



**FORESTSTM
FOR ALL
FOREVER**

MOTION SUMMARIES

UPDATED 11 August 2021

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to help members quickly access key information about the motions proposed for the 2021/2022 General Assembly.

On each page you will find the overall objective of the motion, key points, opinions from members, links to the motion discussion on the members portal, motion discussion recordings and a link to the Secretariat's analysis of each motion.

Please note that the motions included in this document are those that have been discussed by the membership and does not include all motions at this time. We will continue to update this document as discussions take place and motions are merged or amended.

We hope you find this document useful in preparation for the General Assembly.

Statutory Motion 02/2020

Change the frequency of FSC Ordinary General Assembly from 3 years to 4 years

Proposed by
Yadira Paulina Baca Teran, Individual, Social South

Seconded by
Cristian Roberto Velasco Ruano, Individual, Environmental South
Nubia Jaramillo, VERDECANANDE S.A., Economic South

Overall objective: Change the frequency of the FSC General Assembly from 3 years to 4 years to reduce costs and effort and provide more time for FSC to focus on implementation of approved motions. [View the full motion and details here.](#)

Key points:

- Would help reduce ecological footprint generated by international travel
- Would be more efficient use of limited financial resources
- It would be nice to have additional time for FSC to execute approved motions and implement the Global Strategy

A few opinions in favor

“Extending the interval from 3-4 years also provides opportunity for the recommendations from regional FSC meetings to be more generally known, discussed and taken up without going through GA motions.” - John Palmer.

“The 4-year sequence would be good, but we should hold regional chamber meetings before the annual meeting, using technology.” - Ruben Cariqueo Huilcan.

Other opinions

“Keeping three years between General Assemblies leads to constant participation of all members. In addition, this period ensures that we see each other more often and analyze topics of interest more efficiently.” - Victor Ruiz

“More time to implement the motions does not necessarily mean more efficiency in doing so. It can end up even worsening the situation because members would need to hold their ideas one more year until they can present them as motions”. - Camilla Maragnon.

“So the key point is what would happen in between the General Assemblies? If there is a clear path forward and FSC has a system to take action on things that aren't official motions, then I would be in favor. Otherwise too many people believe that the only action available to them are motions” - Chris Gibbons

Learn more:

- [Join the discussion or view more opinions on this motion here.](#)
- Listen to members discuss this motion during a motions discussion session: [Watch here](#)
- [Read the FSC Secretariat's analysis of this motion here](#)

BACK

Statutory Motion 03/2020

Establishment of a system for virtual General Assembly to protect the continuous installation of the highest decision-making body and supreme authority of FSC

Proposed by
Dr. TR Manoharan, Individual, Environmental South

Seconded by
Chris van der Goot, Ecohout Foundation, Social North
Jean Bakouma, World Wildlife Fund for Nature France, Environmental North

Overall objective: Develop and establish an innovative, secure, and efficient electronic system and user-friendly technologies that allows FSC international members to have a useful alternative for full and active participation in FSC General Assemblies without in-person attendance.

The Motion proposes to the following addition at the end of first paragraph in Clause 18 of FSC statute: “, *and if the meeting is presential, virtual or both. Also, the call shall point out the place and mechanisms necessary to connect those who are participating virtually and exercising the right to vote*”. [View the full motion and details here.](#)

Key points:

- This motion is proposing to amend clause #18 of FSC statutes and allow to conduct general assemblies with an option for Members to have full participation and voting without their in person attendance in the venue of the meeting.
- This motion is looking to grant members greater power to call assemblies without dependence on funding, availability of a physical place, or situations such as COVID-19 pandemic.
- The Motion is intended to provide more options for conducting FSC General Assembly: Physical, Virtual or Both (a combination of Physical and Virtual).
- The rationale is to protect the highest decision-making body and supreme authority of FSC. We can't afford to lose FSC General Assembly.

A few Opinions in favour

“yes, yes, yes - GA attendance should be available to all members - including those who cannot travel.” - Sarah Billig

“I would not be pessimistic about this in the sense of members having problems to follow the discussions rather this could increase membership participation if the appropriate mechanisms for decision-making are introduced.” – Alan Smith

“In global auctions, both in-person and virtual bids count. It's easy to broadcast the GA on Zoom + move ALL voting online. This would also make it easier to count votes as opposed to current "eye" methodology.” Michael Bekin

“I like the idea of having a mixed model - virtual + physical. It will be challenging to operationalize but is interesting...”- Camilla Marangon

Other opinions

“One point from the secretariat that the motion doesn't consider: How about virtual participation in physical General Assemblies.” - Kim Carstensen.

