

02/2020 Change in the frequency of FSC Ordinary General Assembly from 3 years to 4 years
 Edited Statutory Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Yadira Paulina Baca Terán	Cristian Roberto Velasco Ruano	Nubia Jaramillo
Organization / Individual	Baca Terán, Yadira Paulina, Ms.	Velasco Ruano, Cristian Roberto, Mr.	VERDECANANDE S.A.
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / South	Environmental / South	Economic / South

Statutory Motion (Motion text /high-level action request):

This motion proposes to change the frequency of FSC Ordinary General Assembly from 3 years to 4 years.

Therefore, Article 18, under the Third Title - General Assemblies of FSC Statutes is proposed for change as follows:

Current text:

*EIGHTEENTH. The General Assembly is the supreme authority of the Organization, composed of individual Members or duly designated delegates of Member's organizations. This body may hold Ordinary or Extraordinary General Assemblies. The Ordinary General Assemblies shall be held at least once **every three years**.*

The meetings, whether Ordinary or Extraordinary, can either be called by the Board of Directors or by a group of Members representing at least 5% (five per cent) of the voting power of the membership. The notices of the meeting shall provide whether the respective meeting will be Ordinary or Extraordinary.

The General Assembly will delegate managerial activities of the Organization to the Board of Directors as set forth in Title Four of these Statutes.

Proposed text, with change to Statutory Motion:

*EIGHTEENTH. The General Assembly is the supreme authority of the Organization, composed of individual Members or duly designated delegates of Member's organizations. Ordinary General Assemblies shall be held at least **every four years**. The meetings, whether Ordinary or Extraordinary, can either be called by the Board of Directors or by a group of Members representing at least 5% (five per cent) of the voting power of the membership. The notices of the meeting shall provide whether the respective meeting will be Ordinary or Extraordinary.*

The General Assembly will delegate managerial activities of the Organization to the Board of Directors as set forth in Title Four of these Statutes.

Background / rationale:

Article 18 in FSC Statutes states that Ordinary General Assemblies shall be held at least **every 3 years**. Based on this, the Secretariat organizes the Assemblies by rotating the regions worldwide, with a great logistical effort to bring the members together face to face. However, if we carry out a recount, many of the motions are not implemented in the interassembly period, and we can see that many proposals are being repeated.

On the other hand, holding face-to-face General Assemblies implies a considerable expenditure of resources, and given that it is an international event, it generates an ecological impact or footprint.

Several FSC members consider that the period of the Ordinary General Assemblies should be **extended to 4 years**, as it would be positive to have additional time for the FSC Network and the Secretariat to promote processes with members to execute the approved motions and to implement the FSC Global Strategic Plan.

Therefore, the extension of the term from 3 to 4 years would be a contributing factor to (1) the implementation of motions and the Global Strategic Plan, (2) the efficient use of limited economic resources, and (3) the minimization of the footprint generated, in line with the nature of our organization.

--

Please note that the feasibility analysis is currently being updated. This version (PDF shown below) does not reflect yet this revision. We will upload the new version shortly.

03/2020 Establishment of a system for virtual General Assembly to protect the continuous installation of the highest decision-making body [cont.]

Edited Statutory Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Thankappannair Rajalayam Manoharan	Chris van der Goot	Nubia Jaramillo
Organization / Individual	Manoharan, TR, Dr	Ecohout Foundation	VERDECANANDE S.A.
Chamber / Subchamber	Environmental / South	Social / North	Economic / South

Statutory Motion (Motion text /high-level action request):

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

Develop and establish an innovative, secure and efficient electronic system and user-friendly technologies that allows FSC International members have an useful alternative for full and active participation in FSC General and Extraordinary Assemblies without their in person presence.

It is necessary to modify the FSC Statutes, by including additions in clause # 18 in the first paragraph:

1. After the first line in the first paragraph of clause #18 shall include the following additions:

“General Assemblies can be held in a presential, virtual or hybrid mode (combining a physical gathering of members with the possibility of other members participating virtually). The resolutions adopted through any of these means shall have the same validity. All references in these Statutes to General Assemblies will be interpreted as encompassing physical, virtual and hybrid meetings, unless specifically clarified.”

2. After the following in the first paragraph of clause #18

“The notices of the meeting shall provide whether the respective meeting will be Ordinary or Extraordinary.”

The next in the same paragraph of clause # 18 shall include the following additions:

“, 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”.

The proposed language for addition in FSC Statutes is given below in the track changes mode:

TITLE THREE

GENERAL ASSEMBLIES

EIGHTEENTH. The General Assembly is the supreme authority of the Organization, composed of individual Members or duly designated delegates of Member's organizations. This body may hold Ordinary or Extraordinary General Assemblies. General Assemblies can be held in a presential, virtual or hybrid mode (combining a physical gathering of members with the possibility of other members participating virtually). The resolutions adopted through any of these means shall have the same validity. All references in these Statutes to General Assemblies will be interpreted as encompassing physical, virtual and hybrid meetings, unless specifically clarified. The Ordinary General Assemblies shall be held at least once every three years. The meetings, whether Ordinary or Extraordinary, can either be called by the Board of Directors or by a group of Members representing at least 5% (five per cent) of the voting power of the membership. The notices for the meeting shall provide whether the respective meeting will be Ordinary or Extraordinary, 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.

