remain accountable for the delivery of their commitments and policies. Companies should therefore report on their actions to protect and enhance HCV forest.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

No evidence of actions taken by the company.	0
The company reports on its actions to protect and enhance at least one identified High Conservation Value within their supply chain. However, these efforts are in areas which the company continues to source from or it is not clear if the company is sourcing from these areas.	5
The company reports on its efforts to protect and enhance at least one identified High Conservation Value within their supply chain and it is clear that these efforts are in areas which have been excluded from their supply chain and set aside for protection.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- To be awarded ten points companies must name the individual HCVs they are protecting in named locations. The company must be clear that the work is to protect identified HCVs and that the area has been excluded from its own operations or supply chain.

QUESTION 4.7 A

Does the company report the proportion of fibre content that is Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certified?

RATIONALE

Regular public reporting allows companies to demonstrate progress on an issue and remain accountable for the delivery of their commitments and policies. Aggregated reporting against the labels under which FSC products can be certified can create confusion for stakeholders. Therefore, in addition to having clear policy commitments and targets which relate to FSC fibre certification, companies should report on the proportion of virgin fibre content which is derived from FSC-certified managed forests.

SCORING MAX SCORE 10

The company does not report this information.	0
The company reports an aggregated figure of certified fibre content/forests.	3
The company reports the proportion of its fibre content which is derived from FSC-certified forests and/or the proportion of its forests which are FSC-certified.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- This question is looking for the companies to break down the percentage of fibre certified to the levels of FSC 100%, and FSC Mix.
- Reporting against a breakdown of FSC Chain of Custody certified operations does not count.

QUESTION 4.7 B

What is the percentage of wood/fibre used by the company that is Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)-certified?

RATIONALE

Regular public reporting allows companies to demonstrate progress on an issue and remain accountable for the delivery of their commitments and policies. Therefore, in addition to having clear policy commitments and targets which relate to FSC certification, companies should report on the proportion of virgin fibre content which is derived from FSC-certified forests.

SCORING NOT SCORED

Not scored. Assessors capture the reported figure only.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- The second part of this question will not be scored. However, assessors should capture the proportion of reported FSC fibre certified to the levels of FSC 100%, and FSC Mix as a percentage.
- The assessor should not include figures related to FSC Chain of Custody or FSC Recycled. This question is just looking to capture certified virgin fibre.

QUESTION 4.8

Does the company report on the details of grievances raised against it (with or without a formalized grievance mechanism) as well as responses and resolutions to these (including status and time frames)?

RATIONALE

Regular public reporting allows companies to demonstrate progress on an issue and remain accountable for the delivery of their commitments and policies. Therefore, in addition to having a formalized and accessible grievance mechanism, companies should publicly report the details of grievances raised, alongside responses and resolutions to these. Third party verification improves the credibility and reliability of company reporting. Therefore, companies reporting such information should also provide evidence that this has been third party verified or that there have been other forms of independent community support for the resolution.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

The company does not report this information.	0
The company reports on grievances raised against it, however does not outline the responses and resolutions to the grievances raised.	3
The company reports on the grievances raised against it and outlines the responses and resolutions to these. However, there is no evidence that this reporting is third party verified or of other forms of independent community support for the resolution.	5
The company reports on the grievances raised against it and outlines the responses and resolutions to these. This reporting has either been third party verified or there is evidence that the resolution has received other forms of independent community support.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- This question only applies to companies that own or control forestry operations/pulp plantations.
- Relevant information will likely be found in company grievance trackers.
- Even though reporting must have occurred within the company's two most recent reporting cycles to score points, recent reporting includes historic resolutions to cases which are more than two years old.
- Companies which state that they consult stakeholders as part of their resolution process should not receive full points as this is not considered third party verification.

QUESTION 4.9 A

Does the company report on its annual total recycled packaging fibre inputs?

RATIONALE

Regular public reporting allows companies to demonstrate progress on an issue and remain accountable for the delivery of their commitments and policies. Therefore, in addition to having a clear policy commitment to maximize the use of recycled fibre inputs in packaging paper, companies should report the percentage of recycled fibre inputs used in their packaging paper product lines.