“I would lean toward only allowing mixed assemblies. That might reduce the concern about 50 members calling for a GA every other month.” - Christopher Gibbons

“Your idea is very relevant and worth a deep discussion. It would be quite easy to structure a system that allows members to participate in the side events and other plenary moments. We appreciate it! What would be much more difficult and costly is a safe system for online voting, especially considering the dynamic changes in the motion wording that happens all the time during the GA. We recommend a careful evaluation to make sure this is legally possible, as well as a cost analysis of a potential safe system. We need this information to decide on establishing a virtual GA or not. Another moment that can be difficult to recreate virtually is the parallel discussions and negotiations about the motions, which are fundamental to help members make informed decisions. We know that most of these negotiations happen during lunch, coffee breaks, and in the hallway. How members could follow up and join these moments virtually? Even if FSC IT brilliantly finds a technological solution for full participation at the GA virtually, its success would still rely on the active engagement of members. Different time zones might be a challenge in this sense. It is very important to consider the expectations of engagement in the cost-benefit analysis.” Camilla Bragotto.

Learn more:

- [Join the discussion or view more opinions on this motion here.](#)
- Listen to members discuss this motion during a motions discussion session: [Watch here](#)
- [Read the FSC Secretariat's analysis of this motion here](#)

BACK

Statutory Motion 04/2020

Strengthening the Network by enhancing membership engagement in regional offices

Proposed by
Alan Smith, Individual, Social North

Seconded by
Zoran Tintor, Individual, Economic South
Elie Olivier Yakam Ngoa, Individual, Environmental South

Overall objective: The change sought is the addition of a membership constituted regional network partner. At present, the membership has no say in how the regional offices are managed and the aim is to ensure that in future the members can participate effectively in their regions. [View the full motion and details here.](#)

Key points:

- The focus is on an inclusive and collective approach to gain synergies by maximizing local knowledge of the membership in a regional context and sharing it across borders
- The organizational model will vary according to local legal conditions but in principle a legally established Independent Regional Network Partner would be established in one country with neighbouring countries affiliated to it
- This would include a composite board of directors drawn from the various participating countries
- Through active membership engagement, multiple advantages to promote certification are realizable collectively and could stimulate an increase in membership in regions where at present there are few international members.

A few Opinions in favor

"I support this motion. We should extend this engagement to national offices also. Cost would not be an issue as more resources can be generated by increased presence and stakeholders participation." - Suneel Pandey

"Members engagement at regional level is crucial. Currently the engagements are inadequate. Alan's motion is appropriate." – TR Manoharan

"I also support this motion because of my experience, the participation of members at the regional level is crucial." – Blandine Nsombo Mosombo

"Decentralisation is crucial for FSC. FSC has become more centralistic over time and at the same time has lost local knowledge and many opportunities to develop certification, especially in the South. Support for motion." – Chis van der Goot

Other opinions

"Although we agree that members should have more voice in the Regional Offices, we are afraid that the establishment of an additional decision-making body in Regional Offices would not be in line with the recommendation of the Governance Review Phase 2. The revision recommends the promotion of the Regional Offices as voices that speak about the local issues without adding another layer to the FSC's governance." - Camilla Marangon

"I don't think we should oversight councils in countries where there are already boards — confusing!" – Jason Grant

Learn more:

- [Join the discussion or view more opinions on this motion here.](#)
- Listen to members discuss this motion during a motions discussion session: [Watch here](#)
- [Read the FSC Secretariat's analysis of this motion here](#)

BACK

Policy Motion 05/2020

FSC Int. Performance

Proposed by
Mike Bekin, Individual, Economic North

Seconded by
Hubert Kwisthout, Individual, Social North
Steve Jennings, Individual, Environmental North

Overall objective: Rethink the structure and functioning of FSC to bring it to a new phase of innovation through a review of roles and responsibilities against the strategic requirements of the organization. [View the full motion and details here.](#)

Key points:

- FSC has grown but not matured – same structure for last 25 years.
- FSC is caught in so much internal bureaucracy it has drifted from its members and Network (60 normative docs).
- An independent review of the structure of FSC to be carried out by an external experienced management consultancy is needed to assess all roles and responsibilities (inc. board) vs. strategic requirements to determine the suitability.

