

01/2020 Addition of French as FSC's Third Official Language
 Edited Statutory Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Athanase Didier Tsanga Ada	Benoit Jobbe-Duval	Vallauri Daniel
Organization / Individual	Tsanga Ada, Athanase Didier, Mr.	Association Technique Internationale des Bois Tropicaux	World Wide Fund for Nature France
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / South	Economic / North	Environmental / North

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THE SECONDER OF THIS MOTION HAS BEEN CHANGED 07/2022)

Purpose: To enable francophone speakers to participate fully in the affairs of FSC. French is a major international language, widely spoken and understood in international organizations and events. Within the FSC family, there are many francophone members, particularly in Africa, who feel largely excluded because they do not have access to translations in the French language. Especially, French as the international communication medium of the stakeholders of the Congo Basin forests, the second largest forest area in the world or second lung of the Earth, should give these stakeholders an opportunity to fully participate in FSC core processes, and to salvage this World's heritage for mankind:

Statutory Motion (change to the Statutes): Present wording: TITLE ONE. Third clause. The official languages of the Organization shall be Spanish and English. The main documents and materials published by the Organization shall be available in both languages. All documents submitted to the Organization, such as standards, applications and Principles and Criteria will be made available in English and Spanish by the Organization. Other languages may be added if approved by the General Assembly. These statutes are available both in English and Spanish, and both texts shall be binding and constitute one single document; in the understanding, however, that in the event of differences between both versions, the English version shall prevail.

Suggested Amendment:

TITLE ONE, Third Clause, shall read: The official languages of the Organization shall be Spanish, French and English. The main documents and materials published by the Organization shall be available in all three languages. All documents submitted to the Organization, such as standards, applications and Principles and

Criteria will be made available in English, French and Spanish by the Organization. Other languages may be added if approved by the General Assembly. These statutes are available both in English, French and Spanish, and both texts shall be binding and constitute one single document; in the understanding, however, that in the event of differences between any of the versions, the English version shall prevail. Specifications for implementation: Translation of principal documents and interpreting during FSC major events

Background / rationale:

The existing statutes specifically all that " Other languages may be added if approved by the General Assembly." Now that FSC has reached high level of international presence, it is time to activate this approval for the French language in particular as it is widely spoken in important forested regions of the world, especially the Congo Basin and Canada; moreover, France itself is an important market.. There are some 300 million French speakers worldwide, either as a first or second language (francophonie.org) which is not far short of the total worldwide of Spanish speakers (470 million according to Wikipedia). In important FSC events, such as the GA, the practice now is to offer simultaneous translations of Spanish and English into French for the greater comprehension of the many members from francophone countries around 90 currently. So, in a sense this motion is to formalize what is already taking place.

Download here the Feasibility Analysis by the FSC Secretariat:

[Feasibility Analysis by the FSC Secretariat](#)

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):

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 08/2022)

The high-level action request is to build on the already established structure of the 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 enable their activities to incorporate more effectively the members' local knowledge, contacts and outlook. The proposed mechanism is to establish independent governance bodies, drawn from international members in a given region, to give strategic and practical guidance to the regional and sub-regional offices. 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 is:

1. 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. 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. 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 to designate specifically in the statutes the role of regional offices, referred to in the Network Policy document (version 2) as regional teams, led by a regional director. In addition, the terminology of National Office shall also be changed to Network Partner as indicated in the approved policy document. The track changes are indicated in italics.

1. FSC *Network Partner*: 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). *Network Partners* shall have a multi-stakeholder governance structure, similar to that of the Organization, as outlined in these Statutes.

2. 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. 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.

4. FSC Regional Committees, integrated by the Chair of each Network Partner, to advise on strategic direction and strengthen collaboration within FSC designated regional offices. Where no Network Partner exists, independent Regional Advisory Councils shall be established to give guidance to the regional entity. These governance bodies shall aim to reflect the basic governance principles of the organisation.

Background / rationale:

At present there is no reference in the Statutes to regional offices nor is there a direct contact channel between the members and these FSC IC appointed entities. There is a clear disconnect with the membership. Moreover regional offices are frequently perceived as means for "top-down" management by FSC IC, the more so in areas of the Global South where there are no or few independent Network Partners. The motion seeks to remedy this and develop an effective membership role by introducing the concept of democratically organised regional advisory entities. The rationale behind this is to build on FSC's Core Strength as being anchored in membership engagement via the Network as identified in the Global Strategy. The intent is to strengthen the present Global-Regional-Local framework to achieve strategic goals by explicitly mobilising and empowering membership participation at the regional level. The suggested model can be developed from that of the Advisory Councils set up for FSC Ukraine and more recently for FSC Africa but with the participants selected by the members with, where possible, both a cross-Chamber and country balance. The committees and councils would have specific policy functions such as market outreach but these would vary according to local conditions. Each regional and sub-regional office would actively engage with the membership to establish

committees or councils within 12 months of the motion being approved. In the unlikely event of insufficient membership interest in any one sub-region, there would then be scope to amalgamate sub-regions into an overall regional advisory council. The cost of the new entities would be relatively low in comparison that of FSC- contracted staff.

The focus is on an inclusive, interactive 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”*. Furthermore, the enhanced engagement would be a cost-effective means for encouraging significant membership participation in regions that do not have Independent Network Partners (INP). The main expected outcome is to develop regional activities more in line with member and stakeholder expectations, using their expertise and contacts. Thereby, through active membership engagement and involvement, multiple advantages to promote certification are realizable collectively. An obvious benefit would be to upgrade market potential across borders through shared knowhow and orient policies according to regional characteristics. Collective experiences in social and environmental aspects can also contribute to upgrading performance. Moreover, bringing together members may generate new possibilities of donor fund-raising at a regional rather than one country level.

An additional consequence of enhanced member engagement via the suggested improvements may well be to 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 as has been noted in the Congo Basin. However, the rationale equally applies in areas which have a stronger membership presence, so enabling members to share experiences and ideas. 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, South/Central Asia, the Balkans and also Latin America where cost considerations are putting at risk individual INPs.

05/2020 Increase FSC Intl. Performance and Transparency
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):

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 08/2022)

FSC Intl. needs to improve its transparency and performance.

Background / rationale:

FSC is a member's organization and the Global Strategy's central principle is "co-creation".

However, in the last few years FSC Intl. has increased its layers of bureaucracy and confidentiality. The current structure is rigid and so it does not stimulate cooperation, both internally and with members. Slowly FSC Int. has become an opaque organisation that is no longer fully accountable for its decisions - something that may affect its credibility as a certification based organisation.

FSC Intl. needs fresh critical thinking so as to improve both its transparency and performance.

This motion requests:

- A structure (depts, units, etc) and processes review by an experienced independent consultant with a view of increasing collaboration, creativity and thus performance.
- As a result of this review, measure, track and publish suitable performance KPIs (e.g. membership engagement levels, responsiveness to member queries, etc) every 12 months.

- Increase visibility, transparency and accountability of Senior Management by hosting open Q&A sessions online with membership (C.O.O. as main host) every 4 months.
- Defuse confidentiality: by default, all finished documents should be openly available to the membership so as to stimulate transparency, contributions and collaboration. Create a clear policy that justifies exceptions clearly and precisely.

06/2020 Referendum-Petition direct democracy
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):

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 08/2022)

Allow for motions to be continually polished by the membership in a updated and redesigned Motions Platform.

Background / rationale:

Based on direct democracy models of Swiss Referendum and UK Petition system. Instead of waiting for GA every 3 or so years M06 asks for the update and redesign of the online motion's platform so that it becomes a continuous forum for co-creation, debate and refinement of motions texts until they reach enough votes to be approved.

The motion requests a re-design of the Motions Platform so that it can:

- host motions (same template as today's: proposer/seconded/title/request/rationale)
- allow for collaborative discussion and refinement (forum/video/slido/etc)

- Include input and collaboration from all units within Secretariat
- Once a motion gathers enough votes (same rules as GA) it becomes approved.
- Motion ideas older than 2 GAs are retired.

This will:

- Reduce chance of motions coming back to GA for clarification
- encourage global participation with its online reach
- allow for longer, broader discussions and so more polished motion texts
- reduce the number of motions to be voted on GAs

This motion does NOT replace GA. But it will allow for easier and better collaboration on motions' texts, saving vital time at GAs for the more complex motions to be discussed.

07/2020 Motion on FSC Oversight Committee
Accepted by MC Policy Motion

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

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

FSC to establish an Oversight and Scrutiny Committee as an independent entity (a group of qualified non-members), reviewing and guiding Internal Audit and Reporting of the whole FSC system to the Board, making recommendations.

Background / rationale:

Objective is to provide independent oversight of the functioning of the FSC system including the FSC International Board, Secretariat, FSC Regional Offices, FSC National Offices and key policies and plans.

The concept of this motion is one of independent oversight. Independent both from the political structures of FSC by way of the membership and chamber-based system; and independent of the Board and Secretariat. A committee of highly professional and well-regarded individuals would form the committee and be given the responsibility to ensure that the board and the secretariat work so as to deliver the intent of FSC Motions, Policies and Plans. The Committee would have no formal decision-making power but would guide the work of FSC system in relation to internal audit and would make recommendations to the FSC International board. The Committee would be open to submission of issues from the membership and other stakeholders though not necessarily bound to act upon them. In the interests of transparency, the Committee would produce an annual report on issues reviewed and its assessment of the operation of the FSC system.

Specifications for implementation:

1. Establish a committee (3-5 people) each of whom would be independent of the membership, secretariat, Regional Offices, National Offices and board
2. The committee would be professionals of standing with a good understanding of Normative Frameworks and the work of FSC, for example maybe from other ISEAL organisations and or from within the ISO system, UN system.
3. The committee to establish its own terms of reference and work plan.
4. The committee to guide the work of the FSC system.
5. The committee to be open to inputs from Members and Stakeholders and review these at their own discretion.
6. The committee to provide recommendations to the FSC International Board but have no decision making authority.
7. The committee to provide an annual report to the membership summarizing activities undertaken, findings and recommendations made.

08/2020 Motion on Alignment of 3 levels of FSC Governance
Accepted by MC Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Chris van der Goot	Peter Dam	Thankappannair Rajalayam Manoharan
Organization / Individual	Ecohout Foundation	Dam, Peter, Mr.	Manoharan, TR, Dr
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / North	Economic / South	Environmental / South

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

FSC to investigate possibilities for better alignment of FSC global governance with regional and national realities. The improvement of this alignment will focus on including a regional Board or Committee, elected from national boards and/or from FSC members in that region, which oversees the regional office, helps to match national needs, and advises the International Board of Directors.

FSC shall seek to decentralize its operations to improve functioning, to recognize diversity and to minimize climate impacts.

FSC shall conduct a study on the feasibility of maximizing decentralizing operations closer to forest dependent communities and/or areas of excellence in specific fields (e.g., technology, marketing, forest policy). The results of this study will lead to recommendations to be shared with the membership.

Background / rationale:

Objective: To provide better alignment of FSC governance with regional and national realities.

Specifications for implementation:

1. Investigate

2. The Board of Directors should promote and activate discussion about decentralization with members and develop a proposal to reform Article 38 of statutes in the immediate next General Assembly.
3. Report to membership
4. Immediate action to improve alignments where possible and to consult and put to vote proposals for structural (statutory) changes.

The motion proposes to align the three levels of governance of the FSC in a decentralized, efficient, collaborative, participative and innovative model of governance that: i) respects the principles of good governance, ii) ratifies power of members as maximum organism to take decisions; and, iii) integrate national and regional perspectives in the global strategic vision.

The rationale of this motion is to increase member's participation in the national and regional levels which are underrepresented in FSC. In some regions national levels empowering members and stimulating members participation do not exist. In some places, members have little or no participation in regional decisions and regional offices don't have communication with members.

Some concerns of excessive centralization and no balance of power has been raised by members in Europe, Latino-America and Africa. This motion is looking to reaffirm that the FSC is a decentralized organization with a transcendental and irreplaceable voice of members in all levels of governance.

The centralization of FSC operations in Europe puts FSC at risk from having operations and staff being distant from forest areas, forest dependent businesses, forest dependent communities and indigenous peoples. Areas of innovation, technology, and policy exist in places better connected to forests, stakeholders and indigenous peoples and FSC should move operations to such areas. Examples would be marketing and technology. Currently, the location of these operations are neither in centres of innovation or found in or near forest dependent regions. Further, locating such operations in centres of excellence will minimize travel and lower climate impacts.

FSC was created as a decentralized member's organization as is written in statutes and every governance instrument need to be connected with these principles. The Global Strategic Plan needs to be aligned also to the principles of this organization in every renovation for each 5 years.

09/2020 Review and Change the Motion Process
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):

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 08/2022)

The motion process needs to be reviewed and changed.

Background / rationale:

The motion process is outdated and causing problems for all of FSC.

It shall therefore be revised, including full participation by membership and secretariat. A new motion system shall be designed that results in a reduction of the quantity and an increase in the quality of motions that go before General Assemblies.

The process of submitting motions initially need not change so all ideas and proposals can be considered by the membership and secretariat, but a new process for filtering, prioritising and improving motions shall be developed.

This motion is not prescriptive as to how it should be developed on purpose - it is outcome oriented.

A successful outcome will ensure that the manageable number of motions reach the GA will:

- have text that is clear and easy to understand by all members
- pass through filters for both quality and priority such as
 - Comprehensive impact assessment (all stakeholders)
 - Funds and staff are available

- Practicality of implementation
- The consultation process is comprehensive, transparent and inclusive, and that the final version is put forward to the membership for approval.

The intention is for:

- Fewer and better motions.
- Well-informed voting, especially on complex and older issues.
- More collaboration between proposers and secretariat before and after voting.
- Secretariat to be transparent and fully **accountable** for its implementation.

10/2020 Respecting the proposals of Standards Development Groups (SDGs)
Accepted by MC Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Benoit Jobbe-Duval	Edwige Eyang Effa	Javier Fernandez Candela
Organization / Individual	Association Technique Internationale des Bois Tropicaux	Eyang Effa, Edwige, Ms.	Fundación Copade España
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / North	Environmental / South	Social / North

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

The FSC shall ensure that balanced proposals of recognized Standards Development Groups (SDGs) based on Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) are respected in relation to the implementation of motions adopted by the global FSC General Assembly of members (FSC GA).

Therefore, FSC shall revise existing norms and/or develop further norms which require scrutinizing motions duly adopted by the FSC membership at global level against the needs and expectations of local constituents. The social, environmental and economic impacts of motions duly adopted by the global FSC GA shall be identified and assessed. Recognized SDGs shall ensure that impacts are comprehensively captured and assessed and that the intent of motions duly adopted by the global FSC GA is maintained.

In case recognized SDGs propose based on FPIC that particular provision(s) of motions duly adopted by the global FSC GA cannot be implemented without compromising the potential for social, environmental and/or economic development, SDGs may propose to amend or replace said provision(s).

The FSC shall respect proposals by recognized SDGs to amend or replace particular provision(s) of motions duly adopted by the global FSC GA.

Background / rationale:

The FSC General Assembly meets periodically and decides on motions proposed by members. Most motions are not accompanied by a comprehensive assessment of local / national / regional and/or international social (including socio-economic and socio-cultural) and environmental and economic impact.

The FSC has successfully adopted systems that rely on expertise, experience and competence of duly convened balanced Standards Development Groups (SDGs). However, these systems are currently not used to the extent possible and needed.

This motion intends use the expertise, experience and competence of recognized SDGs to ensure that the intent of motions adopted by FSC GAs is maintained but to avoid that particular provisions of such motions compromise the potential for social, environmental and/or economic development.

Social, environmental and/or economic realities differ greatly around the world. A single approach to forest management standards and certification is not useful as it would not be able to take into account local, national and/or regional conditions. Recognizing this fact, the FSC systems requires that international FSC Forest Management (FM) standards shall be adapted by recognized SDGs to the realities and conditions of specific regions or countries through elaboration of regionally or nationally adapted FM-standards by SDGs. This principle has proven its value throughout FSC's successful development and is well appreciated by the FSC, its Board of Directors and its membership.

Social, environmental and economic constituents are engaged in SDGs. Decisions in SDGs are taken in democratic processes based on FPIC and equitably balancing social, environmental and economic interests. Members of the SDGs are skilled local professionals familiar with the local conditions. Only these professionals can reliably evaluate the conditions and social, environmental and economic needs in their region and/or country. Furthermore, they are required to implement outcomes of mandatory public consultations, open to all stakeholders. Therefore, the SDGs are the only reliable base for elaboration of national FM-standard. Their considerations and proposals must be respected by FSC.

Download below the Feasibility Analysis by the FSC Secretariat:

12/2020 Improvement of International Board election model
Accepted by MC Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Anatoly Lebedev	Anton Doroshin	Pending Status
Organization / Individual	Lebedev, Anatoly, Mr.	Certification Association Russian Register	
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / South	Economic / South	Environmental / South

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

I suggest to improve the model of election FSC International Board members to equally reflex size of forest cover in the regions by their representation in the Board. Currently 25 % of global forests under CIS countries practically cannot be represented by any person in the Board via direct election by all 1159 international members. Only 1,8 % of them (21 member, including personal ones) are in the list, and have never a chance to overcome voters from other regions. I suggest to establish different value of each vote, dependently on the size of forest area in the certain region, or on the number of regional voters, proportionally. That will finally, after 25 years of remaining outsiders, give Russian speaking global FSC leaders to express our specific problems and defend our interest in the Board, and bring more activity on certification to the vast Siberian forests in Aian Russia, containing 17 % of global forests, remaining in deep corruption and unsustainable logging mode.

Background / rationale:

CIS region amongst 6 FSC global regions possess 25 % of global forest cover. Recently it became global leader in FSC certification, which obviously require increasing attention to the existing problems of this vast forest area from all FSC institutions. Our forests remain national legally, but whole management is delivered to regional governments and logging companies. Vast territory, extremely weak and poor control of logging and markets, corruption in regional forest governance and full dependence of Siberian companies on Chinese markets create a set of obstacles for promotion FSC, particularly in Asian Russia, containing 2/3 of the whole Russian forests. 2 efforts of our international members to enter FSC Board during last 8 years demonstrated clear impossibility for us to win existing elections, despite all experience, free English of candidates and serious support. Tropical forest absolute majority in FSC always reasonably vote for



themselves, and it may be changed via new voting model only.

14/2020 Calibration of national FSC-standards
 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):

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THE SECONDER OF THIS MOTION HAS BEEN CHANGED 03/2021)

We request the organization to undertake an evaluation of national FSC-standards and their contribution to FSCs mission in regard to positive environmental and social standards achievements.

If there are wider differences particularly in neighbouring countries the evaluation should also evaluate the way FSC is endorsing national standards through its existing procedures and if the differences might be connected with different levels of 3-chamber-representations and related effects. The evaluation could start in Europe based on preliminary work which has been done by FSC-partners already, knowing that also in most other regions differences in national standards have been observed and calibration-efforts have been undertaken. Existing results of these efforts should be considered in the evaluation.

Background / rationale:

The mission of FSC is the aim to improve forestry in regards to environmental and social standards. This is achieved through IGIs, 3-chamber-based approaches for national standards and an endorsement process of those national standards. All those elements have to contribute to FSCs mission and need to perform well at all levels.

It is observed that, the interaction of existing rules may not lead to comparable results of standards. Particularly in situations where small countries with comparable growing conditions develop national standards, a reflection of the situation in neighbouring situations is currently not part of the system and leads to differences which are of concern for members. The proposer and the seconders observe the situation in Europe for many years with growing concerns. From other regions the proposer and seconders know, that calibration efforts have taken place but there seems to be no systematic knowledge, if these efforts have led to more comparable standards or to comparable contributions to FSCs mission and its underlying values.

Concerns are NOT only coming from environmental or social organizations, but there is also growing concerns also from an economic perspective, as differences in national standards do lead to serious competitive imbalances in cross-border business.

The motion intends to evaluate the current situation based on existing studies and asks for a transparent process with conclusions of the organization if adjustments are needed and appropriate to deliver to FSCs mission through national FSC-standards.

Conclusions of the evaluation can be:

- Acknowledgement, that existing standards are leading to competitive imbalances
- Adjustments of requirements for national standard development groups (composition, harmonization requirements)
- Rebalancing of requirements for IGI-adoption versus ideas around the risk-based approach program.

The results of the evaluation and following processes can contribute to

- Better national FSC-standards focusing more on FSCs mission
- Reduction of competitive imbalances through FSC-products based on different national standards and not on differences in economy cross boarder
- More focus on relevant issues in national FSC-standards and less bureaucracy for forest owners through a technical system focusing on the key-issues with efficient systems.
- Overview on engagement level and balance of environmental, social and economic views in national standard setting processes.

Download below the Feasibility Analysis by the FSC Secretariat:

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):

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THE SECONDER OF THIS MOTION HAS BEEN CHANGED 03/2021)

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.

16/2020 Acknowledging the synergies that exist between FSC and nationwide legal frameworks developed through the FLEGT Action Plan.

Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Ida Bagus Wiradnyana Putra	Rahmat Rahmat	Andrew Ng
Organization / Individual	Putra, Ida Bagus Wiradnyana, Mr.	The Borneo Initiative	Ng, Andrew, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / South	Environmental / South	Social / South

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THE SECONDER OF THIS MOTION HAS BEEN CHANGED 02/2022)

The membership proposes that FSC formally recognize the strategic importance of mandatory and well-enforced national legislation, developed and endorsed through FLEGT Voluntary Partnership Agreement processes, as foundations for sustainable forest management.

The membership also proposes that FSC endorse a combined audit approach for the SVLK and FSC standards across forest management units in Indonesia.

17a/2020 A pathway towards ensuring high and consistent standards of animal management in FSC certified forests

Edited Statutory Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Ian Redmond	Alan Smith	Kevin O' Grady
Organization / Individual	Born Free Foundation	Smith, Alan, Dr.	O' Grady, Kevin, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Environmental / North	Social / North	Economic / North

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 07/2022)

Full motion title: A pathway towards ensuring high and consistent standards of animal management in FSC certified forests, generating reputational, social, biodiversity, public health and economic benefits while respecting cultural practices.

At the next review of the FSC Principles and Criteria, the following criterion is added in the appropriate Principle:

New Criterion:

The Organization shall meet high and consistent standards of animal management and shall incorporate any human/animal interactions within the Management Unit into existing FSC management plans.

Background / rationale:

Note: due to FSC's formal requirements, the motion on animal* management is presented in two separate, but connected motions:

1. Motion 17a: proposes the addition of a new criterion to the FSC Principles and Criteria. Such a proposal has to be presented as a Statutory Motion.

2. Motion 17b: proposes a set of International Generic Indicators to the new criterion. As this proposal requires a policy change, but not a change in the FSC Principles and Criteria, it has to be presented as a Policy Motion.

High standards of animal management are vital in order to achieve FSC's aims. Why?

- FSC is a leading sustainability standard. Animal protection and welfare matters to the public and is a key consumer issue when making purchasing decisions.

The FSC standards already cover some of the areas envisaged by this motion, eg HCV and Pesticides policy, but responsible animal management is not specifically considered and the high-profile cases and negative publicity we have had, and will continue to have in FSC certified Forest, will continue to damage the FSC Brand

Including high and consistent standards of animal management in the standards will boost the public perception of the FSC brand and the certified forest industry whereas inaction may be perceived as indifference. As a focus on animal welfare develops there are potentially many opportunities to promote the FSC brand on the basis of animal welfare.

FSC certification is also being suggested as an indicator for the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework being developed by the UN Convention on Biological Diversity, in relation to its target on the productivity, sustainability and resilience of biodiversity in agricultural and other managed ecosystems. In order to be seen as a credible indicator, FSC must be able to demonstrate responsible management of wild animals* within certified forests.

- *Note, in this context, animal refers to vertebrate animals.

Download below the Feasibility Analysis by the FSC Secretariat:

17b/2020 A pathway towards ensuring high and consistent standards of animal management in FSC certified forests

Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Ian Redmond	Alan Smith	Kevin O' Grady
Organization / Individual	Born Free Foundation	Smith, Alan, Dr.	O' Grady, Kevin, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Environmental / North	Social / North	Economic / North

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 07/2022)

Full motion title: A pathway towards ensuring high and consistent standards of animal management in FSC certified forests.

At the next review of the IGI (FSC-STD-60-004), the following indicator is added:

Generic Indicator to require that:

Any human/animal interactions in the Management Unit are incorporated into the existing FSC management plans. In the management plan, certificate holders shall demonstrate use of any locally applicable, existing or legislated best management practice guidelines that have been developed and are accepted by key experts and stakeholders.

The indicators for any human/animal interactions in the Management Unit shall include as a minimum:

1. Activity within the Management Unit that may negatively affect non-target species or individuals.
2. Necessary humane management or control of native, alien or pest vertebrate species

3. Respect for indigenous and traditional peoples' rights and cultural practices.

4. A commitment to encouraging and facilitating ongoing research and improvements to the management practices for 1 and 2

The Certificate holder shall demonstrate that, in the process of consultation of their management plan, any feedback from stakeholders in relation to animal welfare provisions has been taken into account.

Background / rationale:

Note: due to FSC's formal requirements, the motion on animal management is presented in two separate, but connected motions:

1. Motion 17a: proposes the addition of a new criterion to the FSC Principles and Criteria. Such a proposal has to be presented as a Statutory Motion.
2. Motion 17b: proposes a set of International Generic Indicators to the new criterion. As this proposal requires a policy change, but not a change in the FSC Principles and Criteria, it has to be presented as a Policy Motion.

High standards of animal management are vital in order to achieve FSC's aims. Why?

FSC is a leading sustainability standard. Animal protection and welfare matters to the public and is a key consumer issue when making purchasing decisions.

The FSC standards already cover some of the areas envisaged by this motion, eg HCV and Pesticides policy, but responsible animal management is not specifically considered and the high-profile cases and negative publicity we have had, and will continue to have in FSC certified Forest, will continue to damage the FSC Brand

Including high and consistent standards of animal management in the standards will boost the public perception of the FSC brand and the certified forest industry whereas inaction may be perceived as indifference. As a focus on animal management practices develops there are potentially many opportunities to promote the FSC brand on the basis of animal welfare.

FSC certification is also being included as an indicator for the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework being developed by the UN Convention on Biological Diversity, in relation to its target on the productivity, sustainability and resilience of biodiversity in agricultural and other managed ecosystems. In order to be seen as a credible indicator, FSC must be able to demonstrate responsible management of wild animals within certified forests.

This isn't a major change – or a costly one. It will not detract resources from other strategic aims. It just uses the current process to incorporate the consideration of animal management issues within the IGIs. It is however recognised that there may be initial efforts and time costs by FMUs in incorporating the requirements into existing management plan and that this may vary depending on factors like local legislative requirements.