The General Assembly will delegate managerial activities of the Organization to the Board of Directors as set forth in Title Four of these Statutes.

Background / rationale:

The rationale is to protect the highest decision-making body and supreme authority of FSC, the General Assembly composed of all members according clause # 18 of FSC statutes. This motion is looking to amend clause #18 of FSC statutes and allow to conduct general assemblies and extraordinary general assemblies with an option for Members to have full participation and voting without their in-person attendance in the venue of the meeting.

The information and communication technologies (ICT) are currently available to hold this kind of virtual meetings and forums.

This motion is looking to grant members greater power to call assemblies without dependence on funding, availability of a physical place, or situations of force majeure such as the latest COVID-19 pandemic. This will promote more participation of members who find difficulties for international travel due to financial constrain and procedural bottlenecks associated with the travel and visa.

Further, these are encouraged as an effective tool to promote UN Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement. This will contribute to the initiative to address climate change by reduced carbon emissions.



Strengthening membership engagement is a key component in the Draft FSC Global Strategic Plan 2021-26.

--

Please note that the feasibility analysis is currently being updated. This version (PDF shown below) does not reflect yet this revision. We will upload the new version shortly.

04/2020 Strengthening the Network by enhancing membership engagement in regional offices
 Edited Statutory Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Alan Smith	Zoran Tintor	Elie Olivier Yakam Ngoa
Organization / Individual	Smith, Alan, Dr.	Tintor, Zoran, Mr.	Ngoa, Elie Olivier, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / North	Economic / South	Environmental / South

Statutory Motion (Motion text /high-level action request):

The high-level action request is to build on the structure of the present Network system to give the membership a stronger role in the FSC regional entities where direct member participation is currently lacking. The governance of existing regional and sub-regional offices would be adapted to achieve this, so allowing their operational activities to incorporate more effectively the members' local knowledge and contacts. To be clear, no replacement of the present offices is intended, rather the aim is to evolve the system. As an interim measure, supervisory boards, drawn from international members in a given region, shall be installed as appropriate to give guidance to the regional and sub-regional offices and provide oversight of their performance. The statute to be amended is under **TITLE 6, THE FSC NETWORK, THIRTY-EIGHT**. The relevant sections are from the second paragraph onwards, namely those numbered 1, 2 and 3. The current wording, indicating proposed track changes, is:

(1) 2. FSC National Office: a legally established and independent FSC partner organization promoting responsible management of the world's forests on behalf of FSC at the national level, on the basis of a formal contract (cooperation agreement). National Offices shall have a multi-stakeholder governance structure, similar to that of the Organization, as outlined in these Statutes.

(2) 3. FSC National Representative: an individual working on behalf of FSC in his/her country to serve as a national point for information and to promote responsible management of the forests under a formal contract (cooperation and service agreement).

(3) 4.FSC National Focal Point: an individual with a specified and agreed task for his/her country, accomplished on a voluntary basis and under a formal contract (agreement). The National Focal Point does not represent FSC.

The statutory change sought is the ability to convert as appropriate an existing regional network entity as in 1 below, so giving regional offices a governance structure similar to that of membership-run national offices (INPs):

1. FSC Regional Network Partner: a legally established and independent FSC partner organization promoting responsible management of the world's forests on behalf of FSC at the regional level, on the basis of a formal contract (cooperation agreement). The Network Partners shall have a multi-stakeholder governance structure, similar to that of the Organization, as outlined in these Statutes.

2. FSC National Office: a legally established and independent FSC partner organization promoting responsible management of the world's forests on behalf of FSC at the national level, on the basis of a formal contract (cooperation agreement). National Offices shall have a multi-stakeholder governance structure, similar to that of the Organization, as outlined in these Statutes.

3 FSC National Representative: an individual working on behalf of FSC in his/her country to serve as a national point for information and to promote responsible management of the forests under a formal contract (cooperation and service agreement).

4. FSC National Focal Point: an individual with a specified and agreed task for his/her country, accomplished on a voluntary basis and under a formal contract (agreement). The National Focal Point does not represent FSC.

Background / rationale:

The rationale is to build on FSC's Core Strength as being anchored in membership engagement and a global network of partners as identified in the Global Strategy. This is explicitly stated: "to enable the achievement of the intended outcomes of this strategy, FSC will strengthen this network in the coming years". The Network will follow the present Global-Regional-Local framework to orchestrate actions to achieve strategic goals by explicitly mobilising membership participation at the regional level. This has particular relevance in areas underrepresented in the FSC system and/or where there is regional similarity.

