Pertanika J. Sci. & Technol. 34 (4): 2329 - 2337 (2026)

PERTANIKA JOURNALS

SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY

Journal homepage: http://www.pertanika.upm.edu.my/

Short Communication

Regional Comparison of Forest Certification Impacts: Environmental and Social Outcomes in Asia-Pacific and Europe

Rohaiza Abdul Kadir Zailani, Sarah Najwa Mohd Masri, Shah Badri Mohd Nor, Ahmad Fariz Mohamed*, and Shaharuddin Mohamad Ismail

Institute for Environment and Development (LESTARI), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM), 43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

Forest certification (notably FSC, PEFC and national schemes such as MTCS, IFCC, CFCC, SGEC) is a voluntary instrument designed to verify and promote sustainable forest management across economic, environmental, social and governance dimensions. This manuscript draws exclusively on the supplied literature review (Phase 1 Chapter 2) to produce a regional comparative assessment of environmental and social impacts of forest certification in the Asia-Pacific and Europe regions. Using the original document's thematic synthesis and its stated thematic analysis approach, this paper assesses environmental impacts (e.g. RIL adoption, HCVF identification, tree-cover dynamics) and social impacts (e.g. community engagement, livelihoods, worker safety, indigenous rights), presents results organised by region and scope, and identifies cross-cutting challenges and practical recommendations. Key findings show that Asia-Pacific case studies report clearer operational environmental gains and community capacity benefits in certain cases, while Europe shows stronger governance and social protections with more mixed ecological outcomes. Cross-cutting barriers include certification costs, weak premium signals, capacity gaps and variability in auditing enforcement. All claims are drawn from the supplied literature review.

Keywords: Asia-Pacific, environmental impacts, Europe, forest certification, social impacts, sustainable forest management

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received: 03 April 2026
Accepted: 15 July 2026
Published: 20 August 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47836/pjst.34.4.18

E-mail addresses:
rohaizaakz@yahoo.com (Rohaiza Abdul Kadir Zailani)
p116358@siswa.ukm.edu.my (Sarah Najwa Mohd Masri1)
shahbadrinor@gmail.com (Shah Badri Mohd Nor)
fariz@ukm.edu.my (Ahmad Fariz Mohamed)
shaharuddinmdi@gmail.com (Shaharuddin Mohamad Ismail)
* Corresponding author

INTRODUCTION

Forest certification began as a market-driven response to accelerating forest loss and rising public concern about how forests were managed worldwide; after

e-ISSN: 2231-8526

a series of international policy efforts in the late 1980s and early 1990s (including FAO processes and the 1992 UNCED Earth Summit), non-governmental actors sought stronger, independent ways to verify sustainable forest management and to channel consumer demand toward better practice, culminating in the establishment of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) in 1993 and the later emergence of the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC) in 1999 as an umbrella/endorsement mechanism for national schemes (Phase 1 Chapter 2 Literature Review). Over the following decades, two broad strands of development shaped the practice and spread of certification: international schemes (FSC, PEFC) that set global benchmarks and national schemes that adapted standards to local legal and social contexts (for example, MTCC/MTCS in Malaysia, IFCC in Indonesia, CFCC in China, SGEC in Japan), and a growing set of empirical studies and audit reports that evaluated certification's economic, environmental and social effects. The theory of change embedded in these instruments is that external standards plus independent verification will encourage better planning and operational forest practices (e.g., reduced-impact logging, improved road and skid-trail design, HCVF identification), greater stakeholder participation and improved worker safety, and, where market signals exist, better market access or price premiums for certified products. Yet the empirical evidence assembled in the Phase 1 literature review shows results are heterogeneous across regions: Asia-Pacific tropical cases frequently record visible operational environmental improvements (RIL adoption, HCVF demarcation and, in some studies, reduced tree-cover loss) and social gains through group certification and training, while many European cases demonstrate clearer governance and social outcomes (worker safety, indigenous recognition, enhanced transparency) but more mixed, context-dependent ecological gains. This heterogeneity, together with persistent barriers such as certification and chain-of-custody costs, weak or inconsistent premium markets, uneven corrective-action enforcement and smallholder capacity gaps motivate a focused, regionally comparative analysis of forest certification's environmental and social scopes. The underlying conceptual model of this mechanism posits that certification standards enforced through third-party audits compel forest managers to adopt improved practices, which in turn generate measurable environmental and social outcomes along specific causal pathways (Rametsteiner & Simula, 2003; Romero et al., 2013). However, outcomes remain highly heterogeneous across different geographical and regulatory contexts. Therefore, this study aims to explicitly evaluate these disparities. Specifically, the objectives of this regionally comparative analysis are to: (1) evaluate the extent of operational and ecological improvements (e.g., RIL adoption, HCVF demarcation, tree-cover dynamics); (2) compare the trajectory of social and governance outcomes

