

Motion in Motion Sessions Summaries

April – June 2025



**General
Assembly
2025 Panama**

Purpose of this Report

This report provides a summary of the **"Motions in Motion" sessions conducted between April 24 and June 5, 2025**. These ongoing sessions are part of FSC's Engagement Plan and Motion Process in the preparation to the General Assembly 2025. The meetings served as a platform for members to present, discuss, and reflect on both statutory and policy motions in **cross-chamber sessions**, offering valuable insights into their purpose, feasibility, and potential impact on the FSC system.

Each motion summary in this report includes the motion title, proposer details, a concise overview of the motion's intent, key findings from the feasibility analysis, and highlights from member discussions. This format is **designed to help readers quickly understand** the essence of each motion while also capturing the diversity of perspectives expressed during the sessions.

The report aims to support informed participation and strengthen collective understanding of the issues at stake, **ensuring that members are well-prepared to contribute meaningfully to decision-making** during the upcoming General Assembly.



Motions in Motion Sessions



**General
Assembly
2025 Panama**

MOTIONS IN MOTION SESSIONS

APRIL – JUNE 2025

Opening Session – April 10, 2025

170
participants

TOTAL
876

Session 2

24 April 2025

Statutory Motion 06/2025
Statutory Motion 07/2025
Statutory Motion 01/2025
Statutory Motion 03/2025

192
participants

Session 3

08 May 2025

Statutory Motion 09/2025
Statutory Motion 10/2025
Statutory Motion 02/2025
Statutory Motion 05/2025

167
participants

Session 4

22 May 2025

Policy Motion 14/2025
Statutory Motion 04/2025
Statutory Motion 08/2025
Policy Motion 47/2025

159
participants

Session 5

05 June 2025

Policy Motion 26/2025
Policy Motion 22/2025
Policy Motion 43/2025
Policy Motion 32/2025

188
participants

MOTIONS SUMMARY TEMPLATE



Chamber of the Motion Proposer

Motion number and link to the Portal

Member's Discussion Summary

Motion 05/2025

Statutory Motion to Establish a Fourth Indigenous Chamber

STATUTORY MOTION TO AMEND THE FOREST STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL STATUTES TO ALLOW FOR A FOURTH INDIGENOUS CHAMBER.

The members of the Forest Stewardship Council resolve to amend the Statutes as follows, to incorporate provisions for the establishment of a fourth Chamber to be known as the Indigenous Chamber; Amend Title TWO, ELEVENTH Article, 3rd paragraph.

From the Feasibility Assessment

A legal and statutory review is required to ensure that proposed changes—such as those affecting the composition of the Board of Directors—are permissible within the current framework.

Members' key discussion points

Key Arguments in Favor

- Recognition as rights-holders: Indigenous Peoples should be acknowledged not merely as stakeholders but as holders of inherent rights.
- Proven model in FSC Canada: The motion draws on Canada's successful experience, where an Indigenous Chamber has functioned effectively without disrupting other chambers.
- Indigenous contributions: Emphasis that Indigenous Peoples are not "problems" to manage but contributors with valuable knowledge and solutions.
- Grounded in international law: Based on the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).
- Urgency: Motivated by recent rights violations (e.g., in Peru), highlighting the need for governance structure change.

Concerns and Objections

- Dilution of existing chambers: creating a fourth chamber would weaken the Social Chamber, which already has fewer members, as most Indigenous populations are currently within it.
- Precedent for fragmentation: Could lead to other interest groups (e.g., smallholders) requesting their own chambers.
- Resource and feasibility challenges: Legal, logistical, and financial implications.
- Overlap with existing structures: Risk of duplication with the Permanent Indigenous Peoples Committee (PIPC) and FSC Indigenous Foundation.
- Siloing risk: Fear that separating Indigenous Peoples into a new chamber might reduce their influence across the other chambers.
- Lack of clear definitions: Uncertainty around who qualifies as Indigenous and how Indigenous enterprises would be classified.

Proposed Alternatives or Additions

- Strengthening national-level Indigenous chambers, especially in the Global South.
- Increasing the voting weight of Indigenous members within existing chambers.
- Creating an inter-chamber working group to ensure cross-cutting Indigenous participation without a structural split.

KEYWORDS: Indigenous Peoples, Governance

Keywords

Motions Summaries



**General
Assembly
2025 Panama**



Motion 01/2025

Adjusting voting percentages associated with individual and organization members in FSC System

Statutory motion to make ONE CHANGE TO TITLE THREE, SECTION NINETEENTH, 3rd PARAGRAPH OF THE FSC STATUTES.