The focus is on an inclusive and collective approach to gain synergies by maximising local knowledge of the membership in a regional context and sharing it across borders. It uses an existing tool, regional offices, but strengthens it by enhancing effective membership participation in line with the enabling priorities of the Global Strategy, in particular: *“FSC will continue to increase its efforts to engage the membership in the implementation of the Global Strategic Plan at global, regional and national levels”*. It also relates to the governance review recommendation to *“build and strengthen existing tools to link FSC International with the local level”*. The enhanced engagement would be a cost-effective means for encouraging significant membership participation in regions that do not have Independent Network Partners (INP) as currently defined. The organisational model will vary according to local legal conditions but in principle a legal entity (Independent Regional Network Partner, IRNP) 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. In the short term, advisory councils, incorporating members from the regions, can be established to ensure effective membership influence in the regional offices while the legal process goes forward. The model can follow that of the Advisory Council set up for FSC Ukraine. By working together through active membership engagement and involvement, multiple advantages to promote certification are realisable collectively. The concept of grouping opens additionally new possibilities of donor fund-raising at a regional rather than one country level.

Moreover, a membership-managed entity may stimulate an increase in membership in regions where at present there are few international members. To quote the previous Strategic Plan, *“Network Partners are a **critical** means by which services are delivered, with the necessary cultural and social understandings”*. This has not been effective in areas where membership engagement is low, particularly so in the Global South. In such regions, the absence of national offices can even be a disincentive to engage with FSC. However, the rationale for IRNPs equally applies in areas which have a stronger membership presence, so bringing together members with similar experiences and backgrounds. There are prototypes already in the Global North, in particular the Australian INP which coordinates with New Zealand. Potential regions for this initiative are the Congo Basin and West Africa, East Africa, South/Central Asia, the Balkans and also Latin America where cost considerations are putting at risk individual INPs.

Video Statement:

<https://members.fsc.org/en/media/04-2020strengthening-the-network-by-enhancing-membership-engagement-in-regional-offices>

--

Please note that the feasibility analysis is currently being updated. This version (PDF shown below) does not reflect yet this revision. We will upload the new version shortly.

05/2020 FSC Int. Performance
 Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Mike Bekin	Hubert Kwisthout	Steve Jennings
Organization / Individual	Bekin, Mike, Mr	Kwisthout, Hubert, Mr.	Jennings, Steve, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / North	Social / North	Environmental / North

Policy Motion (Motion text /high-level action request):

The FSC Secretariat needs to substantially improve its performance, transparency and accountability and thus re-build trust with its FSC members and their elected international Board of Directors. Therefore, the Board of Directors, in its capacity as representatives of the membership shall be responsible to:

- Commission a regular in-depth, independent performance review of all senior staff roles and the adequacy of the organization's structure to fulfill its medium and long-term goals, including delivery of all motions.
- The results of each triennial in-depth review to be fully published 1 month before every GA.
- Commission and publish annual performance assessments for all senior roles*, as the basis for role retention.
- The decision upon what KPIs to measure to be agreed by the board following result of first in-depth review. These can be updated and reviewed after each triennial external review.
- DG together with COO to hold online meetings every 6 months where updated personal and organizational KPIs can be discussed with the membership.

* Senior roles to include all heads of departments and of key projects or programmes (such as Global Development, Climate, Stakeholder solutions, Policy, Comms, Policy Operations, Marketing, Finance, IT, etc)

Background / rationale:



With the growth of FSC, FSC Intl. has drifted away from membership with increasing bureaucracy so that it is no longer fully accountable for its decisions. Old patterns are no longer helpful and now hold back the evolution of FSC. Silos have formed and internal disputes waste time, money and talent. Such culture endangers the assessment of risks and opportunities while ostracising both network offices and members who still remain engaged and committed to the cause. A good starting point would be a performance review of roles, at all levels, carried out by an independent and experienced professional.

There is therefore a need for a severe change to a more transparent culture that the GSP does not address - this is the goal of this motion.

--

Please note that the feasibility analysis is currently being updated. This version (PDF shown below) does not reflect yet this revision. We will upload the new version shortly.

11/2020 Developing and applying social, environmental and economic indicators for the implementation of the FSC Global Strategic Plan

Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Yadira Paulina Baca Terán	Nubia Jaramillo	Margaret Stern
Organization / Individual	Baca Terán, Yadira Paulina, Ms.	VERDECANANDE S.A.	Stern, Margaret, Dr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / South	Economic / South	Environmental / South

Policy Motion (Motion text /high-level action request):

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

Social, environmental and economic indicators shall be developed for the implementation of the FSC Global Strategic Plan (2021-2026).

These indicators will enable the monitoring, reporting and assessment of the implementation of the Global Strategic Plan, and will allow to make visible the working approach on the three pillars that differentiate FSC from other certification systems.

In order to develop them, a Working Group will be established, with a balance of members from the three chambers, which will be convened immediately after the adoption of the motion, and will work for a period of 4 months. The indicators developed will undergo a consultation phase with the support of the Secretariat, and will be submitted to the FSC Board of Directors for approval and inclusion into the Global Strategic Plan implementation process. Also, the selected indicators will be included into the monitoring, reporting and evaluation stages by the FSC Network.

Background / rationale:

The importance of having relevant indicators was initially presented as a proposal to include social indicators. After the analysis of members from the three chambers, the proposal was presented at the General Assembly

- 2017 through Motion 42, including environmental and economic indicators more broadly. Despite the good reception, this motion did not reach the voting stage. The Secretariat expressed its willingness to accept ideas expressed in motions that were not voted on at the GA 2017; however, this was not the case, as no indicators were included in the implementation plan (May 2017) of the FSC Global Strategic Plan 2015-2020 (the development of which was approved at the GA 2014), and which has not yet been evaluated for compliance with goals.