References:

Dubois et al. (2017), International consensus principles for ethical wildlife control. Conservation Biology. doi :10.1111/cobi.12896 Link: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/cobi.12896/full>

<https://www.ipbes.net/news/Media-Release-Global-Assessment>

Download below the Feasibility Analysis by the FSC Secretariat:

18/2020 Improving the application of Principle 9 and stewardship of HCV2s, including IFLs
 Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Markus Pfannkuch	Aluísio Patrocínio de Sousa	André Luiz Menezes Vianna
Organization / Individual	Precious Woods Holding Ltd	COOMFLONA - Cooperativa Mista da Flona do Tapajós	Instituto de Conservação e Desenvolvimento Sustentável do Amazonas
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / North	Social / South	Environmental / South

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 08/2022)

To meet the actual needs of FSC-certified organizations operating in natural forests in maintaining a sound level of performance in social, environmental, and economic aspects, as well as ensuring improved implementation of Principle 9 (P9), the concept of *Intact Forest Landscapes (IFL)* shall be incorporated in FSC's normative framework as a tool for the identification and management of HCV2s. As such:

1. IFLs shall be subjected to the same management and conservation procedures required for HCV2 under principle 9.
 - a. The Global Forest Watch IFL maps shall continue to be a tool for identifying these specific types of HCV2.
 - b. Whenever there is an incidence of IFLs within the Management Unit, the network of conservation areas shall primarily be allocated within these ecosystems.

- c. Thresholds for the establishment of protection zones or the conservation area network shall be determined by national or regional SDGs in a way to guarantee the long-term conservation of these ecosystems and the allocation of ecological corridors aimed to connect existent IFLs within and outside the FMU, according to legally, culturally and ecologically appropriate parameters.
 - d. Whenever there is forest management for timber production within IFLs, harvesting is carried out using specific precautionary measures, including an adaptive management structure, based on robust planning, implementation, monitoring, and the adoption of improvements based on the assessments conducted.
2. Management strategies, including the management of permanent infrastructure, roads, and harvesting trails within HCV2, shall ensure:
 - a. That robust spatial planning is conducted in a way that main roads and access roads minimize the effects of IFL fragmentation.
 - b. That the effect of harvesting, including fragmentation of IFLs, does not result in long-term damage to these HCVs.
 - c. That measures for the prevention of illegal logging, windthrow, degradation, poaching, and other edge effect impacts are adopted.
3. FSC Staff should prioritize projects (including tier 3 proposals) that address advocacy strategies within countries with significant extensions of HCV2, including IFLs, seeking to approach the stewardship of these ecosystems at a landscape level and promote better dialogue with local authorities and other affected and interested stakeholders.
4. The normative effects of motion 65/2014 will be immediately canceled, including:
 - a. International Generic Indicators (FSC-STD-60-004 V2-0, Annex E items 1iii, 4iv, 5viii and 5x; 9.2.4; 9.2.5; 9.2.7; 9.3.3; 9.3.4, Annex H)
 - b. Advice notes (ADVICE-20-007-018 v1-0, 01/01/2017)
 - c. The term “ecosystem intactness” will be replaced with “long-term ecosystem integrity” throughout the normative framework.
 - d. The default indicator and cutoff date end of 2016 mentioned in motion 65/2014 are no longer applicable
 - e. Any IFL related NCRs issued for FSC certificate holders due to violation of the current IFL thresholds shall not suspend or terminate certificates until a regional interpretation is concluded.

Cost to FSC

125'000Euro for five national or regional advocacy initiatives as mentioned under point 3.

Timeline

Cancellation of normative effects mentioned above under point 4: 01.01.2023

Study: to be finished by the end of 2023

Background / rationale:

FSC was created 28 years ago with a mission to achieve environmental, social, and economic impacts through sound forest management. The actual draft of the *FSC Global Strategic Plan* envisages the doubling of the certified area in tropical forests and small-scale community forests in these areas until 2030. This plan acknowledges the role of FSC as a promoter of sound forest management, given the rise of tropical forest deforestation around the globe.

However, driven by the need to protect tropical forests on the planet, in 2014, a Motion was approved stating that the Intact Forest Landscape (IFL) concept should be incorporated into FSC Principles and Criteria for Forest Management all over the world (Motion 65/2014). However, the obligations that came from this measure impose an overwhelming burden on the certified enterprises and do not consider regional specificities. If certified enterprises operating within IFLs are prevented from maintaining their FSC-certified operations, major social and environmental drawbacks can occur by exposing these production forests to deforestation and degradation drivers, such as land grabbing and illegal activities.

In fact, up to 5.5 million hectares of certified natural tropical forest will lose their certification under Motion 65/2014 in the near term or leave FSC soon since these companies are losing economic competitiveness and even the feasibility of operating. This would reduce the certified area in natural forests in the Congo Basin by 90% and in the Brazilian Amazon by 100%. During the Regional Meeting in Cancún, 2018, attendants also concluded that the current rules would put important players in the whole of Latin America aside from FSC forest management certification, such as community-based and small forestry operations.

IFL maps are fundamentally important for the identification of 'pristine' forest areas and, therefore, for several processes aimed at improved forest protection, including the FSC directives under Principle 9. However, taking the concept of 'intact' literally and impeding forest management to occur in FSC-certified production forests within IFLs is senseless for a number of reasons.

1. Perhaps the most important reason is that most forests of the planet, including the tropical ones, have been managed and modified by indigenous populations for centuries. Thus, Motion 65/2014 inconsistently also acts to exclude traditional communities from developing certified small-scale community forest management.

2. The IFL mapping algorithm was developed as a tool for wide-scale ecosystem conservation planning, which is clearly inconsistent with forest management at an FSC FMU level. To cite one of the creators of the algorithm, *“our results are generally not immediately suitable for local-scale conservation planning, as our globally consistent criteria may be in conflict with locally used criteria and locally known disturbances may have been overlooked”* (Potapov et al., 2008). In the same article, Potapov acknowledges that *“...total protection of IFLs may be difficult in some cases for socioeconomic reasons. The most accessible and productive areas for food and timber production may already have been exhausted or degraded, and population growth and lack of other opportunities also increase pressure on remaining marginal areas. In such situations, an appropriate strategy may be to divide IFLs into zones. This would entail creating zones of strict nature protection (where the goal would be to preserve intactness values) and of low-impact management (in which limited forestry operations or small-scale farming with strict observance of ecological norms could take place). ...”* Finally, in 2015, the author says that *“...we suggest that IFLs should be considered when existing PA networks are revised and expanded. We also suggest that monitoring of forest intactness should be treated as an important aspect of national and global forest assessments. ...”* (Potapov et al., 2015)
3. The implementation of Motion 65 will likely shut down most of the operations certified by FSC in the tropics and discourage the growth in certification in other countries, taking the system away from making the difference in tropical countries as stated in its strategic plan. For example, the Motion 34/2017 study in the Congo Basin revealed that FSC certification of tropical forests would barely be possible. The FSC-certified area will shrink under Motion 65/2014, leaving the field to other certification schemes or even non-sustainable and illegal operations. For Brazil, likewise, imposing Motion 65 on the FSC-certified operations in the Amazon would render FSC-certified forestry unfeasible. It would also make the certification system very unattractive in public lands under concessions, with great potential for expansion in the next decade. The study for Canada consistently showed that economic impacts from protecting IFLs would be proportional to the level of these ecosystems to be set aside from logging within the FMUs.
4. Even if Motion 65 is integrally implemented for the sake of nature protection and, hence, ignoring the economic and social aspects that are also foundation aspects of FSC, the gains coming from this measure would be negligible. To cite examples extracted from the Motion 34 studies in key countries, only 10% of Canadian IFLs are under forest tenure, only 1,4% of the Congolese IFLs are inside FSC certified concessions, only 0,6% of the Brazilian IFLs are within certified FMUs, and only 3.5M hectares of the Russian IFLs (out of a total of 255M hectares) are in FSC certified forestry concessions. So, the membership should discuss if it is worthwhile to lose hundreds of certificates, give up the relevance of the FSC system in the tropics, and ignore the social and economic aspects of its mission. Moreover, running the risk of also losing the actual forests certified to land grabbing, poaching, and illegal logging. All just to give a marginal contribution to IFL protection.
5. Forest management and reduced impact logging are the best contribution of FSC forest certification for the long-term conservation of production forests. As suggested by Putz et al. (2019), *“... maximizing intact forest in areas designated for logging might, from a landscape-level environmental perspective, be counter-productive especially if by so doing, timber yields decline. Instead, we advocate first of all for scrupulous use of RIL practices and for yield maintenance in designated portions of the logging landscape that are ecologically and economically appropriate...”*.

The largest extents of IFLs in the key countries investigated by Motion 34 studies are under public or provincial domain, in areas not suitable for logging, or/and largely under legal protection status and indigenous officially recognized territories. Several of these areas are nowadays jeopardized by poaching, illegal logging, and other criminal activities. To use the experience of the FSC system to support and convene the regional debate among different stakeholders, based on the experience accumulated by its membership in reconciling different interests and perspectives, is likely to be the major contribution that FSC can give to the long-term protection on a relevant scale of Intact Forest Landscapes.

References:

Potapov P., Hansen M. C., Laestadius L., Turubanova S., Yaroshenko A., Thies C., Smith W., Zhuravleva I., Komarova A., Minnemeyer S., Esipova E., The last frontiers of wilderness: Tracking loss of intact forest landscapes from 2000 to 2013. *Sci. Adv.* 3, e1600821 (2017).

Potapov, P., A. Yaroshenko, S. Turubanova, M. Dubinin, L. Laestadius, C. Thies, D. Aksenov, A. Egorov, Y. Yesipova, I. Glushkov, M. Karpachevskiy, A. Kostikova, A. Manisha, E. Tsybikova, and I. Zhuravleva. 2008. Mapping the world's intact forest landscapes by remote sensing. *Ecology and Society* 13(2): 51. [online] URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol13/iss2/art51/>

Putz FE, Baker T, Griscom BW, Gopalakrishna T, Roopsind A, Umunay PM, Zalman J, Ellis EA, Ruslandi and Ellis PW (2019) Intact Forest in Selective Logging Landscapes in the Tropics. *Front. For. Glob. Change* 2:30. doi: 10.3389/ffgc.2019.00030

19/2020 Compliance with the law (legislative and regulatory framework) outlined in motion 65 in 2014

Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Benoit Jobbe-Duval	Papy-Claude Bolaluembe Boliale	Norbert Gami
Organization / Individual	Association Technique Internationale des Bois Tropicaux	Bolaluembe Boliale, Papy-Claude, Mr.	Gami, Norbert, Dr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / North	Environmental / South	Social / South

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THE SECONDER OF THIS MOTION HAS BEEN CHANGED 07/2022)

The implementation of Motions 65 will require the consideration of national strategies for the preservation and protection of natural resources. FSC-certified companies must not stray away from the national regulatory framework, in order to comply with these Motions (Compliance with Principle 1).

It will therefore be necessary to supplement the list of 9 recommendations included in Motion 65 with the following recommendation:

"Take into account and comply with the national regulations and strategies relating to the preservation and protection of natural resources and the allocation and use of land."

Background / rationale:

In countries where the state owns most of the forests, the development of management plans is entrusted to forest concessionaires and are approved by the forestry administration. Revisions of management plans must comply with the forest management planning objectives and national strategies.

National conservation and development strategies have been elaborated considering the specific conditions in the countries. Some States have also engaged in individual actions and cooperative frameworks with the aim of contributing to the promotion of sustainable forest management. If these strategies are not congruent with FSC policies, states will not be encouraged to support FSC certification in their country.

Some States have already expressed their concern about the implementation of Motion 65 [reference to the letters from the COMIFAC, Gabon and the Republic of the Congo] via public statements. They are concerned about any external interferences with their land use planning and development objectives. In particular, they express that setting aside additional conservation areas in permanent forest areas dedicated to sustainable forest management is not in line with their land use planning and social and economic development perspectives.

Currently, countries in Central Africa dedicated a large part of their forests to protected areas, including IFLs. About 25% of IFL area in Central Africa are in protected areas and most IFL area, over 50%, is outside protected areas or forest concessions. Governments can focus land-use planning and social and economic development perspectives.

These positions are especially motivated by the risk of a decline in revenues and the undermining of the sovereignty of the States that have defined conservation areas (reserves and national parks) in the forest area. Potential income from conservation forest areas is currently too low (carbon and ecotourism) to represent a realistic alternative to sustainable forest management for multiple purpose, including logging.

The States should be catalysts that encourage FSC certification in order to favour responsible forest management policies. In the event of excessive constraints and incompatibility with their national strategies, these States could oppose the development of FSC certification in their countries. This stands in contrast to the draft Global Strategic Plan 2021-2026 which aims to “Strengthen Government Engagement” and increase the certified tropical forest area and area of community forests.

21/2020 Fundamental and global discussion about IFL core area protection threshold
Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Benoit Jobbe-Duval	Luciana Maria Papp	Norbert Gami
Organization / Individual	Association Technique Internationale des Bois Tropicaux	Papp, Luciana Maria, Ms.	Gami, Norbert, Dr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / North	Environmental / South	Social / South

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 08/2022)

FSC is requested to initiate a **fundamental discussion on the acceptable dispositions under which protection thresholds of IFL core area lower than 50% could be accepted**, in order to achieve the greatest conservation gains in IFLs in the FMU taking into account the scale, intensity and risk of the respective management operations, the precautionary principle, the results of scientific studies, and an analysis of risks for the IFL protection at the level of a country or a group of countries (i.e. beyond the concerned FMUs).

These discussions should aim at finding solutions in places where it was recommended as an interim solution and in countries without NFSS, to find an adapted consensus at the level of a country or a group of countries.

The results of this/these discussions should amend the relevant clause of the guidance FSC GUI 60 004.

Background / rationale:

Since the adoption of the M65 in 2014, strong concerns were raised early on by some certificate holders and governments, among others. The regional assessments (conducted within the Motion 34 implementation) showed 2 main conclusions:

-

The IFL areas inside FSC certified MUs amounted to between 0,6 and 7% of the total IFL area in the landscapes. This small percentage would not really ensure the protection of IFL at landscape and country level, thus only marginally contributing to achieving the intent of Motion 65/2014.

- The economic viability of certificate holders would be threatened at least in a medium to long-term perspective by rules for IFL protection inside FMUs as required under M65.

The Motion 65 is implemented through an Advice Note until a national standard with IFL indicators is launched. The High Conservation Values Technical Working Group developed International Generic Indicators (IGI) to implement the motion which were approved by the FSC Board of Directors in 2017. According to the IGI instructions (Annex H), the figure of what constitutes **the “vast majority” in a national context may differ from the 80% default threshold**, providing it **achieves the greatest amount of conservation gains** based on national or eco-regional considerations.

A guidance as been published in June 2020 to provide a clear case for threshold scenarios below the 80% default threshold stipulated by the International Generic Indicators v2.0 while at the same time clarifying how to respect the IFL definition of ‘vast majority’ (FSC GUI 60 004). In this guidance, a clause presents the conditions under which IFL core areas in MU can be below 50% (Clause vi). These conditions are extremely rare (if not absent) in many parts of the world, especially the tropics.

Some countries already set up Standard Development Groups (SDG) to develop indicators that aim to protect the vast majorities of IFLs and proposed thresholds below 50%. This proposition was refused by the FSC board, and it was proposed to SDG **to apply 50% as interim measure, until more fundamental discussion of relevant thresholds** and how to achieve the overall ‘greatest amount of conservation gains’ for the high conservation values that IFL areas represent at the upcoming FSC General Assembly in October (letter from FSC to FSC Standard Development Groups in the Congo Basin, 24 February 2020).

The results of the Regional Working Groups (RWG), particularly in the Congo Basin, despite the inclusion of interested stakeholders, were not recognized by the Board and the PSC, whereas the results of the work of the RWG had been justified and "validated" by the members.

22/2020 Widening the landscape approach to encompass diverse woodland ecosystems,
address climate change mitigation and generate innovative benefits for stakeholders
Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Alan Smith	Alois Mandlenkosi Mabutho	Marvin Ismael Centeno Solórzano
Organization / Individual	Smith, Alan, Dr.	Mabutho, Alois Mandlenkosi, Mr.	Centeno Solórzano, Marvin Ismael, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / North	Economic / South	Environmental / South

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 08/2022)

The motion requests FSC to begin a process to extend certification and ecosystems services validation to diverse and dispersed woodlands which until now have not been considered mainstream. This focus is now changing as woodlands in general have important implications across a spectrum of interests, not least climate change mitigation and adaptation. If FSC is to grow as envisaged in the Strategic 2026 Objective, it must widen its scope to encompass more diverse forest landscapes and so increase its relevance to the developing challenges. The intent of the motion is then to enhance FSC as a major tool to address environmental and social concerns across a variety of landscapes as well as generating income for stakeholders. At present stakeholders in these areas, particularly communities and smallholders, are either unaware of the utility of FSC certification or else lack the resources and knowhow to become certified even though it is possible under existing standards. Moreover there is no encouragement for them to do so despite opportunities for financial and reputational benefits. The motion asks for: (1) the establishment of a clear policy for such woodlands, including savannas, watersheds and wetlands, semiarid areas, mangroves, as well as land for agroforestry. (2) Within this, particular attention should be paid to the protection of ecosystems not currently covered, especially in relation to the roles they play in tackling climate change, and to gender aspects in household revenue generation from NTFPs. (3) Once the policy is approved, FSC can coordinate a call for project proposals to be designed with partner organisations to seek donor funding to test identified pilot areas, including where there are mosaics of different land uses. (4) In parallel with pilot testing, FSC would create communication and marketing mechanisms to demonstrate the potential positive impact of FSC certification within these landscapes. (5) Lastly guidance would be developed to indicate how existing pathways to certification can be used, identifying modifications needed, if any. All-in-all the approval of this motion would be a win-win for all chambers.

Background / rationale:

The FAO defines land with tree crown cover of more than 10% and an area of more than 0.5 hectares as forest yet these less dense woodlands are frequently not considered viable for FSC certification as the predominant land use is not necessarily for forestry. Even so, FSC is missing out as they can provide important forest products and services and are within the scope of Standard FSC-STD-01-001: "*The Principles and Criteria are globally applicable to all types and scales of forest*". Moreover, many of these woodlands are under threat and are inadequately managed, or not managed at all. For example, the area of mangroves decreased by over 1 million hectares between 1990 and 2020. Yet mangroves are effective in combatting climate change as they absorb 4 times as much CO₂ as terrestrial tropical forests. In addition their certification can extend FSC's presence in countries such as Fiji and Sri Lanka which are currently low profile but have coastal protection projects. Similarly savannas in many regions are under threat by human intervention such as indiscriminate logging and bush burning and yet provide essential ecosystems. The Sahel is another region where dispersed woodlands play a significant role in resisting desertification and at the same time provide high value NTFPs. And a recent paper by CIFOR highlights the potential for carbon sequestration in agroforestry and increased tree cover on agricultural land (Zomer et al, CIFOR, 2022).

The consequences of poor management are various: contamination of wetlands and water sources, soil erosion/landslides in watersheds and along coasts, heightened fire risk, loss of wildlife habitat. Not least are the risks inherent to the livelihoods of indigenous peoples and communities dependent on these diverse woodlands. In addition, the inefficient production of some marketable products such as fuelwood and charcoal, which are important domestic fuel sources in many parts of the world, detrimentally affects tree cover and increases vulnerability to desertification, droughts and exacerbates climate change.

The intent of the motion fits well with the FSC's 2026 Objective of *"Growing Our Reach"* and complements the Focus Forests project. It continues the momentum from the successful UN Environment/GEF supported project *"Expanding FSC certification at Landscape Level through Incorporating Additional Ecosystem Services"*. It relates to Global Strategy Goal 1.4 *"Expand the reach of FSC and its relevance in the fight against climate change and loss of biodiversity"*, Goal 2.4 *"Scale up benefits for Indigenous Peoples, communities, smallholders and workers"* and Goal 3.1 *"Advance the mission through stronger alliances, coalitions and partnerships"*. Certification of responsible management of such landscapes evidences their value to society as a whole, as aspired to in Strategy Goal 3.4 *"Accelerate awareness of the value of forests"*. At the same time, it enhances FSC's capacity to mitigate environmental challenges and protect community and indigenous peoples' livelihoods, dependent on maintaining the ecosystems. RECOFTC in its July, 2022 Newsletter highlights the value of indigenous peoples' communities in climate change mitigation and underscores the need for clear standards for their engagement in carbon markets. Forest restoration in agroecological settings is also relevant - see the recent CIFOR-ICRAF study on forest landscape restoration for coffee farmers in Uganda (World Development, February 2022).

FSC certification can aid market access. There are already export markets for a variety of non-timber products from tree species in semiarid areas such as cashew, shea and argan oil. Ecosystem services can also generate income including from watershed protection and wildlife ecotourism in savannas. Mangrove preservation can increase fish stocks. Carbon markets can be accessed in partnership with other organisations. Government support may well be available to meet the threats referred to above and a role for FSC can be envisaged if government funding is available.

FSC certification enables deficiencies to be identified, management upgraded, and risks mitigated. The social perspective is addressed and includes opportunities to enhance gender equality and indigenous peoples' rights as well as improve income generating prospects, so contributing to poverty alleviation. The gender perspective is particularly relevant for NTFPs which in many regions are harvested by women. If there are different land uses within the landscape, FSC can partner other entities to ensure adequate coverage of agroecological systems. In sum, an innovative integrated approach is advocated. All this has particular relevance to climate change. If the multiple values of such woodlands were not recognised, there is the likelihood of conversion to other land uses, so intensifying climate change threats.

In summary, the motion would extend the potential value of FSC certification in these wider landscapes to a range of stakeholders and society in general, in particular addressing climate change mitigation and adaptation. This requires a number of steps to be undertaken as shown in the high-level action request. The process outcome would achieve the successful conclusion of making FSC's relevance to the diverse woodlands more clearly known as well as providing practical guidance on how to access certification for them, thus over time significantly increasing the area certified. Any modifications needed would also be identified, however the P & C amply cover the scope of the diversity indicated and any such modifications would relate more to international generic indicators than major adaptations of the normative framework (see FSC-STD-60-004). Implementing the steps could be done in a relatively short time frame, say within 2 years of approval, and at low cost especially if external funding is available.

Video Statement:

<https://members.fsc.org/en/media/22-2020widening-the-landscape-approach-to-encompass-diverse-woodland-ecosystems-and-create>

23/2020 Using a landscape approach and 'below-the-canopy' analysis for the protection of
Intact Forest Landscapes

Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Benoit Jobbe-Duval	María Trujillo Yoshisato	Norbert Gami
Organization / Individual	Association Technique Internationale des Bois Tropicaux	Trujillo Yoshisato, María, Mrs.	Gami, Norbert, Dr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / North	Environmental / South	Social / South

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 08/2022)

The identification of protected core areas within Intact Forest Landscapes (IFL) and of specific protection and management measures beyond such core areas should be based on a landscape approach and a 'below-the-canopy' analysis, according to the following process:

- Step 1: Identification of IFLs, their core areas as well as their social, environmental, and economic values based on:
 - a landscape approach beyond the boundaries of the relevant forest management units;
 - a 'below-the-canopy' analysis within the relevant forest management units;
- Step 2: Analysis of assets, issues, risks and conservation priorities using an Environmental and Social Risk Assessment (ESRA) -type methodological approach ;
- Step 3: Definition of strict conservation measures within the core area, of precautionary management measures within the wider IFL area inside the forest management unit, and of monitoring measures across the overall IFL area, based on:
 - the area, scale, intensity, and risks of the forest operations,
 - an FPIC participatory approach with affected local and indigenous communities.

The entire analysis process conducted by the company shall:

- be carried out with engagement with interested and affected stakeholders of the landscape,
- be revised/validated by a peer review.

The outcomes of this analysis process must be made available through a public summary, including maps.

This approach should be applied when only an interim IFL solution is provided by the applicable Forest Stewardship Standard or in case that the applicable Forest Stewardship Standard does not include specific IFL rules.

The FSC Secretariat is asked to develop guidance within a time period of 6 months to define the framework for this new approach.

Background / rationale:

The objective of the motion is **to complement M65** and to evolve the modality of protection and management of IFLs on the basis of :

- the **landscape level**, i.e. beyond the boundaries of the FMU
- the identification of **conservation priorities** within IFLs considering High Conservation Values, by using “below the canopy” data and analysis

IFLs are a concept that has been defined globally on an international scale, which should be applied locally. A different but effective approach is needed in order to:

- achieve the objectives of protecting IFLs as set out in Motion 65/2014,
- meet the mission of the FSC to promote environmentally appropriate, socially beneficial, and economically viable management of the world's forests.

Since the adoption of the M65, strong concerns 2014 were raised early on by some certificate holders and governments, among others. The regional assessments conducted within the Motion 34/2017 implementation showed 2 main conclusions:

- The IFL areas inside FSC certified management units amounted to between 0,6 and 7% of the total IFL area in the landscapes. This small percentage would not really ensure the protection of IFLs at landscape and country level, thus only marginally contributing to achieving the intent of Motion 65/2014.
- The economic viability of certification would be threatened at least in a medium to long-term perspective by rules for IFL protection inside FMUs as required under Motion 65/2014.

Landscape approach

Maintenance of IFL is in FSC's current approach only addressed through a small sub-set of FMUs, which voluntarily commit to FSC standards and certification, but not in the context of the adjacent, much less the wider (forest) landscape. Moreover, only threats through forest management activities are taken into account, while completely ignoring external threats, which are often far more significant - e.g. poaching, illegal logging, conversion of forests including HCVs and IFLs to alternative land uses (forest plantations, industrial agriculture, mining, etc.).

This Landscape Approach shall consider all HCVs within the broader social, environmental and economic context in the landscape across existing land uses, not only the portion which is located in FSC-certified FMUs. This approach shall be integrated with land-use and conservation planning as well as conservation efforts in the wider landscape so that efforts are directed to places where they are most relevant (e.g. where IFLs and/or ICLs exist), most needed (e.g. where biggest threats exist) and most effective (e.g. where measures can maintain viable sets of HCVs at significant scale).

This analysis can be based on the Focus Forests initiative, initiated by FSC to formulate FSC's approach to forests with special environmental and social value. Focus Forests will deliver a mapping to understand IFLs in a wider setting of forests with special value, and landscape approaches, including:

- development and testing of methodologies for improved stakeholder dialogue (game theory) to ensure legitimacy of proposals or decisions made,
- development and testing of ideas for how features in the wider landscape can be considered in decisions for how IFLs should be managed inside FSC certified FMUs.

Third party identification of the biodiversity and social values of the IFL based on field and historical data obtain below the canopy

IFL definition is only considering the intactness of the forest, based on satellite observation of road presence. FSC's current approach fails to consider IFLs as resource for other services of the forest, such as biodiversity, or resource to enable social and economic development. Furthermore, currently a forest IS or ISN'T an IFL (a 0 or a 1), which can be considered as an over-simplification. IFLs should be considered as a spectrum of intactness that ranges from 0 (a paved parking lot) to 100% (a forest operating solely under a natural disturbance regime). This relates to both human intervention as well as biodiversity levels.

The identification of "Intact Forest Landscape(s)" can be expanded from one being based on bio-geographical aspect only, to equitably incorporating historical and current human and nature interactions, which shaped forest landscapes, conform with ICLs, and include as well the existing environmental, social and economic conditions, as well as the local, national and international development aspects related to HCV 2.

An Environmental, economic and Social Risk Assessment (ESRA) based on the SIR approach

is necessary to evaluate the positive social and environmental impact of (i) IFL protection but also the positive impact of (ii) certified RIL-C forest management. This ESRA will help to weight the externalities of commercial and certified forest management. This is crucial to determine the impact of management and strict conservation on the development of local and indigenous communities

Engagement with interested and/or affected stakeholders of the landscape

The identification of core area and management measure should be done through engagement interested and/or affected stakeholders of the landscape. The process should include communication, consultation and providing for the participation of interested and/or affected stakeholders ensuring that their concerns, desires, expectations, needs, rights and opportunities are considered in the establishment, implementation, and monitoring of the management of IFL at the FMU level.

