

## 02/2020\_Change in the frequency of FSC Ordinary General Assembly from 3 years to 4 years and spaces for membership participation

02/2020		ECONOMIC	ENVIRONMENTAL	SOCIAL
STRENGTHS	AM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not need a full GA to make all decisions. Therefore, it's good to have more time between GAs</li> </ul>	Can accept the rationale behind this motion
	PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The experience of in-person GA is unique.</li> <li>We can do it in a 4-year period (experience shows it is possible).</li> <li>Extending the period give more time to implement the motions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good to extend the timeline from 3 to 4 years. 4-year interval gives the Secretariat time to develop solutions and show impact</li> </ul>	
CONCERNS	AM	Adds complexity and work due to the facto 2-year GA interval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to be sure that there are ways in between the 4 years that members can make decisions</li> <li>Members want to make text changes to the motion text in order to be able to agree this</li> <li>Only make changes to the Statutes that are really legally necessary – keep the Statutes lean!</li> </ul>	This may reduce the member participation
	PM	<p><b>What is the motion trying to fix?</b></p> <p>When reading the text, there is a proposal to have a virtual GA in the 2nd year. Finally, what are we trying to fix? (at the end, there will be a GA every two years).</p> <p><b>The issue is not the number of GAs but the number of motions.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In a more extended period between GAs there could be gaps in information and interest from members.</li> <li>How do we manage the motions process in a more extended period between GAs when members submit more motions?</li> <li>The challenge is how to select the motions and have more communication with the proposers and the FSC.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern with interim virtual GAs because it effectively means a GA every 2 years;</li> <li>Keep the Statutes lean!</li> </ul>	<p>The FSC currently does not have the maturity to function without General Assemblies. We do not have sufficient internet connections in rural areas where we most need members' participation. For the most important governance body (the assembly) we are not ready at this time to depend on virtual meetings.</p> <p>One problem is that the motion actually contains two initiatives: (1) GA frequency - the dynamism of the socio-environmental process does not make it convenient to extend the time between assemblies, (2) improve sub-regional participation mechanisms - this could be good. It would be better if the parts were separated.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The motions process requires more engagement meetings adding more complexity.</li> </ul> <p>The Global strategy tries to reduce the number of motions. A black hole between GAs is addressed with regional meetings to bring the member's opinions.</p>		
<b>ACTION / NEGOTIATION REQUIRED</b>	<b>AM</b>	FSC needs extra efforts to help members understand the motions and processes/issues behind them	<p>The Env members present could not vote for this without changes being made to the text of the Motion and that is not now possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>A discussion was held on the problems of not being able to make changes to the Motions at this stage. "History has shown that we need to change motions last minute in order to reach agreement".</i></li> <li><i>It was emphasized that the members need to vote in the changes to the GA procedures that stop the motions being able to be changed last minute as part of the statutory voting items (non-motions). Therefore members could still reject that change.</i></li> </ul>	
	<b>PM</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prefer FSC evolution through a more open process for development of the Global Strategy and associated operating plan and progress indicators;</li> <li>Improve the way FSC works as a business;</li> <li>improve the ways FSC can engage members in decision making! (Other than via motions)</li> </ul>	It is necessary to have a more in-depth discussion of these and to combine motions 2 and 3. If this is not possible, it is better to postpone both in order to analyze the impacts of having virtual assemblies.
<b>GENERAL CH POSITION</b>	<b>AM</b>	This motion is not needed. FSC should continue with regional meetings etc. in between GAs to engage with membership.	Can't support it as it stands	Neutral
	<b>PM</b>			

**03/2020\_Establishment of a system for virtual General Assembly to protect the continuous installation of the highest decision-making body and supreme authority of FSC.**