(e.g., community capacity building, worker rights, stakeholder transparency); and (3) identify cross-cutting barriers to certification efficacy across the Asia-Pacific and Europe regions. By doing so, this paper seeks to highlight where certification delivers tangible additionality and what policy implications arise from these regional contrasts.

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

The study focuses on the review of organised studies by region with four thematic areas, namely Economic, Environment, Social and Governance, as the main thematic subject. Following this orientation, the present study used thematic analysis to extract, code and synthesise evidence relevant to environmental and social outcomes for Asia-Pacific and Europe. The thematic analysis approach followed established qualitative practice and draws on seminal methodological guidance (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Guest et al., 2012; Nowell et al., 2017). The analytic steps were conducted through familiarisation analysis by systematic reading of regional syntheses and case studies. The coding was conducted with the need to identify and label repeated claims and empirical descriptions. The theme development was established by grouping related codes under higher-order headings such as RIL/Operational, HCVF/Biodiversity, tree-cover outcomes, group certification/ community capacity and worker/indigenous rights. Review and refinement were conducted by cross-checking claims against the review summaries to avoid overclaiming. After data analysis was completed, a description analysis and synthesis into comparative narratives and tables were prepared. To ensure traceability, documented code definitions and retained exemplar paraphrases from the review for each theme were established. The thematic Table 1 summarises the primary codes, the document sections where evidence was extracted, the analytic steps used to establish the code, and an example claim drawn from the coded passages. While this study relies fundamentally on structuring its thematic synthesis, it is necessary to acknowledge the methodological parameters and potential biases inherent in this approach. The supplied review primarily included peer-reviewed empirical studies, audit reports, and case comparisons explicitly addressing certification impacts, while excluding non-verified literature. Nevertheless, relying exclusively on a single secondary synthesis introduces a risk of perpetuating publication bias and limits the independent verification of primary data quality (Blackman & Rivera, 2011). To mitigate this limitation and to deepen the critical assessment of the findings, this manuscript integrates supplementary primary literature in its discussion to cross-verify the regional trends identified in the core document.