A few Opinions in favor

"I agree FSC's objectives, processes and strategies must be innovative and adapted to the changes in science and technology, mainly in the forestry sector". Jorge Alvarez Melo.

"I strongly support the motion and just a remark on the many parallels that actually came out of the discussions about the network policy". Dirk Riestenpatt

Other opinions

"Rather than a one-off evaluation, a proposal to institutionalize regular independent performance evaluation of the IC would be reasonable". Ben Vickers.

"Accountability and transparency are separate but interlinked aspects of any organization, particularly membership-based organizations. Transparency enhances accountability". Robert Hrubes.

"I agree with the part of the motion. The part on performance evaluation, clear systems for accountability, are critical, also in the context of communicating with the membership. The part that I disagree with, I have issues with the independent review of the system since we haven't seen yet the results of the second phase of the governance review". Heiko Liedeker.

Learn more:

- [Join the discussion or view more opinions on this motion here.](#)
- Listen to members discuss this motion during a motions discussion session: [Watch here.](#)
- [Read the FSC Secretariat's analysis of this motion here.](#)

BACK

Policy Motion 11/2020

Developing and applying social, environmental, and economic indicators for the implementation of the FSC Global Strategic Plan (2021-2026), its monitoring, reporting and assessment

Proposed by
Yadira Paulina Baca Teran, Individual, Social South

Seconded by
Nubia Jaramillo, VERDECANANDE S.A., Economic South
Margaret Stern, Individual, Environmental South

Overall objective: Provide economic, environmental, and social indicators generated by a chamber-balanced working group to implement the Global Strategy 2021-2026 [View the full motion and details here](#).

Key points:

- Concern about global strategy that we only look at getting # of ha and not social, environmental and economic indicators of success
- The motion proposes that FSC develop a chamber balanced working group to develop indicators to assess the implementation of the Global Strategy

A few opinions in favor

“The 2nd draft of the Strategy brings more light to this issue when setting the development of an Operational Plan, however, we think there is still some room for improvement, especially when it comes to monitoring this Operational Plan.”- Camilla Marangon.

“Develop indicator by the members can improve the transparency of the implementation of the GSP” - Gabriel Rafael

Other opinions

“The Secretariat is working on this, perhaps not to the exact extent of the motion. As an organization, the situation is that we didn’t have great data to begin with as it was not built into our standards/system. But now section 2.3 of the global strategy helps to address our commitment to developing data system to look at and assess the impact of FSC certification. Intended outcomes and systems of measurement for the global strategy are being developed and should be ready at the same time as the global strategy approval.” – Kim Carstensen

“There is nothing wrong with the intent of the motion, but a motion is not needed. developing implementation indicators (are we doing what we said we’d do) and effectiveness monitoring indicators (is what we’re doing having the desired effect) are both basic governance and business planning principles. we do MOT need a motion to do this in association with the GSP and associated operational plan.” – Elston Dzus

Learn more:

- [Join the discussion or view more opinions on this motion here](#).
- Listen to members discuss this motion during a motions discussion session: [Watch here](#)
- [Read the FSC Secretariat's analysis of this motion here](#)

BACK

Policy Motion 15/2020

Sustainable Intensification

Proposed by
Dirk Riestenpatt, Individual, Economic North

Seconded by
Nina Griesshammer, Individual, Environmental North
Volker Diefenback, Industriegewerkschaft Bauen-Agrar-Umwelt, Social North

Overall objective: We request the membership to stop the current process for “sustainable intensification” (SI) and continue work on relevant subjects within existing FSC processes and structures. [View the full motion and details here.](#)

Key points:

- The summary of results of the Sustainable Intensification Advisory Group (SIAG) show subjects and contents, which are already integral parts of forest management within the framework of FSC or are definitely prohibited by FSC (GMO – Genetically Modified Organisms).
- The overall objective of the process of SI remains unclear even after a series of international meetings, webinars and conference-calls. It also is unclear why the issue of GMOs are being referred to in presentations around SI, even though SIAG itself excludes GMO explicitly from the process and from a perspective use within FSC.
- Furthermore, a clear mandate of the membership for the work on the subject of GMO and or Genetic Engineering (GE) is lacking.