Currently (April 2020), the FSC Global Strategic Plan 2021-2026 is being updated, so it is the right moment to develop indicators that show the work of the FSC system in the social, environmental and economic fields. Indicators that, in addition to pointing out FSC's values, will facilitate the monitoring, reporting and assessment of the implementation of the Global Strategic Plan under development.

This motion proposal is in line with FSC's horizon for updating its Global Strategic Plan, which seeks to achieve a situation in which the value of forests is recognized and which compensates for improved safeguard and management of the world's forests; seeking real solutions and decisions with impact on the ground, through FSC's main strength: its members and forest stakeholders. The Plan, which is currently under consultation, includes three strategies: (1) The core strategy is to refine and further develop the forest certification tool, together with new solutions for forests related to climate change, forest stakeholders, etc. (2) This will be achieved by mobilizing markets and transforming them for the future; and (3) by creating partnerships and working together to identify and implement solutions.

The indicators developed will play an important role for the strategies indicated in the previous paragraph to guide the work of the entire FSC Network, where the work in the social axis (benefits of key stakeholders such as: forest workers, smallholders, forest communities, non-timber forest product collectors, women, indigenous peoples, key social sectors), in the environmental axis (protection of ecosystems, high conservation values, forest landscapes, restoration) and in the economic axis (sustainability, new markets, new products, allies) will be made visible.

--

Please note that the feasibility analysis is currently being updated. This version (PDF shown below) does not reflect yet this revision. We will upload the new version shortly.

15/2020 Sustainable intensification
 Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Dirk Riestenpatt	Nina Griesshammer	Volker Diefenbach
Organization / Individual	Riestenpatt, Dirk, Mr.	Griesshammer, Nina, Mrs.	Industriegewerkschaft Bauen-Agrar-Umwelt
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / North	Environmental / North	Social / North

Policy Motion (Motion text /high-level action request):

We request the membership to stop the current process for “sustainable intensification” and continue work on relevant subjects within existing FSC processes and structures.

Background / rationale:

As up to now, the topic of SI as defined by the SIAG reads as follows (quoted from a document presented by SIAG):

“When talking about intensification, we consider:

- Best management practices and stand level management improvement
- Pre-commercial thinning
- Traditional breeding techniques used to intensify production and practiced already in FSC certified forests in some regions, incl:
 - Genomic Seed selection
 - Cloning (using best individuals), etc.

Biotechnology tools and genetic engineering not allowed in FSC certified forests and products

- incl. mutations in DNA (through chemicals or radiation), CRISPR and others

There is currently no discussion to allow for genetic modification in FSC certified operations and products”

It is obvious that this summary shows subjects and contents, which are already integral parts of forest management within the framework of FSC or are definitely prohibited by FSC (GMO).

Furthermore, the SIAG states, that SI should help identify (quote),

“where and under what conditions different initiatives for sustainable intensification can provide shared value and benefits to all affected stake-holders” and how

“sustainable intensification could lead to the identification of new social, environmental and economic approaches, strategies and solutions in the FSC”.

These motivations are at the very core of FSC and are part of the day-to-day work of every employee in certified operations and with FSC staff, but it is definitely misleadingly labeled “Sustainable Intensification”. A possible name for such a process could be “Evaluation of selected forest management issues and chances for improving the overall benefit of FSC certification”.

Consequently, the overall objective of this process 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.

The remaining contents of the debate so far (thinnings, use of pesticides, use of fertilizers, reduction of consumption patterns, recycling etc.) do not need a process called SI, but can be addressed with a high level of flexibility within current FSCs structures and regulations.

The process as such risks at a very broad level the integrity of FSCs requirements and governance structures and should therefore be stopped immediately.

--

Please note that the feasibility analysis is currently being updated. This version (PDF shown below) does not reflect yet this revision. We will upload the new version shortly.

20/2020 Climate Emergency Motion
 Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Mike Bekin	Alan Smith	Steve Jennings
Organization / Individual	Bekin, Mike, Mr	Smith, Alan, Dr.	Jennings, Steve, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / North	Social / North	Environmental / North

Policy Motion (Motion text /high-level action request):

Building on the work done so far, and on Strategy 1 of the Global Strategy (1.4 Expand the reach of FSC and its relevance in the fight against climate change and loss of biodiversity) this motion requests the Board of Directors and the Secretariat to put Climate Change (CC) and Biodiversity (BD) loss as centre stage in the implementation of the Global Strategy. This way FSC is to become widely recognized as a provider of clearly measured and verified outcomes to governments, companies and individuals seeking assurances that their certified forests, ecosystems and products meet the current and future needs of our rapidly changing world.

Background / rationale:

Climate Change and loss of biodiversity are mentioned heavily in the Global Strategy (Intro, S1/1.4, etc) yet only marginally in the IGIs and other aspects of FSC work. Given the accelerated severity of our biosphere’s collapse and the role that forests can play in its mitigation and adaptation, FSC can no longer afford to risk its own relevance by continuing to ignore its responsibility in being a leading articulate voice for all forests and its peoples.