The purpose of the motion is to amend the FSC Statutes to adjust the voting percentages associated with individual and organizational members.



From the Feasibility Assessment

It was recognised that any changes would have practical implications, especially in the calculation of quorum and participation of members.

Members' key discussion points

Key Arguments in Favor

- The current 90/10 voting power distribution (organizational/individual) is deemed excessive and outdated, not reflecting the current realities of the FSC membership.
- The motion seeks a more balanced voting system of 60% for organizations and 40% for individual members, aiming to strengthen individual member influence while maintaining majority organizational power.
- Supporters view this as a step towards democratizing FSC and correcting power imbalances where a single organization may dominate a chamber's vote.
- Recognized as a long-expected and fair adjustment, especially considering the contributions of individual members who often work voluntarily.

Concerns and Objections

- Some argue the proposed percentages appear arbitrary and lack a clear rationale or evidence base.
- Concerns exist that reducing organizational power might disincentivize participation and financial contributions from organizations.
- There may be complications in reaching a quorum; giving more power to individuals requires greater participation from the membership to achieve it.
- It was clarified that the cap on affiliate memberships (limiting the number of organizational members for programmatically affiliated organizations to 10) is not binding if the motion is passed unless the high-level text is amended

Proposed Alternatives or Additions

- The Secretariat emphasized that the feasibility analysis is available and encourages reviewing it for details.
- It acknowledged that any change would have practical implications, especially related to quorum calculation and member engagement.
- The Secretariat does not take a position on whether 40/60 is "correct" but notes that the consequences (e.g., engagement requirements) need careful consideration.

KEYWORDS: Balanced representation, Participation, Governance



Motion 02/2025

Adopting Brazilian Portuguese as an official FSC language

***Statutory motion** to amend FSC Statutes to include Brazilian Portuguese as a fourth official language, alongside English, Spanish, and French.*



From the Feasibility Assessment

While legal registration of the change is straightforward, the implementation requires major adjustments to translation systems, websites, and staff operations, including hiring Portuguese-speaking staff and revising all communications.



General
Assembly
2025 Panama

Members' key discussion points

Key Arguments in Favor

- Inclusion of a major FSC engagement improvement: The motion is designed to improve access and participation for Portuguese speaking communities, especially in Brazil and the Amazon, a vital region for FSC's work.
- Barrier Reduction: Many Brazilian stakeholders are unable to engage meaningfully in FSC processes due to lack of translation.
- Chamber Balance Improvement: Increased participation from Social and Environmental chambers is expected, potentially addressing existing imbalances in representation.
- Precedent from French Inclusion: Supporters cited the successful adoption of French, which boosted participation across Francophone Africa, arguing Portuguese should receive the same treatment.

Concerns and Objections

- Terminology - "Brazilian Portuguese": The Secretariat and members argued the correct term should be "Portuguese", as used officially in Brazil's constitution and to avoid creating dialect-specific precedents. Other official languages (English, French, Spanish) are not country-specific.
- Precedent for Other Requests: Members raised concerns that this could open the door to future proposals for Mexican Spanish, European Portuguese, etc., escalating complexity.
- Cost Implications: Translating and interpreting across four languages increases costs exponentially (from 3 to 12 translation paths). Includes costs for staffing, platform development, and quality control.

Proposed Alternatives or Additions

- Use "Portuguese" instead of "Brazilian Portuguese":
- Leverage AI Translation with human review.
- Arguments were made that national initiatives, such as FSC Brazil, should continue managing translations, reserving official status for truly global needs.
- Clarify criteria for Official Languages: define clear thresholds or indicators for a language to qualify as official (e.g., number of members, regional impact, etc.).

KEYWORDS: Membership, Engagement



Motion 03/2025

Criteria and bases for Protocol to assign new members to the FSC Social, Economic and Environmental Chambers

Statutory motion to amend the FSC STATUTES, TITLE THREE, CLAUSE TWENTY, FIRST... and SECOND PARAGRAPH

The purpose of the motion is to add eligibility criteria for the three chambers (Social, Economic, and Environmental) and to identify principles that contribute to structuring a clear and transparent protocol for assigning new members



From the Feasibility Assessment

Proposed changes should be reviewed to see if they are compatible with the legal requirement for non-profit organisations to be members of the social and environmental chamber.