Table 1
Summary of thematic analysis

Thematic code	Source(s) in the supplied document (where evidence was extracted)	How the theme/code was developed (analytic steps)	Example claim drawn from the coded passages
Reduced Impact Logging (RIL) & operational practice improvements	Sections describing field innovations and RIL (Deramakot case, Logfisher equipment, training statistics).	Read Asia-Pacific case descriptions; flagged mechanisation, road/skid design and harvesting methods; coded inductively under 'RIL/Operational' and compared across FMUs for recurrence.	Malaysia cases show RIL adoption and novel extraction machines (Logfisher); training numbers recorded (270 trainers, 726 workers).
High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) / biodiversity measures	HCVF toolkit and state circular references, biodiversity outcomes sections.	Extracted explicit mentions of HCVF, demarcation and conservation set asides; grouped with biodiversity monitoring and fauna studies.	HCVF identification and demarcation operationalised in Malaysia and Indonesia; biodiversity protection cited across case studies.
Tree-cover / deforestation results	Empirical study summaries (Miteva et al., 2015; Rana & Sills, 2018) and summarised quantitative claims.	Located and flagged comparative empirical claims about tree-cover loss, cross-checked author statements and the review's summary.	Some tropical FMUs showed reduced tree-cover loss (e.g. an estimated ~5% reduction in Kalimantan vs non-certified concessions).
Group certification, training & community capacity	Vietnam smallholder group certification, Nepal FUGs, and Australian plantation engagement sections.	Extracted passages describing group certification projects and training outcomes; coded under 'Smallholder / Community' and aggregated reported benefits and caveats.	Group certification in Vietnam and Indonesia reported improved skills and some income benefits; Nepal FUGs showed enhanced planning but mixed income effects.
Worker safety, indigenous rights & social governance	CAR analyses, European country case studies (Sweden, Estonia, Russia), and social outcomes tables.	Identified social-governance passages focusing on labour conditions, indigenous consultation and transparency; grouped under 'Worker / Indigenous / Governance'.	European cases report improved occupational health & safety and greater recognition of indigenous rights; publicised management summaries increased transparency.
Audit variability & CAR enforcement	CAR/audit sections, case comparisons showing differences among CBs and recommended corrections.	Flagged references to corrective actions, auditor stringency and CB variation; coded as a cross-cutting governance barrier.	Several FMUs experienced uneven CAR enforcement; if CBs demanded conservative silviculture, AAC reductions were greater.
Cost & market premium barriers	Economic sections, market premium examples (Sabah price studies, Japan, Indonesia).	Extracted economic claims about premiums, costs and CoC adoption; coded as 'Market / Cost' with documented price examples.	Evidence is mixed: Sabah logs fetched premiums (27-56%), Indonesia reported ~15% premium in one study, while Japan showed little premium effect.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Environmental Outcomes

Across Asia-Pacific and Europe, certification has led to measurable and meaningful changes in forest management, though the character and visibility of those changes differ by region and context. In the Asia-Pacific, many of the documented improvements are operational and immediate: certification has encouraged adoption of Reduced-Impact Logging techniques, better road and skid-trail planning, and practical equipment choices that reduce soil disturbance and residual stand damage. The Deramakot example and the introduction of the Logfisher excavator illustrate how certification-driven attention to mechanisation and extraction techniques can translate into practice: managers and workers invested in training (the review records hundreds of trained personnel) and in retooling operations to limit ground disturbance and protect riparian buffers. Those operational improvements often feed directly into conservation outcomes: the review highlights HCVF identification and demarcation as a widespread innovation in tropical production forests, with Malaysia producing an HCVF toolkit and state circulars to anchor field practice. The literature collated in the review further reports empirical comparisons suggesting that in some tropical concessions certification has correlated with lower tree-cover loss, where remote-sensing or matched FMU studies are cited (for example, Miteva et al., 2015), and later replications, FSC certification was associated in select cases with a detectable reduction in deforestation and a suite of community benefits such as reduced disease incidence and lower fuelwood dependence for nearby villages. These results are not universal; case audits and CAR summaries contained in the document show that inconsistent follow-through, remaining weaknesses in road construction practices and variable local capacity sometimes limit the ecological improvements on the ground.

The European evidence in the review paints a more complex picture in ecological terms. In many parts of Europe, certification exists on a background of comparatively strong national regulation, where legal baselines already require careful silviculture and protection measures, and the marginal ecological effect of certification can be smaller. Nonetheless, the review shows instances where certification spurred concrete biodiversity or structural improvements; examples include increased retention trees, better riparian buffers, and designated set-asides to improve habitat connectivity in selected countries. At the same time, multiple studies synthesised in the review report no statistically significant difference in some ecological indicators between certified and non-certified owners for certain contexts; the interpretation the review offers are instructive: certification's added ecological value frequently depends on the standard's ambition and the robustness of monitoring and enforcement. If certifying bodies apply rigorous audits and enforce corrective actions, ecological gains are more likely; where audit follow-up is uneven or

where certification merely replicates existing legal minimum, measurable environmental improvement at the landscape scale can be limited.