This motion seeks to plug this gap by requesting FSC to explore, develop and implement innovative ways in which it can ensure and claim that its certified forests, ecosystems and products have verified positive impacts that are both needed and desirable by our changing world (CSR, impact reporting, investors, labelling etc).

This would allow both FM and ES certificate holders to tap into large pots of impact funding as well as other sources of sustainable finance income.

There is already a growing body of scientific research (RIL-C can halve selective logging emissions from tropical forests. Elli et al. 2019. Forest Ecology & Management 438. Elsevier) as well as numerous credible specialist providers and technologies available both in terms of impact measurement and reduction. FSC must seek such partnerships so as to speed up the implementation of this motion and demonstrate results within a maximum of 18 months.

Examples of such measurable outcomes of innovative FSC solutions could be:

- Temperature reduction by increase in canopy layering or cover;
- Improved indigenous peoples' livelihoods and decreased migration from forest to urban centres;
- Improved ground permeability by afforestation (countering the effects of other climate impacts of increased rainfall and flood);
- Future proofing plantations by choosing climate resilient species;
- Net positive carbon sequestration;
- Measured reduction in carbon emissions;
- etc

--

Please note that the feasibility analysis is currently being updated. This version (PDF shown below) does not reflect yet this revision. We will upload the new version shortly.

24/2020 FSC's advocacy to promote forest management certification in tropical protected areas
 Accepted by MC Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Raúl Gilberto López Recinos	Glenda Amarilis Lee Pinto	Lincoln Quevedo
Organization / Individual	López Recinos, Raúl Gilberto, Mr.	Lee Pinto, Glenda Amarilis, Ms.	Quevedo, Lincoln, Dr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / South	Economic / South	Environmental / South

Policy Motion (Motion text /high-level action request):

FSC shall implement an advocacy program with the governments of countries in the tropics that have important surfaces of protected areas, with the purpose of significantly contributing to the conservation of such areas, to the sustainability of managed forests, to the maintenance or improvement of the ecosystem services, and to the socio-economic development of populations living in sites where, because of their zoning and management categories, the use of forest resources and ecosystem services is possible. This objective will be developed through the implementation of incentives from national and/or local governments (such as technical assistance, development projects, marketing of their products and/or carbon markets, etc.) for forest management, **FSC certification** and sustainable land use which, at the same time, will generate benefits for communities and small forest owners who live and depend on resources in protected areas.

For this purpose, FSC establishes a chamber balanced (environmental, social and economic) working group with the task of proposing to FSC International Board of Directors, within 18 months, a strategy of action and a plan for general FSC advocacy with governments that have protected areas in the tropics.

Background / rationale:

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"**.

It is proposed that **FSC** shall carry out advocacy before state governments, to generate sustainable models of FSC certification within protected areas, where the communities, smallholders and indigenous peoples, shall benefit. For example, the case of the Mayan Biosphere Reserve/Guatemala, where tangible results and impact have been achieved as local stakeholders are empowered, the government supports certification and FSC tools are complementary. FSC should approach state governments that manage protected areas, where the use of forest resources is restricted. This will encourage FSC certificate holders to do everything in their hands to maintain it over time, since it will serve as a safeguard before public opinion of the sound management that is being implemented on these public or state lands, in addition to other potential incentives or financing, such as achieving better prices for their certified products.

Under the premise that all protected areas in the tropics are significant as they house environmental goods and services and yet they present weaknesses of a legal, technical, and financial nature that cause consequences and threaten the permanence of the forests, such as: invasions, illegal logging, hunting, forest fires, agricultural borders and social conflict.

The Rio 1992 summit (Science magazine), has marked a milestone "in terms of the need to preserve biodiversity and since then, many more protected areas have been declared around the world, with the aim of halting the loss of biodiversity". Paz Cardona A.J., 2018, refers that currently there are 202 000 protected areas in the world and yet 70 % of them present high human pressure, due to the demand for existing resources in their ecosystems. Ovando N., 2012, concludes that protected areas are a proven tool to maintain essential natural services and help increase resilience and reduce vulnerability of human welfare to climate change, so it is necessary to advocate to improve their management.

--

Please note that the feasibility analysis is currently being updated. This version (PDF shown below) does not reflect yet this revision. We will upload the new version shortly.

36/2021 Deletion of Criterion 5.3
 Accepted by MC Statutory Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Margaret (Peggy) Smith	Lineu Siqueira Jr.	Sean Cadman
Organization / Individual	Smith, Margaret (Peggy), Dr.	Siqueira, Lineu, Mr.	Cadman, Sean, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / North	Economic / South	Environmental / North

Statutory Motion (Motion text /high-level action request):

FSC-STD-01-001 V5-2 FSC Principles and Criteria for Forest Stewardship

Current language in FSC-STD-01-001 v 5-2

5.3 *The Organization* shall demonstrate that the positive and negative *externalities** of operation are included in the *management plan**.