A few opinions in favour

“Very well put - full support from us - will look forward to hopefully kill this unjustified diversion from the mission of the FSC - the sooner the better!” Jens Holm Kanstrup

“I agree this is an urgent call as this topic was not approved by FSC G.A. to be implemented and lacks clarity about its objectives. Furthermore, Sustainable Intensification is starting to getting in FSC standards, as it was recommended by PSU review report FSC PRO-60-002 V3-0 The Development and Approval of FSC National Risk Assessments and FSC PRO-60-002a V1-0 National Risk Assessment Framework: Another important driver for proposing this revision is the need for alignment of the National Risk Assessment Framework with FSC forest management certification requirements on topics of high relevance such as: forest conversion, commercial logging in IFLs, indigenous and traditional people’s rights, among others. The same applies to other topics relevant to FSC including salvage timber, submerged timber, exceptions on exceptional climatic events like wind damage, floods, etc., sustainable intensification, impact analysis and monitoring framework, SIR, Policy of Association (ongoing work in FSC), and alignment with landscape based approaches (RSB, RSPO, etc.). Furthermore, FSC-PRO-60-002a V1-0 needs to be brought in line with the Risk Based Approaches guidance (FSC-GUI-60-010 V1-0 and FSC-PRO-60-010 V1-0).” Gabriel Coimbra Rafael

“I don't think the discussion yesterday [Motions Discussion on 16 Oct 2020] highlighted enough the real aim of "Sustainable Intensification", a terminology used to disguise the drive to get GMOs into the FSC system. The main advocates of GMOs are the plantation companies in Brazil and yet they did not participate actively. Surprisingly some of the ENGOs opposed to this also did not enter into the discussions. Perhaps we are at the stage of no compromise which does not auger well for FSC as there is a real risk that some organisations will leave FSC if they don't get their way. Like Dirk, I also do not know why this was selected as a major topic by the Secretariat as it came out of the blue, unlike other subjects which have for long been given their deserved attention in the system. To respond to Hubert [comments made on 16 Oct 2020, see below], I agree that plantations do have their place in the system for a variety of reasons but GMOs??” - Alan Smith

Other opinions

“There is a problem with the way that SI has been done. The literature is about how to make plantations more intensive. What we need is an approach where increased intensity is possible in places that are not currently intensely managed. For example in tropical forest management there are almost no post felling silviculture

done and recent research shows this could offer improvements in productivity and profitability. We therefore need to look at where there is little management or in degraded situations [rather than in plantation situations] where an increase in the intensity of management could bring benefits including to biodiversity and ecological services and restore areas much more quickly were they not to be managed.”– Berty (Hubertus) van Hensbergen

“SI has been discussed in different forums, including FAO. We believe that the dialogue on SI will provide support for shared values to certificate holders identifying social and environmental benefits. It is not expected a final product, but an open dialogue, including sensitive themes (as GMO and other biotechnologies) is necessary. The same process, open dialogue and science-based discussion, was adopted by the pesticide policy review and it was considered a success case.” - Patricia Machado

“From my perspective the discussion should be more around optimising resources, whether this [is for] land, forest, [or] community benefits. This also supports initiatives for restoration of degraded areas. Does this form part of the Motion?”... “Plantations may also be planted for protection of natural forests, facilitating restoration of critical ecosystems within a land holding or provision of community wood needs? Hence my original question” – Stuart Valentine

“It seems to me that the future of the production of wood products will have to come from plantation forestry - that is, if we want to preserve the natural forests we still have. When we talk about plantations, we talk along the lines of maximizing yield. There are all kinds of problems associated with such an approach, as we know. So, the required FSC standards for plantation management should be increased significantly. Even so, we - FSC - cannot afford to ignore the scientific developments that are underway, in particular in connection with gene editing. This cannot be wished away, so we should start seriously discussing it.” - Hubert Kwisthout

Learn more:

- [Join the discussion or view more opinions on this motion here.](#)
- Listen to members discuss this motion during a motions discussion session [Watch here.](#)
- [Read the FSC Secretariat's analysis of this motion here](#)

BACK

Policy Motion 24/2021

FSC's advocacy to promote forest management certification in tropical protected areas