Broad and proven stakeholder support for the proposed IFL core area percentage would be a requirement. This could be achieved through a landscape dialogue as proposed in Focus Forests and involve an FPIC process where relevant rights holders are affected.

Transparency is a key to the conservation of nature in and outside of certified areas. The publication of all results is thus crucial to hold forest managers accountable and for consent amongst all stakeholders. This includes the publication of the ESRA, the results of the FPIC process, the identification of all forest values below the canopy and finally, maps of the forest management unit including all HCV, IFL and IFL core areas.

The precautionary Principle: In case of doubt concerning the fact that a site (part of a FMU) is or is not an IFL, the site will be consider as an IFL, temporally, before getting insurance of the classification: IFL or not IFL.

25/2020 Creating and implementing a mechanism to promote the establishment of small community forest enterprises

Accepted by MC Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Richard Mancilla	Fanny Alicia Ortiz Urbina	Federico Odio Echeverria
Organization / Individual	Mancilla Terrazas, Richard Fernando, Mr.	ALTROPICO Fundación Alternativas para el Desarrollo Sostenible en el Tropico	Odio Echeverria, Federico, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / South	Social / South	Environmental / South

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

This motion seeks FSC to develop and implement a mechanism to promote the establishment of small community forest enterprises with the aim of increasing FSC certified area in natural forests and facilitating access to markets for forest owners and peasant, native or indigenous communities.

The above mentioned mechanism implies that FSC engages on serious and consistent efforts, so that through the Regional Offices at least one person is assigned to create an agile instance together with each country that applies the mechanism. In addition, it includes the management of resources from FSC, donors and cooperators, which will be directed to the implementation of small community forest enterprises. This model will be replicated at the region level where FSC is present. Capacity building in forestry and timber issues, market access, leveraging of funds, business plans, and sustainability should also be envisaged; all within the scope of forest certification of small operations.

In order to develop the mechanism, 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 5 months with a consultation phase supported by the Secretariat. The proposed mechanism will be submitted to the FSC Board of Directors for approval and subsequent implementation in at least one pilot region.

Background / rationale:

In order to justify the proposal made in the present motion, some aspects have been taken from the experience of forest management and FSC certification in Latin America, specifically in Bolivia, and the relationship of forest stakeholders with the National Office (FSC Bolivia and the FSC Latin America Regional Office).

A) Pressure on the region's forest resources:

It is important to remember that forest cover in Latin America and the Caribbean in 2005 was 924 million hectares, corresponding to 46 % of the region's total land area and 23 % of the world's total forest area. Within the region, 90 % of the forest area is in South America, 9 % in [Central America and Mexico and only 1 % in the Caribbean](http://www.fao.org/3/a0470s/a0470s-04.htm) (<http://www.fao.org/3/a0470s/a0470s-04.htm>).

Forest cover in Latin America and the Caribbean continues to decline. The net annual loss during the 2000-2005 period amounts to 4.7 million hectares, corresponding to 65 % of the global net annual loss.

The global forest industry has undergone a strong process of restructuring and consolidation throughout the 1980s and 1990s, influenced primarily by the phenomenon of globalization. In Latin America and the Caribbean, this process of the forest industry was not uniform for all countries and in some of them there was no significant development. The process was marked by different factors, among which we can highlight:

B) Limitations in indigenous and peasant communities that own forest production lands:

- Very elementary community forest organization structure (purpose and objectives).
- Non-existent industrial infrastructure.
- Excessive generation of rules, complicates proper interpretation.
- Insufficient economic resources and weak financial structure.
- Deficient technical assistance specialized in business management, production, yields, quality, prices and markets.

Consequently, the following limitations are generated:

- Weak organizational and administrative structure of community forest organizations.
- High costs of outsourced services (harvesting, hauling, loading, transport, sawing and marketing).
- Low prices obtained from forest intermediaries; they don't consider equity and fair price.
- Devaluation of forest products induces social stakeholders to encourage deforestation and change use of forest land.
- Extreme poverty in many indigenous and peasant communities, which have a diversity of natural resources.

To better understand and interpret the threat to forests and woodlands in the Latin American region, it is important to know that more than 60 % of forests and forest lands are in the hands of indigenous and peasant stakeholders; organizations that, despite their limitations, have always been attentive to the developments of FSC certification, having not obtained economic benefits that make visible the opportunity cost of having implemented responsible forest management practices, for the reasons explained.

In addition to considerations of scale, intensity and risk of harvesting in natural forests, it is important to implement actions that contribute to the fulfillment of the 17 sustainable development objectives of the UN Agenda 2030, related to sustainable forest management in peasant, native or indigenous communities. Forest management and FSC certification are thus aimed at improving the living conditions of peasant, native or indigenous communities, and maintaining the ecosystem services of natural forests in Latin America.

It is extremely important to value forest resources by avoiding its destruction, strengthening productive business systems and establishing partnerships and complementarity systems within the framework of enhancing community links between the different stakeholders on the land use, transformation and marketing to achieve the good living.

"The continuous process of generating and implementing social, community, citizen and public management measures and actions for the creation, provision and strengthening of material, social and spiritual conditions, capacities and means, within the framework of culturally adequate and appropriate practices and actions, which promote relations of solidarity, mutual support and cooperation, complementarity and the strengthening of community and collective building links to achieve good living as a new civilizing and cultural horizon".

C) Reversing conditions by increasing FSC-certified areas in natural forests, making it easier for forest owners and peasant, native or indigenous communities to access markets:

Forest management and FSC certification must be promoted by creating and implementing a mechanism to encourage the establishment of small community forest enterprises with the aim of increasing the FSC certified area in natural forests and facilitating access to markets for forest owners and peasant, native or indigenous communities.

This implies that FSC engages on serious and consistent efforts, including the management of international cooperation resources from donor countries and national counterparts, to address the urgent need for:

1. Having an agile and dynamic body in the Regional Office (LARO in this case), to manage and follow up the mechanism.
2. Managing economic resources, to implement community forest enterprises as a model, for the countries of the Region (Latin America in this case).
3. Developing and implementing professional capacity building in the region to meet the demands and needs of community forest enterprises, via local capacity building (through the FSC Bolivia National Office in this case), in the following fields:
 - Harvesting (felling, cutting, waste management and sawing).

- Processing and manufacturing of forest products.
 - Quality management and product classification.
 - Markets.
 - Management and business leadership.
 - Planning and resource allocation based on objectives.
 - Leveraging funds by presenting business plans to banks promoting industry and markets.
 - Development of proven methods for product identification and costing.
4. Creating the appropriate scenario for the certification of small forestry operations:
- Seeking initial funding for certification assessments.
 - Finding preferential markets for certified products from community forest enterprises.
 - Creating a common fund established by the community forest enterprises to choose sustainable certification.
 - Documenting successful experiences of community forest certification, to replicate models and maintaining the objectives set.

NOTE:

This motion is proposed by Richard Mancilla, Economic Chamber, Bolivia; seconded by ALTROPICO. Due to a technical issue, it does not appear as a proponent, which will be adjusted in the process prior to GA 2021.

26/2020 Strengthening compliance with Principle 3 by making it a critical requirement
Accepted by MC Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Larry Joseph	Jens Holm Kanstrup	Robert Follet
Organization / Individual	Joseph, Larry, Mr.	Forest of the world	Mistik Management Ltd.
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / North	Environmental / North	Economic / North

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

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

- The introduction of the concept of 'critical requirements' to *Forest management evaluations FSC-STD-20-007 (V3-0)*
- That non-compliance with a critical requirement be considered *fundamental failure* and thus a major non-conformity resulting in a Major Corrective Action Request requiring immediate action by the forest manager.
- That all of Principle 3 be considered critical requirements except in the case of community managed operations where the community is in full control of all parts of the management and forest operations.

Background / rationale:

Background/Rationale: Indigenous Peoples' community representatives and organisations, NGOs, individual researchers and FSC members have repeatedly expressed concern about violations of Indigenous Peoples' rights being evaluated, or risking evaluation, as 'minor non-compliances' in FSC Forest Management Evaluations. The pressure on land and resources is increasing globally causing incidents of neglect of basic human rights, including indigenous peoples' rights to land and resources, as well as their right to self-determination, e.g. through the consultation based on their free, prior and informed consent (FPIC). On a yearly basis, many Indigenous Peoples' leaders are reported being killed because they are trying to defend their rights. Violations of IP rights should not occur within the FSC-system. There is a Pesticides policy guaranteeing that some environmental violations are promptly dealt with; an example exists where the use of pesticides without derogation resulted in an immediate suspension of a certificate. Human rights violations should not be treated with less severity, but with equal immediate consequence. Indigenous



peoples' rights are human rights, and their violation always creates a fundamental failure. A concept of 'critical requirements' could address this, i.e. non-compliance with a critical requirement shall always be considered a major non-compliance (FSC-STD-20-007, 8.7 and 8.8), requiring immediate action by the forest manager (FSC-STD-20-007, 8.10.2).

27/2020 Strengthening compliance assessment of Principle 3 through increased auditing frequency and increased quality and capacity of auditors

Accepted by MC Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Larry Joseph	Jens Holm Kanstrup	Robert Follet
Organization / Individual	Joseph, Larry, Mr.	Forest of the world	Mistik Management Ltd.
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / North	Environmental / North	Economic / North

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

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

- The requirement that auditors of Principle 3 are specialists on Indigenous Peoples' rights.
- The involvement of a local expert in the Principle 3 auditing process, e.g. a legitimate indigenous representative or a member of a local NGO, endorsed by both the Indigenous Peoples' community and The Organization.
- That all criterion of Principle 3 be the subject of mandatory surveillance (FSC-STD-20-007, 6.3.8), making audit obligatory every year instead of every five years. Exemptions: If a certificate holder demonstrates consistent compliance with P3, or if P3 is low risk for a country or a region, the requirement of annual audits could be reduced through agreement between the rights holders and the certificate holder. The same exemption from annual audits applies for smallholder and community certificate holders.

Background / rationale:

Background/Rationale: Concerns have been raised about the robustness of auditing Principle 3, triggered by evidence of violence of Indigenous Peoples' rights within the FSC system. The issue has been a source of complaints at GA's during plenary sessions, and also the Permanent Indigenous Peoples' Committee (PIPC) has raised complaints about it. Simultaneously, auditors observe that their judgement of compliance with the principle varies a lot across the FSC world, and complain that they have had no specific training on how to evaluate e.g. consultations based on free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), or accommodations that could

occur through the interactions of these processes. As a consequence, evaluations are most often a matter of interpretation of the evidence provided by The Organization.

The violation of Indigenous Peoples' rights is rarely associated with smallholders and community managed operations, and efforts have been made to ease the cost and difficulty of certification of exactly those groups. Therefore, for example, an agreement explained and signed by the *legitimate representatives* of the Indigenous People and the certificate holder at a community assembly could replace annual audits for smallholders and communities.

28/2020 Overcome Value Chain Barriers for small operations by remedying identified problems in the Chain of Custody (CoC) procedures, thereby increasing participation.

Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Alan Smith	Stuart Goodall	Jens Holm Kanstrup
Organization / Individual	Smith, Alan, Dr.	Confederation of Forest Industries	Forest of the world
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / North	Economic / North	Environmental / North

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 07/2022)

The motion is asking the FSC to clarify and adapt as necessary Chain of Custody (CoC) requirements for small operations to overcome the complexities they perceive in the CoC standard FSC-STD-40-004. This implies a move from a generalised approach in the current "one size fits all" approach to more specifically tailored requirements for both stakeholders in the Global North and Global South. A survey of such operations, including smallholders and indigenous communities as well as small businesses along the supply chain, shall first be undertaken to assess which are the main difficulties. As a result, appropriate measures to remedy the identified problems would be designed to overcome these, either for incorporation into the existing standard, or as supplementary tools to facilitate improved access. The revision shall aim to increase not only the uptake of CoC certification by small businesses and traders but encourage more FM certification, particularly by smallholders and communities. As a corollary, this may allow more direct market access by them. All these actions would raise their visibility within the system as targetted in the Global Strategy and would not affect in any way larger operations.

Background / rationale:

The rationale is to provide clarity on CoC certification requirements and improve

accessibility for small operations, whether small companies or traders along the supply chain or smallholders and communities who market their products more directly to end-users. The aim is to provide incentives to overcome the existing barriers. The actions requested would in no way lower the bar on supply chain integrity, rather they would make the normative provisions more appropriate to operations. Difficulties so far encountered include the challenge of many smaller stakeholders to understand fully the complexities of the standard as well as non-applicable provisions for them such as the credit system. Examples of potential users failing to make progress range from smallholders in Latvia who ended up selling certified wood as non-certified to traders and of indigenous communities in Bolivia giving up FM certification as they could not understand the complexities of the CoC standard.

As an indication of the potential for FSC, the FAO states that around 30% of the world's forests are managed by local people and, if you add in the many small businesses along the supply chain, the opportunity for FSC is impressive. In fact the Global Strategy aims to increase the certification of natural tropical forests and other areas managed by smallholders, communities and Indigenous peoples to a total of 50 million hectares by 2026. In 2021 according to FSC data, about 11 million hectares were certified by these target groups so the scope for increasing the total is considerable. If approved, the motion would contribute significantly to accomplishing this objective.

The proposal is consistent with the Global Strategy objective of Growing Our Reach, and Strategy Goal 2.1 “*Advance FSC in value chains that have the highest potential for contributing towards our 2050 vision*” and Strategy Goal 2.4. “*Scale up benefits for Indigenous Peoples, communities, smallholders and workers*”. Standard FSC-STD-04-004 as currently designed relies on the one-size-fits-all approach which is not well suited to the conditions of small operations, both in the Global North and South. Some elements may be irrelevant to small businesses, such as the provisions of the credit system. Not only are difficulties created in understanding compliance requirements but cost-effectiveness is reduced if third parties are relied on for advice on how to get certified.

The challenge posed by small operations is being tackled by the Community and Family Forests Programme to make the forest management normative framework more appropriate for small operations. The motion intent links with actions already being taken through that programme. A similar approach for smallholders and communities to facilitate access to FSC certification is to open opportunities to shorten the supply chain by reducing dependence on intermediaries, so enabling them to get closer to market outlets and lower transaction costs.

The changes requested are straightforward. The intent is an adaptation and/or clarification of the existing standard, focussing only on those elements relevant to small operations and defining the characteristics of those operations which would qualify for applying an adapted standard. The necessary revisions can be done relatively quickly either directly by the Secretariat through the Community and Family Forests Programme or by a Technical Working Group within a modest budget. A target date for completion would be December, 2023. A subsequent expected outcome would be to increase both CoC and FM certification of smallholders and communities by at least 25% within a timeline of two to three years after completion.

Video Statement: <https://members.fsc.org/sites/default/files/2020-08/Alan%20Smith%201.mp4>

29/2020 Introduction of Circular add-on options in CoC
Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Maude McNair Rahbek	Jens Holm Kanstrup	Luis Armando Aznar Molina
Organization / Individual	Masai Clothing Company ApS	Forest of the world	Aznar Molina, Luis Armando, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / North	Environmental / North	Social / South

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THE PROPOSER OF THIS MOTION HAS BEEN CHANGED 07/2021)

Purpose

With this motion we ask FSC to implement a voluntary sustainable and circular add-on to the chain of custody certification through which certificate holders can obtain third party verification of their sustainable and circular efforts.

The purpose of this motion is to ensure that FSC continues to be the most relevant certification to businesses worldwide in a time where sustainable and circular certification schemes is on the rise.

Further, the intention is to drive and encourage certificate holders to achieve a higher level of responsibility, sustainability and circularity in their fiber chains through more sustainable material sourcing, production in responsible and circular setups. All of which will not only benefit the environment overall but also help levitate pressure on our forests worldwide and ensure a more responsible use of fibers.

The certification add-on will be relevant for industries and brands already working with FSC, enabling them to take action on new demands from consumers and costumers, but it will also make the FSC-certification and purpose even more relevant to industries, which are already using wood fibers but not traditionally pursuing the FSC-membership or certification, e.g. the textile industry. As a result, the add-on would increase the reach of FSC to new and existing industries.

The purpose of this motion is to strengthen the FSC brand, purpose, dissemination and scope to be the preferred organization and certification within the field of all types of wood-based products. And thus, assuring that our overall purpose – responsible forestry now and in the future – remains at the top of the agenda and relevant to brands, producers and consumers around the world.

Policy Motion (high level action request)

We ask FSC to develop and implement a voluntary procedure for sustainable and circular setups as an add-on for regular chain of custody certification. The procedure could cover a range of different sustainable and circular setups like:

- Circular closed loops for water and/or chemical usage during production
- Circular setups where own fibers are taken back into the supply chain and reused

Specification for Implementation

1. FSC should harness the innovative forces in its global network of offices to establish a taskforce with the purpose of developing an offering and a procedure to introduce a sustainable and circular add-on to FSC-certification.
2. The taskforce should collaborate with leading experts in circular models to ensure that the selected model has the largest possible positive impact on material use and lifecycle impact of the certified products. The task force should rely on the vast accumulated pool of knowledge and industry best-practices already available.
3. Opportunities for complete or partial recognition of other standards and systems for circularity should be assessed and sought.
4. The procedure shall be developed in stages with each stage released when it is ready to ensure solutions to be brought to market as soon as possible.
5. Development should start with developing a procedure for circular loops, which have already been implemented and demonstrated in a number of companies. This to ensure that solutions are made available to the marketplace fast.

The first iteration procedure and product offering(s) covering circular loops and responsible material production should be implemented no later than Q3 2022.

Cost to FSC:

The cost for FSC will be the costs related to a development of a new procedure according to the rules of developing new normative documents as well as the ongoing maintenance, training of internal staff and certification bodies in implementation.

It is likely that part of the cost could be fundraised through donors encouraging organizations to develop circular and innovative solutions. Seeking this financial aid should be sought but not delay the start date for the development.

The business case for the implementation is the increased reach to new sectors in rapid growth as well becoming more relevant to existing certificate holders to maintain their certificate. As a result, FSC will both ensure a steady AAF revenue stream as well as increased brand value.

Timeline:

Q1-Q2 2021: Creation of task force. Research, analysis and determination of certification scope based on scientific data and industry best practices. Develop V1 of procedure.

Q3 – Q4 2021: Test of V1 of procedure focusing on circular loops and energy consumption.

Q1 2022: Release of V1 of procedure.

Q1-3 2022: Development of V2 of procedure adding the ability to take back fibers in circular loops.

Policy document(s) to be revised/developed:

A procedure as a voluntary add-on to FSC-STD-40-004.

Background / rationale:**The sustainable certification jungle**

In past years, a vast number of sustainable certifications and products have been introduced to the market, making it harder and harder to navigate for both brands, producers and consumers. How do we choose between established and new schemes? Which ones are more reliable and credible? Which ones are most strategically to the point for our business? And how do we communicate it all to our customers in a way that they understand and can use it to guide their purchases?

Looking at the certifications, rating systems, indexes and products available and applicable to wood-based garments alone, the list is already long: FSC, PEFC, Rainforest Alliance, Higg Index, Canopy Hot Button, Liva-Eco®, Ecovero®, Tencel®, Refibra®, Renewcell®, Ioncell®, Spinnova®, Global Recycle Standard, Ellen MacArthur Circulytics, Cradle-to-Cradle, UL Environment, Global Reporting Initiative, US Green Building Council rating system, the Grüner Knopf, the EU Eco-label, the Nordic Swan eco-label, ISO-14020 (and other ISO standards), Oeko-tex – to name the most renowned systems and solutions currently available to certify, rank and evaluate the sustainable and circular features in our supply chains.

Most of these cover only their proper part of the supply chain or a process, and most of them are

- failing to address the supply chain from a holistic point of view
- only relevant in certain regions
- only relevant in certain industries
- failing in having third-party verification
- only FSC has a democratic three chamber governance system.

This leaves brands with a huge task to obtain and keep track of a multitude of certifications, if they want to accommodate today's market and customer demand for product and supply chain sustainability.

Having many different certifications is not very attractive when trying to communicate with consumers. Adding a small booklet to your products to showcase all your certifications and sustainable features will only clutter the message. And from the producer point-of-view, the audit fatigue at the factories due to introduction of new and at many times overlapping schemes is already an issue.

So, for everyone involved, from source through production to brand and consumer, a one-stop-shop covering the chain and the product holistically from forest to shelf, would be ideal.

FSC already have FSC Recycled. Why isn't that enough?

FSC recycled has existed for a number of years now and has during the last years enabled a wider use due to the allowance of pre-consumer input to be utilized as well. However, the recycled label does not equal circular production. It only allows for fibers to be reused, if they are re-made into a new product. Taking back fibers, e.g. an already produced cardboard box post-consumer and reusing it again for the same purpose, is not allowed. True circular setups with fiber takeback hence could not carry the FSC label. If we want motivation for companies to reuse their fibers instead of buying new ones, we need to find a future setup, where we can recognize the circular use of fibers – of course without jeopardizing the integrity of the FSC brand.

Further, the FSC Recycled can only be obtained if a product is made from 100% recycled fibers, but for some industries and products, this is not yet technically possible to achieve. E.g. fabric containing recycled cellulose fibers can at this point contain maximum 30% recycled fibers (trials and research is ongoing to increase this). It would be a motivation for companies to pursue recycling and circularity, and could help to increase demand for FSC pure fibers, and thus incentivize FSC FM certification, if it was possible to grade the level of recycling in products combined with FSC pure fiber. This might require a new label or perhaps just a new and more positive version of the FSC Mixed label, mixed in the sense of recycled and pure fibers, preferably with a recycled % with the label.

A holistic and circular approach to a valuable resource

In the FSC strategy it is underlined that FSC is on a longer-term mission to change the perception of forests and have their true value realized. As a result, FSC is working to ensure that wood fibers are considered for what they truly are: A valuable resource.

However, this is not yet reflected in the way FSC-certified supply chains. The current FSC normative framework favors linear tradition setups, where fibers are used once and where companies have no means to highlight if their production methods are sustainable beyond the sourcing.

For FSC to truly unleash the value of forests we should be moving past business as usual and drive the organization towards a new way to view forest resources and how they are used. Sustainable and responsible materials do not concern only the origin of the fibers, it concerns the entire chain, and chemical and water usage as well as energy consumption and end-of-life handling are central problematic areas in the material lifecycle.

We need to ensure that FSC encourage and enables FSC certified companies to highlight their efforts ensuring sustainability and thereby addressing a growing market demand while at the same time relieving the pressure on our forests to deliver an increasing amount of fibers.

30/2020 Implementation of system wide volume tracking system
Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Per Bogstad	Jens Holm Kanstrup	Alan Smith
Organization / Individual	Kingfisher plc	Forest of the world	Smith, Alan, Dr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / North	Environmental / North	Social / North

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THE PROPOSER OF THIS MOTION HAS BEEN CHANGED 08/2022)

FSC shall accelerate the implementation of a system-wide and credible volume tracking system, in order to avoid fraud with FSC labelled products and protect the integrity and brand value of FSC.

This could be through the recently piloted FSC Blockchain IT Platform, or another mechanism. As a minimum each certificate holder must report each purchase and sale transaction of material holding an FSC claim through a web-based material accounting system, and the certification claim. Information is then made available to the customer receiving the material, allowing an FSC claim to be passed on to the next customer in the supply chain, and so on to the retailer. This assures that only volumes with a certified claim can be passed on in the supply chain, but it also allows the auditors to carry out a much more robust audit.

To protect confidential and other sensitive information the volume tracking system should be a closed system where only the transaction between two parties is visible to its owners; and where solely certification bodies, ASI and FSC have further access to be able to identify mismatches in the system. Such a technology should be designed to cater for reasonable access controls.

The system shall be implemented as soon as possible, using a stepwise approach with the most risk prone supply chains fully tracked by end of September 2023; and members to be kept up to date on performance against interim and longer-term milestones.

Background / rationale:

Stakeholder expectations and regulatory requirements are increasing. As an absolute minimum it is expected that certified forest product claims are verifiable in a swift and credible manner. The paper-based material accounting systems used by most certificate holders does not allow this.

The EC has set out in the Draft Deforestation Regulation, that for all products in scope (other than products with forest origin of Low Risk); economic actors must record and communicate the forest source(s) of origin in a Due Diligence Statement; likely to come into force between late 2023 and 2024. The emerging market needs related to this regulation should be carefully considered in the design of the workplan to ensure efficiency of efforts across the forest sector to deliver legal compliance.

This proposed approach also supports the implementation of Strategy 1: Co-Create and Implement Forest Solutions; Objective 1.3: Enhance verification and integrity of the FSC Global Strategy.

Why are we seeing these responses?

Forest product supply chains can be complicated and, on several occasions, fraud has been identified where the volume of timber going into a supply chain does not match the volume of final products sold to the customer. Most recently this has been seen with charcoal and bamboo and historically there have been indications of volume fraud related to garden furniture production in Vietnam and walnut in eastern Europe. In addition, DNA tests carried out in the paper industry indicates serious problems.

These cases undermine the integrity of FSC to a degree that FSC from a commercial brand value perspective is much less attractive than it could and should be.

Where is this already being done?

Other certification schemes such as Sustainable Biomass Program have already with success implemented a volume tracking system; where each certificate holder must report each purchase and sale transaction of certified material through a web based system. This assures that only volumes with a certified claim can be passed on in the supply chain, it also allows the auditors to carry out a much more robust audit.

What are the benefits of a volume tracking system?

- Audits are more robust because the audit does not rely on invoices, credit notes and other paper which can be manipulated
- Making transactions is much easier because passing on claims is done digitally and not via paper or electronic invoices.
- Auditors can prepare the audit much better because they have access to all the transaction data, including volume, from their own offices and thus can spend more time doing interviews and deep dives into higher risk transactions
- There is transparency across the supply chain even when multiple certification bodies have audited different links in the chain
- FSC would be able to analyze data in real-time across supply chains

In the future such a platform would be essential for passing on information on ecosystem services such as life cycle GHG emissions, watershed conservation and biodiversity impact, which from an industry perspective is extremely important and valuable information which needs to follow the FSC certified material in supply chains and is vital to underpin Strategy 2 'Transform Markets' objectives of the FSC Global Strategy.

31/2020 The FSC Normative requirements for the operation of ASI
Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Ulrich Leberle	Jens Holm Kanstrup	Alan Smith
Organization / Individual	CEPI - Confederation of European Paper Industries aisbl	Forest of the world	Smith, Alan, Dr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / North	Environmental / North	Social / North

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 05/2022)

As soon as possible in the first half of 2023, FSC shall develop the normative requirements for the assessment process and reporting (outcome) of the Assurance Services international (ASI) to - Frame the work of ASI as a service provider - Determine what ASI is accountable for - secure sufficient resources to provide a robust service to FSC - strengthen ASI ability to provide equal service to CAB's and CH's The normative requirements should be developed in accordance with FSC's standard setting procedure (FSC-PRO01-001) and stakeholder engagement.