Proposed new language for FSC-STD-01-001 v 5-2

~~**Delete 5.3** *The Organization* shall demonstrate that the positive and negative *externalities** of operation are included in the *management plan**.~~

Background / rationale:

FSC shall amend FSC-STD-01-001 v 5-2 by removing Criterion 5.3 from the standard. Subsequently, the IGI (FSC-STD-60-004 v 2-0) will be changed 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.

Several SDGs in the development of their National Forest Stewardship Standards, the Policy and Standards Committee (PSC) that approves those standards, and the Forest Management Community (formerly the Forest Network) have identified Criterion 5.3 and its related IGI as problematic. The FSC Board at its November 19, 2020 meeting decided to 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.

Criterion 5.3 requires an Organization to identify the social and environmental impacts of its operations and reflect them in the management plan. IGI 5.3.1 requires that costs “related to preventing, mitigating or compensation for negative social and environmental impacts are quantified and documented in the management plan” and 5.3.2 requires that “benefits related to positive social and environmental impacts of management activities are identified and included in the management plan.”

The problem is that such impacts and/or their extent cannot be foreseen or may not be immediately known because such impacts take time to appear. To further quantify relevant costs and benefits and reflect the results in the management plan is a guessing game and therefore an unrealistic task for an Organization to undertake. The Organization is committed in the rest of Principle 5, Benefits from the Forest, to minimizing impacts, including ensuring timber harvesting levels are at or below a level that can be permanently sustained, and ensuring diversified benefits and/or products.

Other principles and criteria also address minimizing environmental impacts (principles 6 and 9) and ensuring social and economic benefits (principles 3, 4 and 7); thus, Criterion 5.3 is also redundant.

There are minimal costs to deleting Criterion 5.3, including the work that will be required of the Performance and Standards Unit to remove this Criterion from the relevant policy documents, amend the IGI, and provide SDGs and CBs with guidance on amending their standards.

--

Please note that the feasibility analysis is currently being updated. This version (PDF shown below) does not reflect yet this revision. We will upload the new version shortly.

48/2021 Streamline the Ecosystem Services procedure, incorporate more services and maximise its potential.

Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Alan Smith	Lineu Siqueira Jr.	Thankappannair Rajalayam Manoharan
Organization / Individual	Smith, Alan, Dr.	Siqueira, Lineu, Mr.	Manoharan, TR, Dr
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / North	Economic / South	Environmental / South

Policy Motion (Motion text /high-level action request):

The potential of ecosystem services (ES) certification is not being effectively realised and therefore FSC is requested to improve the process by streamlining the ES standard FSC-PRO-30-006 and the accompanying guidance FSC-GUI-30-006. The intent is to make it more comprehensible and easier to access as well as lowering costs. The ultimate aim is to accelerate the uptake as well as demonstrating FSC's relevance to climate change mitigation and adjustment. The range of services can be expanded beyond the 5 so far recognised and allow as appropriate “bundling” various services together under one claim to enhance market prospects. The specific actions requested are the following: (1) Upgrade the standard and guidance documents to make them more comprehensible. (2) Encourage better use of the option to include the ES validation process with FM certification. (3) Improve market outreach and scope rather than taking the conventional product-oriented approach. Overall, ES certification can increase the awareness of society in general to the value of the multiple forest services to the environment, including climate change mitigation and the continued security of services necessary to maintain livelihoods and biodiversity. The motion is totally in line with FSC Global Strategy objectives as specified in the background section. In sum, this motion if implemented is a win-win for all chambers and moreover would support the Secretariat's efforts to strengthen the overall approach.

Background / rationale:

Despite being available since 2018, ES certification has only been taken up in 28 projects worldwide. Of these, the majority are in Latin America and Europe, with just one in Africa (Namibia) and two in Asia (China and Indonesia).

An initial step to improve uptake would be to incorporate ES services into an amplified FM process as an additional option to those who want it. This would help to overcome the concept that obtaining ES certification is a lengthy and costly exercise which then becomes a deterrent to uptake. An eventual step could be to develop a stand alone standard to demonstrate impact.

The motion can deliver on various Global Strategy Goals, namely: 1.4 “Expand the reach of FSC and its relevance in the fight against climate change and loss of biodiversity”, 3.4 “Accelerate awareness of the value of forests” and 2.2 “Accelerate the market uptake of FSC-certified products and ecosystem services”.

Part of the problem is the complexity of the standard and process – PRO-30-006 is 64 pages long, more than the main FM standards combined. The Guidance document is also 61 pages long, which gives an idea of the challenge faced by prospective ES stakeholders. Moreover the ES certification covers just 5 services which have to be validated separately. Although some of these services such as carbon sequestration and watershed services are crucial, many others are missed out. CIFOR has identified a total of 23 ES services (see https://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf_files/OccPapers/OP-66.pdf) most of which FSC does not take into account. Another aspect is that there is often an interconnection with non-forest land uses where a landscape approach is appropriate, especially in relation to agro-ecological services such as shade trees and to agro-forestry. Restoration on degraded land is another dimension in which ecosystem services certification can play a role. There also needs to be an awareness of new technologies available such as Earth Observation and other remote audit options which will make validation easier.