Proposed by

Raúl Gilberto López Recinos, Individual member, Social South

Seconded by

Glenda Amarilis Lee Pinto, Individual member, Economic South
Lincoln Quevedo, Individual member, Environmental South

Overall objective: The purpose of this motion is to contribute to the conservation, sustainable management, maintenance or improvement of the ecosystem services, and socio-economic development of populations living in protected areas in the tropics through the implementation of an advocacy program with the governments in relevant countries in the tropics. [View the full motion and details here.](#)

Key Points:

- This motion is linked to the long-term outcomes that FSC proposes in its Global Strategic Plan 2021-2026: "Governments improve policy and regulation, and people and institutions act with a sound knowledge of how their decisions impact forests and how forests impact their lives".
- FSC to set up a chamber balanced Working Group to develop a strategy and an advocacy plan for governments with protected areas in the tropics within 18 months and submit to the plans to the FSC International Board of Directors.
- The purpose of this motion could be achieved through the implementation of incentives from national or local governments, through technical assistance, development projects, marketing, and FSC certification as a guarantee of responsible forest management in protected areas.

A few Opinions in favour

"Protected areas in tropical regions are important, among other things, for climate change issues and certification of ecosystem services is relevant here. However, it needs to be simplified to improve understanding and reduce costs. Motion 48/2020 addresses this aspect". Alan Smith.

"This motion is very important. We must not forget that the FSC was initially developed to find a solution for tropical forests, whose wood was boycotted in the 1980s. And we see today that the majority of certified areas are in temperate and boreal forests. The promotion of sustainable forest management in tropical forest must also be the subject of a real strategy by the international FSC, relayed by national initiatives". Caroline Duhesme

"We support your motion, very welcome! We also agree that different strategies and the involvement of regional offices and national initiatives would be of paramount importance". Ricardo Imaflora.

Other opinions

"Your motion is great and very well aligned with the Global Strategy. However, I think the development of advocacy strategies for tropical forests would be much better done by the National Offices than by an international WG, as Gemma said. Maybe the motion could demand FSC to provide National Offices with the due resources to properly take on this task". Camilla Marangon.

"How does this motion 24 fit with the current proposal for revision of the FSC Network, now in public consultation? Would motion 24 change the roles of FSC regional/national offices?". John Palmer.

“An example of forest management and compliance with FSC P&C within a protected area is in the Multiple Use Zone of the Maya Biosphere Reserve in Guatemala, which has more than 20 years of forest certification to date”. Wylsson Martínez.

“In addition to coordinating with national governments, we should also consider the socialization and articulation with local governments (provincial and district), since they are closer and have a direct relationship with the population settled nearby or within the natural forests”. Jorge Alvarez Melo.

“We need to move from the situation where tropical forests are considered “timber mines” to where tropical forests are "managed" for multiple purposes, including timber production”. Rodrigo Arce.

Learn more:

- [Join the discussion or view more opinions on this motion here.](#)
- Listen to members discuss this motion during a motions discussion session: [Watch here](#)
- [Read the FSC Secretariat's analysis of this motion here.](#)

BACK

Policy Motion 20/2021

Climate Emergency Motion

Proposed by
Mike Bekin, Individual, Economic North

Seconded by
Alan Smith, Individual, Social North
Steve Jennings, Individual, Environmental North

Overall objective: To incorporate the climate emergency into the heart of FSC so that it becomes central to its activities and decisions. [View the full motion and details here.](#)

Key points:

- Forests are one of the most important elements in the fight against climate change.
- FSC wants to remain the global beacon for “responsible” forestry and chose the slogan “Forests for all forever”.
- Strategy 1.4 already says: “Expand the reach of FSC and its relevance in the fight against climate change and loss of biodiversity.”
- Given the above, FSC needs to completely focus its efforts towards creating and maximising its contribution to the global climate and biodiversity emergency.
- Inaction during an emergency is simply irresponsible with forests and people, both current and future.