SCORING MAX SCORE 5

The company does not report this information.	0
The company reports its annual total recycled fibre inputs as a percentage of total fibre inputs.	3
The company reports its annual total recycled fibre inputs for packaging paper as a percentage of total fibre inputs.	5

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Context is important here as terms such as ‘recovered’ and ‘reused’ are not always used as equivalent terms to recycled fibre. If the company is describing a process of efficient use such as incorporating off cuts back into their production system, this is not considered recycled fibre.
- References to ‘fibre optimization’ are not sufficient for points as this is considered efficient use of fibre unless it is clear they are describing optimising the number of times a fibre can be recycled.
- Relevant information will likely be found in the company's Sustainability/ESG Report or on their corporate webpage.
- To be awarded five points the company is not required to break down its reporting to different packaging paper products to score points. However, it must be clear that it is reporting on recycled fibre for packaging paper production specifically.
- If the company only manufactures packaging paper and they report the total percentage of recycled fibre used, this would be sufficient for points.
- Assessors should capture reporting on the use of FSC recycled certification.

QUESTION 4.9 B

What is the percentage of reported total annual recycled packaging fibre inputs?

RATIONALE

Regular public reporting allows companies to demonstrate progress on an issue and remain accountable for the delivery of their commitments and policies. Therefore, in addition to having a clear policy commitment to maximize the use of recycled fibre inputs in packaging paper, companies should report the percentage of recycled fibre inputs used.

SCORING NOT SCORED

Not scored. Assessors capture the reported figure only.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- The second part of this question will not be scored.
- Assessors should capture the reported figure for the company's total annual recycled fibre inputs.

QUESTION 4.10

Does the company report on its efforts to improve the recycled fibre supply chain?

RATIONALE

Products designed to ensure they can be recycled and access to recycled fibre act as constraints to the increasing availability of recycled fibre in many countries. Ensuring sufficient supply of recycled fibre helps to relieve the pressures on forests. Companies that develop products to ensure they can be fully recycled and/or support initiatives to increase fibre availability for recycling are demonstrating progress towards improving recycled fibre availability within the packaging sector.

SCORING MAX SCORE 5

The company does not report this information.	0
The company reports that it either designs products that can be 100% recycled or is part of an industry collaboration/initiative to increase the availability of recycled fibre entering national markets. However, the company does not report on both.	3
The company reports that both designs products that can be 100% recycled and is part of an industry collaboration/initiative to increase the availability of recycled fibre entering national markets	5

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Sector initiatives include collaborations with government, circular design organisations, supply chain actors and NGOs with the aim of increasing the availability of recycled fibre entering supply chains.
- Examples of such initiatives include 4evergreen.

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS AND SCORING

SECTION 2: NEXT GENERATION SOLUTIONS

Next Generation Solutions: Policy and Commitments

QUESTION 5.1

Does the company acknowledge the need to develop Next Generation fibre solutions in order to reduce the pressures of forest conversion?

RATIONALE

The utilization of Next Generation fibres is an effective strategy which can be used by companies to eliminate the use of Ancient and Endangered Forest (AEFs) in paper packaging production.

Next Generation fibres are non-wood agricultural residues and alternative fibres, such as waste left over after the grain harvest, food industry waste, dedicated crops (those that fix carbon in the soil and don't compete with food crops), and other available feedstocks. Next Generation fibres have 95% to 130% fewer GHG emissions, 88% to 100% less land-use impacts and 5x lower impact on biodiversity and threatened species (Canopy website).

Companies should therefore acknowledge the development of Next Generation fibre solutions as an issue relevant to their business.

SCORING MAX SCORE 10

No evidence that Next Generation fibre solutions are regarded as a relevant business issue.	0
The company identifies Next Generation fibre solutions as a relevant business issue.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Next Generation fibres are non-wood agricultural residues and alternative fibres like waste left over after the grain harvest, food industry waste, dedicated crops (those that fix carbon in the soil and don't compete with food crops), and other available feedstocks. Companies are not required to use the specific term 'Next Generation fibres' to score points, however, must demonstrate broad alignment with this definition.
- To score points for alternative fibres, the company must clearly state that these are alternatives to wood as opposed to alternative to plastics.
- Companies that acknowledge Next Generation fibres as a relevant business issue and/or set out the reasons why it might be a business issue (e.g., because of public/customer concerns, security and sustainability of supply, cost, etc) are awarded points.
- Companies which publish policies that address Next Generation fibres, even if they do not explain why this is a relevant business issue, may also be awarded points.
- The score does not take account of the importance assigned by companies to Next Generation fibres (e.g., relative to other corporate responsibility issues).