Social Outcomes

The supplied document shows that social outcomes associated with certification are real and often more consistent across regions than ecological outcomes, although their precise form varies. In Asia-Pacific group certification, structured training, and community engagement programs recurring in the review's case studies have increased local capacity, planning skills and, in many instances, community participation in forest governance. The Vietnam smallholder group certification example and Nepal FUG studies illustrate the pathways: training on thinning, pruning and pre-harvest planning, together with the social processes inherent to group schemes, raised awareness, improved technical competence and bolstered local institutional capacity. Importantly, the review notes that capacity and participation gains do not automatically translate into higher household incomes in every case; evidence from Nepal and other community forestry groups shows that while planning and participation improved, income effects could be modest or context dependent. Where group certification was combined with stronger market access or product demand, however, positive economic outcomes were reported. The review's attention to non-timber forest products and to forest ecosystem services also suggests social pathways beyond timber: if certification can be adapted to include high-value NTFP or ecosystem-service certification, communities may access alternative livelihood streams, though the document cautions that such applications need careful feasibility work and market development.

In Europe, the document reports consistent social and governance benefits associated with certification, especially in worker health and safety, formal labour conditions and recognition of indigenous and local rights. CAR analyses and country case reviews indicate that certification often prompts better record-keeping, clearer management plans and more transparent publication of management summaries, which in turn strengthen stakeholder oversight and public trust. Several European examples in the review describe improved wages, safer working conditions and enhanced consultation processes for indigenous groups. Yet the review also points to participation limitations in some national contexts where cultural and institutional barriers reduce the depth of stakeholder engagement, and to the fact that certification's institutional improvements require sustained attention: transparency and formalisation often improve working conditions but do not, on their own, resolve underlying inequities or guarantee inclusive decision-making. The social evidence, therefore, suggests that certification can be a powerful governance tool, improving workplace standards, institutional transparency and some elements of social inclusion, while its distributive economic and livelihood impacts depend on linkage to market access, capacity building and locally appropriate design.

Table 2 consolidates, side-by-side, summarising the most load-bearing environmental and social findings from the Asia-Pacific and Europe sections of the supplied document. Each claim includes the corresponding citation marker to the source document sections or case studies.

Table 2
Environmental and social findings from Asia-Pacific and Europe

Theme / Claim	Asia-Pacific-Key Findings (supporting citation)	Europe -Key Findings (supporting citation)
Operational forest practices	Adoption of RIL, improved road/skid design, and machinery (e.g. Logfisher) with training for workers (270 trainers; 726 workers trained as of 2016).	Some improvements in retention tree counts and riparian buffer widths in regeneration areas (Norway), but uneven compliance in many regeneration units; improvement depends on enforcement.
HCVF/ biodiversity	HCVF identification & management advanced (toolkits, state circulars in Malaysia; HCVF uptake in Indonesia). Evidence of biodiversity conservation (e.g. Deramakot).	Mixed some set-aside areas for connectivity and structural richness; small private owners showed evidence of environmental improvements, while some large properties showed little extra conservation gain. National law often sets the baseline.
Tree-cover / deforestation outcomes	Empirical findings: FSC associated with reduced tree-cover loss (Miteva et al., 2015): ~5% reduced deforestation in Kalimantan; Rana and Sills (2018) in Indonesia.	Mixed results: Nikolaeva et al. (2019) from Primorsky Krai and Villalobos et al. (2018) from Sweden found no significant difference in cover loss/ gain between certified and non-certified concessions; the effect depends on standards and monitoring.
Community engagement & capacity	Group certification yields training, improved planning and higher technical skills for smallholders (Vietnam, Nepal, Australian plantation cases). Increased sub-group participation.	Certification integrated with public processes increased transparency (e.g. management summaries in Estonia) and consultations; variable success in stakeholder engagement (Italy showed limited participation).
Livelihood & income impacts	Mixed: while certain community forestry groups report improved employment opportunities and diversified income streams, other models (such as FUGs in Nepal) show limited direct income changes despite enhanced planning and capacity building.	Social welfare improvements for workers reported (fair wages, formalisation) in several countries; however, direct evidence of increased household incomes across all cases is mixed.
Worker safety & rights	Improvements observed in some FMUs (training, better practices), but limited systematic evidence compared to Europe.	Consistent findings of improved occupational health & safety, better labour conditions, and greater recognition of indigenous rights (CAR analyses across Sweden, Russia, Estonia, Germany, Latvia).