The Guidance document is also not straightforward, comprising 8 general modules and 5 additional, one for each ES. The process described raises questions, for example Module 2 on the Theory of Change may not be directly applicable if the intent is to conserve an existing service. Or Module 5 on Determining the Comparison may not be achievable if no previous data to compare with are available. It is further confusing as Section 11 of the ES procedure states that no comparison is required if validation is the option but then no claim can be made without a validation of impact! All-in-all, the guidance document requires a comprehensive revision. This can be coupled with developing a training programme, oriented especially to train trainers to further the understanding of how to become ES certified to a much wider audience than hitherto.

The marketability of ES certification needs improvement, not just by “bundling” services together, but also but by taking a new look at its potential value to stakeholders. A coherent outreach platform is required to promote the advantages of ES certification. At present, the concept marketed seems to be a product-oriented one whereas the main market opportunities can be much wider, appealing to environmentally disposed buyers looking to verify impact. Climate change mitigation and adaptation is a clear market opportunity, not just for carbon capture but combatting the effects caused by climate change such as flooding, land erosion, wild fires, biodiversity loss. Revenues can be generated from these including for conserving water sources, maintaining high conservation values and ecotourism. Finally opportunities to partner other organisations can be explored with an emphasis on co-creation to appeal to interested private sector stakeholders.

This is not an isolated motion, it has direct relevance to other motion proposals. These include Motion 20/2020, the Climate Emergency motion, which outlines the need for FSC to address climate change through measured outcomes, and Motion 49/2021, which links directly ecosystem services with climate change and consequent adaptation to it. As with Motion 48/2021, Motion 49/2021 also calls for streamlining the process but focusses more on a market-oriented approach to stimulate demand. The emphasis of Motion



48/2021 is compatible with this but concentrates on the supply side by making it much easier to access the process. There are also Motion 24/2020 on promoting certification in tropical protected areas, and Motion 53/2021 on the creation of a procedure for recognising cultural services and practices. For both of these motions, the ecosystem services tool can be used to achieve their intents, using carbon sequestration or biodiversity conservation in the case of Motion 24, or widening the scope to include cultural services in the case of Motion 53. In effect, all these motions add up to a package by which FSC can demonstrate its usefulness by going beyond the conventional parameters that have defined FSC hitherto.

In summary, the expected outcomes of this motion are to increase and accelerate the uptake of ES certification, improve the marketability and to improve access to smallholders and communities. Cost savings can also be expected. Overall the image of FSC as a key instrument to meet environmental challenges and demonstrate impact will be enhanced. If no substantial improvement is made, there is the risk that other certification organisations may take over the initiative successfully begun by FSC.

--

Please note that the feasibility analysis is currently being updated. This version (PDF shown below) does not reflect yet this revision. We will upload the new version shortly.

57/2021 Expanding opportunities for remote FM and CoC auditing, beyond Covid, through a risk-based approach.

Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Melissa Graham	Alan Smith	Thankappannair Rajalayam Manoharan
Organization / Individual	SCS Global Services	Smith, Alan, Dr.	Manoharan, TR, Dr
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / North	Social / North	Environmental / South

Policy Motion (Motion text /high-level action request):

FSC shall develop and establish a risk-based approach that makes clear when remote audits are acceptable, with the goal of increasing opportunities for conducting remote audits in both FM and COC audit cycles beyond the COVID- 19 era. This risk-based methodology shall be developed and incorporated into the current revision of the FM FSC-STD-20-007 evaluation standard, and the next revision of the COC FSC-STD-20-011 evaluation standard.

Background / rationale:

In 2020 and continuing into 2021, extensive use of remote auditing has become a necessity due to COVID-19. Certification Bodies have expanded our Information and Communication Technology (ICT) tools to provide the platforms where we can remotely collect, review, and verify evidence. Through the use of ICT tools, and creative use of other technology (cameras, drones) virtual auditing practices are found to be effective and robust.

Remote audits have been witnessed by ASI as well as CBs witnessing their own auditors, and since the beginning of implementing remote audits due to the pandemic, ASI oversight has not detected a lack of integrity with respect to conducting remote audits. Remote audits also provide opportunities for the rotation of auditors where previously, it may not have been as feasible due to the locations of a Certificate Holder. Remote audits may be able to open doors to smaller companies that might not otherwise be able to afford certification. Remote audits mean reduced travel costs which are a benefit to both CHs and CBs, and less business travel means a smaller impact on climate.

Given that FSC has already provided a risk-based framework (included in Derogation 2020-005 and the current revision of FSC-STD-20-007), and that FSC has already started the process of investigating remote auditing technologies, it is evident that there needs to be a clear pathway to expand opportunities for remote auditing, including incorporating remote audits within both FM and COC audit cycles continuing post-COVID. The risk-based approach that is included in Derogation 2020-005 needs to be reviewed and updated, and feedback needs to be provided on the draft FSC-STD-20-007. There have been plenty of lessons learned over the past year by both CHs and CBs which could provide valuable insight to further develop the risk-based approach.

Remote auditing systems are practical and can be very effective; however, it is recognized that not all situations may be suitable for remote auditing and that there may be some limitations in infrastructure or accessibility (remote locations) that technology may not be able to overcome. Within the risk-based approach, ensuring that workers', indigenous peoples' and community interests are fully taken into account should be a priority. If, within an auditing situation, access to such communities is limited, then according to the developed risk-based approach the audit should not be eligible to be conducted fully on-site.