General
Assembly
2025 Panama

Members' key discussion points

Key Arguments in Favor

- Clarifies and formalizes eligibility criteria and guiding principles for assigning new members to FSC chambers.
- Aims to bring greater transparency, consistency, and legitimacy to the member assignment process.
- Builds on a long-standing discussion, incorporating learnings from previous motions (14/2014, 62/69/2017, 35/2021).

Concerns and Objections

- Motion may have broader political, social, and economic implications beyond protocol definition.
- Criteria to differentiate nonprofit/for-profit status were seen as insufficient or unclear.
- Concerns about centralizing approval power in the Board and the lack of an appeal process.
- Motion omits relevant criteria, such as the “primary interest in forest” or the role of employee versus decision-maker in organizations
- It was questioned whether the criteria should be in the Statutes or in protocols or in policy documents

Proposed Alternatives or Additions

- Include eligibility and ethical criteria directly in policy or protocol documents rather than the Statutes.
- Reintroduce or strengthen internal regulations instead of placing full responsibility on statutory language.
- Allow members to self-identify their chamber, at least partially, based on values and mission.

KEYWORDS: Transparency, Eligibility, Membership



Motion 04/2025

Policy for Association (PfA) Adherence

Statutory motion: PURPOSE: THIS MOTION PROPOSES AMENDING CLAUSE TWELVE OF THE STATUTES OF FSC TO REQUIRE MEMBERS —*both current and new*— TO EXPLICITLY ACCEPT THE POLICY FOR ASSOCIATION (PFA) APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS THROUGH A SELF-DECLARATION.



From the Feasibility Assessment

The Secretariat sees the motion as a necessary step to strengthen FSC's governance and ethical framework. Incorporating PfA adherence into the Statutes would promote alignment across membership levels. However, successful implementation will depend on clear enforcement and communication to avoid confusion or resistance to future PfA revisions.

Members' key discussion points

Key Arguments in Favor

- The motion is intended to strengthen FSC's ethical standards and reputation by making PfA acceptance a condition of membership.
- Enhances ethical integrity by making PfA acceptance a formal legal requirement.
- Improves alignment between FSC's practices and its Statutes, seeking to enhance consistency across governance levels, and reduce reputational risks linked to member behaviour.
- Aligns with previous Board decisions and promotes greater transparency and accountability within the membership.
- Clarifies member obligations, reinforcing reputational safeguards and transparency across the organization.
- Broad support across chambers, recognizing the importance of reinforcing FSC's accountability mechanisms.

Concerns and Objections

- Wording clarity: Suggestions to revise language (e.g., singular vs. plural "policy/policies") for legal precision and for clarity (e.g. the phrase "must adhere and comply with" might not make proper sense in English).
- Statutory placement: Debate over whether the new requirement should be in Clause 12 (membership entry) or Clause 13 (member responsibilities).
- Enforcement ambiguity: Some asked for clear mention of consequences for non-compliance, beyond existing expulsion clauses and include an investigation process.
- Applicability scope: Questions raised about certificate holders and Network Partners, whose obligations are governed differently (contractual vs. statutory).

Proposed Alternatives or Additions

- Include a standalone clause in the Statutes addressing PfA adherence comprehensively for all FSC actors.
- Clarify that changes to the PfA should happen "in consultation with membership", based on past revision experiences.
- Consider formalizing the consequences of non-adherence directly in the amendment language.
- Examine placement of the requirement under Clause 13 for clarity on ongoing obligations.
- Include adherence to the Policy for Association not only in the Statutes, but also in the Network Policy, to ensure consistency across all levels of governance and alignment among members and associated entities.

KEYWORDS: Governance, Ethical Framework, PfA



Motion 05/2025

Statutory Motion to Establish a Fourth Indigenous Chamber

STATUTORY MOTION TO AMEND THE FOREST STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL STATUTES TO ALLOW FOR A FOURTH INDIGENOUS CHAMBER.

The members of the Forest Stewardship Council resolve to amend the Statutes as follows, to incorporate provisions for the establishment of a fourth Chamber to be known as the Indigenous Chamber; Amend Title TWO, ELEVENTH Article, 3rd paragraph.



From the Feasibility Assessment

A legal and statutory review is required to ensure that proposed changes—such as those affecting the composition of the Board of Directors—are permissible within the current framework.