Background / rationale:

- There is currently no transparent framework that covers the work of ASI as a service provider to FSC and yet the work of ASI is crucial to the credibility of FSC, FSC Certificate Holders, FSC Conformity Assessment bodies.
- The FSC members and stakeholders need to know what ASI should be accountable for and this is currently absent.
- The FSC NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK seems complete ONLY when it includes:
 - i) Certificate Holder normative framework – i.e what CHs are expected to do and report

ii) CAB normative framework – what CABs are expected to do and report

iii) ASI normative framework – what ASI is expected to do and report.

Note: The above motion must not be seen as threatening the independent work of ASI as ASI must still develop and implement its own assurance system. Rather it should be seen as complimenting the transparent road to the entire credibility of the FSC system as CHs, CABs and ASI are the key and core players that stakeholders holders must know and understand their way of working and reporting. It is also important that FSC members can see that ASI is delivering what we want from them to support the FSC system for all members.

32/2020 Strengthening of FSC office in Siberia and it's partial subordinating to Asia-Pacific region

Accepted by MC Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Anatoly Lebedev	v mem test 3	Anton Doroshin
Organization / Individual	Lebedev, Anatoly, Mr.		Certification Association Russian Register
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / South	Environmental / South	Economic / South

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

I suggest seriously strengthen currently symbolic branch of Russian\CIS FSC office in Siberia, represented now by one person in Krasnoyarsk and subordinate it operationally to Asia-Pacific region in FSC. This motion targets to bring huge volume of FSC timber from Siberia-RFE, exported almost exclusively to China, under better market control from entire Asia-Pacific office, and better understand internal mechanisms, operating in the globally biggest FSC chains of custody flow - Siberia-China-EU. Currently alone FSC official in Krasnoyarsk should get some target support from FSC International in a form of 2 assistants, speaking English and Chinese to constantly collaborate and coordinate work of 45 Siberian FSC companies with colleagues in Asia-Pacific office, while financially and administratively this small office should remain as a part of CIS. This also will help to involve more companies to FSC at the RFE, where our position is now dramatically weak.

Background / rationale:

Currently Russian forests area equals totally 1 147 mln ha (11,5 mln km²) - globally biggest entire boreal zone. And 2/3 of this area is located in Asia, where about 45 timber companies operate. They supply absolute majority of timber to China, which makes their certification process quite different from companies, supplying to EU from European Russia, particularly regarding CoC certification. Most of Siberian companies are also deeply or totally depend on Chinese shareholders or owners, which makes serious control and audit quite complicated due to language problems and Chinese tradition to hide real and present fake data and documents. So, for real understanding of CoC process inside China, which often determines behaviour of companies in Siberian forests, it is very important for Siberian FSC staff and auditors to closely collaborate



with FSC Asia-Pacific office. Activation of such collaboration will also help to develop presence of FSC at the Far East and successfully compete with PEFC here, particularly in efforts to protect still rich intact forests here, which now suffer from massive logging under PEFC certificates.

(see <https://www.sixthtone.com/news/1003369/how-illegally-harvested-timber-is-greenwashed-in-china>)

33/2021 Strengthening the FSC Code of Conduct
Accepted by MC Policy Motion

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

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

To strengthen the FSC Code of Conduct (currently the version dated February 2019, which applies obligatorily to the Board) so that members of the FSC international Board of Directors have minimised exposure to an institutional conflict of interest when the Board discusses/decides on the practicability of motions which were proposed or seconded by any of its own members.

Background / rationale:

Any FSC member is assured of the right to propose or second motions to the General Assembly. The Board of Directors, which is composed of elected FSC members, has ultimate power to decide 'if the implementation of a decision, [approved] motion or resolution appears to be impossible or to have undesired side effects' (paragraph 3 of Statute 28). At least two other FSC documents give explicit judgmental roles to the Board: statutory motion 1 (2014) and section 19 of FSC-PRO-01-001 V3-1 (March 2015).

Apart from the evident conflict of interest arising from proposing and then deciding on the future of a motion, a further complication exists when the Board of Directors is requested to propose/second motions derived from deadlocked Working Groups or the work of the FSC Secretariat. This is the case with five current Statutory motions for GA 2021:

- 34/2021 – to clarify and amend the process and causes to destitute a member from FSC;
- 35/2021 – to revise the membership criteria for chamber allocation;
- 37/2021 – to revise Criterion 6.9 of the FSC Principles and Criteria V5-2 to add HCVs and social benefits;
- 38/2021 – to revise Criterion 6.10 of the FSC Principles and Criteria V5-2 – Option 2;

39/2021 - to revise Criterion 6.10 of the FSC Principles and Criteria V5-2 – Option 1.

Only FSC members in good standing can vote (Statute 13). The right to vote is associated with the right to present motions (Article 2561 of the Civil Code of the State of Oaxaca, Mexico, which applies to FSC being registered in Mexico). Staff working for FSC cannot be members (Statute 15) and so can neither vote nor propose motions.

However, to rely on Board members to put forward motions on behalf of the Secretariat only worsens the delicate balance required by any Board member, who have a clear duty to avoid conflicts of interest, as confirmed in the FSC Code of Conduct. There are hundreds of other members that could propose and second motions which are consequent to the work of the Secretariat without exposing the Board to this unnecessary conundrum.

We therefore request that in the interest of a better performing Board and FSC, the following actions be carried out:

- Lawyers improve the wording in the code of conduct of Board members so that it acknowledges, discourages and restricts such conflicts of interest.
- When avoidance of a conflict of interest is not possible, that Board members must be minuted as recusing themselves from discussions/decisions on those motions.
- A legal review is carried out so as to explore what other ways might there be to prevent such situations.

34/2021 Statutory Motion to Clarify and Amend the Process and Causes to Destitute a Member from FSC

Accepted by MC Statutory Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Barbara Bramble	Rulita Wijyaningdyah	Alan Thorne
Organization / Individual	Bramble, Barbara, Ms.	Wijyaningdyah, Rulita, Ms.	A. Thorne Consulting
Chamber / Subchamber	Environmental / North	Social / South	Economic / North

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

Statutory Motion (changes to the Statutes):

Amend Clauses Thirteenth and Seventeenth

Present wording

THIRTEENTH. Members shall have the following rights and obligations.

1. To participate and vote in all General Assemblies and postal ballots. To such effect and as further explained below, each Member shall have the right to cast one vote. The weight of a member's vote will depend on the chamber and sub-chamber to which they are members, and their type of membership (individual or organizational Member). In order to prevent conflict of interest, members should abstain from discussing and voting in those matters in which their interest is opposite to the Organization's.
2. To vote and be elected to hold any of the offices of the Organization referred to in these Statutes.
3. To submit initiatives related to the Organization's works and activities, as well as those related to the achievement of its mission and purposes.
4. To pay Ordinary and Extraordinary dues.

5. To assist the Director General and the Commissions formed by resolution of the General Assembly to achieve the purpose of the Organization.
6. Any other rights and obligations that might be determined from time to time by the General Assembly.

The rights of a Member in connection with General Assemblies shall be automatically suspended when the dues of that Member are five months in arrears.

SEVENTEENTH. Membership of the Organization will cease in any of the following cas

1. Due to voluntary resignation, submitted to the Board of Directors in writing, two months prior to its effective date. The Member resigning from the Organization's membership will not be entitled to any refund of membership dues paid.
2. Due to the issuance by the General Assembly of a destitution resolution. The following shall be considered as destitution causes: (i) to participate in activities contrary to the interest s of the Organization, as outlined in the FSC Policy for Association; or (ii) that the Member no longer meets membership requirements, or (iii) non-payment of annual dues for two consecutive years.

A destitution process may be initiated by any member of the Board of Directors or by a Member supported by two other Members. Any proposed destitution must be submitted to the Board of Directors in writing accompanied by a justification. The Board of Directors will review the matter and if it considers that the complaint is substantiated it will grant the Member the opportunity to present its position on the matter within one month from the date on which the Member is informed in writing (including by e-mail) of the destitution process and its supported justifications.

If within one month of the date on which the Member is informed of the Board's preliminary conclusion the Member does not challenge in writing (including by e-mail) this conclusion before the Board, the Member shall be considered to have withdrawn from the Organization's membership. If the Member does challenge the Board's preliminary conclusion, the Board of Directors shall submit the proposal together with the arguments of the Member for a decision of the General Assembly, which shall be final.

As listed above, non-payment of annual dues for two consecutive years is also considered as a destitution cause. If the dues of a Member are two years in arrears, the Member shall be informed in writing (including by e-mail) of this circumstance and will be granted the opportunity to pay all outstanding dues within one calendar month. If within such period the Member does not pay the outstanding dues, the Member shall be considered to have withdrawn from the Organization's membership. If the Member challenges its destitution, the Board of Directors shall submit the case for a decision of the General Assembly, which shall be final.

3. Due to the death of a Member, when the Member is an individual. In such an event, membership may not be assigned to another individual, not even by will or in any other forms. All the contributions made during the lifetime of the Member will be considered as part of the patrimony of the Organization.

4. Due to the dissolution and/or liquidation of an organizational Member. In such an event, membership may not be assigned to another entity in any form. All the contributions made by the organizational Member to the Organization will be considered as part of the patrimony of the Organization.

If a former Member, who is considered to have voluntarily withdrawn from the Organization or that was destitute from the membership due to non-payment of annual dues for two consecutive years, seeks readmission to membership, all outstanding dues at the time of withdrawal or destitution must be paid in advance. After this has been done, the Member may be readmitted at the discretion of the Board without having to complete the application procedures for new Members. A Member that was destitute due to any other reason could be eligible to apply for readmission to the Organization if previously approved by the Board. In this case, the resolution of the circumstances that had led to the destitution should be required before the destitute member can reapply.

Suggested Amendments (new language is included in red and language to be removed is strikethrough):

THIRTEENTH. Members shall have the following rights and obligations.

1. To participate and vote in all General Assemblies and postal ballots. To such effect and as further explained below, each Member shall have the right to cast one vote. The weight of a member's vote will depend on the chamber and sub-chamber to which they are members, and their type of membership (individual or organizational Member). In order to prevent conflict of interest, members should abstain from discussing and voting in those matters in which their interest is opposite to the Organization's.
2. To vote and be elected to hold any of the offices of the Organization referred to in these Statutes.
3. To submit initiatives related to the Organization's works and activities, as well as those related to the achievement of its mission and purposes.
4. To pay Ordinary and Extraordinary dues.
5. To assist the Director General and the Commissions formed by resolution of the General Assembly to achieve the purpose of the Organization.
6. Any other rights and obligations that might be determined from time to time by the General Assembly.

The rights of a Member in connection with General Assemblies shall be automatically suspended when the dues of that Member are five months in arrears ~~or when, after following the process set forth in Clause Seventeenth, the Board of Directors concludes that a Member must be excluded from the Organization due to the existence of one or more destitution causes. Members whose rights have been suspended will be considered not in good standing.~~

SEVENTEENTH. Membership of the Organization will cease in any of the following cases.

1. Due to voluntary resignation, submitted to the Board of Directors in writing, two months prior to its effective date. The Member resigning from the Organization's membership will not be entitled to any refund of membership dues paid.
2. Due to the issuance by the General Assembly of a destitution resolution. The following shall be considered as destitution causes:
 - i. to participate in activities contrary to the interests of the Organization, as outlined in the FSC Policy for Association; or
 - ii. that the Member no longer meets the membership requirements stated in Clause Twelve; namely:
 - A. That the Member is *bona fide* and genuinely supports FSC and its activities.

A Member shall not be considered *bona fide* and supportive of FSC and its activities if its actions or inactions affect, or could affect, negatively the best interests of the Organization. Below is a non-exhaustive list of examples that could be considered destitution causes as they are *non-bona fide* and evidence a lack of genuine support of the Organization and its activities:

 - a. Creating significant reputational damage to the Organization by intentionally or repeatedly discrediting FSC and its activities.
 - b. Publicly promoting competing organizations or certification systems to the detriment of FSC.
 - c. The lack of adherence to FSC's dispute resolution system.
 - d. The violation of these Statutes and/or other FSC policies, standards, guidance notes, regulations or similar.
 - e. Actions that constitute harassment against or physical damage to other individual Members or the representatives of organizational members, FSC's staff and consultants, or any other individual that participates in any other capacity in the Organization's activities and events.
 - f. Failure to meet commitments made on becoming a member.
 - B. That there are no outstanding social, environmental or legal grievances, or
 - iii. non-payment of annual dues for two consecutive years.

The following process shall be followed to destitute a Member:

A destitution process may be initiated by any member of the Board of Directors or by a Member of FSC supported by two other Members. Any proposed destitution must be submitted to the Board of Directors in writing accompanied by a justification. The Board of Directors will review the matter and if it considers that the complaint is substantiated it will grant the Member the opportunity to present its position on the matter within one month from the date on which the Member is informed in writing (including by e-mail) of the destitution process and its supported justifications.

If within one month of the date on which the Member is informed of the Board's preliminary conclusion the Member does not challenge in writing (including by e-mail) this conclusion before the Board, the Member shall be considered to have withdrawn from the Organization's membership. If the Member does challenge the Board's preliminary conclusion, the Board of Directors shall review the Member's arguments and will make a concluding decision on the matter.

If the concluding decision of the Board of Directors is that no destitution cause is present, the exclusion process shall finalize. If the concluding decision of the Board of Directors is that the Member must be excluded from the Organization due to its actions or inactions that affect or could affect the best interests of the Organization and considered by the Board a cause for destitution, the rights and obligations of the Member set forth in Clause Thirteenth shall be automatically suspended and the member shall be considered not in good standing. In any case, the Member shall be informed in writing (including by e-mail) of the Board's decision.

~~submit the proposal together with the arguments of the Member for a decision of the General Assembly, which shall be final~~

If within one month of the date on which the Member is informed by the Board about its concluding decision to exclude the Member, the Member does not challenge in writing (including by e-mail) this conclusion before the Board, the Member shall be considered to have withdrawn from the Organization's membership. If the Member does challenge the Board's concluding decision, the Board of Directors shall submit the case for a decision of the next Ordinary General Assembly, which shall be final. The rights and obligations of the Member shall be suspended until a final decision is made in the next Ordinary General Assembly.

As listed above, non-payment of annual dues for two consecutive years is also considered as a destitution cause. If the dues of a Member are two years in arrears, the Member shall be informed in writing (including by e-mail) of this circumstance and will be granted the opportunity to pay all outstanding dues within one calendar month. If within such period the Member does not pay the outstanding dues, the Member shall be considered to have withdrawn from the Organization's membership. If the Member challenges its destitution, the Board of Directors shall submit the case for a decision of the General Assembly, which shall be final.

3. Due to the death of a Member, when the Member is an individual. In such an event, membership may not be assigned to another individual, not even by will or in any other forms. All the contributions made during the lifetime of the Member will be considered as part of the patrimony of the Organization.
4. Due to the dissolution and/or liquidation of an organizational Member. In such an event, membership may not be assigned to another entity in any form. All the contributions made by the organizational Member to the Organization will be considered as part of the patrimony of the Organization.

If a former Member, who is considered to have voluntarily withdrawn from the Organization or that was destitute from the membership due to non-payment of annual dues for two consecutive years, seeks readmission to membership, all outstanding dues at the time of withdrawal or destitution must be paid in advance. After this has been done, the Member may be readmitted at the discretion of the Board without having to complete the application procedures for new Members. A Member that was destitute due to any other reason could be eligible to apply for readmission to the Organization if previously approved by the Board. In this case, the resolution of the circumstances that had led to the destitution should be required before the destitute member can reapply.

Specifications for implementation:

Amend Clauses Thirteenth and Seventeenth of the Statutes as proposed above.

Background / rationale:

This is one of a group of 5 motions, which is being proposed by 3 members of the FSC Board of Directors, as a mechanical step, in order to facilitate placing questions before the FSC General Assembly. The Board does not take a position on the language of any of these motions, and welcomes discussion and recommendations for amendments among the FSC membership in the period leading up to the General Assembly.

Destitution of members is a very rare thing in FSC, and this must continue to be the case. FSC is an organization that allows and even encourages lively discussion between very different opinions in its membership, and where criticism is important and inevitable. However, there are cases where deliberately damaging actions of members can threaten the organization or its reputation in major ways, and the current statutory rules make it virtually impossible for the Board of Directors to act to protect FSC in such cases in between General Assemblies.

The purpose of this proposed motion is therefore to clarify and amend the process and causes to destitute a Member from FSC and to stipulate a new rule under which the rights and obligations of the corresponding Member could be temporarily suspended if the Board of Directors resolves that a destitution cause is present. The member in question would be considered not in good standing, and its rights and obligations would remain suspended until the membership makes a final decision on the matter in the next General Assembly. For these purposes, Clauses Thirteenth and Seventeenth of the Statutes, which set forth the rights and obligations of members and the process to destitute a Member from FSC, respectively, must be amended.

This motion is proposed by the board chair and the two vice-chairs of the board in order to give the membership a chance to discuss and make decisions on topics that the board believes are important for FSC. The board agrees on the importance of enabling a membership decision of the topic at the General Assembly, but there is no board position on the specific text of the motion. The board wants to engage in further discussion with the membership on this and will be very interested in receiving feedback from membership discussions. The motion text can then be adapted in line with suggestions from the membership before final discussions at the General Assembly. The board hopes the process can lead to good decisions with broad membership support at the General Assembly.

In past experiences, the interpretation of what constitutes a cause to destitute a member has proven to be difficult. The current Statutes lack clarity on the matter. Specifically, the destitution cause of not being a “*bona fide*^[1] member that genuinely supports FSC and its activities” should be clarified. To remedy this issue, it is proposed to include a non-exhaustive list of examples of actions and inactions that would be considered *non-bona fide* and that would evidence a lack of genuine support of FSC and its activities; namely:

- Creating significant reputational damage to the Organization by intentionally or repeatedly discrediting FSC and its activities.
- Publicly promoting competing organizations or certification systems to the detriment of FSC.
- The lack of adherence to FSC’s dispute resolution system.
- The violation of these Statutes and/or other FSC policies, standards, guidance notes, regulations or similar.
- Actions that constitute harassment against or physical damage to other individual Members or the representatives of organizational members, FSC’s staff and consultants, or any other individual that participates in any other capacity in the Organization’s activities and events.
- Failure to meet commitments made on becoming a member.

Furthermore, the process to destitute a Member should be clarified through an amendment of the current Clause Seventeenth of the Statutes. Under the proposed amendment it will be established that once the Board of Directors has reviewed a destitution proposal, as well as the arguments of the

corresponding Member, it will make a concluding decision on whether the Member should be excluded, or not, from the Organization. If the concluding decision of the Board is to exclude the Member, and the Member challenges such decision, the Board of Directors would then have to submit the case for a decision of the membership at the next General Assembly.

It is proposed that once the Board of Directors makes a concluding decision that a Member must be excluded from the Organization, the rights and obligations of such Member would be automatically suspended and the member shall be considered not in good standing, until a final decision is made by the membership in the next Ordinary General Assembly. On these new rules, it should be noted that:

- The final decision on whether to exclude, or not, a Member from the FSC is reserved to the General Assembly.
- However, if the Board of Directors considers that an exclusion cause is present, the corresponding Member should assume the consequences of its unacceptable actions and be suspended from its rights as a Member until the General Assembly makes a final decision on the matter. The member will be considered not in good standing. A member that is considered not in good standing can participate in events and membership meetings (including the GA), but cannot participate in working groups, committees, board elections (cannot nominate, second or be a candidate), cannot vote for Board elections and GA motions and cannot propose or second motions.
- The obligations of the Member would also be suspended (i.e. the obligation to pay dues).
- Once the General Assembly makes a final decision, the Member would either be definitely excluded from the Organization or reinstated as a Member with all its rights and obligations.

Cost to FSC: administrative costs required to amend the statutes of FSC and related FSC's materials, and to update its website.

[1] The Latin expression "*bona fide*" indicates a spirit of loyalty, respect and fidelity, this is, a lack of simulation and malice in the relationship between two or more parties. In the case of FSC, the relationship between its members and of the members towards the Organization. The Courts have defined "*bona fide*" (*buena fe*) as an honest, diligent, and correct behavior that imposes a duty of loyalty and honesty, and the obligation to act without any malicious intent.

35/2021 Statutory Motion to Revise the Membership Criteria for Chamber Allocation
Accepted by MC Statutory Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Barbara Bramble	Rulita Wijayaningdyah	Alan Thorne
Organization / Individual	Bramble, Barbara, Ms.	Wijayaningdyah, Rulita, Ms.	A. Thorne Consulting
Chamber / Subchamber	Environmental / North	Social / South	Economic / North

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

Statutory Motion (change to the Statutes):

Amend Clause Twentieth

Present wording

TWENTIETH. The Organization's membership criteria to the three chambers shall be as follows.

1. Membership of the Economic Chamber shall be open to individuals, companies and organizations who principally have a commercial interest in forest management, the production, processing or commercialisation of forest products, or in the activities of the Organization, including, but not limited to the following.
 - a. Forest management and forest product companies.
 - b. Manufacturing companies.
 - c. Wholesalers, retailers, traders and brokers.
 - d. Consulting firms.
 - e. Commercially oriented communally-owned forest enterprises, indigenous organizations or community groups.
 - f. Industry associations.

- g. Research organizations and academics whose primary interests are the economic or trade of forest products.
 - h. Certification bodies.
 - i. Government owned or controlled entities.
 - j. Employees, consultants and representatives of the above.
2. Membership of the Social Chamber shall be open to individuals and not-for-profit organizations whose principal purpose and interest is socially beneficial forestry, including, but not limited to the following.
- a. Socially oriented communally-owned organizations, indigenous organizations and community groups.
 - b. Trade unions, labor unions and workers associations.
 - c. Non-Governmental & Organizations engaged in social development, social justice, strengthening civil society or similar.
 - d. Organizations and associations working to promote recreational uses of forests.
 - e. Research organizations and academics whose primary interests are social issues within forestry.
 - f. Development non-governmental organizations.
 - g. Employees, consultants and representatives of the above.
3. Membership of the Environmental Chamber shall be open to individuals and not-for-profit organizations whose principal purpose and interest is the protection, preservation or conservation of the natural environment, including, but not limited to the following.
- a. Environmental non-governmental organizations.
 - b. Environmental interest groups.
 - c. Research organizations and academics whose primary interest is the protection, the technical aspects of forest management and the preservation or conservation of the natural environment.
 - d. Environmentally oriented communally-owned organizations, indigenous organizations and community groups.
 - e. Employees, consultants and representatives of the above.

A membership protocol shall be in place to guide the Board's decisions on whether a Member should be assigned to the Economic, Social or Environmental Chamber.

Suggested Amendment (new language is included in red and language to be removed is strikethrough):

TWENTIETH.

The Organization shall assign its members to one of its three chambers; namely: to the economic, social or environmental chamber. To that end, the Organization will consider the main purpose, mission, vision, day- to-day operations, activities and any other elements of the member's profile that can assist in the better placement of each member in one of the referenced chambers.

The Organization's membership criteria to the three chambers shall be as follows.

1. Membership of the Economic Chamber shall be open to individuals, companies and organizations who principally have a commercial interest in forest management, the production, processing or commercialisation of forest products or in the activities of the Organization, including, but not limited to the following:
 - a. Forest management and forest product companies.
 - b. Manufacturing companies.
 - c. Wholesalers, retailers, traders and brokers.
 - d. Consulting firms.
 - e. Commercially oriented **smallholders and forest owners**, communally-owned forest enterprises, indigenous organizations or community groups.
 - f. **Commercially oriented organizations that serve smallholders and forest owners and/or run smallholders group certificates.**
 - g. Industry associations.
 - h. Research organizations and academics whose primary interests are the economic or trade of forest products.
 - i. Certification bodies.
 - j. Government owned or controlled entities **with an economic mandate.**
 - k. Employees, consultants and representatives **at a management level and with decision making power in** of the above.
 - l. **Other individuals whose main interest in forests is economic shall be assigned to the Economic Chamber.**
2. Membership of the Social Chamber shall be open to individuals and not-for-profit organizations whose principal purpose and interest is socially beneficial forestry, including, but not limited to the following:
 - a. Socially oriented **smallholders and forest owners**, communally-owned organizations, indigenous organizations, and community groups.
 - b. **Socially oriented organizations that serve smallholders and forest owners and/or that run smallholders group certificates.**
 - c. Trade unions, labor unions and workers associations.
 - d. Non-Governmental Organizations engaged in social development, social justice, strengthening civil society or similar.
 - e. Organizations and associations working to promote recreational uses of forests.
 - f. Research organizations and academics whose primary interests are social issues within forestry.
 - g. Development non-governmental organizations.
 - h. **Government owned or controlled entities with a social mandate**^[1]
 - i. Employees, consultants and representatives of the above.

- j. Other individuals whose main interest in forests is social shall be assigned to the Social Chamber.
3. Membership of the Environmental Chamber shall be open to individuals and not-for-profit organizations whose principal purpose and interest are the protection, preservation or conservation of the natural environment, including, but not limited to the following:
- a. Environmental non-governmental organizations.
 - b. Environmental interest groups.
 - c. Research organizations and academics whose primary interest is the protection, the technical aspects of forest management and the preservation or conservation of the natural environment.
 - d. Environmentally oriented smallholders and forest managers, communally-owned organizations, indigenous organizations, and community groups.
 - e. Environmentally oriented organizations that serve smallholders and forest owners and/or that run smallholders group certificates.
 - f. Government owned or controlled entities with an environmental mandate^[2].
 - g. Employees, consultants and representatives of the above.
 - h. Other individuals whose main interest in forests is environmental shall be assigned to the Environmental Chamber.

As stated in Clause Twelve, Members must inform the Organization's Director General of any important changes in the particulars supplied in support of their application that could affect their eligibility for membership to the chamber they were originally assigned to, that could make their reallocation necessary. The Secretariat is also entitled to regularly ask the Members to inform if there have been changes in their purpose, mission, vision, day-to-day operations, activities or in any of the other elements of the Member's profile that were considered for its placement in one of the three chambers; especially, when a Member applies to a position in the Board of Directors, in a committee or in a working group.

A membership protocol shall be in place to guide the Board's decisions on whether a Member should be assigned to the Economic, Social or Environmental Chamber.

Specifications for implementation:

Amend Clause Twentieth of the Statutes as proposed above.

[1] Internal note (not part of the current statutes or proposal): The motion proponents are aware that certain of the new proposals included here, including the acceptance of government-owned entities in the social chamber, necessitate further definition and discussion by the members.

[2] Internal note (not part of the current statutes or proposal): The motion proponents are aware that certain of the new proposals included here, including the acceptance of government-owned entities in the environment chamber, necessitate further definition and discussion by the members.

Background / rationale:

This is **one of a group of 5 motions, which is being proposed by 3 members of the FSC Board of Directors, as a mechanical step, in order to facilitate placing questions before the FSC General Assembly. The Board does not take a position on the language of any of these motions, and welcomes discussion and recommendations for amendments among the FSC membership in the period leading up to the General Assembly.**

With regard to this specific motion, per the mandate of Motion 62 and Motion 69 of GA2017, the Board of Directors would like to discuss with the membership a set of proposals to address the statutory motion GA2017 62 to review and revise the membership allocation criteria. The purpose of this discussion will be to consider revisions of the membership criteria for chamber allocation, in order to strengthen FSC's governance system and to increase its level of transparency and accountability. For these purposes, Clause Twentieth of the Statutes, which contains the current membership criteria of the Organization, must be amended.

The suggestions included in the Statutory Motion proposal come from the Governance Review 2.0 report, from direct member feedback and from issues identified by the membership unit in the FSC International Secretariat.