03/2020		ECONOMIC	ENVIRONMENTAL	SOCIAL
STRENGTHS	AM	Adds flexibility to organize virtual GA. Less travelling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good motion especially in light of the modern world; need to be able have hybrid meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FSC has this technical capacity in carrying out virtual General Assembly</li> <li>• Virtual can be a solution as members are not always able to travel to physical meeting</li> </ul>
	PM	The motion is more oriented to facilitate the participation of the members; it is not clear that it is aiming to add more complexity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moton intention: meant to allow FSC to better engage with members and to allow members to better engage with FSC;</li> <li>• Makes it easier for members to call for a GA;</li> <li>• Hybrid GA to enable fuller and more equitable member participation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Esta moción está más ajustada al espíritu y análisis que habíamos hecho durante las discusiones de gobernanza.</li> </ul>
CONCERNS	AM	Is this needed, since FSC can already now organize virtual GA if needed. Does this motion create a culture of continuous GA mode and changes in the system?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are changes to the Statutes really needed to be able to have virtual and hybrid GAs? We are having virtual meetings already.</li> <li>• Only make changes to the Statutes that are really legally necessary – keep the Statutes lean!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connection quality and other IT problems vary among regions</li> <li>• Different time zone which then inhibits discussions among members</li> </ul>
	PM	It is A risky motion that could add complexity. The current statutes do not prevent the organization of virtual GAs or the type of meetings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FSC’s GA is different from a GA of commercial institution (FSC has a huge number of motions);</li> <li>• Reform of motion process and implementation needed before more motions are encouraged.</li> </ul>	

		<p>There is concern about the aspect of “protecting the permanent installation of the supreme authority. What does it mean?</p> <p>There are still many uncertainties about the online voting process, use of proxies, etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep the Statutes lean!</li> </ul>	
<b>ACTION / NEGOTIATION REQUIRED</b>	<b>AM</b>	FSC needs to have a system to strengthen its virtual meeting set-up in general.	Clarify whether changes to the Statutes really needed to be able to have virtual and hybrid GAs?	Hybrid version should be promoted, not exclusive to virtual or physical
	<b>PM</b>			
<b>GENERAL CH POSITION</b>	<b>AM</b>	Important that FSC has the flexibility to organize virtual GA if needed but do we need motion for that? We can do this already now without a motion.	Generally favourable if the change is actually needed	Can accept this motion
	<b>PM</b>	Very sensitive motion in terms of the consequences for the general operation of the system.		

04/2020\_Strengthening the Network by enhancing membership engagement in regional offices

04/2020		ECONOMIC	ENVIRONMENTAL	SOCIAL
STRENGTHS	AM	Would strengthen membership engagement on regional level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sense this is long overdue</li> <li>• A transnational approach makes sense</li> <li>• It would help with harmonising national FM standards</li> </ul>	Member engagement will be stronger
	PM	The intent of the motion is excellent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not a new layer of overall FSC governance (FSC governance resides with GA, international Board and Secretariat in that order);</li> <li>• Additional mechanism to engage with members.</li> </ul>	It would be very good for the membership to support this motion
CONCERNS	AM	Creates a new governance layer in the system. Could complicate the current organization and its roles and responsibilities and accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only make changes to the Statutes that are really legally necessary – keep the Statutes lean!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An extra layer of governance</li> <li>• Addition of complexity</li> </ul>
	PM	<p>The purpose of the motion is fair, but it is not clear if the solution is the right one.</p> <p>Not in favor of regional boards. It would add an extra level of governance, increasing the complexity with no positive results.</p> <p>The intent is excellent, the solution wrong. The role of the regional offices is not to engage members.</p> <p>How is this motion aligned with the revision of the NP? For example, in the revision of the NP, there is a section of roles and responsibilities. Therefore, the intent of the motion could be address there.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motion #4 is a reflection of discontent: i.e. the current perception is of a Secretariat preference for centralized controls (versus the call by this motion for strong regional preferences for more local control). <i>NB: This is not a concern with the motion but the concern the motion is trying to address.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How would the Secretariat respond if this motion is approved? How would the network policy be revised?</li> <li>• The question is: Should we wait for the Secretariat to come up with a policy to give the membership a fair chance to influence what the regional office is doing, or do something now?</li> <li>• Also, the current image is a top-down approach from Bonn to control the regional offices without input from members.</li> </ul>
	AM	There are other ways to achieve the goals of this motion → we need to have regional		Adding some options to have or organize some regional activities involving members

<b>ACTION / NEGOTIATION REQUIRED</b>		offices engaging members more actively, FSC should contribute to this.		
	<b>PM</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs more discussion; especially in relation to control of resources (money).</li> </ul>	
<b>GENERAL CH POSITION</b>	<b>AM</b>	Divided views, majority supporting, some opposing.	Many support, others need more discussion first	The motion was well supported.
	<b>PM</b>			To vote in favor of this motion

• 05/202\_[FSC Int. Performance ]