Members' key discussion points

Key Arguments in Favor

- Recognition as rights-holders: Indigenous Peoples should be acknowledged not merely as stakeholders but as holders of inherent rights.
- Proven model in FSC Canada: The motion draws on Canada's successful experience, where an Indigenous Chamber has functioned effectively without disrupting other chambers.
- Indigenous contributions: Emphasis that Indigenous Peoples are not “problems” to manage but contributors with valuable knowledge and solutions.
- Grounded in international law: Based on the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).
- Urgency: Motivated by recent rights violations (e.g., in Peru), highlighting the need for governance structure change.

Concerns and Objections

- Dilution of existing chambers: creating a fourth chamber would weaken the Social Chamber, which already has fewer members, as most Indigenous populations are currently within it.
- Precedent for fragmentation: Could lead to other interest groups (e.g., smallholders) requesting their own chambers.
- Resource and feasibility challenges: Legal, logistical, and financial implications.
- Overlap with existing structures: Risk of duplication with the Permanent Indigenous Peoples Committee (PIPC) and FSC Indigenous Foundation.
- Siloing risk: Fear that separating Indigenous Peoples into a new chamber might reduce their influence across the other chambers.
- Lack of clear definitions: Uncertainty around who qualifies as Indigenous and how Indigenous enterprises would be classified.

Proposed Alternatives or Additions

- Strengthening national-level Indigenous chambers, especially in the Global South.
- Increasing the voting weight of Indigenous members within existing chambers.
- Creating an inter-chamber working group to ensure cross-cutting Indigenous participation without a structural split.

KEYWORDS: Indigenous Peoples, Governance



Motion 06/2025

Statutory Motion to Strengthen our Code of Conduct applicable to Members and others

Statutory motion to amend THE FSC STATUTES TO FORMALLY RECOGNISE THE EXISTENCE OF OUR FSC CODE OF CONDUCT APPLICABLE TO MEMBERS AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS AND THE IMPORTANCE OF PROPERLY IMPLEMENTING AND ENFORCING IT.

The proposal is to amend the last paragraph of Clause Twelfth, to add a new section in Clause Thirteenth and amend its last paragraph, and to amend the first paragraph of Clause Eighteenth of the Statutes



From the Feasibility Assessment

The Secretariat supports the motion's intent but notes the need for strong internal communication and awareness campaigns. Acceptance of the Statutes implies acceptance of the Code; individual signatures would not be required from existing members and new members would accept them as part of the registration process



General
Assembly
2025 Panama

Members' key discussion points

Key Arguments in Favor

- Formal incorporation of the FSC Code of Conduct into the Statutes enhances legal strength and accountability.
- Enables the Board to act more decisively on misconduct, with a clearer mandate.
- Builds on an already adopted code (2019) to ensure all members are bound by ethical principles.
- Promotes FSC's reputation and reinforces good governance.

Concerns and Objections

- Lack of clarity on procedural safeguards such as due process and appeal rights.
- The name "Code of Conduct" may not reflect the depth of ethical expectations; "Code of Ethics" was proposed.
- Concern that referring to 'updated versions' within the Statutes creates legal ambiguity.
- Risk of overloading the Statutes with implementation details better suited for policy documents.

Proposed Alternatives or Additions

- Clarify and reinforce due process mechanisms in the Code itself.
- Consider renaming the Code to better reflect its purpose.
- Move implementation specifics to policy-level documents to avoid Statute overload.

KEYWORDS: Accountability, Ethics



Motion 07/2025



Updating Terminology to Align FSC Statutes and Network Policy

Statutory motion to amend THE STATUTES OF FSC TO ALIGN THE TERMINOLOGY IN THE STATUTES AND THE FSC NETWORK POLICY APPROVED BY THE FSC BOARD DIRECTOR IN 2021.

The intention is to provide more clarity and to be consistent with frequently used vocabulary and documents. Including terms such as ‘network partners’, ‘national representatives’ and ‘FSC Coordinator’.



From the Feasibility Assessment

Motion is consistent with existing policy and provides operational clarity, reflecting the language currently in use.

Statutory changes require formal approval by the membership, even if they are terminological.