A few Opinions - in favor

“Motion 20 is critical - and it is worth noting that recent research indicated that forests with elephants sequester and store 7% more carbon than those which have lost their elephants. Thus, healthy forests with their keystone species intact are more valuable in the carbon markets than those without.” – Ian Redmond

“I support this motion but there are also immediate global water security and biodiversity crises. Ecosystem services beyond carbon provided by managed forests must be emphasized, with supporting data!” – Peggy Stern

“I support Mike's motion, it's very important to complement what FSC already does on this issue.” - Raul Lopez

“FSC's entire normative framework is already a solution to mitigate climate change. So the idea of developing a narrative to properly valorize this is terrific. And also the idea of having real data to support this narrative is great. This is indeed very positive for the certificate holders. I would like to see the motion being more specific in this sense. On the other hand, FSC should not be a provider of climate solutions to governments, because this is not FSC's role.” - Camilla Marangon

A few opinions - other:

“The general objective of the motion is important, but what is concretely required by this motion? IGI review? tool for monitoring?” - Caroline Duhesme

“I'd like to understand better how FSC's actions will be different 5 years from now than they would be if present initiatives continue.” - Seth Zuckerman

“I support making climate change concerns and goals as a key guiding focus for work, but it needs to be balanced with key social issues such as worker safety and indigenous peoples' rights” - Shoana Humphries

“The objective is important, but we must seek concrete action to strengthen what is already being done at this time.” - Hernan Zaldívar

“May I suggest the language should be as practical as possible for the Board to be able to help direct specific actions. Every NFSS being developed attempts to address biodiversity, resilient forests and ending conversion and degradation. We are also working on restoration partnerships as well as Carbon mgmt. as well. What would be different as a result of this motion?” - Alan Thorne

“FSC should have an integrated approach to mitigation of climate heating, conservation/restoration of biodiversity and natural ecosystems, clean water, etc.” – John Palmer

“In the implementation of this motion it is important to recognize that it’s not FSC that will really going to do anything but the certificate holders which will be demonstrating in their stewardship, in their management units, how they are responding to the motion. And so what is recommended in detail of the next version of the motion should be geared in two ways 1. What should the certificate holders be doing and 2. How should the certification system be adapted.”

Learn more:

- [Join the discussion or view more opinions on this motion here.](#)
- Listen to members discuss this motion during a motions discussion session: [Watch here](#)
- [FSC International Feasibility plan](#)

Statutory Motion 36/2021

Deletion of Criterion 5.3

Proposed by
Margaret (Peggy) Smith, Individual, Social North

Seconded by
Lineu Siqueira Jr., Individual, Economic South
Sean Cadman, Individual, Environmental North

Overall objective: Removal of Criterion 5.3 from the standard and change the IGIs (FSC-STD-60-004) in conformity with the removal of this Criterion, including removal of the Instructions to Standard Developers for Criterion 5.3 and indicators 5.3.1 and 5.3.2. [View the full motion and details here.](#)

Key Points:

- Several SDGs in the development of their National Forest Stewardship Standards, the Policy and Standards Committee (PSC) and the Forest Management Community have identified Criterion 5.3 and its related IGI as problematic.
- The FSC Board support a recommendation that a statutory motion be presented to the 2021 General Assembly on the removal of Criterion 5.3 and its related IGI and asked PSC to prepare a motion.
- Other principles and criteria also address minimizing environmental impacts and ensuring social and economic benefits.

A few opinions in favor:

“The problem that is identified is that SDGs and National Initiatives report that Indicators in 5.3 are among the most problematic to adapt or amend. The Criterion is so vague that it is very difficult to adapt or amend. It is reported as essentially unauditible”. - Keith Moore.

“The Board has asked the PSC to bring information on trends and issues they are learning through the modernization of the NFSS's across FSC. With almost 40 standards done now, PSC has identified a recurring theme on 5.3.” - Alan Thorne.

A few opinions - other:

“It is not clear what implications this motion would have on compliance with the principles and indicators. How are we not going to foresee the impacts?” - Victor Ruiz.

“Have you taken into consideration the impacts on the revision of all FSC standards (P&Cs, IGIs, regional/national standards)”. - A. Didier Tsanga Ada.