05/2020		ECONOMIC	ENVIRONMENTAL	SOCIAL
STRENGTHS	AM	There is a lot going on in the Secretariat, but members do not know about it. The Secretariat already improves in terms of transparency.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sentiment of the motion to review after 25 years is good.</li> <li>There are processes/issues within FSC that need review</li> </ul>	<p>Overall support – would like to add</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance should also measure the services of Secretariat to <u>national offices</u></li> <li>Work should be done to simplify the number and type of communication, which would also make it more effective</li> </ul>
	PM	<p>The motion will make possible to makes changes beyond the motions</p> <p>Allows more transparency a strength is it increases accountability and transparency and ensuring knowledge / skills is appropriate for work</p> <p>Supportive on the motion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Proposal for comprehensive performance review;</li> <li>➤ Analysis of the motion addressed some small technical aspects (e.g. personnel reviews made public);</li> <li>➤ Definitely support for accountability;</li> <li>➤ intent of the motion is excellent, but original text of the motion needs to be improved and refined.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Total support for this motion. We need more oversight for the Board and Secretariat. This motion is a call for realizing this kind of evaluation and reports in the interest of transparency and better information for members concerning results for different areas of work. This motion is very important, especially due to other chambers not being open to social chamber motions. It is better to postpone this motion until next year to work out all the details.</li> <li>➤ We are very behind in having structures regulated and we have a lack of transparency. We need to do what we can now. We should not wait and postpone it to 2022.</li> </ul>
CONCERNS	AM	<p>FSC is so unique and complex so that it is tough for outsiders to understand and judge on FSC.</p> <p>FSC's democratic system makes FSC sometimes slow in implementing change.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A lot is going on anyway and is the Board role in general, its on their radar already</li> <li>Motion is not very specific and a bit mixed in what its asking for</li> <li>Outcome orientation is not really related to the main thrust of the motion and this is already taking place</li> <li>Unclear from an accountability perspective on how to measure its completion/delivery</li> </ul>	
	PM	<p>What about current initiatives already in place in FSC.</p> <p>If the motion is passed could be a limited response (as in the past). The idea is to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Performance not visible/transparent for membership;</li> <li>➤ Aspects listed in the motion to some extend mix aspects of very different type;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ I support the intent of this motion, e.g., we struggle in defining the role of the board between strategic and operational activities. However, the motion is too prescriptive and focuses too much on operational side. Has many</li> </ul>

		create a dedicated position, a point of interaction with the membership.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Currently strong focus on personnel/staff/etc.</li> <li>➤ This is the job of the FSC BoD; scope of performance review is already in agenda of BoD;</li> <li>➤ Performance evaluation/accountability needs to be complemented by strong systematic institutional learning;</li> <li>➤ Intent of the motion is excellent, but original text of the motion needs to be improved and refined (cut-off date for amending motions was much too early).</li> </ul>	different levels of action, which makes it difficult to support as is.
<b>ACTION / NEGOTIATION REQUIRED</b>	<b>AM</b>	Find ways how to better implement change.	Recommendation to pull the motion now, clean it up and make it more specific on how to make internal processes more efficient.	(as from above )- would like to add <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance should also measure the services of Secretariat to <u>national offices</u></li> <li>● Work should be done to simplify the number and type of communication which would also make it more effective</li> </ul>
	<b>PM</b>		➤ it is an option to withdraw this motion this year and table an edited version in the GA next year.	
<b>GENERAL CH POSITION</b>	<b>AM</b>	In line with the motion.	Broadly supportive of the review part of the motion	Support
	<b>PM</b>			General Support, but some mixed views on presenting it now or amending it and presenting it later



11/2020\_[Developing and applying social, environmental and economic indicators for the implementation of the FSC Global Strategy ]