This motion is proposed by the board chair and the two vice-chairs of the board in order to give the membership a chance to discuss and make decisions on topics that the board believes are important for FSC. The board agrees on the importance of enabling a membership discussion and a decision at the General Assembly on the topic, but there is no board position on the specific text of the motion. The board wants to engage in further discussion with the membership on this and will be very interested in receiving feedback from membership discussions. In parallel, the Board is finalising a Membership Protocol which will explain more about the current membership allocation criteria and how decisions are made, including situations when allocation is not self-evident. The Protocol will be available to the membership for information and discussion in the lead-up to the General Assembly, and the Board invites feedback on this document. The motion text can then be adapted in line with suggestions from the membership before final discussions at the General Assembly. The board hopes the process can lead to good decisions with broad membership support at the General Assembly.

At the GA 2014, the FSC membership approved Motion 42, which called for a wide-ranging governance review to assess what improvements might be made to FSC's governance institutions. The FSC governance review working group was established (the "Governance Review Working Group") to make recommendations to the FSC International Board and the FSC membership in the lead-up to the 8th General Assembly in 2017.

As one part of its findings, the Governance Review Working Group identified some concerns among members regarding the chamber allocation criteria and presented a statutory motion to review and revise membership criteria for chamber allocation (GA2017 62). This motion was approved at the General Assembly. The Governance Review Working Group also submitted a policy motion (GA2017 / 69) recommending continuing to work on strengthening FSC's governance system following the FSC General Assembly 2017. This motion was also approved by the GA2017, and the Secretariat started its implementation with the collaboration of the University of Magdeburg ("Governance Review 2.0").

During Governance Review 2.0 surveys, interviews and analysis were undertaken by FSC's consultants who provided relevant comments and recommendations from members and stakeholders related to their concerns regarding the chamber allocation membership criteria. Based on the input received from members, from stakeholders and from FSC's staff, the following adjustments to the membership criteria contained in the FSC Statutes is recommended:

INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS

- **Allow a distinction between management and non-management level** to assign individual members to the economic or other chambers (i.e. an employee of a big retailer with no decision power can be assigned to social or environmental chamber; likewise, with an auditor conducting environmental or social audits).
- **Increase checks of member allocation where possible with reasonable effort:** Constantly monitoring the activities of hundreds of individual members seems like an immense task with only limited benefits. It is suggested to increase the checks for individual members who apply for positions, e.g. in the BoD or in working groups. In addition, members could be asked regularly to confirm that there are no major changes in their activities that could make a reallocation necessary.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERS

- **Organizations that serve smallholders and run smallholder group certificates**

Empower smallholders by adding a categorization rule for organizations that primarily work on equitable issues serving smallholders.

- **Environmental entities that own and/or manage forestland**

Based on the organization's primary mission - allow environmentally and socially aligned organizations to join their most appropriate mission-aligned chamber even if they manage forestland.

- **Communally owned forest enterprises, indigenous organizations or community groups and smallholders and forest owners**

Allow organizations whose primary mission is social to join the Social Chamber even if they manage forestland.

- **Government owned or controlled entities**

Allow Government owned or controlled entities to be assigned to the social or environmental chamber if they in fact pursue social or environmental interests.

Cost to FSC: administrative costs required to amend the statutes of FSC and related FSC's materials, and to update its website.

37/2021 Required changes to the FSC Principles and Criteria to implement the Policy to Address Conversion
Merged Statutory Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Barbara Bramble	Rulita Wijayaningdyah	Alan Thorne
Organization / Individual	Bramble, Barbara, Ms.	Wijayaningdyah, Rulita, Ms.	A. Thorne Consulting
Chamber / Subchamber	Environmental / North	Social / South	Economic / North

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN MERGED WITH MOTION 38/2021 AND 39/2021)

The FSC Membership approves the following changes to the *FSC Principles and Criteria v5-2* resulting in a new version 5-3 in order for *the FSC Policy to Address Conversion* (PAC) to take effect:

1. Revise Criterion 6.9 – to reflect the PAC's new definition of conversion by including High Conservation Value (HCV) areas, and by requiring also social benefits to be generated in instances of 'minimal conversion' (i.e., conversion affecting a very limited portion of the Management Unit) after the PAC's effective date. Further, as the new definition of conversion does not include a scenario where plantations on sites directly converted from natural forest are turned into non-forest land use, this scenario is now termed 'transformation' in the revised C6.9.
2. Revise Criterion 6.10 – to reflect the PAC's provisions for remediation of conversion activities that took place between November 1994 and 31 December 2020.
3. Add a new Criterion 6.11 – to reflect the PAC's strict approach towards conversion after 31 December 2020 and the broadened scope of benefits to be generated in instances of 'minimal conversion'.
4. Revise the definition of 'Restore/Restoration' – to make sure it is fully aligned with the new wording and the more comprehensive concept in the PAC.

5. Add the definition for 'Very limited portion' as it has been further adapted in the PAC – to clarify that it applies in total, irrespective of when the conversion occurred.

[Added text is shown in **red**, deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~.]

1. REVISION TO CRITERION 6.9

Current C6.9:

6.9 *The Organization** shall not convert natural *forest** to *plantations**, nor natural forests or plantations on sites directly converted from natural forest to non-forest land use, except when the conversion:

- a. affects a very limited portion of the area of the *Management Unit**, and
- b. will produce clear, substantial, additional, secure long-term conservation benefits in the Management Unit, and
- c. does not damage or threaten *High Conservation Values**, nor any sites or resources necessary to maintain or enhance those *High Conservation Values*.

Revised C6.9:

6.9 *The Organization** shall not convert natural *forest** **or HCV* areas** to *plantations** **or to non-forest land use**, nor ~~natural forests or transform~~ plantations on sites directly converted from natural forest to non-forest land use, except when ~~it~~**the conversion**:

- a. affects a very limited portion ~~of the area~~ of the *Management Unit**, and
- b. will produce ~~clear, substantial, additional, secure~~ long-term *conservation** **and social** benefits in the Management Unit, and
- c. does not ~~damage or~~ threaten *High Conservation Values**, nor any sites or resources necessary to maintain or enhance those *High Conservation Values*.

2. REVISION TO CRITERION 6.10

Current C6.10:

6.10 *Management Units** containing *plantations** that were established on areas converted from *natural forest** after November 1994 shall not qualify for certification, except where:

- a. clear and sufficient evidence is provided that *The Organization** was not directly or indirectly responsible for the conversion, or
- b. the conversion affected a very limited portion of the area of the Management Unit and is producing clear, substantial, additional, secure long term conservation benefits in the Management Unit.

Revised C6.10:

6.10 *Management Units** containing *plantations** that were established on areas converted from *natural forest** **between** November 1994 **and 31 December 2020** shall not qualify for certification, except where:

- a) ~~clear and sufficient evidence is provided that *The Organization** was not directly or indirectly responsible for the conversion.~~
- a)b) the conversion affected a very limited portion ~~of the area~~ of the *Management Unit** and is producing clear, substantial, additional, secure long-term conservation benefits in the *Management Unit**, or**
- b) *The Organization** which was directly or indirectly involved in the conversion demonstrates restitution of all social harms and proportionate remedy of environmental harms as specified in the FSC Remedy Framework, or**
- c) *The Organization** which was not involved in conversion but has acquired *Management Units** where conversion has taken place demonstrates restitution of priority social harms and partial remedy of environmental harms as specified in the FSC Remedy Framework.**

3. ADDITION OF A NEW CRITERION 6.11

New C6.11:

6.11 *Management Units shall not qualify for certification if they contain *natural forests** or *High Conservation Value** areas converted after 31 December 2020, except where the conversion:**

- a) affected a very limited portion of the *Management Unit**, and**
- b) is producing long-term *conservation** and social benefits in the *Management Unit**, and**
- c) did not threaten *High Conservation Values**, nor any sites or resources necessary to maintain or enhance those *High Conservation Values**.**

4. REVISION OF THE DEFINITION FOR 'RESTORE/RESTORATION'

Current definition for 'Restore/Restoration':

Restore/ Restoration: These words are used in different senses according to the context and in everyday speech. In some cases 'restore' means to repair the damage done to environmental values that resulted from management activities or other causes. In other cases 'restore' means the formation of more natural conditions in sites which have been heavily degraded or converted to other land uses. In the Principles and Criteria, the word 'restore' is not used to imply the recreation of any particular previous, pre-historic, pre-industrial or other pre-existing ecosystem (*Source: FSC 2011*).

The Organization is not necessarily obliged to restore those environmental values that have been affected by factors beyond the control of The Organization, for example by natural disasters, by climate change, or by the legally authorized activities of third parties, such as public infrastructure, mining, hunting or settlement. FSC-POL-20-003 The Excision of Areas from the Scope of Certification describes the processes by which such areas may be excised from the area certified, when appropriate.

The Organization is also not obliged to restore environmental values that may have existed at some time in the historic or pre-historic past, or that have been negatively affected by previous owners or organizations. However, The Organization is expected to take reasonable measures to mitigate, control and prevent environmental degradation which is continuing in the Management Unit as a result of such previous impacts.

Revised definition – for Restoration/Ecological Restoration:

Restore/ Restoration/Ecological Restoration:****

Process of assisting the recovery of an ecosystem, and its associated *conservation values, that have been degraded, damaged, or destroyed. (Source: adapted from 'International principles and standards for the practice of ecological restoration'. Gann et al 2019. Second edition. Society for Ecological Restoration [SER]) (shortened version – refer to the FSC Remedy Framework for full definition)**

~~These words are used in different senses according to the context and in everyday speech. In some cases 'restore' means to repair the damage done to environmental values that resulted from management activities or other causes. In other cases 'restore' means the formation of more natural conditions in sites which have been heavily degraded or converted to other land uses. In the Principles and Criteria, the word 'restore' is not used to imply the recreation of any particular previous, pre-historic, pre-industrial or other pre-existing ecosystem (Source: FSC 2011).~~

NOTE: The Organization is not necessarily obliged to restore those environmental values that have been affected by factors beyond the control of The Organization, for example by natural disasters, by climate change, or by the legally authorized activities of third parties, such as public infrastructure, mining, hunting or settlement. FSC-POL-20-003 The Excision of Areas from the Scope of Certification describes the processes by which such areas may be excised from the area certified, when appropriate.

The Organization is also not obliged to restore environmental values that may have existed at some time in the historic or pre-historic past, or that have been negatively affected by previous owners or organizations – **with the exception of those values negatively affected through instances of conversion and whose restoration form part of a Remedy Plan which The Organization is required to follow. In all instances,** However, The Organization is expected to take reasonable measures to mitigate, control and prevent environmental degradation which is continuing in the Management Unit as a result of such previous impacts.

5. ADDITION OF THE DEFINITION FOR 'VERY LIMITED PORTION'

New definition for 'Very limited portion', adopted from the PAC definition:

Very limited portion: The affected area shall not exceed 5% of the *Management Unit, irrespective of whether the conversion activities have taken place prior to or after *The Organization** is awarded with FSC Forest Management certification. (Source: FSC-POL-01-007).**

Background / rationale:

Purpose

The purpose of this motion is to make changes to relevant parts of the *FSC Principles and Criteria* in order to reflect the proposals of the *FSC Policy to Address Conversion*, result of intense discussions among members through years and different processes, so that the policy can become effective.

The changes include:

1. Revision of Criterion 6.9
2. Revision of Criterion 6.10, which is split in:
 - a. Revised C 6.10 addressing requirements related to conversion between November 1994 and 31 December 2020.
 - b. New C 6.11 addressing requirements related to conversion after 31 December 2020.
3. Revision of the definition of 'Restore/Restoration'.
4. New definition of 'Very limited portion'.

This motion consolidates the three motions (37, 38 and 39) previously presented by the same proposers for this General Assembly.

Background

FSC membership has aimed for halting the loss of natural forests ever since FSC was formally established in 1994 and members agreed upon the first set of Principles and Criteria for responsible forest management later in that year.

Since then, FSC has restricted conversion of natural forests. Forest plantations which have been established by converting natural forests after November 1994 have not been eligible since then for FSC certification if the Organization was responsible for the conversion.

As the years passed, conversion and how FSC can contribute to restoration have continued being relevant topics for the members.

In 2004, FSC launched a chamber-balanced Plantations Review process where these aspects were discussed, amongst several other challenges in plantations forestry. The process resulted in some fundamental improvements in the Principle and Criteria. However, the question of the "ownership loophole" (how to deal with organizations that were taking over previously converted land but were not involved in the conversion) remained unsolved and the FSC membership has passed motions in all General Assemblies since 2011 to revisit and revise the conversion rules: Motion 18/2011, Motion 12/2014 and M7/2017.

Through Motion 7 at the FSC General Assembly 2017 in Vancouver (Canada), the membership requested FSC to put in place a mechanism, building upon previous work, to develop a holistic conversion policy and appropriate treatment at Principle, Criterion, and Indicator levels, considering compensation for past conversion, in terms of

- a. restoration and/or conservation for environmental values; and
- b. restitution for socio-economic values.

As per Board Meeting 77th, a member-based and sub-chamber-balanced Working Group (WG) was established with a focus on developing a high-level conversion policy based on ideas already generated and discussed in the previous Motion 12 process, including the conversion of forest-related ecosystems.

By December 2020, and after having consulted on three drafts, the WG developed the 4th draft of the *FSC Policy to Address Conversion* (read more [here](#)). The WG reached consensus on most of the aspects of the policy, including:

- Allowing remedy for past conversion, which allows FSC to contribute to restoration and restitution global efforts.
- The inclusion of lasting changes to HCV areas in a new and comprehensive definition of conversion, which will apply to conversion activities after December 2020.
- The non-eligibility of lands converted after December 2020 for certification.

The only topic where the WG did not reach consensus was subclause 3.b) in policy element 3, which outlines requirements for organizations that have acquired management units with areas converted between 1994 and December 2020.

In 2021, the Secretariat commissioned the development of a White Paper to propose a way forward to address this scenario. The White Paper was developed in consultation with members and other stakeholders.

At the 88th Board meeting, the Board reviewed the proposals from the White Paper and agreed that the policy element 3b) had to link the environmental and social remedy liability with the land and that fair and feasible remediation had to be required for organizations not involved in conversion but that acquired converted area.

At the 89th Board meeting, the Secretariat presented a proposal for policy element 3b) of the proposed *FSC Policy to Address Conversion* based on this Board guidance. The feasibility of this proposal was subsequently assessed through a commissioned study on the economics of forest conversion based on data from the forestry sector and academic literature:

*3.b) Organizations** that were not involved in conversion but have acquired a management unit where conversion has taken place, are eligible for FSC Forest Management certification of that management unit upon demonstrated conformance with the core requirements for the **restitution* of priority social harms*** and **partial remedy of environmental harms** in the *FSC Remedy Framework*.

The specifications related to the implementation of the remedy required by the *FSC Policy to Address Conversion* are included in the *FSC Remedy Framework*. This framework also includes remedy requirements for the *Policy for the Association of Organizations with FSC*.

The proposed set of revisions to the *FSC Principles and Criteria* in this statutory Motion can be seen as an end-product of an almost 20-year-long learning process and represent a compromise solution between the three FSC chambers.

The level of ambition of the proposed revisions included this motion is even higher than in the existing 1994-rule, because the new cut-off date of December 2020 applies not only to natural forests, but also to the High Conservation Value areas in forest-related ecosystems, such as grasslands, peatlands, and wetlands. At the same time, these revisions will help stakeholders affected by the conversion to get compensation for the social harms that happened in the past, and ecological restoration will have a well-defined role in bringing the plantations management closer to nature. Furthermore, this motion to revise the *FSC Principles and Criteria* is aligned with the new *FSC Policy to Address Conversion* and *FSC Policy for Association* with regard to closing the 'ownership loophole' and providing clear steps for remedy in the *FSC Remedy Framework*.

Finally, the proposed changes will provide a route to millions of hectares of forest plantations, which are currently out of the reach to FSC to become FSC certified and managed in a responsible manner according to our Principles and Criteria.

A rejection of the proposed changes to the *FSC Principles and Criteria* would lead the *Policy to Address Conversion* not becoming effective. In this case, the current status quo would remain, leaving the ownership loophole open and weakening FSC's efforts to help repair past social and environmental damage.?

40a/2021 Review the applicability of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) in Principle 4
 Edited Statutory Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Leendert van der Vlist	Camilla Bragotto Marangon	Gemma Tillack
Organization / Individual	Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples	IBA - Indústria Brasileira de Árvores	Rainforest Action Network
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / North	Economic / South	Environmental / North

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THE PROPOSER OF THIS MOTION HAS BEEN CHANGED 04/2022)

1. Revise Criterion 4.2 of the FSC Principles and Criteria

Current 4.2

4.2 *The Organization** shall recognize and *uphold** the legal and *customary rights** of *local communities** to maintain control over management activities within or related to the *Management Unit** to the extent necessary to protect their rights, resources, lands and territories. Delegation by local communities of control over management activities to third parties requires *Free, Prior and Informed Consent**.

Proposed revised 4.2 (new language is included in red)

4.2 *The Organization** shall recognize and *uphold** the legal and *customary rights** of *local communities** to maintain control over management activities within or related to the *Management Unit** to the extent necessary to protect their rights, resources, lands and territories. Delegation by local communities *referred to by FSC as traditional peoples** of control over management activities to third parties requires *Free, Prior and Informed Consent**.

2. Add a new Criterion to Principle 4 of the FSC Principles and Criteria

Proposed new 4.3 (current 4.3 and following criteria should be re-numbered)

4.3 In the event of delegation of control over management activities, a binding *agreement** between *The Organization** and the *traditional peoples** shall* be concluded through *Free, Prior and Informed Consent**. The agreement shall* define its duration, provisions for renegotiation, renewal, termination, economic conditions and other terms and conditions. The agreement shall* make provision for monitoring by traditional peoples* of The Organization*'s compliance with its terms and conditions.

3. Revise Criterion 4.8 of the FSC Principles and Criteria

Current 4.8

4.8 The *Organization** shall* uphold* the right of *local communities** to protect* and utilize their *traditional knowledge** and shall* compensate *local communities** for the utilization of such knowledge and their *intellectual property**. A *binding agreement** as per *Criterion** 3.3 shall* be concluded between *The Organization** and the *local communities** for such utilization through *Free, Prior and Informed Consent** before utilization takes place, and shall* be consistent with the *protection** of *intellectual property** rights.

Proposed revised 4.8 (new language is included in red and language to be removed is ~~strikethrough~~):

4.8 The *Organization** shall* uphold* the right of *traditional peoples** ~~local communities~~* to protect* and utilize their *traditional knowledge** and shall* compensate ~~them~~ *local communities** for the utilization of such knowledge and their *intellectual property**. A *binding agreement** as per *Criterion** 3.3 shall* be concluded between *The Organization** and the *traditional peoples** ~~local communities~~* for such utilization through *Free, Prior and Informed Consent** before utilization takes place, and shall* be consistent with the *protection** of *intellectual property** rights.

4. Add a new definition to the Glossary of Terms of the FSC Principles and Criteria

New definition to be inserted:

Traditional Peoples: Traditional peoples are social groups or peoples who do not self-identify as indigenous and who affirm rights to their lands, forests, and other resources based on long-established custom or traditional occupation and use. (Source: Forest Peoples Programme (Marcus Colchester, 07 October 2009). (From: FSC-STD-40-004 V3-0 Chain of Custody Certification))

Background / rationale:

Note: due to FSC's formal requirements, the motion on the applicability of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) is presented in two separate, but connected motions:

1. Motion 40a: proposes the revision of an existing criterion and the addition of a new criterion to Principle 4 of the FSC Principles and Criteria. Such a proposal has to be presented as a Statutory Motion.
2. Motion 40b: proposes a change to the International Generic Indicators and to the Instructions for standard developers to address the revised and the new criterion. As this proposal requires a policy change, but not a change in the FSC Principles and Criteria, it has to be presented as a Policy Motion.

The FPIC concept was born as a direct response to the need for an internationally recognized instrument that could protect indigenous and traditional peoples by giving them the right to grant, withhold, or modify their consent over activities that might impact their lands, resources, and culture. This collective right is upheld by ILO 169 and by the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and is based on the right to self-determination and on the distinct social, economic, and political systems of indigenous, tribal peoples and other traditional peoples, as well as their particular language, culture, and beliefs. Therefore, this motion does NOT intend to question or raise doubts on the importance of the FPIC to indigenous and traditional peoples and its applicability in Principle 3.

It is important to mention that in many parts of the world, there are peoples with long-term customary rights in lands and forests, who either do not self-identify as indigenous peoples or who are not recognized as such by national governments or neighbouring communities but who nevertheless have distinctive cultures and ways of making a living from their lands and forests. These peoples, referred to as 'traditional peoples' by FSC, do have rights to self-determination that are upheld in international law and should therefore be considered as having the right to FPIC. Such peoples include 'tribal peoples' in Asia and Africa, 'customary law communities' in Indonesia, and 'Maroon' peoples (*quilombola*) in the Caribbean, Central and South America. The intention of P4 was to respect and uphold the rights of these peoples, requesting the application of FPIC.

Within the FSC normative framework, FPIC is applicable to indigenous peoples (FSC-STD-60-004 V2-0 EN, Principle 3) and to local communities who have a traditional, close or long-term relationship with forests and customary rights (FSC-STD-60-004 V2-0 EN, Principle 4). However, criteria in P4 are not so clear when they refer to these local communities, and since the current definition of "local communities" is very wide, it has caused confusion in the application of FPIC.

Therefore, this motion calls for the revision on several criteria, its respective indicators and Instructions for Standard Developers, so that FPIC applies to those peoples who have this right, being those with long-term customary ties to lands and forests such as indigenous and traditional peoples; and the inclusion of a clear definition of traditional peoples in the P&C Glossary, in order to ensure their proper identification.

On the other hand, Principle 4, is referring to local communities whose rights are affected by the management activities. The broad FSC concept of 'local communities' may include, for example, large-scale neighboring farmers, owners of holiday houses, small municipalities, as well as recently moved communities with no close connection with forests, since they have the right of property over their lands, as any citizen who owns a house, for instance. Although such local communities clearly should not enjoy the same right of FPIC as indigenous and other traditional peoples, they should be considered rightsholders and part of an engagement process in order to not have their rights and resources impacted by the forestry activities and have their concerns and needs addressed in the organization's Management Plan, as set out in current criteria 4.5, 4.6 and 7.4, for example.

The confusion created regarding this concept of local communities, which not only within FSC, but in other spaces and contexts, has been used to include indigenous peoples or traditional peoples, and an unclear wording in P4 have led to the misapplication of FPIC.

With the aim, precisely of respecting, protecting and upholding the rights of local communities and traditional peoples, and at the same time providing the Organization with clear standards, it is considered essential to make the changes proposed to P4.

40b/2021 Review the applicability of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) in Principle 4
 Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Leendert van der Vlist	Camilla Bragotto Marangon	Gemma Tillack
Organization / Individual	Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples	IBA - Indústria Brasileira de Árvores	Rainforest Action Network
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / North	Economic / South	Environmental / North

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THE PROPOSER OF THIS MOTION HAS BEEN CHANGED 04/2022)

Amend standard FSC-STD-60-004 V2-0 EN in Principle 4 as follows

1. Revise the Instructions for Standard Developers in Criterion 4.1 (new language is included in red and language to be removed is strikethrough):

INSTRUCTIONS FOR STANDARD DEVELOPERS: This Criterion* requires identification of local communities* with a fair and legitimate claim to be allowed access to benefits, goods or ecosystem services* from the Management Unit*. They include those who have affirmed their rights to land, forests* and other resources based on long established use, and also those who have not yet done so (due for example, to a lack of awareness or empowerment). ~~They also include local communities* referred to by FSC as traditional peoples*.~~

~~This Criterion* further requires identification of local communities* affected by management activities including those within the Management Unit* or neighbouring the Management Unit*, and those that are more distant, who may experience negative economic, social and/or environmental impacts as a result of management activities within the Management Unit* (Indicator 4.1.1).~~

Mechanisms to address disputes* with local communities* shall* follow the requirements in Criterion* 1.6 if they are related to legal tenure; and follow the requirements in Criterion* 4.6 if they are related to the impacts of management activities (Indicator 4.1.2).

~~Standard Development Groups shall* describe and provide examples of situations in their jurisdiction where local communities are considered traditional peoples* as defined by FSC.~~

2. Revise the Instructions for Standard Developers in Criterion 4.2 (new language is included in red and language to be removed is strikethrough):

INSTRUCTIONS FOR STANDARD DEVELOPERS: Standard Developers shall* consider the applicability of active engagement* and co-management at the national and sub-national level (Indicator 4.2.1 and 4.2.4)

~~Standard Developers shall* develop indicators to ensure that the right to Free Prior and Informed Consent* is granted only to local communities* with established legal* or customary rights* within the Management Unit*. The scope of Free Prior and Informed Consent* for local communities* is limited to the rights that exist within the Management Unit* and only to the extent that management actions have an impact on those rights- (Indicator 4.2.4).~~

Standard Developers shall* ensure that good faith* is understood as a term used in ILO Conventions and recognized as an auditable element. (Indicator 4.2.5)

3. Revise the International generic Indicators in Criterion 4.2 (new language is included in red and language to be removed is strikethrough):

4.2.1 Through culturally appropriate* engagement* local communities* are informed of when, where and how they can comment on and request modification to management activities to the extent necessary to protect their rights, resources, lands and territories*.

4.2.2 The legal* and customary rights* of local communities* to maintain control over management activities are not violated by The Organization*.

4.2.3 Where evidence exists that legal* and/or customary rights* of local communities* related to management activities have been violated the situation is corrected, if necessary, through culturally appropriate* engagement* and/or through the dispute* resolution process in Criteria* 1.6 or 4.6.

4.2.4 Free, Prior and Informed Consent* is granted by local communities* referred to by FSC as traditional peoples* prior to the delegation of control over management activities that affect their identified rights through a process that includes:

4.2.4.1 Ensuring the traditional peoples* local communities* know their rights and obligations regarding the resource;

4.2.4.2 Informing the traditional peoples* local communities* of the value of the resource, in economic, social and environmental terms;

4.2.4.3 Informing the traditional peoples* local communities* of their right to withhold or modify consent to the proposed management activities to the extent necessary to protect their rights, and resources, lands and territories*; and

4.2.4.4 Informing the traditional peoples* local communities* of the current and future planned forest* management activities.

4.2.5 Where the process of Free Prior and Informed Consent* has not yet resulted in an FPIC agreement, the Organisation* and the affected traditional peoples* local communities* are engaged in a mutually agreed FPIC process that is advancing, in good faith*, and with which the community is satisfied.

4. Add new Instructions for Standard Developers and new International Generic Indicators to new Criterion 4.3 (new language is included in red and language to be removed is strikethrough):

INSTRUCTIONS FOR STANDARD DEVELOPERS: Standard Developers shall* develop indicators taking into consideration that traditional peoples* may choose to ratify binding agreements* in writing or in another format of their choosing according to culturally appropriate* engagement*. Binding agreements* reflect cultural requirements and may also be based on oral and honour systems, to be applied in cases where written agreements are not favoured by traditional peoples*, either for practical reasons or on principle.