Learn more:

- [Join the discussion or view more opinions on this motion here.](#)
- Listen to members discuss this motion during a motions discussion session: [Watch here](#)
- [Read the FSC Secretariat's analysis of this motion here](#)

BACK

Policy Motion 48/2021

Improvements in Ecosystem Services certification to simplify the procedure, incorporate more services and maximise the potential

Proposed by
Alan Smith, Individual, Social North

Seconded by
Lineu Siqueira Jr., Individual, Economic South
TR Manoharan, Individual, Environmental South

Overall objective: The motion request FSC improves the Ecosystem Services process by simplifying the standard FSC-PRO-30-006 and the accompanying guidance FSC-GUI-30-006. [View the full motion and details here.](#)

Key Points:

- The actual EE.SS. process is complex, confusing, and therefore costly; each service must be verified individually and requires 7 steps.
- FSC is missing the opportunity to demonstrate its relevance to significant issues such as climate change, water source protection, and sustainable resource utilization.
- Only 5 services are included whereas CIFOR has identified 23.
- The marketability of ES certification needs improvement taking a new look at how it is approached. A coherent outreach platform is required to promote the advantages of Ecosystem Services certification to potential end-users.

A few opinions in favor:

"I support this motion. Especially for forests under community management. In Africa it would be an opportunity for these forests that are no longer very rich in marketable species to certify the ecosystem services they contain. Especially the provisioning and socio-cultural services". - Marie Mbolo

"I totally agree with simplification and recognition of the benefits already provided by certificate forests." - Ricardo Camargo Cardoso

"Excellent motion, the market approach is necessary. There is still a lot to be done in the alignment with the market." - Hernán Zaldivar.

A few opinions - other:

"On 48, these are good ideas. I would like to see a clearer articulation of the market value of this certification. How do you sell the claim? How do you monetize it? Who are the buyers and what do they get? How does the claim align with existing schemes to sell ecosystem services? These are things I have found lacking. "A motion to include a new Criterion would then lead to IGI and is a stronger direction. Andrew Goldberg, supported by Camilla Marangon and Caroline Duhesme).

"I'm happy to see this motion. There is enormous potential to develop health and well-being services related to the forests, which is measurable. We should not forget that measuring the impact is not easy, and we need to find the balance between simplicity in the procedure and credibility in the methodology and outcome. Also, we are missing an entity that can play as a broker between supply and demand in the system. Until we don't have that actor, the ES will not fly. They are often not themselves in the position of promoting the ecosystem services declared." - Liviu Amariei.

Learn more:

- [Join the discussion or view more opinions on this motion here.](#)
- Listen to members discuss this motion during a motions discussion session: [Watch here.](#)
- [Read the FSC Secretariat's analysis of this motion here](#)

BACK

Policy Motion 57/2021

A Pathway Towards Expanding Opportunities for Remote Auditing

Proposed by
Melissa Graham, SCS Global Services, Economic North

Seconded by
Alan Smith, Individual Member, Social North
TR Manoharan, Individual Member, Environmental South

Overall objective: FSC shall develop and establish a consistent risk-based approach to remote auditing with the goal of increasing opportunities for conducting remote audits in both FM and COC audit cycles beyond the COVID-19 era. [View the full motion and details here.](#)

Key points:

- Ultimately this motion seeks to set the expectation for FSC that increased opportunities for remote auditing will be included in the revision of FM and CoC evaluation standard revision processes. However, the intent is to not replace all on-site audits, but rather to expand on the current risk-based approach for remote audits.
- If there is reason to believe that the full scope of the audit cannot be confidently and appropriately audited using remote ICT, then the risk-based approach should make it clear that a remote audit would not be allowed.
- If proper Information Communication Technology tools can not be established, then the audit would not be eligible to be conducted remotely.
- If there is risk identified of missing key components in the evaluation, such as access to workers' and indigenous peoples, then a fully remote audit would not be allowed.
- Remote audits mean reduced travel costs which of course is a benefit to certificate holders, an opportunity to curb greenhouse gas emissions and the opportunity to rotate auditors which in turn will help maintain audit rigor.