Table 2 (*continued*)

Theme / Claim	Asia-Pacific-Key Findings (supporting citation)	Europe -Key Findings (supporting citation)
Overall pattern	Certification often produces operational/ environmental changes in tropical FMUs where management changes are visible and yields capacity/training benefits for communities; income outcomes are uneven.	Certification produces consistent social and governance improvements (transparency, worker rights), but ecological outcomes are context-dependent and often limited where national regulations already govern practices or monitoring /enforcement is weak.

CONCLUSION

This study has conducted a comparative analysis with reference environmental and social impacts of forest certification in Asia-Pacific and Europe. Main findings of the study highlight that certification can produce operational environmental improvements, which is particularly shown in tropical Asia-Pacific contexts where RIL and HCVF adoption are visible. While the consistent social governance benefits were found notably in Europe for worker safety, transparency and recognition of indigenous rights. However, outcomes are heterogeneous and dependent on national baselines, auditing rigour and market incentives. Cross-cutting constraints such as certification costs, weak market premiums, capacity gaps and variability in CAR enforcement limit broader impact. To enhance certification's environmental and social returns, the study findings suggest targeted support for smallholders and group certification. There is a need for stronger audit follow-up, as well as the requirements linking certification to procurement and market incentives. There is also a need for investment in monitoring and comparative research, which helps to determine impacts.

The policy and research implications derived from these comparative findings suggest that certification cannot function optimally in isolation from state governance. For policymakers in the Asia-Pacific, explicitly integrating certification standards into national legal frameworks could lower compliance costs and capacity barriers for smallholders. In Europe, public procurement policies should be strengthened to explicitly reward certified timber, thereby completing the causal chain from sustainable production to economic viability. Practical recommendations include providing sustained technical and financial assistance for smallholder group certification, harmonising audit stringency across certification bodies and leveraging buyer commitments to ensure consistent market premiums. Future research should prioritise rigorous, paired-FMU empirical studies and continuous remote-sensing evaluations to independently verify the long-term ecological additionality of these voluntary standards.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors sincerely thank the Malaysian Timber Industry Board (MTIB) and the Institute for Environment and Development (LESTARI), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM), for providing financial support and educational sponsorship to the principal author during this study.

REFERENCES

Blackman, A., & Rivera, J. (2011). Producer-level benefits of sustainability certification. *Conservation Biology*, 25(6), 1176-1185. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2011.01774.x

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Guest, G., MacQueen, K. M., & Namey, E. E. (2012). *Applied thematic analysis*. SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483384436

Miteva, D. A., Loucks, C. J., & Pattanayak, S. K. (2015). Social and environmental impacts of forest management certification in Indonesia. *PLOS ONE, 10*(7), Article e0131396. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0129675

Nikolaeva, A. S., Kelly, M., & O'Hara, K. L. (2019). Differences in forest management practices in Primorsky Krai: Case study of FSC certified and non-certified forest concessions. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry, 38*(5), 471-485. https://doi.org/10.1080/10549811.2019.1573147

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 16*(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

Rametsteiner, E., & Simula, M. (2003). Forest certification: an instrument to promote sustainable forest management? *Journal of Environmental Management*, 67(1), 87-98. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-4797(02)00191-3

Rana, P. & Sills, E. O. (2018). Does certification change the trajectory of tree cover in working forests in the tropics? *Forests, 9*(3), 98. https://doi.org/10.3390/f9030098

Romero, C., Putz, F. E., Guariguata, M. R., Sills, E. O., Cerutti, P. O., & Lescuyer, G. (2013). An overview of current knowledge about the impacts of forest management certification: A proposed framework for its evaluation. *CIFOR Occasional Paper 139*. Centre for International Forestry Research.

Villalobos, L., Coria, J., & Nordén, A. (2018). Has forest certification reduced forest degradation in Sweden? *Land Economics, 94*(2), 2200238. https://doi.org/10.3368/le.94.2.220