Recognizing that traditional peoples* may not want to grant Free Prior and Informed Consent* and/or delegate control for their own reasons, the traditional peoples* may choose to offer their support for management activities in a different way of their choosing (Indicator 4.3.1 and 4.3.2).

4.3.1 Where control over management activities has been granted through Free Prior and Informed Consent* based on culturally appropriate* engagement*, the binding agreement* contains the duration, provisions for renegotiation, renewal, termination, economic conditions and other terms and conditions.

4.3.2 Records of binding agreements* are maintained.

4.3.3 The binding agreement* contains the provision for monitoring by traditional peoples* of The Organization*'s compliance with its terms and conditions.

5. Revise the International generic Indicators in Criterion 4.8 (new language is included in red and language to be removed is strikethrough):

Current 4.8.2

4.8.2 *Local communities** are compensated according to the *binding agreement** reached through *Free, Prior and Informed Consent** for the use of *traditional knowledge** and *intellectual property**

Proposed revised 4.8.2

4.8.2 **Traditional peoples*** ~~Local communities*~~ are compensated according to the binding agreement* reached through Free, Prior and Informed Consent* for the use of traditional knowledge* and intellectual property*.

Background / rationale:

Note: due to FSC's formal requirements, the motion on the applicability of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) is presented in two separate, but connected motions:

1. Motion 40a: proposes the revision of an existing criterion and the addition of a new criterion to Principle 4 of the FSC Principles and Criteria. Such a proposal has to be presented as a Statutory Motion.
2. Motion 40b: proposes a change to the International Generic Indicators and to the Instructions for standard developers to address the revised and the new criterion. As this proposal requires a policy change, but not a change in the FSC Principles and Criteria, it has to be presented as a Policy Motion.

The FPIC concept was born as a direct response to the need for an internationally recognized instrument that could protect indigenous and traditional peoples by giving them the right to grant, withhold, or modify their consent over activities that might impact their lands, resources, and culture. This collective right is upheld by ILO 169 and by the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and is based on the right to self-determination and on the distinct social, economic, and political systems of indigenous, tribal peoples and other traditional peoples, as well as their particular language, culture, and beliefs. Therefore, this motion does NOT intend to question or raise doubts on the importance of the FPIC to indigenous and traditional peoples and its applicability in Principle 3.

It is important to mention that in many parts of the world, there are peoples with long-term customary rights in lands and forests, who either do not self-identify as indigenous peoples or who are not recognized as such by national governments or neighbouring communities but who nevertheless have distinctive cultures and ways of making a living from their lands and forests. These peoples, referred to as 'traditional peoples' by FSC, do have rights to self-determination that are upheld in international law and should therefore be considered as having the right to FPIC. Such peoples include 'tribal peoples' in Asia and Africa, 'customary law communities' in Indonesia, and 'Maroon' peoples (quilombola) in the Caribbean, Central and South America. The intention of P4 was to respect and uphold the rights of these peoples, requesting the application of FPIC.

Within the FSC normative framework, FPIC is applicable to indigenous peoples (FSC-STD-60-004 V2-0 EN, Principle 3) and to local communities who have a traditional, close or long-term relationship with forests and customary rights (FSC-STD-60-004 V2-0 EN, Principle 4). However, criteria in P4 are not so clear when they refer to these local communities, and since the current definition of "local communities" is very wide, it has caused confusion in the application of FPIC.

Therefore, this motion calls for the revision on several criteria, its respective indicators and Instructions for Standard Developers, so that FPIC applies to those peoples who have this right, being those with long-term customary ties to lands and forests such as indigenous and traditional peoples; and the inclusion of a clear definition of traditional peoples in the P&C Glossary, in order to ensure their proper identification.

On the other hand, Principle 4, is referring to local communities whose rights are affected by the management activities. The broad FSC concept of 'local communities' may include, for example, large-scale neighboring farmers, owners of holiday houses, small municipalities, as well as recently moved communities with no close connection with forests, since they have the right of property over their lands, as any citizen who owns a house, for instance. Although such local communities clearly should not enjoy the same right of FPIC as indigenous and other traditional peoples, they should be considered rightsholders and part of an engagement process in order to not have their rights and resources impacted by the forestry activities and have their concerns and needs addressed in the organization's Management Plan, as set out in current criteria 4.5, 4.6 and 7.4, for example.

The confusion created regarding this concept of local communities, which not only within FSC, but in other spaces and contexts, has been used to include indigenous peoples or traditional peoples, and an unclear wording in P4 have led to the misapplication of FPIC.

With the aim, precisely of respecting, protecting and upholding the rights of local communities and traditional peoples, and at the same time providing the Organization with clear standards, it is considered essential to make the changes proposed to P4.

41/2021 Define a Confidentiality Policy which enables transparency without compromising the integrity of FSC

Accepted by MC Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Martha Cecilia Guadalupe Nuñez Cañizares	Susie Russell	Peter Dam
Organization / Individual	Núñez Cañizares, Martha, Ms.	North Coast Environment Council	Dam, Peter, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / South	Environmental / North	Economic / South

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

A Confidentiality of Information Policy and relevant enabling instruments will be defined, based on the review, analysis and updating of FSC's provisions in this regard, with the aim of facilitating appropriate, transparent and consistent compliance with this policy, whose objective is to increase transparency, trust and engagement in institutional management and the improvement of its governance. To this effect, a technical group of three people (FSC members and non-members) with expertise in the field and knowledge of FSC as an organization and its internal governance system will be established. Within 5 months after the passing of the motion, the technical group will submit to the Board of Directors a draft policy and the relevant enabling instruments. The Board of Directors will review it immediately and will arrange the process of consultation with the membership and subsequent approval. The updating of the requirements and tools will involve defining the rationale or justification explaining under what circumstances and in respect of what confidentiality is considered imperative. The policy shall consider the Global Strategy in order to enable and not interfere with the implementation of the strategies and the successful achievement of the proposed outcomes (co-creation; information sharing, communication of impacts, among others).

Background / rationale:

Given its nature -as a certification body- FSC must comply with clear information confidentiality measures and rules, in order to safeguard its integrity as a system, protect the intellectual property of policies, standards and procedures, among others, and protect certificate holders and accredited certification bodies. Moreover, FSC is a membership-based organization, being its General Assembly the highest decision-making body; in order for the membership to effectively exercise this duty and right, it must be provided with the relevant information. However, the confidentiality provisions currently in place are not known by all

members, nor is there clarity as to who must comply with them and how. Generally, it is known that: - According to the Statutes (clause 24), the members of the International Board of Directors "shall sign a confidentiality and non-disclosure agreement", and shall also sign a declaration of non-conflict of interest. It is known that, for this purpose, the Board of Directors has defined a Conflict of Interest Policy, which -among other requirements- obliges its members to maintain the confidentiality of information, but the criteria that determine it as such are unknown. - The membership and the members of the working groups should also be bound by confidentiality of information provisions. - As part of the Principle Cooperation Agreement they sign when they enter FSC AC, the National Offices and Network Partners must sign a Non-Disclosure and Confidentiality Agreement which includes a number of restrictions. Failure to comply carries monetary penalties; however, these agreements are based on an unclear explanation. - Also, the measures governing the staff of the International Secretariat and FSC AC are unknown; however, in recent years, members have been denied access to information that is handled between the International Secretariat and the Executive Directors or National Coordinators of the National Offices. The same applies for information from the Regional Offices. All these measures and restrictions, whose rationality, moreover, has not been sufficiently explained, whose criteria have not been sufficiently defined or justified, and whose application is poorly consistent, are giving rise to situations such as the following: - Members are unable to access the documentation on which the Board of Directors' decision-making is based, since almost all of the documents related to the issues to be discussed at the meetings of the Board of Directors are classified as confidential. Because of this limitation, they cannot express their point of view or give any advice or feedback to their representatives on the Board of Directors. - Members are unable to access the information that relates to and directly affects their management at the local level, and in turn are unaware of the substantive basis for the information that the Board of Directors is receiving from the representatives of the Regional Offices. - Members of the Board of Directors cannot ask for advice or feedback from membership, for fear of breaking the rules of confidentiality, causing uncomfortable situations with their constituents. This is in addition of a poor communication between the different FSC bodies; despite the progress and dynamics generated in 2020, there are no suitable mechanisms for information exchange, nor have been the channels for relationships and accountability clearly defined. These situations, in turn, are causing: - Lack of knowledge and even disinterest on the part of the members about what is happening in the organization, which has a direct impact on their levels of empowerment and capacity to engage with sufficient and appropriate information in consultations, working groups and definition of projects; advice to those who represent them in the Board of Directors; - Lack of trust, frustration on the part of the members, and appropriation of the decisions taken, which in the long term is becoming an obstacle, a critical knot that results in a weak functioning of the Network; - Difficulty on the part of the members of the Board of Directors to ensure the necessary transparency and facilitate the engagement of the members in the organization's governance and decision making. It is absolutely essential to solve these problems, since the lack of information and transparency generates different kinds of confusion, conjectures and assumptions. A consistent Confidentiality Policy is required in order to safeguard the integrity of the organization and maintain the support and input of the people who believe in its principles and mission.

42/2021 Communication Policy and Strategies FSC
Accepted by MC Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Yadira Paulina Baca Terán	Vivian Heredia Hernández	Marcelo Langer
Organization / Individual	Baca Terán, Yadira Paulina, Ms.	Heredia Hernández, Vivian, Ms.	Langer, Marcelo, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / South	Economic / South	Environmental / South

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

Communication in an organization such as FSC transcends the idea or concept of a tool for the transmission and reception of information at the internal and external levels. On the contrary, from a broader perspective we understand communication as a collective process of social construction through which internal and external relationships are built and consolidated, and which fosters the understanding, deepening and recognition of organizational culture. In this sense, communication is closely articulated with the structure and governance of FSC, with the different internal and external processes of cultural construction of the organization, its principles, mission, vision, values and the codes that support it.

On the basis of the above, we consider it essential to **design and implement a policy and strategies of internal and external communication**, which encourages a language towards joint creation whose forms adopt the interaction with stakeholders at a global level. A policy based on the recognition of the socio-cultural, economic, environmental, local and regional diversity of the different levels of FSC (local, regional, global).

To this end, the Secretariat is requested, based **on a diagnosis of its communication management**, to generate a proposal for a communication policy and strategies including relevant elements: objectives, plans, programmes and projects.

The communication policy should establish principles, values and objectives that stimulate the transparency of decision-making processes, the consolidation of the members' sense of belonging and that increases their levels of participation and empowerment, among others. In this respect, communication strategies should define the roles of the stakeholders engaged in the various processes.

This policy should be developed with the support of a **group technical experts** in the subject, and be calibrated with a **team of members from the different chambers and regions**.

The effort must be carried out within six months after the motion has been passed and submitted to the Board of Directors for approval.

Background / rationale:

The results of the survey conducted in the second stage of the governance review, (R.G. 2.0) highlighted those related to FSC communication. Members showed a very strong wish from all sides to be better informed about FSC's structures and governance, and about the work and achievements of the FSC Board and the Secretariat. There was also a strong wish for the development of new tools to enable member engagement, discussion and influence related to FSC's work (Governance review report).

In the light of the above, the Secretariat prepared new materials to explain key issues on FSC structure and governance, the new Member Portal, a newsletter and webinars have been developed to address different subjects at the global and regional level.

Regarding this, we must point out the efforts of the regional coordinators together with the Secretariat to generate spaces for meetings and discussion (regional meetings of members, the 2020 general meeting of members, dialogues on conversion, etc.) through the website during the pandemic generated by Covid-19 in the year 2020.

These efforts have been significant in terms of the objective of building greater engagement in the different processes and discussions. However, they have not been enough. Currently, communication is limited to disseminating information, but does not reach a level of interaction that would consequently strengthen relationships between all stakeholders and strengthen appropriation and a culture of transparency and accountability.

At the moment, we have what we might call "short circuits" in the channels of communication, especially between members and representatives of the National Offices and the Board of Directors. This lack of clarity in the communication culture within FSC is also reflected in the interactions between Board of Directors, working groups and technical working groups, for example.

At the positioning level, there are no clear policies regarding how FSC should position itself. In some countries it is a platform for brand promotion; in others, it promotes results, and in others, it promotes products without a clear line of principles. This leads to the brand value being diluted in the face of larger brands, not to mention the impact of certification.

Therefore, it is necessary and a priority to think of communication as a process of social production of messages that are agreed upon, negotiated and legitimized collectively, shaping thus a specific way of being as an organization, of belonging as members, of playing specific roles depending on the place and function exercised, and of projecting a particular identity to the outside world.

A communication policy including clear principles and strategies will generate, at the internal level, the necessary conditions to improve, strengthen and achieve greater transparency of the system; strengthen the

network and the sense of belonging of the diversity of members (individuals, smallholders and communities, Indigenous Peoples, companies, etc.); foster engagement through collective work spaces in which consensus is reached, decisions are made and problems are solved at different levels and in different regions. It will undoubtedly impact the development of the Global Strategy 2021-2026.

Externally, FSC communication policy will consider communication processes for building relationships with governments and stakeholders in the different regions. These processes will enable a better understanding and approach to local and regional contexts and issues; they will make advocacy possible among political actors; to establish networks and spaces for exchange and cooperation and the generation of a more articulated and collaborative effort, in order to face the challenges proposed in the Global Strategy.

It is important to emphasize that the organization's communication policy, through specific strategies, will influence the visibility and consolidation of FSC vision and mission at a global level, and its positioning in relation to current issues of great relevance such as climate change, biodiversity protection, gender equality and equity, eradication of child labor, forced labor, forms of slavery and others that are included in the Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations.

43/2021 Incorporation of phytosanitary records in the dossier of the forest management unit
 Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Pablo Raúl Cordon Cabrera	Carolt Enriquez Albizures de Pereira	Pablo Ignacio Domínguez Hernández
Organization / Individual	Cordon Cabrera, Pablo Raúl , Mr.	Enriquez Albizures de Pereira, Carolt, Mrs.	Domínguez Hernández, Pablo Ignacio, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Environmental / South	Social / South	Economic / South

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 06/2022)

FSC will require the Forest Management Unit to integrate a forest pest and disease monitoring tool within two years.

Background / rationale:

Forests and plantations globally interact with organisms considered entropically as "pests and diseases". However, at present, due to the effects of climate change, there is an increasing interaction with these organisms that can cause negative impacts at critical levels, or even their death, in forests and plantations.

Currently, certified areas register the products used for pest and disease control and management in the production Forest Management Unit. Nevertheless, this registry does not detail who these responsible organisms are. In order to know the health status of certified forest areas, it is necessary to develop an internal monitoring tool to register the presence of pests and diseases, since these are cyclical. This would ensure preventive actions. For example, it is known that some groups of insects are causing changes in the composition and structure of forests due to the presence of *Coptotermes formosanus*, which was believed that could not affect natural forests and was unique to isolated urban trees, as mentioned by Evans et al., 2019, in a study conducted in the southeast United States.

44/2021 Secure member-based decisions on the use of GMOs in the FSC-system
Edited Policy Motion

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

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THE SECONDER OF THIS MOTION HAS BEEN CHANGED 03/2021)

We request the organization to make sure that decisions on the use of GMOs in FSC-associated and FSC-certified operations remain in the full responsibility of a membership-decision. We therefore ask the secretariat to implement an open and transparent decision-making process, which gives the membership the opportunity to agree and decide about the objectives and desired outcomes of the use or non-use of GMO within the FSC-system.

Background / rationale:

While following the debate on sustainable intensification as well as an informative process initiated by the secretariat on genetic engineering within the FSC-community it seems, that within FSC several processes which include aspects of GMO are done with unclear objectives and intransparency for members.

This motion has its backup in general exclusions of GMOs in the Principle and Criteria as well as in the Policy for Association and in requirements for Controlled Wood. All three normative frameworks are very clear on an exclusion of GMOs at all levels. This underlines how much a debate on the matter touches on fundamental values of FSC, and consequently decisions touching or even changing FSCs position on GMOs need broad discussions, transparent communication and a general agreement by the membership.

It would be unacceptable for the proposers seeing a policy shift through proposals of partial aspects (like the process of sustainable intensification) in absence of an overall agreed objective for such fundamental changes of the FSC-system.

Any proposed outcome of ongoing processes in regards to GMOs (GMO-engineering, sustainable intensification) should therefore be only implemented after confirmation by the membership against current decision requirements in the statutes.

45/2021 Enhance and Improve the Conversion and Remedy Package to Protect FSC's Credibility

Accepted by MC Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Dirk Riestenpatt	Martha Cecilia Guadalupe Nuñez Cañizares	Gemma Tillack
Organization / Individual	Riestenpatt, Dirk, Mr.	Núñez Cañizares, Martha, Ms.	Rainforest Action Network
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / North	Social / South	Environmental / North

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

The FSC membership requests enhancements and improvements are made prior to the effective date of the Policy for Association FSC-POL-01-004 Version 3-0, Policy to Address Conversion FSC-POL-01-007 Version 1-0, the two Versions of the Remedy Framework for PfA V2 and V3, and associated supporting architecture, including any documents on normative and guidance procedures and protocols, designed to implement a holistic approach to address conversion of natural forests and deliver social and environmental remedy throughout the FSC systems.

Background / rationale:

The process for development / revision of the FSC Policy on Conversion as commissioned / guided by Motions 37/2002; 18/2011; 12/2014; 7/2017 failed to achieve consensus among FSC members and constituents. Despite the absence of sustained opposition among FSC members, the FSC International Board approved the Policy to Address Conversion FSC-POL-01-007 Version 1-0 after some progress had been made towards consensus. There remains the need for further enhancements and improvements to ensure the "Conversion and Remedy Package" is a robust, transparent, and credible set of policies, procedures, and internal systems that can be implemented in a manner that safeguards the reputation of the FSC.

Especially the following aspects shall be implemented:

- Finalize and approve robust, operational, and auditable Remedy Frameworks that will be used when implementing the Policy to Address Conversion, Policy for Association v2 and v3 and subsequent versions. All applicable Remedy Frameworks are published with full access for all FSC members in a public consultation process intended to ensure the resolution of concerns prior to decisions on approval by the FSC International Board.
 - Special care is taken to accommodate the recommendations received from the Permanent Indigenous Peoples' Committee that more clarity is needed on: how Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) will be ensured, consistent with the requirements of UNDRIP and international human rights norms; the addition of sufficient FPIC 'gates' in the remedy process; how to include intangible social harms; how to ensure adequate qualifications and measures to ensure independence of 3rd party verifiers and the role of affected rights-holders in their selection; and the involvement of independent assessors from the beginning of the remedy process.
 - The improvement of the FSC Remedy Frameworks to include explicit requirements for adherence to the FSC's FPIC Guidance and independent verification at each FPIC "gate"—including the stages of baseline assessments, remedy plan agreement, and remedy plan implementation. Independent Assessor/s must be engaged from the start of the remedy process to advise on establishment of a culturally appropriate grievance mechanism, throughout the remedy process (including 3.3 and 3.4 and 4) during the application of FPIC, and for the identification of stakeholders/ affected and impacted rightsholders and impact areas, and determining baselines. It is unacceptable for these steps in the remedy process to be undertaken by the Organisation.
- The FSC establishes robust and transparent criteria for applying the new definitions of *corporate group** and *control**, beyond the current definition of involvement, in the Remedy Framework for PfA v2 so that these provisions can be applied systematically and fairly to applicants and organizations seeking to end disassociation. The criteria for 'outstanding magnitude or gravity of harm' and interpretations or Advice notes on the application of additional measures must be consulted with the FSC members. Additional measures shall include the full remediation of social and environmental harm caused by all individuals and organizations and their *corporate group**, in the period between December 1 1994 and December 31 2022.
- The FSC secretariat collaborates with members that are already developing a rigorous methodology to apply the AFi definition of corporate group to establish a robust and transparent procedure/protocol for the FSC, *Third Party Verifiers* and *Independent Assessors*, to use to identify and review *substantial information** and make determinations on *control** and the extent of *corporate groups**.
- The FSC establishes robust and transparent criteria and guidance for use to determining the conversion threshold* when implementing the Policy to Address Conversion and the provisions for minimal conversion stipulated by FSC-POL-01-007 in the context of association.
- The FSC establishes robust and transparent dispensation criteria, and standardized adapted procedures, for *small-scale smallholders** to safeguard against the creation of a new ownership loophole and speculative conversion.

- The FSC establishes a robust process for the revision of standards and procedures to ensure a holistic and consistent approach to addressing conversion throughout the FSC normative framework. The FSC Board and Secretariat ensures consistency across all standards, including FSC Controlled Wood.
- Ensure that throughout the Conversion and Remedy Package the burden of proof for compliance with and exemplary conduct related to FSC norms and systems is a normative requirement for organizations seeking to (re-)associate with FSC, seeking certification of FMUs and/or seeking to implement remedy/remediation for environmental and/or social harm caused by conversion.

The FSC shall consider a considered review of the process for development / revision of the Conversion and Remedy Package to ensure learnings and improvements in the FSC's competencies in developing policies and procedures.

The FSC shall consider establishing a stand-alone standardized auditing procedure for the FSC Remedy Frameworks. The standard will i) be developed by a well-resourced and trained standards development group ii) build upon the work underway on the verification of restoration, and iii) define clear criteria and indicators for auditing/ third party verification of compliance with the FSC Remediation Framework, especially fulfilment of FPIC rights.

Furthermore, this motion aims to maintain the momentum that has been built to deliver a holistic package across the FSC as a system. The decisions at hand are of such crucial importance for the future development but also to the credibility of FSC.

46/2021 Incentives and benefits for the conservation of Intact Forest Landscapes and Indigenous Cultural Landscapes

Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Grant Rosoman	Martha Cecilia Guadalupe Nuñez Cañizares	Aida Greenbury
Organization / Individual	Greenpeace New Zealand	Núñez Cañizares, Martha, Ms.	Greenbury, Aida, Ms.
Chamber / Subchamber	Environmental / North	Social / South	Economic / South

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 08/2022)

To support the implementation of Motion 65 (2014), FSC will collaborate globally with members and key stakeholders to develop an approach that provides incentives and benefits for the protection of Intact Forest Landscapes (IFL) and Indigenous Cultural Landscapes (ICL) associated with FSC certified management units and the adjacent landscapes.

This incentives and benefits approach will be primarily aimed at supporting Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLC)s to protect their forest and support their rights and livelihoods but will collaborate with key stakeholders, in particular concession holders, to develop an equitable, culturally appropriate, inclusive and economically viable business model that supports IFL and ICL conservation. An independent conservation fund approach will be considered with funding from donors, supply chain actors, and Payment for Ecosystem Services.

Background / rationale:

Protecting the 'vast majority' and the integrity/intactness of IFLs within a landscape and a certified concession poses a number of challenges, including how to support local livelihoods and benefits from the forest and the potential loss of ability to harvest timber from that area. To achieve long-term protection of IFLs, there needs to be economic and practical incentives and benefits for local stakeholders, while ensuring Indigenous Peoples' (IP) rights are respected. Meanwhile, the key reason for protecting IFLs can also be a source of economic support: the global benefit of ecosystem services including mitigating climate change, biodiversity conservation and watershed protection.

FSC needs to collaborate with global stakeholders across all chambers to identify the appropriate incentives and benefits and new business models (such as PES) that are needed to achieve the conservation outcomes with local stakeholders. Conservation funds are not new but having a financing mechanism dedicated to IFL and ICL protection associated with FSC is new and essential. FSC's role will need to be determined but at a minimum it will guide the establishment of a fund that is compatible with the FSC system and take a place on the board or management committee of the fund. It will need to be established with key partners and donors with an interest in intact forest conservation to help stay under 1.5, conserve biodiversity and respect Indigenous Peoples' rights. These include institutions such as IUCN, ITTO, UNEP, as well as governments, companies, banks, investors, and NGOs. It will need to clearly define what the scope of support would be from the fund for incentives and benefits, including for the establishment of a new business model to replace a portion of the opportunity cost of forgone logging of IFLs/ICLs, criteria for inclusion, as well as safeguards, monitoring, reporting etc. It would be expected that FSC supply chain partners and brands selling FSC products would contribute to the fund.

47/2021 Alignment of the FSC Standards with International Sustainability and Sustainable Development Program and Planetary Boundaries

Accepted by MC Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Marcelo Langer	Yadira Paulina Baca Terán	Lineu Siqueira Jr.
Organization / Individual	Langer, Marcelo, Mr.	Baca Terán, Yadira Paulina, Ms.	Siqueira, Lineu, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Environmental / South	Social / South	Economic / South

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

As the Green Bonds have been improving on the last five years, it is important to engage FSC in dialogues with international programs that work with objectives similar to those of FSC, however with different methodologies, methods of analysis and generation of results; these dialogues shall result in harmonization of these standards, and hence creating synergies in their approaches to reversing the global scale of planetary degradation.

Objective: This motion aims to develop and establish indicators and methodologies to align FSC standards with those programs (see table under “Background”). With these methodologies, the FSC scheme will improve its ability to measure the evolution of (forest) management and production systems in companies throughout the years.

The methods and findings can be communicated and shared with the other programs in the process of establishing multi- and transdisciplinary dialogues with these programs. This strengthens the role of FSC as an entity that dialogues with other global entities, and it will give FSC greater visibility and acceptance. Such dialogue it is also innovative in establishing basic lines and systems for measuring the evolution of FSC standards.

Background / rationale:

The evolution of the understanding of the principles of sustainability, sustainable development, and planetary limits has evolved intensively and through various programs for their measurement, management, and governance. The FSC certification program has also evolved significantly. Even with all the evolutions of the FSC methodologies, the standards adopted by the FSC are still established individually and without the consideration of aligning the indicators with the goals of the international Sustainability, Sustainable Development, and Planetary Limits programs.

There are great opportunities to associate FSC standards with the thoughts and developments presented in the various international programs, of sustainable development, climate change, solutions based on nature, payments for environmental services, sustainable development goals and others. There are many opportunities for growth. Moreover, a method for qualifying and increasing the robustness of the FSC is via determination of parameters and measurement values for the FSC indicators and standards.

The possibility of using computational programs and artificial intelligence methods to measure the quality of indicators, and their levels of achievement, has gained space and been more adopted by international sustainability and sustainable development programs.

The following is a list of programs, methods and instruments for sustainable development and sustainability that may have dialogues with the FSC standards, so that parameterization of global actions and intentions in favor of harmonic development with natural resources is built, which even today does not have been established.

LIST OF SUSTAINABILITY, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC RELATED PROGRAMS AND INDICATORS

Harmonizacao 1

Image not found or type unknown

The indices that propose to measure the quality of the development of well-being and human life, use in their bases, social and economic indicators, however, the environmental bases of these mechanisms for the construction of indexes are related to the supply to meet the socio-economic development standards human.

It is important to note that many of the mechanisms analyzed in this motion address issues such as water and sanitation, but from an economic and social perspective. These mechanisms do not deal with natural environmental factors and their local characteristics, with the aim of ensuring analysis of the quality of the variable components of the environmental dimension, necessary and desirable and for human well-being and economic development. There are few mechanisms that present proposals for analyzing, measuring, and monitoring biotic and biotic environmental factors in their natural states, or that determine and portray the quality of the environment, the conservation and preservation of natural resources in a sustainable manner.