A few opinions - in favor

"I also support this motion." - Ricardo Camargo Cardoso

"Good motion, I support it. Motion addresses well also possible worries related to remote auditing. It is important to safeguard FSC's credibility if remote auditing will in the future be more often used. We already have good experiences on remote auditing!" - Inka Musta

"I support this motion. Technology is such that rigor can be maintained in most circumstances, bolstered by periodic physical audits as needed." - John Andersen

"We should aggressively encourage and promote remote auditing at all levels. This Motion is a good step towards this." - TR Manoharan

"It is a great and a futuristic motion." - Suneel Pandey

"Remote auditing in low-risk situations is inevitable as technology advances. If we don't evolve, we will experience certificate holders leaving the system. We have already seen key CHs leave the system due to a perception of decreasing value and support of the CHs. We are really focusing on low-risk audits; any higher-risk audits would have to be conducted on-site." - Maggie Schwartz

A few opinions - other:

"I think remote audits are useful for extreme events like the pandemic, but in general, FM Audits need to be on-site. The CoC ones can be remote, without any problem." – Glenda Lee

"Using evolving IT tools is the way to go but social aspects may in many cases still be subject to on-site, in-person auditing." - Alan Smith

"Within an emergency situation you understand the need for this type of audit. However, at the level of FM audits there is a risk that rigor will be lost, for example, the social and environmental aspects." - Alonso Gonzales

"Given the concern about the rigor of a remote audit, I would suggest moving forward first with "case studies", to see if it is really functional." - Lincoln Quevedo

"The motion is very interesting. The remote audits make it possible to go even deeper into the documentation and the discussions. However, it is necessary to have rigid protocols and risk criteria to keep the audits credible." - Camilla Marangon

"In general, fear of risk should not prohibit FSC from developing new solutions to streamline FSC system. But naturally the risk has to be addressed properly and included in the solution design." - Janne Näräkkä

Learn more:

- [Join the discussion or view more opinions on this motion here.](#)
- Listen to members discuss this motion during a motions discussion session: [Watch here](#)
- [Read the FSC Secretariat's analysis of this motion here.](#)

Policy Motion 61/2021

Compile a digital map of FSC-certified forests worldwide

Proposed by
Seth Zuckerman, Northwest Natural Resources Group, Environmental North

Seconded by
Paul Vanderford, Sustainable Northwest, Social North
Linwood Gill, Usual, Redwood Forest Company, Economic North

Overall objective: Increase the credibility and transparency of FSC certification by creating a map of FSC certified forests worldwide, while respecting the privacy needs and desires of some certificate holders. [View the full motion and details here.](#)

Key points:

- Shapefiles showing the boundaries of all forest management certificates would be entered into a database maintained by the FSC Secretariat.
- Certificate holders would decide whether the boundaries of their forest would be made public in "[FSC On the Map](#)."
- The results of a [public certificate search](#) would indicate whether a certified forest could be found on that public map.
- The motion currently calls for certifying bodies to provide the shapefiles to FSC, but an amendment is under consideration to shift the responsibility to the certificate holder.

A few Opinions - in favor

"I agree with the proposal, an interactive map would greatly facilitate access to stock information from certified sites." Lincoln Quevedo

"I think the motion is good! It's important to leverage technology to reach everyone" – Glenda Lee

"This is a good motion. The maps should be made available free or at minimum cost." – TR Manoharan

"I support the motion and think it could also be a fantastic educational tool for public outreach. Also, it would help demonstrate ecosystem services such as rainfall generation if linked to <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n0mupl4FZsQ>" – Ian Redmond

"I support this motion, I think it is excellent that technology be used to display certified sites, forest management, chain of custody, and ecosystem services." – Paulina Baca

"I see a number of benefits for FSC having this information available internally to assist in decision making and providing accurate data to Working Groups working on various projects." Stuart Valintine

Other opinions

"In Central Africa, forests belong to states and shapefile (which are changeable) are data of sovereignty. I don't see how this data will be transmitted." - Marie Mbolu

"My advise is to explore a similar Motion from the GA in Spain and why it failed." - Denis Popov

"There are more and more countries are developing laws to protect data. So more and more CHs will have constraints in making their shapefiles available. We need to balance cost-benefits-resources." - Camilla Marangon

"Important to maintain clarity on the objective for collecting this information and expectation for updating. Also, what is the point of FSC maintaining shapefiles/GIS information if the information is not published? If there is an additional objective in doing that - it should be made clear in the motion." - Sarah Billig

"I think this information is very good to have available for both external and internal use, but I do not see how the motion would further existing efforts in this regard in FSC." - Stuart Valintine

“This might be very sensitive issue for private forest owners, especially smallholders.”- Inka Musta

Learn more:

- [Join the discussion or view more opinions on this motion here.](#)
- Listen to members discuss this motion during a motions discussion session: [Watch here](#)
- [Read the FSC Secretariat’s analysis of this motion here.](#)