11/2020		ECONOMIC	ENVIRONMENTAL	SOCIAL
STRENGTHS	AM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sentiment of the motion is correct. We agree on the reporting part.</li> </ul>	
	PM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Work on indicators to the Global Strategy already underway – publication scheduled for September 2021;</li> <li>➤ Will the indicators currently being prepared, be consulted with membership?;</li> <li>➤ Indicator systems would not only be interesting for implementation of the strategy, but also for monitoring performance of national standards and policies;</li> <li>➤ System of indicators will be evolving over time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The motion was originally proposed in 2017, but was not prioritized for discussion. We had a social strategy, but we never implemented it. Now we have goals that we need explicitly implemented. We do not have indicators to measure if we are doing this. For example, the gender issue has not been addressed. This is why we need indicators for the Global Strategic Plan.</li> <li>➤ Several members expressed agreement and support this motion</li> <li>➤ The Board is discussing indicators to measure progress, and a framework will be posted on a website. To monitor we need data, and the FSC has a team working on data gathering, so our ability to analyze data will improve. It will help if members could take a look at the framework and provide feedback.</li> <li>➤ Totally agree with this.</li> <li>➤ Views can vary by region, so I would like to hear from other regions to see if they have different points of view.</li> </ul>
CONCERNS	AM	The implementation plan to the Global Strategy is going to be published so the motion becomes redundant.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Redundant, not necessary, It is old now because indicators are out soon (September 2021).</li> <li>The motion asks for working group but there are no people willing to participate in working groups now.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The GS should be translated into policies first which should then have indicators attached to them</li> <li>Need to Develop policies which ensure concrete social outcomes</li> <li>From one member – a concern that FSC is becoming too bureaucratic</li> </ul>
	PM	The motion is redundant. The members will receive the information about how the	➤ Motion developed because indicators and performance reporting were not	➤ The indicators should include concrete measures of success

		<p>Strategy will be implemented and measured in the next days.</p> <p>We need to make it clear that the motion may be redundant, but FSC needs to follow through with the implementation and monitoring.</p>	<p>forthcoming, while implementing of Global Strategy is already long underway;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Is there a system for systematic institutional learning linked to the indicators systems?;</li> <li>➤ Needs to be linked to the development of the next strategic phase;</li> <li>➤ Message to the BoD is it needs much more responsive, effective and efficient systems to provide input rather than the rather lengthy motions process (motions process is expression of frustration);</li> <li>➤ Working group is NOT the right (effective/efficient) mechanism to develop such high level meaningful indicators.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ There has been suggestion that perhaps as an intermediary level, there should be policies, and indicators for those. Thinking more about how to translate strategy into action, and then indicators.</li> <li>➤ There has also been concern about creating another working group, given the difficulty in finding members for working groups. This would be good to address by motion proponents when speaking about the motion.</li> <li>➤ It would be good if Board members could explain the progress of the Board with regard to the indicators, so that we do not duplicate efforts. If the motion is accepted, I would think the WG would look at the indicators already developed and build on them from there.</li> <li>➤ Hope that the economic chamber will support this motion</li> </ul>
<b>ACTION / NEGOTIATION REQUIRED</b>	<b>AM</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To reach out to the proposer and seconder and withdrawn now and move it 2022 in case the indicators aren't out by that time.</li> </ul>	
	<b>PM</b>	A strong commitment from the Board will eliminate the uncertainties.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ It would be good for the motion proponents to address the problem of finding WG members.</li> </ul>
<b>GENERAL CH POSITION</b>	<b>AM</b>	Motion is redundant.	It is redundant	Support
	<b>PM</b>	Motion is redundant.		➤ General Support for the motion

15/2020\_[Sustainable intensification]

15/2020		ECONOMIC	ENVIRONMENTAL	SOCIAL
STRENGTHS	AM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The motion is absolutely important.</li> <li>• Intensification destroys responsible management.</li> <li>• There are risks in not stopping the SI process.</li> <li>• The overall concept of sustainable intensification is OK, BUT [discussions on] GMO and Bioengineering should be stop right now.</li> </ul>	
	PM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Stop the current rather ineffective process and restart with a comprehensive new approach;</li> <li>➤ Intensification also leads to intensification of social &amp; environmental impacts;</li> <li>➤ How the issue is addressed is a question of credibility for FSC.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The motion asks to stop ongoing work in understanding GM. The other part of the work, e.g., shared values, should continue as part of normal practice. The aim for the motion is to stop work on GM, but continue work on other areas of sustainable intensification.</li> </ul>
CONCERNS	AM	<p>We need to find was to supply wood to satisfy the growing demand in a sustainable demand. Sustainable Intensification is a way to do so. The membership needs to take an informed decision on SI so the SI process is needed to learn and gain information. Genetic Engineering is happening anyway and FSC needs to learn about it.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The motion might stop the ongoing learning and information and knowledge base in FSC.</li> <li>• Those plantation companies and companies operating [negatively] with sustainable intensification can always be addressed by the Policy of Association.</li> </ul>	<p>New technologies are being developed in <u>many</u> areas and FSC should try to get a better understanding of them but not at the risk of damaging FSC;</p>
	PM	<p>A motion requesting to stop a dialogue, regardless of any subject, is totally against the principles of FSC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FSC is a multistakeholder platform where all membership is invited to discuss and build together, any issue. If you do not agree with any idea, bring to the table suggestions and concerns. But to refuse to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Problem that “sustainable intensification” is very different in different parts of the world and that they were mixed with genetic engineering (GE) discussion, and that there is no systematic risk analysis;</li> <li>➤ Confusion on how this subject was brought to the membership;</li> <li>➤ Needs to be complemented with a discussion on intelligent use of wood resources;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Concern that if this goes forward without everyone supporting it, there will be destructive divisions within FSC. The main concern is not genetic engineering, but GMOs.</li> <li>➤ A big no for this motion. All possible stakeholders are not being consulted, e.g., we do not know if FPIC is being implemented for pueblos originarios on all continents. This goes against the spirit of the FSC. There needs to be an equilibrium among all of the members.</li> </ul>