49/2021 FSC Ecosystem Service Procedure as a mitigation mechanism to meet global market demand for net-zero and net-positive targets

Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Alessandro Leonardi	Alan Smith	Thankappannair Rajalayam Manoharan
Organization / Individual	ETIFOR	Smith, Alan, Dr.	Manoharan, TR, Dr
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / North	Social / North	Environmental / South

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

FSC shall allow the use of claims generated from the Ecosystem Service Procedure (FSC-PRO-30-006) to demonstrate progress towards achieving net-zero and net-positive targets for climate, biodiversity, and water at all stages of the **mitigation hierarchy** [1], including measurement, avoidance, reduction, restoration, and compensation or neutralisation of residual impacts within and beyond value chains. The necessary actions proposed in this motion include:

1. FSC shall revise the Ecosystem Services Procedure to approve the use of FSC certification and verified positive ecosystem service impacts for making claims towards achieving certificate holders (CHs) and sponsors' science-based targets at all stages of the mitigation hierarchy, including water neutrality, net-positive or no-net-loss biodiversity, net-zero climate impacts, and integrated nature-positive strategies. FSC-verified positive ecosystem service impacts can be applied to avoidance or reduction targets, and compensation or neutralisation claims shall only be applied to residual impacts.

2. Prior to using FSC-verified claims to meet their mitigation targets, FSC shall require all CHs and sponsors to demonstrate their commitment to Mitigation Hierarchy-aligned approaches before the use of FSC-verified claims through a clearly defined and publicly available Policy of Association. These requirements could be adapted according to the business size or risk posed by CHs and sponsors.

3. FSC shall **ensure the integrity of all claims and their use**. This includes the development of **an impact registry to increase traceability and transparency, avoid risks** of double-counting, lack of additionality, inaccurately estimated baselines or impacts, or misuse of claim. FSC shall require that **claims are non-transferable, of fixed duration, and immediately retired upon registration of sponsorship**. FSC shall also establish **clear guidelines for benefit-sharing** from sponsorships among certificate holders, local communities, certification bodies, project developers, and FSC itself to ensure a fair distribution of impact investments.

4. FSC should develop stronger partnerships with leading institutions and networks to integrate FSC within a highly competitive and rapidly evolving market and take the necessary steps **to position FSC as a globally recognized mitigation instrument** for climate, water, and biodiversity systems.

5. FSC shall allocate the appropriate resource to promote the FSC ES procedure among CHs and sponsors through training, locally adapted guidance, and outreach of FSC National Offices and stakeholders.

The intent of this motion is to make claims generated from FSC-verified positive impacts clearer, more transparent, and better equipped to respond to society's needs and market demand while bringing more value for FSC certificate holders. This motion is submitted in parallel to complement Motion 48 which aims to expand the scope of FSC ES certification and lower barriers to entry for certificate holders - in fact, Motion 49 should be framed as the demand-side improvements and safeguards necessary to make these procedural revisions worthwhile.

With the proposed improvements, the FSC Ecosystem Services Procedure can become a tool that attracts sustainable finance to support forest managers for their positive impacts, preserves FSC integrity, and affirms FSC as the highest-quality certification standard for valuing all the benefits provided by the responsible management of forests.

[1] The mitigation hierarchy ([Forest Trends, 2020](#)) is a widely accepted framework for best-practice approaches to minimising and neutralising negative impacts from business operations. Originally conceived for achieving no-net-loss or net-positive biodiversity impacts, the hierarchy provides step-wise guidance for prioritising measures to avoid, minimise, restore, and compensate impacts in order of importance.

Background / rationale:

Responsibly-managed multifunctional forests are highly effective nature-based solutions that must be utilised to meet zero-deforestation, climate, biodiversity, water, and other nature-positive targets in ways that sustain local livelihoods. Indeed, both institutions and private companies want to understand how their support for FSC-certified forests - e.g., sponsorship of ecosystem services or switching to 100% FSC Chain of Custody - can be used to meet these targets with honesty, transparency, and maximum impact.

However, the current potential of the FSC-verified impacts and certification to meet these challenges is being wasted. As a result, certificate holders all over the world are excluded from or uncertain of their verified ecosystem service value within rapidly developing markets despite their clear positive impacts on carbon storage and sequestration, water resources, soil health, and biodiversity.

Forests are increasingly seen as an important nature-based solution to maintaining multiple ecosystem services (hydrological, biological, atmospheric) within safe planetary system boundaries ([EC, 2020](#)). Multiple standards and networks are developing tools and guidance to help institutions, governments, and private entities achieve nature-positive claims, avoid deforestation, and reduce harmful impacts in forest ecosystems ([SBTN, 2022](#); [CDP, 2022](#); [AFI, 2022](#)). In addition, upcoming regulation is aimed to require companies to demonstrate their commitment to protect and enhance the services provided by forests ([EC, 2021](#); [EC, 2022](#)).

In response to this tidal shift in the voluntary and regulatory markets, institutions ([EC, 2020](#)), companies ([Patagonia, 2020](#)), and citizens are dedicating increasing financial resources to forests. This includes support for responsible forest management, zero-deforestation commodity commitments, tree planting campaigns ([WRI, 2018](#)), carbon credits generation and trade, development of domestic carbon markets, REDD+ projects, forest conservation initiatives, investments in forests as property assets, etc.

All these initiatives demonstrate a rapidly growing and evolving market demand with a common goal: to slow down, halt, and reverse the negative impacts of human activities on nature. There are many market actors responding to this demand whose names are familiar: Verra, Gold Standard, the Alliance for Water Stewardship, PEFC, CCB, and others are developing methodologies and certification schemes to demonstrate positive impacts and attract financial support for project development. **Until now, FSC has not dedicated the necessary resources to position itself as a high-integrity standard within the ecosystem services markets.** Therefore, few of the initiatives listed above are likely to create new FSC-certified forests, support and bring value to existing FSC-certified forests, or choose FSC certification as a quality standard.

This situation is harmful in multiple ways:

- It will harm the FSC system in favour of other less comprehensive standards.
- It will harm investors because other standards do not as effectively value the full benefits and multifunctionality of forests, thus increasing the potential for less effective, weak, reversible, and socially unfair projects (e.g., many projects use the term “co-benefits” to describe biodiversity, water, fair work conditions, indigenous rights, community engagement, and poverty alleviation compared to carbon storage and sequestration);
- It will harm FSC forest managers and their forests because they won't have enough resources to fight the climate crisis, biodiversity loss, and changes to local water regimes ([ESA, 2020](#)). These extreme events are decreasing the capacity of forests to deliver ecosystem services both in quantitative and qualitative terms ([Marshed, 2019](#)) while requiring additional efforts from forest managers.

- Finally, the current philanthropy-based model of sponsorship (Annex D of ES Procedure) exposes FSC to greenwashing risk. The FSC ES Annex D model of publicly recording sponsorship does not include a policy of association or know-your-customer safeguards that are standard in other compensation mechanisms. Anyone can support verified impacts and include them in their sustainability claims without demonstrating adherence to the other key steps of the mitigation hierarchy (measurement, quantitative and time-bound target-setting, avoidance, reduction, and local restoration).

The best way to face these challenges is to promote the multifunctionality of forests and value all the benefits they provide. This includes the provision of forest products for circular- and bio-economies while not harming the capacity of forests to conserve biodiversity, capture carbon, improve soil, and satisfy the increasing need of people for green care, recreational, and social uses.

For this purpose, since 2018 FSC has deployed the FSC Ecosystem Services Procedure, a tool that can be used by forest managers on top of FSC FM certification to demonstrate their capacity to conserve and/or enhance ecosystem services. Thus, the FSC Ecosystem Services Procedure – and the outcomes of its application, i.e., the FSC-verified positive impacts – may be seen as a competitive solution within the ecosystem marketplace.

Today, more than 40 certificate holders worldwide have successfully applied the FSC Ecosystem Services Procedure and more than 100 companies and 10,000 citizens are directly supporting FSC forest managers using the Ecosystem Services Procedure (<https://www.wownature.eu/en/for-business/> & <https://fsc.org/en/for-forests/ecosystem-services>).

Forest managers appreciate the FSC Ecosystem Services procedure because:

- it rewards their daily efforts for responsible forest management
- it encompasses different ecosystem services
- it provides a better price than other rewarding instruments
- it fits every type of forest and forest manager (planting/improving/conserving/SLIMF smallholders/indigenous)
- it does not harm the users' and owners' rights over the forest (companies do not *buy* ecosystem services, they *support forest managers through sponsorships*)
- it does not conflict with timber and firewood production.

Companies, governments, and citizens appreciate the FSC Ecosystem Services Procedure because:

- it is applied on top of the FSC standards, minimising the short- and long-term risks of investment with comprehensive environmental, social, and economic safeguards
- the FSC logo is well-known, widely recognized, visible on the market and easy to communicate
- it is consistent, ensuring the same quality across the globe
- it is in line with the efforts to shift towards bio-economy using FSC-certified materials
- it is not subject to speculation (not transferable, no guesswork during climate crisis)

Despite these improvements, the FSC Ecosystem Procedure has only realised a fraction of its potential. There are two main drivers: First, the procedure itself is limited in scope and overly complex, limiting its growth by creating barriers to entry, especially for smallholders. Motion 48 was passed during the 2021 General Assembly to directly address this problem and mandate a full revision guided by FSC International and a [Technical Working Group](#) with balanced representation among FSC members. Secondly, the position of FSC towards using the ES procedure as a compensatory mechanism remains ambiguous in a market full of direct and explicit competitors. The expected outcomes of Motion 49 are to improve the capacity of the FSC system to attract financial support to reach nature-positive goals while maintaining our credibility and integrity.

For this purpose, we suggest the following market-oriented improvements of the FSC Ecosystem Services Procedure.

Recommended Market-oriented improvements include:

- Clarify the use of FSC-verified positive impacts for achieving sponsors' nature-positive goals, including the compensation of residual impacts in strategies based on the mitigation hierarchy approach.
- Improve training (planning a "training for trainers" too) and outreach requirements to improve awareness and uptake by the FSC Network, consultants and companies.
- Require the adoption of Mitigation Hierarchy ([Forest Trends, 2020](#)) -like approaches to sponsors.
- Require sponsors to sign the Policy for Association to ensure community alignment of mission and values (PfA);
- Improve the registry system of the sponsorships for Ecosystem Services. This may include the duration of the sponsorship; improving the visibility of sponsors and forest managers with verified positive impacts on ecosystem services, and clarifying the direct links between sponsorship, management activities, and quantified impacts - For example, sponsorship claims of carbon sequestration and storage should be subtracted from the total certified carbon stock to avoid the risk of double-counting.
- Establish clear benefits-sharing requirements from impact investments, including Certificate Holders, local communities, Certification Bodies, project developers, and FSC itself.
- Clarify/expand the role of the Certification Bodies (as regards for example eligibility of sponsors; registry of sponsorships; etc.).

50/2021 Policy Motion on the right of access to workers
 Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Coen van der Veer	Dennis Kraft	Zoran Tintor
Organization / Individual	Building and Wood Workers' International	Sveriges Ornitologiska Förening	Tintor, Zoran, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / North	Environmental / North	Economic / South

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 08/2022)

Policy Motion on the right of access to workers

“The certified organisation shall at the first request grant trade union representatives that seek to inform workers* in the certified organisation grant physical access to the workers for these trade union representatives. The management shall provide adequate information about the physical whereabouts of the workers. If the workplace itself is not a suitable place, the management shall make the best possible effort to reach an understanding about where the union representatives can meet the workers. The management will not interfere in these meetings, nor will it prevent workers from attending these meetings, or reprise or punish workers for attending these meetings. This requirement shall be applicable unless the management can demonstrate by compliance with laws, regulations, or collective agreements that the organisation meets or exceeds this requirement.

Background / rationale:

The workers united in affiliates of the Building and Wood Workers International (BWI) congratulate the FSC community on the important step forward to incorporate the FSC core labour requirements in the chain of custody certificates. The Freedom of Association as a fundamental right has been recognised. Important for the realisation of this fundamental human right is that workers receive adequate information about the union and the right to become a member. And there is only one that can give this information and that is the union and her officials. However, we all know that the forest and forest-based industry has a lower than average union density. In part because of the high rate of informal work in the sector, the remoteness, the work in rural and remote areas. In order to ensure that workers are well informed and aware of their rights, we propose that union representatives at their first reasonable request get all information and facilities to inform the workers at the work site about their rights at work with as little interference with the day to day work of the workers as possible. If the work site is not a suitable place for this exchange of information than the management and union representatives shall in cooperation decide what a suitable time and place is for this exchange. Workers shall meet no interference or have to fear reprisal or punishment for attending these meetings.

In most countries this is regulated through law or collective bargaining agreements, but FSC has the ambition to certify even in countries where these basic human rights are not ensured. In order to make sure that there is a consistent approach to the right to organise we want all certified organisation have the same obligations.

51/2021 Policy Motion on the right of workers to elect their own Occupational Health and safety representative(s)

Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Coen van der Veer	Dennis Kraft	Zoran Tintor
Organization / Individual	Building and Wood Workers' International	Sveriges Ornitologiska Förening	Tintor, Zoran, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / North	Environmental / North	Economic / South

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 08/2022)

FSC has in its standards requirements for Certificate Holders to ensure commitment to the Occupational health and safety of the workers in their operations. They range from having an designated appointed representative for Occupational Health and Safety to procedural requirements.

The proposers of this motion want to add in all relevant standards (FM, COC and CW-FM) the requirement, that unless by national law, regulations or collective bargaining agreement, workers have a representation that meets or exceeds this goal of this requirement, each certified organisation shall have for each 20 workers 1 elected occupational health and safety representative, that elections shall be held regular but at least every 4 years. That workers that wish to be a candidate can express that wish and their motivation to all workers without fear of reprisal or interference, from the management, the elected representatives receive adequate training, and they can freely (without fear) exercise their function, advising management and workers on the best practices in health and safety in the workplace. Again this requirement can be met by the certificate holder if there is a similar binding obligation that meets or exceeds the goals of this provision.

Background / rationale:

By figures from the FAO and ILO the Forestry sector is having the second most dangerous occupations, after active soldiering.

During the latest International Labour Conference in June 2022, there was a decision to include Occupational Health and Safety as a fundamental right to the ILO declaration on fundamental rights and principles at work with reference to ILO conventions 155 and 187. The declaration served as a cornerstone for the worker's rights in the FSC normative framework.

FSC has in the requirements of its standards for Certificate Holders to ensure commitment to the Occupational Health and Safety of the workers in their operations. They range from having a designated appointed representative for Occupational health and safety to procedural requirements.

The proposers of this motion want to ensure that all certificate holders shall have, by the workers elected occupational health and safety representatives. If there are laws, regulations or collective bargaining agreements that have similar requirements that meets or exceeds the goals of this requirement, which is the case in many countries, the certificate holder will comply with this requirement by compliance with these legally binding requirements. The proposers want to assure that the certificate holder shall hold these elections regularly but at least every 4 years. That workers that wish to be a candidate can express that wish and their motivation to all workers without fear of reprisal or interference (from the management) and that the elected representatives receive not only adequate training but that they can freely without fear exercise their function, advising management and workers on the best practice in health and safety in the workplace.

Background

Principle 2.3

2.3 The Organization* shall implement health and safety practices to protect workers* from occupational safety and health hazards. These practices shall, proportionate to scale, intensity and risk* of management activities, meet or exceed the recommendations of the ILO Code of Practice on Safety and Health in Forestry Work.

IGI 2.3 The Organization* shall* implement health and safety practices to protect workers* from occupational safety and health hazards. These practices shall*, proportionate to scale, intensity and risk* of management activities, meet or exceed the recommendations of the ILO Code of Practice on Safety and Health in Forestry Work. (C4.2 P&C V4)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR STANDARD DEVELOPERS: Standard Developers shall* identify in Annex A Section 3.4 national laws and regulations regarding workers'* health and safety that meet or exceed the ILO Code of Practice on Safety and Health in Forestry

Work and ILO Convention 155, Occupational Safety and Health Convention (1981).

Standard Developers shall* identify any gaps between the requirements of this Criterion* and national regulations and describe how these gaps are to be addressed by The Organization* (Indicator 2.3.1).

2.3.1 Health and safety practices are developed and implemented that meet or exceed the ILO Code of Practice on Safety and Health in Forestry Work.

2.3.2 Workers* have personal protective equipment appropriate to their assigned tasks.

2.3.3 Use of personal protective equipment is enforced.

2.3.4 Records are kept on health and safety practices including accident rates and lost time to accidents.

2.3.5 The frequency and severity of accidents are consistently low compared to national forest* industry averages.

2.3.6 The health and safety practices are reviewed and revised as required after major incidents or accidents.

COC: 1.4 The organisation shall commit to occupational health and safety (OHAS). At a minimum, the organisation shall appoint an OHAS representative, establish and implement procedures adequate to its size and complexity, and train its staff on OHAS.

C155 - Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981 (No. 155)

Article 19

There shall be arrangements at the level of the undertaking under which--

- (a) workers, in the course of performing their work, co-operate in the fulfilment by their employer of the obligations placed upon him;
- (b) representatives of workers in the undertaking co-operate with the employer in the field of

occupational safety and health;

- (c) representatives of workers in an undertaking are given adequate information on measures taken by the employer to secure occupational safety and health and may consult their representative organisations about such information provided they do not disclose commercial secrets;
- (d) workers and their representatives in the undertaking are given appropriate training in occupational safety and health;
- (e) workers or their representatives and, as the case may be, their representative organisations in an undertaking, in accordance with national law and practice, are enabled to enquire into, and are consulted by the employer on, all aspects of occupational safety and health associated with their work; for this purpose technical advisers may, by mutual agreement, be brought in from outside the undertaking;
- (f) a worker reports forthwith to his immediate supervisor any situation which he has reasonable justification to believe presents an imminent and serious danger to his life or health; until the employer has taken remedial action, if necessary, the employer cannot require workers to return to a work situation where there is continuing imminent and serious danger to life or health.

52/2021 Incentive System for the Recognition of Excellence
 Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Doralice Ortiz Ortiz	Alessandro Leonardi	Hernán Verscheure
Organization / Individual	Corporación Aldea Global	ETIFOR	Comité Nacional pro Defensa de la Fauna y Flora (CODEFF)
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / South	Economic / North	Environmental / South

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THE SECONDER OF THIS MOTION HAS BEEN CHANGED 05/2022)

FSC will design and implement an incentive system that recognizes the forest certification processes of companies, smallholders, indigenous communities and community enterprises that, in addition to complying with FSC Principles and Criteria, make an additional effort to minimize their environmental impact; to transcend their social impact; and to strengthen governance through the articulation with stakeholders and the development of transparent processes. These actors will become an example of excellence that strengthens and positions FSC image and contributes to the creation and strengthening of a culture of continuous improvement and the stabilization of the global forestry system.

The call for applications and election of the winners will be implemented through a virtual democratic process, taking advantage of the experience of the membership in voting processes for the Board of Directors, according to the location by continent and geographical position, north/south, in periods that concur with the General Assembly; subsequently, according to the results, the time of implementation may be modified. The candidature may be self-motivated or based on the nomination of a third member of the membership with the approval of the nominee.

Characteristics of the participants:

- At least 5 years of membership in the FSC system. Being up to date with membership fees
- Not having received warning calls for inappropriate behavior
- Having the capacity to present a detailed report of their work in addition to the certification process and impact on environmental, social and governance issues for voter consideration

- Participate in the call process with the support of an organizational representative from each chamber: Economic, Social and Environmental.

Types of recognition:

- **Recognition of business excellence**, through one or more of the following options:

Option 1. Visibility during FSC General Assembly

Option 2. The FSC certification seal of the winning company shall be presented in gold color

Option 3. The FSC certification seal of the winning company will have an additional star

- **Economic recognition for smallholders and community enterprises**

Winning certified smallholders, indigenous communities and community enterprises will receive a reward equivalent to the cost of certification for 2 years, which is a burden that often limits continuity in the certification process.

Note: these certification costs for certified smallholders, indigenous communities and community enterprises can be managed through sponsorships with large companies or with stakeholders outside the FSC Network.

Background / rationale:

FSC certification is internationally recognized for the integrity of its quality processes, the governance system that differentiates it and the raise and growth achieved. There are other certification processes that include some elements of FSC but have not achieved such a representative lead. The certification systems include in some way those social, environmental and economic components that constitute sustainable development. In this process, FSC should seek an added value that further differentiates and positions it in this competitive environment.

One aspect that can contribute to this added value is, in addition to strengthening compliance with social and environmental objectives, as shown by the impact stories presented by FSC on its website, is the improvement of corporate governance of certified companies as a contribution to the relationships between stakeholders for the visibility of FSC, as well as transparency and the development of anti-corruption practices as an example of the integrity of FSC. All this additional work carried out by companies, smallholders and communities has not achieved the recognition it deserves. By improving the corporate governance of these stakeholders, it will be possible to strengthen the culture of continuous improvement, which is necessary to maintain the system's leadership in the international scene.

Related experiences can be identified in the principles of responsible investment promoted by the United Nations through the promotion of environmental, social and governance (ESG) strategies (<https://www.unpri.org/>), and in organizations such as the European Foundation for Quality Management - EFQM, created more than 30 years ago with the aim of improving the practices and competitiveness of companies in Europe (<https://www.efqm.org/>).

53/2021 Policy Motion to incorporate to ecosystem services a procedure for recognition of cultural services and practices to strengthen and endure over time the interconnection of Indigenous Peoples with their territories, and have an affordable verification

Accepted by MC Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Alina Liviet Santiago Jiménez	Peter Dam	Grant Rosoman
Organization / Individual	Santiago Jiménez, Alina Liviet, Ms.	Dam, Peter, Mr.	Greenpeace New Zealand
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / South	Economic / South	Environmental / North

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

FSC fortalezca el proceso de servicios ecosistémicos a través de un procedimiento específico para pueblos indígenas, tomando en cuenta:

1. la protección y mantenimiento de prácticas culturales y ancestrales, incluida la tutoría de las próximas generaciones
2. la protección y mantenimiento de lugares culturales y sitios arqueológicos
3. fortalecer y mostrar los beneficios sociales de los bosques
4. Al tener aplicabilidad en los pueblos y territorios indígenas, se requiere que los procedimientos que se implementen en los estándares para su verificación se adapten a las actividades que los pueblos indígenas realizan, facilitando el proceso
5. el costo de la verificación sea gradual, tomando como base que no tenga costo para los pueblos que ya cuentan con alguna certificación FSC en manejo forestal y/o cadena de custodia, puesto que el pago de una certificación adicional es una carga económica. En caso de que no tengan una certificación FSC que el costo de su verificación de servicios ecosistémicos sea asequible. El costo puede ponerse a consulta con base al consentimiento previo, libre e informado al cual tienen derecho los pueblos indígenas
6. Considerar la elaboración de un anexo que permita evaluar de manera sencilla y clara a los pueblos

indígenas en materia de servicios ecosistémicos, culturales, impactos sociales, salud, entre otros

Background / rationale:

La intención de esta moción es reconocer que el trabajo de las comunidades indígenas y tradicionales es crucial para proteger los sitios de importancia cultural y también que es fundamental que el conocimiento tradicional de los Pueblos Indígenas y las comunidades sea reconocido, mantenido, transmitido dentro de sus comunidades y también más ampliamente compartida. Dicho conocimiento se desarrolla a través de su vínculo intrínseco y duradero con su entorno y naturaleza e incluye, entre otros, la protección de la biodiversidad, el cuidado y uso de productos forestales no maderables para usos múltiples y para el manejo de incendios, la administración y actividad empresarial comunitaria, el marco legal que rige a los pueblos indígenas dentro de su territorio.

54/2021 Motivating CoC-certified organizations to increase the percentage of FSC-certified products within their organization.

Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Bert de Jong	Hubert Kwisthout	Joeri Zwerts
Organization / Individual	DuraCert	Kwisthout, Hubert, Mr.	Zwerts, Joeri, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / North	Social / North	Environmental / North

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 08/2022)

In this motion, FSC is asked to provide public insight into the progress made by each Chain of Custody certificate holder in improving the sustainability of their supply chain. To this end, certificate holders will be required to calculate the share of FSC-certified products compared to all forest products within their organization on site level. The share will be based on the sales value and will be indicated as a percentage. FSC will adapt the public certificate holder database so that this percentage (not any financial information) can easily be registered by certificate holders themselves. Registering is mandatory and the certification bodies are required to check the accuracy of this data during audits. The percentage recorded in the FSC database will be saved for each year so that progress can be monitored. This motion should be implemented within a 3 years' period. By applying this motion, certificate holders will be motivated to make their supply chains more sustainable, resulting in an increase in the demand for certified products.

Background / rationale:

NOTE: The text of this motion has been adapted following input from the various chamber discussions and direct input from members.

An increasing number of certificate holders are using FSC certification as a means of market access but are not necessarily motivated to increase the proportion of FSC-certified sales of their organization. In some countries with a high number of certificate holders, we even see so-called "empty certificates", i.e. organizations that are certified but do not sell FSC-certified products at all. It goes without saying that this development does not directly contribute to the development of sustainable forest management. Of course, FSC could choose to enforce a minimum share of FSC-certified products at a certificate holder, but there are certainly situations where this could have negative side effects. This would also not be in line with the voluntary nature of FSC.

In practice, the motion will result in a graphic display of the development of the share of certified versus non-certified forest products in the organization at site level shown in the public certificate holder database. Due to the confidential nature of financial data, only the percentage indicating the share should be entered and no financial data will be requested. The share is based on the sales value, firstly because for the AAF a calculation must already be made of the total turnover of forest products, with which to a large extent the data for the certified part is already present. Secondly, the sales value is an easy figure to find in an organisation's accounts, so the CB can properly check the correctness of the percentage.

By applying the motion, certificate holders are not obliged to follow a prescribed growth path, but by making the progress publicly available, the market will become self-regulating and certificate holders will be more interested in making their supply chains more sustainable. This is in line with the global strategy goal of accelerating the market uptake of FSC-certified products and ecosystem services (global strategy goal 2.2). In addition, the progress information offers customers and clients the opportunity to make informed choices in their purchasing process. Next to this, FSC will be able to develop ways to combat "empty certificates" based on real data. Possible other ideas of combatting "empty certificates" are e.g. restrictions for the trademark use and/or a disclaimer on certificates stating that the certificate is not proof of the certified status of a product. The motion will also give FSC more insight into the actual efforts of certificate holders and enable it to take more targeted action to improve the sustainability of the supply chains. A healthy relationship between certificate holders and FSC will be restored and ultimately the demand for certified products will increase.

55/2021 Increase system transparency with regard to organizations and products certified through Chain of Custody group certification.

Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Bert de Jong	Alan Smith	Nina Griesshammer
Organization / Individual	DuraCert	Smith, Alan, Dr.	Griesshammer, Nina, Mrs.
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / North	Social / North	Environmental / North

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 07/2022)

This motion asks FSC to match the visibility and traceability of organizations and their products certified through Chain of Custody (CoC) group certification (FSC-STD-40-003 V2-1 CR 3.1) with that of individually certified (single site) organizations and products. CoC group certified organizations shall be issued with their own license (e.g. sub)code so that their products can be traced more easily. These organizations shall also have their own record on the FSC database, with reference to the group manager, making the individual scope of certification and contact details publicly available. This ensures greater transparency of supply chains that consist (in part) of these types of organizations. The existing allocation of responsibilities between the group manager and group members shall be maintained (e.g. in the case of nonconforming products or false claims), as well as the benefits offered by group certification, such as the possibility of having the group manager approve the trademark use (Trademark Use Management System). The adjustments to the system should not lead to a more complex group certification system and not lead to increased costs or higher administrative burden for the group manager and group members. The motion should be implemented within a 3 years period.