Members’ key discussion points

Key Arguments in Favor

- Enhances clarity and consistency in documents and daily operations.
- Recognizes evolved governance models and vocabulary used over recent years.
- Considered a simple correction by many members and aligned with good governance

Concerns and Objections

- Some members believe the motion involves deeper governance issues, not just terminology.
- Concerns about the impact on representation, especially from the Global South.
- Doubts about the need for statutory changes for what is viewed as administrative.
- Questions about clarity, legal consistency across languages, and member understanding.
- Concern over rigid statutory processes for future minor updates

Proposed Alternatives or Additions

- Consider addressing terminology updates through Board decisions instead of Statute changes.
- Clarify definitions further before final approval to avoid misinterpretation.
- Propose a future motion that allows the Board to manage minor updates more flexibly.

KEYWORDS: Terminology



Motion 08/2025

Statutory Motion to Formalise the Holding of Virtual and Hybrid General Assemblies of Members

Statutory motion: THIS MOTION PROPOSES AN AMENDMENT TO THE STATUTES OF FSC TO FORMALLY INCLUDE THE POSSIBILITY OF HOLDING VIRTUAL OR HYBRID (COMBINATION OF IN-PERSON AND ONLINE ATTENDEES) GENERAL ASSEMBLIES. The current Statutes only provide for in-person gatherings. Therefore, the proposal is to change the first paragraph of Article Eighteenth of the Statutes...

The goal is to align FSC's legal framework with Mexican law—under which FSC is registered and to modernize FSC governance, ensuring legal validity of virtual/hybrid meetings and enhancing member participation and accessibility.



From the Feasibility Assessment

The Secretariat confirmed that Mexican legislation requires provisions for holding virtual and hybrid General Assemblies to be stated in the Statutes for such assemblies to be legally valid. The motion formalizes practices already used (e.g., 2021/2022) and is seen as a necessary legal step.

Members' key discussion points

Key Arguments in Favor

- The change in the Statutes is explicitly required by Mexican law for virtual/hybrid assemblies to be recognized.
- The motion reflects FSC's commitment to modern governance by embracing digital tools.
- The success of the virtual General Assembly (GA) in 2021 and linked hybrid GA 2022 (Bali) proved that virtual engagement can work and should be formally enabled within the organization's legal structure.
- Hybrid and virtual formats would enable broader participation, especially from members in remote, under-resourced, or marginalized regions, who may not be able to attend in person due to cost or logistics.
- This is not an entirely new concept—FSC has already conducted assemblies using these formats. The motion aims to formalize what is already working, ensuring legitimacy and continuity going forward.

Concerns and Objections

- Connectivity Issues: There are concerns about members in regions with poor internet access, especially in the Global South.
- Unequal Participation: There were worries that virtual attendees may face reduced influence, particularly when it comes to informal interactions, lobbying, or networking—often central to consensus-building during in-person events.
- Hybrid Format Dynamics: Some members questioned whether a hybrid format would alter the tone or quality of debate, diminishing the interpersonal richness of fully in-person gatherings.
- Potential Reduction in Travel Support: Concern that in-person subsidies may be reduced, though the Secretariat assured otherwise.

Proposed Alternatives or Additions

- Prioritize in-person format: One participant proposed adding language to prioritize in-person assemblies while allowing virtual/hybrid as needed.
- Clarify Rules of Procedure: Several asked how procedures for hybrid meetings will be established. The Secretariat confirmed these are already being developed, translated, and will be voted on electronically.
- Maintain Regional Meetings: Suggested to retain or expand regional in-person events to complement virtual access.
- Proxy Voting Improvements: Mentioned improvements in proxy processes to increase transparency.

KEYWORDS: Governance, General Assembly



Motion 09/2025

Implement Solution Forums as a result of M9 to reduce number and increase the quality of motions

Statutory motion AMEND THE FSC STATUTES to add A NEW TWENTY-FOURTH STATUTE AND A SUB-CLAUSE TO THE TWENTY-NINTH STATUTE (WHICH WOULD BECOME THE THIRTIETH).

The intention is to create one ‘Solution Forum’ per chamber, conceived as a ‘formal space’ to engage members on ‘key strategic issues of the organization’. Topics will be selected by each chamber and members from all Chambers will then be invited to participate.



From the Feasibility Assessment

Challenges linked to the fact that the forums could ‘add complexity to the structure and governance’ of the FSC, ‘impose greater demands on members’ and entail ‘significant costs’ for the organisation

Members’ key discussion points

Key Arguments in Favor

- Seeks to formalize Solution Forums as a response to Motion 9/2022, aiming to reduce the number and improve the quality of motions.
- Encourages co-creation and strong member participation around key strategic topics identified by each Chamber.
- Provides a structured, formalized space for engagement that extends beyond the General Assembly.
- Aligns with advice from the Board and Secretariat to institutionalize agile, inclusive governance.