		<p>discuss, in an open and transparent way, because you do not like/agree with any theme, is totally against the principles of the dialogue.</p> <p>If this motion is approved, it may be opened a dangerous pathway to block the dialogue in different themes, including sensitive issues. This is not constructive for anyone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It could set a dangerous precedent to shutting down any future dialogue when we disagree on the content of the discussion.</li> </ul> <p>Other forums are not going to stop the discussions!</p> <p>The term "sustainable intensification" is a subtle form of greenwashing--that is, making unsubstantiated environmental claims.</p> <p>The motion is being erroneously presented as a "yes" or "no" vote for GMO approval. But it is not the point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The title is tricky and can induce errors when voting. A member who is not closely following the subject will not understand its intention. And can ask herself/himself when voting: "Am I in favor of allowing Sustainable Intensification?". And this is not the intention of the motion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ No intention to move towards use of GMO in forest operations;</li> <li>➤ Intention of the BoD to set conditions for research and trials;</li> <li>➤ [Discussions] could give members a chance to make well-informed, intelligent decisions in future – to move.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ We need to continue the Board level discussions with advisory groups. This is necessary for members to take well-informed decisions.</li> <li>➤ With or without this motion, the companies are going to continue to work to increase production and profits. The theme of this motion is intensification, not GMOs. If we approve it we close the possibility of including GMOs for companies that are simply looking to increase profits. The are is not support from the South for this motion, only from the north. A large part of certified areas in the south are in plantations. If we close this discussion we will not be able to discuss social and environmental issues for these companies.</li> <li>➤ No to SI, when it implies passing over the rights of indigenous peoples</li> <li>➤ The motion is aimed at alerting us as to how the discussion should be. SI does not only respond to GMOs. There is a reference to “benefit sharing” – for who? How to be determined? The fear is what is happening right now. There should be research about all issues. This motion is very political. Research should be about the issues necessary to achieve the existing P&amp;C. We should change the focus of dialogue on this issue.</li> </ul>
<p><b>ACTION / NEGOTIATION REQUIRED</b></p>	<p><b>AM</b></p> <p><b>PM</b></p>			

<b>GENERAL CH POSITION</b>	<b>AM</b>	Against the motion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a split into two quite different positions: half would rather stop the motion and half would rather support it.</li> </ul>	Mixed
	<b>PM</b>	Against the motion		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A lot of concern about what SI means, the role of GMOs versus other methods, and the focus of FSC's research on this issue. There is definitely need for further discussion on this issue.</li> </ul>

20/2020 [Climate Emergency Motion]

20/2020		ECONOMIC	ENVIRONMENTAL	SOCIAL
STRENGTHS	AM	FSC does already a lot to fight climate change, but is not promoting the effects. FSC should better show its contribution in fighting climate change.	<p>This is part of a set of 3 motions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M20: Climate Crisis is an important topic and FSC need to have a clear and continuous role on this;</li> <li>• M48: Ask for improvement on Ecosystem Services provision by FSC certified forest managers</li> <li>• M49: Ask for improvement on attracting financial resources from the demand side</li> </ul> <p>The motion is addressing all different aspects related to Climate Emergency. The motion is also addressing biodiversity.</p>	
	PM	<p>This motion is important and should be clarified and stronger. FSC should position itself more clearly on the guarantees it brings in terms of zero deforestation in the fight against climate change.</p> <p>The key is to make strong alliances and FSC is the perfect platform for this. There are many funds for climate change to increase the impact of the organization.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Part of a 3 motions set (20; 48; 49);</li> <li>➤ Was already presented at the last GA;</li> <li>➤ Multiple reports globally on loss of ecosystems and ecosystem functionality;</li> <li>➤ FSC can relate its systems to maintaining ecosystem functionality in relation to climate change (climate smart forestry);</li> <li>➤ New opportunity to bring FSC to a much broader audience.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Agree with emergency level of climate crisis.</li> <li>➤ If this motion is approved with the other climate related motions, e.g. about ecosystem services, those motions have more details. FSC needs to be recognized as leader on this issue. The motion does not go into a lot of details on how, the intent rather is to raise the issue.</li> <li>➤ Members are concerned about current consumption models</li> <li>➤ There was a lot of discussion this morning in support of this motion. Our standard is very much a safeguarding standard and not an outcomes standard; we want to change this, but currently the only tool we have to demonstrate outcomes is ecosystem services. Cultural service motion is also relevant.</li> <li>➤ The combat of climate change is an important issue for small producers and has been for a very</li> </ul>

