This is wrong. On December 18, Resolute stated that “we would certainly support an equitable consultative mediation process.” We also stated that “the provincial governments of Quebec and Ontario would be the only appropriate overseers of a mediation process. They are the stewards of public forests.” Instead of recognizing this fact, why does FSC choose to misconstrue the facts? Could this be evidence of a strategy to try and isolate Resolute in the public eye?

As FSC is well aware, the issues for which they proposed mediation affect numerous forest products companies—not just Resolute. Others have expressed concerns, and a number of certificates have been terminated or suspended. In fact, FSC suspensions and terminations in Canada currently total 13.8 million hectares. And yet the focus of FSC—like the focus of Greenpeace—has been entirely on Resolute.

The mediation process proposed by FSC carried no set rules. While FSC has been pushing for such a process, Resolute has been engaged in FSC’s existing consultation process on its new Canadian forest management standard. Why is this process never mentioned?

Interestingly, the only ENGO FSC has specifically named in its proposal for a mediation process… is Greenpeace.

That meeting included provincial officials and other industry representatives—not just Resolute. All unanimously expressed concerns about the issues at hand, and committed to work through them within the current FSC consultative process. Again, why does FSC continue to single out Resolute?

Resolute has extensive consultative and commercial partnerships with First Nations across Quebec and Ontario. To imply otherwise is simply untrue.

Resolute has expressed legitimate concerns in a series of lengthy letters to Kim Carstensen—never once receiving a substantive response. Why?

Richard Garneau was an early supporter of FSC. He pushed to adopt FSC certification and Resolute has strongly supported the certification standard since then. Only when Greenpeace began to attack Resolute on various fronts, including its FSC certificates, did issues begin to arise.

Resolute has expressed meaningful concern in a series of lengthy letters to Kim Carstensen—never once receiving a substantive response. Why?

We would be interested to know which “derogative” comments FSC is referring to.

Resolute Forest Products’ attitude and unwillingness to engage in finding a solution to prob-lem raised will be presented to the Board of FSC International at its next meeting in March this year. The Board will be asked to consider Resolute Forest Products application as a member of FSC, or whether there are other means in FSC’s statutes of making it clear that FSC does formally require its members to share the same values of cooperation and constructive engagement that the FSC system is built on,” explained Carstensen.

For more information, contact:

Lisa Smyth
Communications Programme Manager, FSC International
email: l.smyth@fsc.org

Monika Patel
Director of Programs & Communications, FSC Canada
e-mail: m.patel@ca.fsc.org
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The mediation process proposed by FSC carried no set rules. While FSC has been pushing for such a process, Resolute has been engaged in FSC’s existing consultation process on its new Canadian forest management standard. Why is this process never mentioned?

Interestingly, the only ENGO FSC has specifically named in its proposal for a mediation process… is Greenpeace.

What FSC received from Resolute and others were legitimate expressions of concern. Why has FSC never bothered to address these concerns in any meaningful way?

Assuming FSC is referring to Greenpeace, who are leading a fundraising campaign targeting Resolute and misleading the public about the health of the Canadian boreal forest. Resolute has had no choice but to defend its reputation and that of its employees and partners. Given that the case is currently being heard in court, it is unacceptable for FSC to interject. Did FSC propose a mediation process to resolve forest management issues, or to resolve a totally unrelated dispute between two of its members?

We did not create the problems— we simply raised them.

This would be an unfortunate development, as Resolute is still the second largest holder of FSC certificates in Canada and North America.