

## Chamber meeting notes template - 15 September 2022:

### Economic Chamber

*Note: One template and one Slido poll per Chamber will cover both morning and afternoon sessions, the afternoon session will build on the morning session's discussions*

*See also the live Slido ranking poll results [\[insert ink\]](#).*

*Note: You can continue to change your Slido entry until the cross-chamber discussion on 22 Sept 2022.*

Motion number	The Broad Chamber Perspective:	Positive aspects/reasons to support the motion	Problems/issues with the motion	Additional info & next steps Eg: - Motion Ambassador assigned – who? - Approach other chambers? - Seek clarifications?
	Strong support, high rank			
	Some support, mid rank			
	Less support, lower rank			
Choose fill colour				
<b>General comments</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many comments on issues with wording in motions. How to change details in motions that block the motion even if all agree on the overall idea?</li> <li>Many motions on the same subject IFL (M18, 23, 10 and 19): mitigate unintended consequences from Motion 65 from 2014. How can those be consistent? M18 and M23 more crucial for prioritization.</li> </ul>				
M18	Strong support	-Allow certified management of tropical forests, allow applying IFL (Intact Forest Landscapes), prevent foresters from moving to alternatives to FSC or no certification. -Improve quality of the HCV2 identification and management. (long-term) -Avoid loss of certificates in the tropics (short-term)	-Development of the long-term solution to IFL protection will take time. -Suspension of some normative effects might not be accepted by Env. Chamber	Brazilian approach In Brazil alone: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>500k ha to lose their certificate in the coming 12months</li> <li>2.5-3 mill ha to lose their certificate in the mid-term</li> </ul> No opposition in today's eco chamber discussions
M23	Strong support	-Ask for a fundamental revision of IFL requirements, with the support to	Does it address the difference in definitions?	Congo Basin approach

Motion number	The Broad Chamber Perspective:	Positive aspects/reasons to support the motion	Problems/issues with the motion	Additional info & next steps Eg: - Motion Ambassador assigned – who? - Approach other chambers? - Seek clarifications?
	Strong support, high rank			
	Some support, mid rank			
	Less support, lower rank			
Choose fill colour				
		SDGs (Standards Development Groups) -Landscape approach should lead to a good solution for IFL conservation -M18 & M23 key to the future of current and future FSC system implementation in the tropics. -Based on a large consensus and engagement	-Suspension of some normative effects might not be accepted by Env. Chamber -Challenge: high level of consensus to reach -It misses recovery aspects	Widely support by Eco Ch on morning and afternoon
M10	Strong support	-Improves process to take comments of standard development group (SDG) into account. Support continuous commitment in SDGs -To address frustration of SDGs members -Accept and rely on the “on the ground” and local knowledge of the SDG	-The notion of FPIC in the motion is not clear. Mixes up different approaches of FSC governance. -Wording is not perfect.	SDG proposals have been refused in Latin America and South Africa and in Congo Basin. Brazilian Standard blocked
M19	Some Support	-Needed for state owned forests. -Make sure national law can be complied with.		
M16	Some support in the morning Less support in the afternoon	-Bring duplications (and therefore cost and burden) between different audits for FLEGT, FSC, etc. down	-What is the concrete action? -Will the new EU regulations impact FLEGT and therefore the motion. -Has the situation changed since the motion has been written? -Very specific for Indonesia, might not be relevant for other regions.	New EU deforestation law. But FLEGT still relevant in countries with VPA’s (Voluntary Partnership Agreements).

Motion number	The Broad Chamber Perspective:	Positive aspects/reasons to support the motion	Problems/issues with the motion	Additional info & next steps Eg: - Motion Ambassador assigned – who? - Approach other chambers? - Seek clarifications?
	Strong support, high rank			
	Some support, mid rank			
	Less support, lower rank			
Choose fill colour				
			-Not sure how a combined approach could be developed.	
M9	Strong support	<p>-Can help to have better and fewer motions. FSC members need to know better about the consequences of motions before voting on them. Impact assessment not fully there yet, this would be improved with the motion.</p> <p>-Positive to include a risk/impact assessment before voting.</p>	<p>-Wording is very “open” which leaves space for the good and the bad.</p> <p>-Isn’t it already addressed? This year’s process is the proof.</p> <p>-What is meant with secretariat and proposer after voting?</p> <p>-Not clear what the comprehensive stakeholder process should look like</p>	
M49	Strong support	<p>-Ecosystem valorisation is needed, make these areas also economically viable.</p> <p>-The FSC ecosystem services (ESS) procedure may contribute to it.</p> <p>-Current ESS procedure does not yet allow to sell claims and respond to the needs of potential buyers for net-zero and net-positive strategies.</p> <p>-Avoids that a certificate holder must apply two different, expensive standards (FSC certification and carbon/ESS certification). Develops a standard that provides what the market asks for.</p>	<p>Focus on ESS or only on carbon?</p> <p>Complexity of the proposed system.</p> <p>Some wording issues in regard to “association”.</p>	<p>Wesley Snell to have a space at the Cross Chamber meeting to speak about the motion (<a href="mailto:wesley.snell@etifor.com">wesley.snell@etifor.com</a> )</p>

Motion number	The Broad Chamber Perspective:	Positive aspects/reasons to support the motion	Problems/issues with the motion	Additional info & next steps Eg: - Motion Ambassador assigned – who? - Approach other chambers? - Seek clarifications?
	Strong support, high rank			
	Some support, mid rank			
	Less support, lower rank			
Choose fill colour				
M14	Less support in the afternoon	-In principle correct, considerable differences in neighbouring countries, that do not seem justified.	-Isn't it already happening (Congo Basin)? -Can it turn against the country SDG? -Might work in some areas but not in others	
M5	Between Strong and Some support	-Can bring some "fresh air" to an established, inflexible system. -Brings members and FSC Management closer together. -External analysis of the current problems to provide solutions.	-Rational and motion text do not fully correspond. -Maybe not very directive. -Wording issues.	
M59		In principle yes	But too prescriptive (e.g. number of offices: 5)	Check what is the latest version
M45			Much of the work asked for is already done	
M50	Some support in the morning			
M51				Motion would still be happy to change the motion with respect to the number of representatives (1 by 20 workers)
M31	Some support in the after-noon Strong support in the morning	Improves transparency.	Timeline not too strict?	
M15	Less support in the afternoon		-Legitimate process going on, not good practice to stop it. -Tries to restrict discussions?	Motion should be discussed

Motion number	The Broad Chamber Perspective:	Positive aspects/reasons to support the motion	Problems/issues with the motion	Additional info & next steps Eg: - Motion Ambassador assigned – who? - Approach other chambers? - Seek clarifications?
	Strong support, high rank			
	Some support, mid rank			
	Less support, lower rank			
<i>Choose fill colour</i>				
M55	Strong support in the afternoon	-Might increase transparency -Will allow companies in a CoC Group certificate to be individually listed in the FSC database		
<b>Statutory Motions</b>				
M40a				Relies on M40b