				<p>long time. It would be good to have a discussion at some point about their role.</p> <p>➤ There is a lot more that could be done to generate revenue for smallholders from ecosystem services.</p>
<b>CONCERNS</b>	<b>AM</b>	Climate change is important, but there is a risk to lose the balance with other important aspects in FSC's vision. The motion should not create higher burdens to certificate holders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Text is unclear.</li> <li>• Is not really asking for actions.</li> <li>• It does not reflect biodiversity in the title.</li> </ul>	
	<b>PM</b>	<p>The motion could significantly limit constraining FSC to promote the potential of forest management and the forest products in a way compatible with solutions to climate change.</p> <p>Tend to agree with this motion in general. However, some concerns are about what's going on in FSC now, considering the Global Strategy, and not bringing more complexity to medium and smallholders in FSC standards to avoid pushing these actors out of the system.</p>	<p>➤ FSC is doing something but FSC systems could be oriented to be far more efficient and effective in addressing forests, forestry, forest functionality in relation to climate change.</p>	<p>➤ Not clear how this motion would be implemented. Asking for better outcomes is more related to the indicator discussion we just had.</p>
<b>ACTION / NEGOTIATION REQUIRED</b>	<b>AM</b>			
	<b>PM</b>			
<b>GENERAL CH POSITION</b>	<b>AM</b>	FSC needs to sharpen the position on climate change. In favor of the motion.	Positive if seen in the light of the three motions on climate.	
	<b>PM</b>			➤ General Support for the motion

36/2021\_Removal of Criterion 5.3

36/2021		ECONOMIC	ENVIRONMENTAL	SOCIAL
STRENGTHS	AM			
	PM			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The perceived concern underlying this motion is more around costs of trying to determine the externalities</li> </ul>
CONCERNS	AM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why can't impacts (negative externalities) be identified?</li> </ul>	Questioning why this request is done on motion basis as P&C is a packed deal which needs to be seen as a whole, not one by one.
	PM	The chamber did not discuss the motion due to a lack of time at the meeting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>motion #36 - is misconceived because the proposers do not understand the difference between the Criterion and the IGIs;</li> <li>the problem is with the way the IGIs are formulated and therefore it is the IGIs that need to be changed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The criterion should not be eliminated. I think there is a misunderstanding. It is always necessary to analyze the external impacts of forest management and include them in the management plan. Managers must also implement FPIC now to identify and respond to possible negative impacts, which means they must understand potential impacts and define how they will respond. I am surprised that when we are working on a remediation procedure this motion has been raised.</li> <li><i>It is necessary to consider the impacts that could be generated outside the management area. The whole system aims to address these impacts.</i></li> <li>Normally the Principles and Criteria are considered as a package, so this could set a dangerous precedent if this is approved.</li> <li>The reason to delete this criterion is not clear.</li> </ul>
ACTION / NEGOTIATION REQUIRED	AM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More discussion needed re why can't impacts (negative externalities) be identified?</li> <li>Need to hear Grant Rosoman's thoughts on this (<i>had to leave chamber session</i>)</li> </ul>	
	PM	The chamber did not discuss the motion due to a lack of time at the meeting.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify if we are understanding the purpose of the motion incorrectly, e.g., maybe the translation could be improved.</li> </ul>
GENERAL CH POSITION	AM	Divided views, majority supporting, some opposing	Sense members do not support	The motion was not supported as it would set an unwelcome precedent.



	<b>PM</b>	The chamber did not discuss the motion due to a lack of time at the meeting.	Sense members do not support	
--	-----------	--	------------------------------	--