Background / rationale:

For a short explanation of the need for this motion, check out these two videos:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zaYJsdoNAiw>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LgUcRXgQQ_U

Within the FSC system, approximately 35% of all CoC certified organizations are members of a multi-site certificate, part of which is through group certification. CoC group certification simplifies access to certification for small independent enterprises, and based on the existing figures in countries in North America and the European Union, it has great growth potential for FSC, especially in the global south.

Organizations certified through group certification comply with the same requirements as individual certificate holders and sell certified and labelled products in line with FSC-STD-40-004. The products are covered by the scope and license code of the group manager. However, this scope contains the sum of all product types and associated information such as wood species and output claims of all products from all sites included in the group certificate.

Furthermore, the products are labelled with the license code of the group manager, which means that the products cannot be traced back to the original organization that put the labelled product on the market without the assistance, research or tracing back by the group manager. In addition, it is currently not possible to perform a system integrity check in the form of e.g. transaction verification without the involvement of the group manager. The FSC system needs to make information about products traceable to the CoC group certified organization, more transparent and publicly available in line with its own global strategy goal of improving the verification and integrity of the FSC system (global strategy goal §1.3).

To keep group certification accessible, the adaptations to the system should not increase costs or administrative burden for these organizations. Implementing the motion will result in the improvement of search results in the FSC database, the FSC system will have a better data basis to e.g. carry out transaction verifications, and will be in line with international legislation on product and supply chain integrity that is currently being developed. It will also assist the Policy for Association complaints resolution by facilitating traceability and enabling the origin of the products to be more easily identified.

History

Some years ago, a number of group managers united to form the Chain of Custody Group Network (CGN). The members of this network are all FSC International members and come from the USA, Canada, the Netherlands, Germany and Italy. As their group certificates grew, they saw that at the same time the traceability of their group members and the products involved became increasingly difficult. In the year 2017 this resulted in a letter to FSC International with a number of proposals for solving this. In response, FSC International indicated that the changes could not be made under the existing regulations, but that a motion during the FSC GA would be necessary.

Motion amended on 13 July 2022.

56/2021 Induction of Social Expert in CB
Accepted by MC Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	D.P.S Verma	Yaswanth Gatta	Rohini Chaturvedi
Organization / Individual	Verma, Dharam Pal Singh, Dr.	Gatta, Yaswanth, Mr.	Chaturvedi, Rohini, Dr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Social / South	Economic / South	Environmental / South

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

The purpose of this motion is to ensure that all audit teams should have a social expert for comprehensively auditing the social parameters laid down by the FSC system specifications for certification.

ANN-3 of the FSC standard No FSC-STD-20-001 which deals with 'GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR FSC ACCREDITED CERTIFYING BODIES, lays down conditions for constituting audit teams. Box-2 of this Annexure lays down requirements for the selection of the audit team. While dealing with social issues, the box states that-

IF, IT IS LIKELY THAT -----THEN THE TEAM SHALL INCLUDE-----

What the provision requires that the audit team includes environmental, economic & forestry expertise; a social expert is not mandatory but of subjective nature.

This creates discrimination. All the P&Cs contain social aspects & P &Cs 2,3,4,5 &9 especially require addressing the social issues. There are no forests across the globe that do not have interaction with local, indigenous communities & workers.

The motion proposes to replace the present wording with-

“The audit team shall include members with social expertise, concerned with the local communities, indigenous people rights, tenure issues & workers’ rights & interpretation of FSC social HCVs. The team shall include experts with appropriate language/ dialect [or translators] & experience of interacting with indigenous people & local communities, in the region concerned. The team shall include members with knowledge & capacity to evaluate workers rights such as health & safety aspects& application of local employment legislations.”

FSC mission accepts that socially beneficial forest management helps both local communities & society at large as well as it ensures long-term benefits to sustain the forest resources. As a result of this, FSC system provides equal importance to social issues on par with economic & environmental ones. Social issues take care of local concerns of communities/ indigenous people residing in and around the FMU, laborers associated with & working of the organization. Use of FSC LOGO is allowed at the end of an elaborate assessment done by the audit team Since social issues are recognized as critical to sustainability, it is imperative that these are addresses adequately at the time of auditing/ certifying the sustainability. The ASI has mandated that the audit team should have the required expertise of the sector being audited. Social issues are very critical in forest management. Consequently, presence of a social expert in audit team becomes crucial.

The current wording of FSC-STD-20-001 V4-0EN only provides to include social experts in audit team

“IF IT IS LIKELY THAT THERE ARE SUFFICIENT INTERACTIONS WITH NEIGHBORING COMMUNITIES”.

Thus, the wording used in the standard of FSC – STD-20-001 V4-0 EN requires the inclusion of social experts in the audit team – “if there is sufficient interaction with the neighboring communities”. This wording used in the standard is not only subjective but highly discriminatory. Consequently, social issues are often overlooked- leading to the dissatisfaction of affected social stakeholders. The motion proposes to always include a social expert in the audit team.

Background / rationale:

The purpose of this motion is to ensure that the audit team contains a social expert for a comprehensive audit. Currently, the inclusion of social experts is not mandatory.

58/2021 More bears, more eagles, more clean water – accelerating the shift from rule-based to outcome-orientated Standards

Edited Policy Motion

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

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 08/2022)

The FSC membership requests the FSC Secretariat/global leadership team to give priority under the Global Strategy 2021-2026, Goal 1.2, to accelerate the shift from rule-based to outcome-orientated, risk-based Standards and associated procedures through implementation of the Required Actions specified below.

FSC's downstream stakeholders are wanting more evidence that certification is assuring positive social and environmental outcomes and longer-term positive impacts. Certificate holders should be able to make market claims that their stewardship is increasing the forest biodiversity, that the Management Units (MUs) have more bears, more eagles, more clean water, more habitat with more rare plants; and that human rights of workers and Indigenous Peoples are upheld effectively while the MUs continue to be financially viable.

This shift has been urged previously by the membership. This shift is important in preparation for the revision of the FSC global Principles and Criteria from Version 5 to Version 6, which is long overdue compared with the ISO norm of 5 years.

Required Actions

This Policy Motion requests the Board Strategic Planning Committee to commission ISEAL or an equivalent quality assurance association (suggestion by Alan Smith)(1) to undertake the following 14 Required Actions; ISEAL is named because it has the experience, competency and managerial drive – as shown in the VIA project (2018) - to organise and coordinate the proposed demonstrations. ISEAL's convening power is also shown in its 'Jurisdictional monitoring and claims good practice guide' and its 'Guiding practices on effective

company actions in landscapes and jurisdictions' V1-0 February 2022,
https://www.isealalliance.org/sites/default/files/resource/2022-04/ISEAL_Effective%20Company%20Actions%20document%202022_V4.pdf

The precedent for outsourcing the undertaking is that the FSC Board commissioned and directs the New Approaches programme, now called the FSC Community and Family Forests program (2):

1. Plan and coordinate a series of trials and demonstrations of outcome-orientated responsible forest stewardship. The aim is to show how outcome orientation differs from rule-based Standards, makes more use of local knowledge, delivers information more useful for marketing, and may reduce greatly the burden of independent audits.
2. Focus in these trials and demonstrations on a small number of locally-adapted outcome-orientated, risk-based progress Indicators compatible with FSC's global P&C; may include rule-based Indicators for some composite outcomes. The intention is to show how quality of forest stewardship can be assured – not guaranteed – through attention to a small number of key (or critical) progress Indicators which demonstrate the health and viability of the Management Unit, socially and environmentally. Such work will contribute to FSC's aim of streamlining the normative framework (3). NOTE: there is no suggestion that these trials and demonstrations should cover all the subjects in V5 of the FSC Principles and Criteria.
3. The trials and demonstrations should apply the ISO (International Standards Organization) concept of improving values for verifiable outcomes in contrast to the present FSC focus on conforming to static rules.
4. Aim for demonstrations and trials in Management Units in one industrial-scale and one community-scale forest enterprise in each of three FSC regions.
5. The Indicators are for demonstration of improved values according to notions of responsible stewardship; they are not the same as Indicators for formal comparative research experiments where fine differences may be examined. An example of outcome-orientated Standards is the smallholder version of the Sustainable Agriculture Standard developed by Rainforest Alliance (4).
6. Work with the Accountability Framework Initiative to incorporate modern Environmental, Social and Governance Indicators.
7. Check with holders of the FSC Promotional Licences that the progress Indicators are meaningful aids to marketing of products from FSC FM-certified forests.
8. Ensure close working with ASI-accredited conformity assessment bodies so that the progress

Indicators are verifiable with consistency and minimum ambiguity by field auditors.

9. Prepare and publish a detailed structured report(s) on these exercises, as input to the Version 6 of the global set of FSC Principles and Criteria which are streamlined, outcome-orientated and risk-based.
10. Contract with specialists such as academic ecologists and labour organisers and major retailers to ensure that the progress Indicators are acceptable measures of improving values, meaningful to and supportable by stakeholders. The engagement of specialists is to ensure that surrogate indicators, which may be needed to substitute for primary Indicators which are too difficult or too expensive to assess at MU level, are still credible and reliable.
11. **Examples of outcomes and associated progress Indicators for individual Management Units:**
 - a. **improved biodiversity outcome, progress indicators from the top of trophic pyramids, such as rising numbers of resident or visiting raptor birds (eagles, falcons, hawks, owls);**
 - b. **improved quality of water flows out of the MU, progress indicators as improving clarity and better smell of water at fixed assessment stations all through the year;**
 - c. **improved working conditions for full-time and part-time staff of the MU, progress indicators as declining counts of work-related accidents, rising net salaries relative to the national cost-of-living indices.**
12. Encourage the participants to assess the costs of implementing the demonstration outcome-orientated Standards and to compare with the costs of previously used rule-based Standards, including audit costs. Encourage the participants to publish at least qualitative comparative commentaries on these exercises, comparing experiences of rule-based with outcome-orientated Standards.
13. The terms of reference for these actions will be developed by the Board Strategic Planning Committee, not by the Secretariat. The TORs will be based on the recommendations made in the reports cited in paragraph 6 of the section below on Background.
14. This project to demonstrate outcome-orientated Standards will take 3-5 years.

(1) Alan Smith

(2) The precedent is that the Board commissioned and directs the New Approaches programme

(3) see page 15 in the FSC Global Strategy 2021-2026.

(4) <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwitwrfnxuLuAhXhJzQIHfDUAOMQalliance.org%2Fbusiness%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2019%2F02%2Frainforest-alliance-sustainable-agriculture-standard-smallholders-v1.0.pdf&usg=AOvVaw372Va2qVGlpPOGEDfpdUYm>, V1-0, November 2018

Background / rationale:

The outcome-orientated approach is now commonly preferred under the charters on Corporate Environmental and Social Responsibility and Governance (CESRG) adopted by commercial companies with

shareholder ownership. Our objective is not to seek immediate replacement of the FSC's rule-based Standards and associated Procedures but to demonstrate that outcome-orientation is also feasible for FSC. The reports from ISEAL and other participants, provided to the FSC membership, should give a sound basis for a membership debate at the next General Assembly (2026?) on making a full switch to outcome-orientated and risk-based from rule-based Standards.

The objective is to initiate a process for this major shift, following the lead of ISO in 2012, by starting with demonstrations of the technical and financial feasibility and acceptability of outcome-orientated, risk-based Standards in place of rule-based Standards. This would be one of the early steps in the transition from V5 of the FSC Principles and Criteria to V6 (suggestion from Sean Cadman) (5)

Outcome-orientated Standards enable certificate holders to demonstrate verifiably to other stakeholders that their responsible forest stewardship is improving environmental and social values in measurable ways, not simply following rules. These other stakeholders include direct buyers, wholesalers, retailers and final consumers. The expectation of improving values has grown in charters of corporate environmental and social responsibility and governance (CESRG) over the past two decades and notably since the International Standards Organisation (ISO) changed from rule-based to outcome-orientation in 2012. Most ISO-compatible global quality assurance schemes made this shift also in 2012 or soon after.

It is clear that FSC members have a wide variety of understandings of the meanings of 'outcome-orientation' and 'rule-based Standards' (suggestions from Daniel Hall and Dirk Riestenpatt)(6). The demonstrations should include a variety of communications to explain that outcome orientation for FSC means definition by the owner/manager/certificate holder of the Management Unit of the intended outcomes of responsible forest stewardship in relation to the 10 FSC Principles. The outcomes are verifiable improvements over legal minimum outcomes or business-as-usual, and would usually be achieved only after periods exceeding one 5-year certification cycle. The defined outcomes therefore need to be interpreted through auditable verifiable progress Indicators from identified baselines. For example, biodiversity outcomes might be expressed as an X% increase in the populations of raptor birds or black bears; water outcomes might be a Y% increase in the length of always-clearwater rivers; health outcomes might be a B% decrease in the incidence of malaria in small children of the forest workers.

For consistency in auditing, and when outcomes are composites, some progress Indicators may still be framed in terms of improving conformance to stewardship rules (suggestions from Daniel Hall and Dirk Riestenpatt) (7). For example, forest protection might be assessed as increasing lengths of boundaries or fire breaks cleared.

In addition to the several/many academic recommendations by tropical ecologists (examples of Claudia Romero and Jack Putz)(8) and forest governance specialists, the Accountability Framework Initiative, IKEA (global forestry manager Mikhail Tarasov)(9), the ISEAL-coordinated VIA project (April 2018), the Meridian Institute (September 2018), and Global Forest Watch at the World Resources Institute have all urged FSC to move to outcome-orientated Standards.

FSC is now an outlier in staying with rules instead of verifiable improvements in values. The long process of conversion of National Forest Stewardship Standards (NFSS) from V4 to V5 of the FSC Principles and Criteria and the IGLs has shown how difficult it is to set global rules which are also meaningful and relevant to national and Management Unit levels. The NFSS conversion process has shown that FSC lacks a strong conceptual basis for asserting what must be retained for a viable global certification scheme and what flexibility can be allowed for national interpretation (suggestions from Heiko Liedeker and Daniel Hall)(10).

The notable increase in procedural rules and interpretations since 2016 is directly contrary to the expressed desires by members, certificate holders, auditors and national offices for streamlining towards simpler, shorter, more coherent, more consistently audited, better communicated certification standards.

FSC has failed to grasp the multiple realities of community- and smallholder-forestry, for which a complex rule-based approach is notably inappropriate and irrelevant (suggestions from Hannah Scrase, Alan Smith, Richard Donovan, Steve Midgley)([11](#)). The proposed demonstrations should require the direct involvement of local support organisations to provide long-term assistance in training for the business aspects of forest stewardship such as bookkeeping, accounting, money management, advertising, packaging, product promotion. At least one of the demonstrations should address the very common situation of a smallholder or family forest being in effect a living bank account; a timber harvest is taken at long intervals to provide capital for major family events – marriage, funeral, house building, boat building, purchase of land or livestock – but otherwise the stewardship is limited to protection (suggestion from Steve Midgley)([12](#)) of property boundaries, precautions against wildlife poaching and wildfire, and the provision of social and environmental services. Note that this demonstration would emphasize the need for a revised FSC Smallholder and Community Label Option, separate and distinct from FSC FM certification, 100% and MIX labels and their on-product claims. An example from agricultural certification is the smallholder version of the Rainforest Alliance's Sustainable Agriculture Standard (draft V1-0 2018) ([13](#)).

This Motion is just one aspect of streamlining the increasingly complex FSC certification system (currently 69 documents in the normative framework), thus enabling more informed and meaningful engagement by a higher proportion of the FSC membership and certificate holders (suggestion from Heiko Liedeker)([14](#)).

Estimated Cost:

As the topic of this Motion is covered by Goal 1.2 in the Global Strategy, we assume that such work is already budgeted. Some major members of the economic chamber have spoken about making this shift in approach to Standards over several years, and may be willing to contribute, either monetarily or by providing demonstration sites.

Annex, extract from the FSC Global Strategy 2021-2026, Strategy 1, Goal 1.2 -

QUOTE

Streamline policies and standards towards outcome orientation

- Streamline policies and standards to make them easier to understand and implement consistently.
- Reduce complexity and reflect risk, while ensuring credibility and enabling more focus on desired outcomes delivered through good performance. Streamlining includes enabling easy access to FSC requirements for all, clarity in requirements and their relevance to given geographical and socio-economic conditions.

Intended outcomes:

- FSC requirements are easily accessible to all who need them through modern technology and data management practices that enable all types of stakeholders to retrieve and consult them at any time;
- New FSC policies and standards are based on clear and consistent principles of streamlining and outcome-orientation. They ensure high integrity, credibility and balance global consistency with local adaptability. They are risk based, clear, relevant, reliable, user-friendly and efficient, and demonstrate

and communicate.

UNQUOTE

- (5) Sean Cadman
- (6) Daniel Hall and Dirk Riestenpatt
- (7) Daniel Hall and Dirk Riestenpatt
- (8) Claudia Romero and Jack Putz
- (9) Mikhail Tarasov
- (10) Heiko Liedeker and Daniel Hall
- (11) Hannah Scrase, Alan Smith, Richard Donovan, Steve Midgley
- (12) Steve Midgley
- (13) <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&alliance.org%2Fbusiness%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2019%2Fagriculture-standard-smallholders-v1.0.pdf&usg=AOvVaw372Va2q>
- (14) Heiko Liedeker

<https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwjHoPeazJfVAhVCrp4KHfQiCplQRralliance.org%2Fbusiness%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2019%2F02%2Frainforest-alliance-sustainable-agriculture-standard-smallholders-v1.0.pdf&usg=AOvVaw372Va2qVGlpPOGEDfpdUYm>

(14) Heiko Liedeker

59/2021 Developing the Network in the Global South through establishing FSC National Offices
and enabling increased membership engagement

Edited Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Peter Dam	Thankappannair Rajalayam Manoharan	Marie Mbolo
Organization / Individual	Dam, Peter, Mr.	Manoharan, TR, Dr	Mbolo, Marie, Dr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Economic / South	Environmental / South	Social / South

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

(ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE: THIS MOTION HAS BEEN EDITED 08/2022)

To reinvigorate the Network in the Global South, FSC shall approve a minimum of 5 new legally-established independent network partners (National Offices) in countries designated as South within a period of two years following the 2021 General Assembly. The initiative for the establishment of these Independent Network Partners (INP's) shall come from the local membership and focus on countries with significant forest cover or market potential, or both. Additional supporting factors for the investment could include the longer term prospects for economic growth in the forest and forest product sectors, the contribution to mitigating climate change, and the potential for protecting indigenous peoples' livelihoods and the forest ecosystems in general. As has been stated in previous Global Strategy Plans and governance reviews, effective membership participation, in particular from the Global South is "critical" for fulfilling FSC's mission at the local level.

FSC International shall therefore encourage the establishment of independent network partners, with a clear strategic aim of developing the Network in those areas which are important for FSC. Accordingly FSC regional offices as well as the international secretariat shall constructively support those members who take the initiative to create new independent network partners at national level. Additionally, to facilitate progress, a support group of motivated international members, widely drawn, shall be constituted to advise aspiring candidates. In sum, FSC IC shall provide the necessary assistance to achieve the intended outcome of Global Strategy 1.1.to drive change on the ground, contributing to FSC's mission through active membership involvement.

Background / rationale:

There is a marked imbalance between the presence of INPs in the Global South versus the Global North, with negative consequences in promoting FSC goals nationally as well as internationally. The number of INPs in the North is currently 19 versus 10 in the South. Of the INPs in the South, most are located in Latin America with just one (Malaysia) in the Asia-Pacific region and none at all in Africa and Eastern Europe. Moreover over the last 10 years, 8 INPs in the Global South have been closed, mainly in Africa but including two in Latin America. During this time, just one new INP has been established, in Argentina in 2019.

The substitution of membership-run national offices by regional and sub-regional offices has meant that members' local knowledge and contacts, both with governments and potential stakeholders, have not been utilised, resulting in the slow growth of FSC certification especially in important tropical areas. Moreover opportunities for external funding have been lost. In some regions, notably in Africa and Asia, the absence of FSC on the ground has helped competing certification systems to expand. The presence of an Independent National Office established as a legal entity will be valuable to the FSC International Members from the country to effectively contribute their resources to promote FSC locally in addition to directly engage with Government Programmes.

Therefore a rapid reversal is required to counter the downward trend which has reduced INP presence and replaced it with centrally-controlled entities. As has been shown in the Global North, the most effective way to promote FSC is through national membership engagement. To restart the process, no time should be lost in setting-up INP national offices in areas where viable INPs could operate to get across the FSC message of the value of responsible forest management.

The expected outcomes of this motion are not only to increase the uptake of FM and CoC certification, and attract more membership involvement but also to deliver wider benefits such as more empowerment of indigenous peoples and local forest communities, securing workers' rights, gaining government recognition and protecting ecosystems from deterioration. The market value of FSC in certifying responsible forestry will also be demonstrated. Overall, the achievement of these outcomes through locally-managed national offices will enhance the image of FSC both nationally and internationally.

This motion links to the following Intended Outcome under Strategy 1.1. of the revised FSC Global Strategic Plan: *FSC members, network partners, staff, certificate holders and external stakeholders are convened in initiatives to co-create and implement local forest stewardship solutions that drive change on the ground while contributing to FSC's global mission.*

60/2021 An Objective evaluation method by performance system for FSC audits
Accepted by MC Policy Motion

	Proposed By	Seconded By	Seconded By
Name	Marcelo Langer	Yadira Paulina Baca Terán	Lineu Siqueira Jr.
Organization / Individual	Langer, Marcelo, Mr.	Baca Terán, Yadira Paulina, Ms.	Siqueira, Lineu, Mr.
Chamber / Subchamber	Environmental / South	Social / South	Economic / South

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

To improve the credibility and robustness of FSC, we request **to standardize the certification processes of the Forest Management (FM) and Chain of Custody (CoC) certification in their forms of evaluation and measurement, to make them more robust, accurate, and reliable. See detailed Method proposed under “background”.**

Objectives – i.e. specific actions to achieve the goal:

- Establish objective assessment methodologies + methods for FSC standards;
- Define performance levels of applications of standards in FM systems;
- Standardize audit systems with definition of certification levels for the preparation of audit reports and evaluation of reports by specialists;
- Increase the accuracy of audit results;
- Train and promote adoption of aligned and leveled understanding for auditors;
- Improve the measurement of the results of audits, to give more credibility to the results, reliability to the FSC claims, and communication with the social actors involved in and affected by the FSC certified management products;
- Reduce problems with consumers' understanding of FSC standards and objectives;
- Minimize differences in understanding and evaluation of FSC standards in different realities, intensities, and dimensions of certified systems.

Background / rationale:

Over 24 years working on the implementation of FM systems according to FSC standards in different realities, it was possible to perceive and verify the different parameters of measurement and application of FSC P&C, by different auditors in conditions and maturity levels similar with different results; and, under different conditions, but with similar assessments. Different certifiers, their lead auditors and other team members, at specific times and in continuous periods, employ different evaluation criteria for the validation of actions, management procedures and conduct of FSC certified organizations, which creates discomfort, reduced credibility and certainty of the results. The reason is that teams of auditors have different backgrounds of training, knowledge and practical experiences, which allow the development of correlation and evaluation between the Organization's management standards, its internal and external social, economic and environmental aspects and conjunctures, in all its extension of application of impacts, FSC standards.

The different methods and criteria for determining the level of compliance with the standards generate different perceptions of the credibility of FSC products to their consumers and the reliability of the FSC seal.

Consequently, and despite the FSC's social, environmental, and economic standards systems, the accuracy of the current FSC FM and CoC auditing systems are subjective and depend on each auditor's personal analysis and value judgments and the team's skills in understanding these processes and their internal and external interrelations. This generates doubts and uncertainties about the quality of the audit, the validity and reliability of the FSC program.

Currently, programs and systems for assessing governance and business management are adopting new criteria for measuring and determining performance levels and meeting pre-established standards. Through these new criteria, government officials and managers aim to evaluate their systems with greater assertiveness, robustness, and precision.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) models are being developed to incorporate experiences and results in their programs and methods for calculating the impacts and quality of the management activities of products and companies.

Through these AI models and objective methods of measuring results, management indicators and the quality of management of social, environmental, and economic resources and the FSC standards, FSC's audit processes can become more reliable and more certain.

By adopting objective assessment models, the processes and the FSC itself will become more reliable. Companies that adoptees will know more accurately their levels of service and the distances of their activities to the best FSC standards. Thus, companies will be more satisfied, their customers and consumers will have greater choice and certainty of their decisions.

Including objective and measurable criteria, the transparency of the audits will be greater and will have better conditions for monitoring and evaluating the performance of companies, year by year, in relation to their attendance and deepening in the application of FSC standards in all their management activities.

Through the performance scale method, it will be possible to parameterize the indicators, establish metric units that are dimensionless and capable of being integrated into an integrated FSC management performance index.

The integrated FSC management index will make it possible to understand and replicate audit results under different conditions and by different auditors.

Raising the quality of the system and increasing the recognition of FSC to all its stakeholders.

Due to the great differences in the levels of perception, knowledge, and experience of the auditors, and with this the dissatisfaction of companies with the results of the FSC audits, it is necessary and urgent to adopt a measurable and parameterized metric system in all the application territories of the FSC.

Therefore, it is necessary to adopt this objective method of auditing performance, which allows uniformity of audits and integration of FSC standards, with greater transparency and confirmation of the open and plural participation of FSC managers in companies.

Thus, we propose the following Methodology

How to generate procedures for a free evaluation of the auditors' judgment criteria that ensure greater confidence in FSC by its consumers?

To answer this question, we propose the method of objective valuation method for FSC Performance Indicators, TABLE 1.

TABLE 1. Valuation Method for FSC Performance Indicators

Table 1

Image not found or type unknown

Applying the performance scale to all principles, criteria and indicators, then the method of harmonizing the indicators is applied, and thus, it is possible to integrate them.

After harmonising the valuation of the indicators, they should split into each group, their averages calculated for each criterion, and the sum and average of the criteria for each Principle.

Once the averages of the criteria and each principle are averaged, the average sustainable FSC value of the company which has the FSC certification, is calculated by its Value S

Equation 1

Image not found or type unknown

In addition to the objective method of assessing indicators and verifiers, there is also a need to value the stories of certified companies, their evolution and loyalty to the FSC certification scheme.

Since companies, in addition to maintaining compliance with FSC standards, evolve their understanding of social and environmental additionalities and externalities.

For these reasons, the results of the integration of each of the Principles will be valued by the FSC performance index (FSCPI).

To develop an impartial and objective evidence-based audit method, we propose the method of the FSC Performance Index FSCPI:

Equation 2

Image not found or type unknown

1. Additional value for continuing the Certification process (Co)

Table 2

Image not found or type unknown

2. Additional value of the maturity of the FSC certification process (Ma)

Table 3

Image not found or type unknown

3. Additional Major CAR recurrence value by Principle (Rec)

Table 4

Image not found or type unknown

4. Additional biodiversity value in the FSC certification period (Bio)

Table 5

Image not found or type unknown

5. Additional social value in the FSC certification period (Soc)



Table 6

Image not found or type unknown

6. Additional economic value during the FSC certification period (Econ)

Table 7

Image not found or type unknown