QUESTION 5.2

Does the company have a published policy or stated commitment to Next Generation fibres?

RATIONALE

The utilization of Next Generation fibres is an effective strategy which can be used by companies to eliminate the use of Ancient and Endangered Forest (AEFs) in paper packaging production.

Next Generation fibres are non-wood agricultural residues and alternative fibres, such as waste left over after the grain harvest, food industry waste, dedicated crops (those that fix carbon in the soil and don't compete with food crops), and other available feedstocks. Next Generation fibres have 95% to 130% fewer GHG emissions, 88% to 100% less land-use impacts and 5x lower impact on biodiversity and threatened species (Canopy website).

Companies should therefore formalise their approach to the Next Generation fibres in a commitment, policy or equivalent document (such as a statement of guiding principles, code of practice, or sourcing charter). Whilst the existence of a commitment/policy does not guarantee implementation, the absence of a commitment/policy suggests that Next Generation fibres are not firmly on the business agenda.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

No evidence of a published policy or stated commitment to Next Generation fibres.	0
The company has published a policy/stated commitment to Next Generation fibres. However, there is no description of how the policy is to be implemented.	5
The company has published a policy/stated commitment to Next Generation fibres, including a description of the processes in place to ensure that this is effectively implemented.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- The assessment does not differentiate between companies which publish stand-alone Next Generation fibre policies and companies which incorporate Next Generation fibres into wider responsible sourcing or sustainability policies or codes of practice.
- Policies issued by company subsidiaries are not sufficient for points, as these are not considered as overarching policies.

QUESTION 6.1

Does the company support the development of commercial-scale production of pulp, paper and packaging from sustainable alternative fibre sources?

RATIONALE

The development and use of alternative fibre sources in paper packaging is a collective issue for corporations as well as being an individual issue for companies to manage. Making progress therefore requires individual companies to support broader efforts into the development of commercial-scale alternative fibre solutions.

Investing in research and development, partnerships or collaborations aimed at exploring Next Generation fibres demonstrates progress towards development of commercial-scale solutions.

SCORING

MAX SCORE 10

No evidence that the company supports the development of commercial-scale production of pulp, paper and packaging from sustainable alternative fibre sources.	0
The company reports that it is engaged in research, development or partnerships related to the development of alternative fibres.	3
The company self-reports that it produces a minimum of 50,000 tons of alternative fibre solutions. However, the company does not have any relevant products listed on Canopy's EcoPaper Database.	5
The company has at least one relevant product which is commercially available.	10

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Canopy uses its EcoPaper Database to determine if a company's activities are considered 'commercial scale'.
- When assessing companies using Canopy's EcoPaper Database, assessors should apply the following filters:
  (3) Company: Select relevant company
  (4) Non Wood Fibres: 'Select all'
- Companies may be awarded ten points for any product which appears in the EcoPaper Database when the above filters are applied, even if this product does not directly apply to packaging.
- Companies may also be awarded ten points for listing a product on their own website that is stated as being commercially available for use now and meets the required definition of Next Generation fibre.

QUESTION 7.1 A

Does the company disclose the annual total Next Generation fibre usage?

RATIONALE

Regular public reporting allows companies to demonstrate progress on an issue and remain accountable for the delivery of their commitments and policies. Therefore, in addition to having clear policy commitments and targets which relate to Next Generation fibres, companies should quantitatively report on their usage of these.

SCORING MAX SCORE 10

The company does not report this information.	0
The company publishes the total annual usage of Next Generation fibre. However, the company does not disclose this figure as a proportion of total fibre used.	5
The company publishes the total annual usage of Next Generation fibre as a proportion of total fibre used.	10

QUESTION 7.1 B

What is the percentage of reported total annual Next Generation fibre inputs?

RATIONALE

Regular public reporting allows companies to demonstrate progress on an issue and remain accountable for the delivery of their commitments and policies. Therefore, in addition to having clear policy commitments and targets which relate to Next Generation fibres, companies should quantitatively report on their usage of these.

SCORING NOT SCORED

Not scored. Assessors capture the reported figure only.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- The second part of this question will not be scored.
- Assessors should only capture the company's reported figure for its total annual Next Generation fibre inputs as a percentage.