In summary, the expected outcome of Motion 57/2021 is for FSC to include within the FM and COC evaluation standards (FSC-STD-20-007 and FSC-STD-20-011) clear risk-based approaches that outline when remote audits, or hybrid remote audits, are feasible and appropriate. The expectation is to not completely replace on-site auditing, but rather to expand the opportunities for remote auditing, taking advantage of the breadth of remote auditing technologies that are increasingly available.

--

Please note that the feasibility analysis is currently being updated. This version (PDF shown below) does not reflect yet this revision. We will upload the new version shortly.



61/2021 Compile a digital map of FSC-certified forests worldwide
Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Seth Zuckerman	Paul Vanderford	Linwood Gill
Organization / Individual	Northwest Natural Resource Group	Sustainable Northwest	Usal Redwood Forest Company, LLC
Chamber / Subchamber	Environmental / North	Social / North	Economic / North

Policy Motion (Motion text /high-level action request):



Within a year after this motion passes, Forest Management Certificate Holders (CHs) shall be required to provide FSC International with digital shapefiles of their certified lands, so that FSC International may maintain an **internal** map of all FSC-certified forests. The only data required will be the name of the Certificate Holder, the certificate code, the name of the Certifying Body, and the boundaries of the certified area.

When Certificate Holders provide this information, FSC International will ask whether they consent for the boundaries of their certified forests to appear on a **public** map of certified lands. This consent is entirely voluntary, at the discretion of the Certificate Holder. A public certificate search will indicate whether the certified Forest Management Unit can be found on the public map.

Certificate Holders are exempt from providing these shapefiles if disclosing the location of property or management boundaries to FSC is prohibited by law.

FSC staff will provide accommodations for smallholders and CHs with limited technical capacity, including:

- providing a mechanism to accept shapefiles created in Google Earth and other freely available mapping platforms;
- allowing additional time for compliance; and
- in the case of group certificates covering many smallholders, setting a maximum area below which members of a group certificate can be represented by a point on the map instead of their forest's complete boundaries.

Background / rationale:

This motion balances Forest Management Certificate Holders' desire for confidentiality with the need to bring FSC in step with contemporary expectations about transparency in certification -- expectations that have grown in recent years now that satellite imagery is at the fingertips of anyone with an internet connection.

Although the act of certification is delegated to accredited organizations, the Forest Stewardship Council is ultimately responsible for the lands certified under its name. Thus it is essential that FSC International should know where those lands are located. At the same time, some Certificate Holders are reluctant to reveal any more information than necessary. Thus, this motion allows them to keep their forest boundaries from appearing on a public map if they prefer, and limits the kinds of data they are required to deliver to FSC International.

This initiative can dovetail with the use of remote sensing as part of the audit process, to help focus audit effort in the most significant areas, thereby reducing costs and improving effectiveness. Some Certifying Bodies already take advantage of the [FSC GIS Portal](#) -- this motion would make it easy to expand its use.

In recognition of the diverse legal restrictions that Certificate Holders face in the many countries where FSC operates, the motion exempts Certificate Holders who are prohibited by law from sharing this information with FSC International.

To accommodate the different levels of technological capacity that are available to large timber firms compared with smallholders, the motion calls on FSC to shape the implementation of the motion so that it does not become a hardship. In particular, FSC staff can make available a tool that accepts digital shapefiles created in freely available mapping platforms such as Google Earth, which would not require Certificate Holders to purchase any software. Such a tool is already functioning as part of the FSC GIS Portal.

For smallholders and so-called “mega certificates” with hundreds of members, the motion proposing setting a threshold below which it makes sense to give Certificate Holders the option of recording a single point to represent their Forest Management Unit, rather than tracing their forest boundaries.

But enough about the possible obstacles and ways to overcome them. Instead, we encourage members to consider the great potential that this motion holds:

Last year, through the [FSC Open Knowledge Repository](#), FSC launched a pilot project through which the boundaries of certified forests are shown as an overlay to satellite imagery. [FSC On the Map](#) portrays certified forests in a planetary and landscape context -- transforming the way we think of certified forests just as the image of Earth from lunar orbit did in the famous 1968 photo taken by the astronauts of Apollo 8.

So far, FSC On the Map includes certified forests from Russia, Canada, New Zealand, Portugal, Romania, and the Baltic region. By expanding this coverage to any consenting certificate holder, FSC can enhance the transparency and credibility of certification, bolstering public trust in FSC, and advancing Goal 1.3 of the FSC Global Strategy, “Enhance verification and integrity.”

Geospatial data has become more widely available over the past decade, and public expectations of transparency and access to geographic information have increased as a result. It will be better for us to undertake this project proactively than to see it carried out selectively by critics of FSC, or through platforms such as [Global Forest Watch](#). FSC should keep pace with the public’s expectations in order to retain its social license.

A sample of FSC on the Map

Image not found or type unknown

--

Please note that the feasibility analysis is currently being updated. This version (PDF shown below) does not reflect yet this revision. We will upload the new version shortly.