Concerns and Objections

- Some members questioned the necessity of including Solutions Forums in the Statutes instead of implementing them through Board decisions.
- Concerns about overlap with existing initiatives like regional meetings.
- Questions about time and resource demands on members.
- High-cost implications for implementation.
- Unclear differentiation between Solution Forums and other consultation formats.

Proposed Alternatives or Additions

- Consider implementing Solutions Forums through Board mandates or protocols without requiring statutory changes.
- Integrate or redesign existing regional meetings to fulfill the same purpose.
- Explore online and AI-driven formats to reduce costs and increase accessibility.

KEYWORDS: Participation, Strategy, Member Engagement



Motion 10/2025



Protecting the life of Indigenous Peoples in Voluntary Isolation

Statutory motion proposing changes to CRITERION 3.1 of the FSC Principles and Criteria - FSC-STD-01-001 V5.3 TO SAFEGUARD THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES IN VOLUNTARY ISOLATION

The proposed changes include: (1) FSC will not allow certification of operations in areas where Indigenous Peoples in voluntary isolation live; (2) Precautionary principle must be applied; [3] Redefinition of Management Unit boundaries where necessary; (4) Avoid any attempt to engage *with these groups*, (5) Respect the right free determination and the right to live in voluntary isolation.



From the Feasibility Assessment

The changes are feasible and align with FSC's Global Strategy and ethical principles. Implementation could imply reduction of certified areas and new obligations for organizations.

Members' key discussion points

Key Arguments in Favor

- Strong support for the intent of the motion and the need to protect Indigenous Peoples in voluntary isolation and their rights.
- Necessary to address a gap in the FSC system.
- Reflects international human rights instruments such as the UN Declaration and ILO Convention 169.
- Seen as urgent and essential for FSC's credibility and alignment with its social mission.
- Reinforces Indigenous rights, cultural preservation, and autonomy.

Concerns and Objections

- Defining boundaries of management units may be difficult due to Indigenous mobility.
- Need for a clear, consistent definition of "voluntary isolation."
- Potential reduction in certified areas and associated costs.
- Uncertainty over whether ecosystem services could be certified in such areas.

Proposed Alternatives or Additions

- Analyse internationally recognised definitions and update the glossary.
- Immediate guidance is needed for the development of IGIs in the P&C review process, possibly by a small group and if possible before the GA.
- Clarify rules for ecosystem service certification in areas with voluntary isolation.
- Consider additional policy tools to support implementation beyond the P&C change.

KEYWORDS: Rights, Indigenous Peoples



Motion 14/2025

Developing the Network in the Global South through encouraging and enabling membership engagement for establishment of new FSC National Offices

Policy motion: TO REINVIGORATE THE NETWORK IN THE GLOBAL SOUTH, FSC SHALL ENCOURAGE THE SETTING UP OF NEW, LEGALLY ESTABLISHED INDEPENDENT NETWORK PARTNERS (National Offices) IN COUNTRIES DESIGNATED AS SOUTH, through active engagement with Members and... *support to mobilize the resources needed. Initiatives shall come from local membership, focusing on countries with significant forest cover, market potential, or both. Other supporting factors include prospects for forest sector growth, climate change mitigation, protection of ecosystems and indigenous livelihoods. Effective Global South participation is "critical" to fulfilling FSC's mission.*



From the Feasibility Assessment

The Secretariat supports the focus on strong, member-led Network Partners in the Global South as vital to FSC's mission. It highlighted ongoing work, such as a readiness tool and new Regional Membership Managers. However, unclear scope and timing in the motion make estimating resources challenging.



General
Assembly
2025 Panama

Members' key discussion points

Key Arguments in Favor

- The motion addresses a historical underrepresentation of the Global South in FSC governance and operations.
- It emphasizes the need for locally driven offices rather than centralized structures from Bonn.
- Offices in the South can help engage governments, attract funding, and develop projects in areas like climate and ecosystem services, aligning with FSC's strategic goals.
- Supporters pointed to the closure of offices in Cameroon and Colombia as regressions. There's a call to treat Network Partners as investments, not expenses.
- More than market size: Advocates argued that criteria should go beyond forest size or market value to include biodiversity, indigenous rights, and member potential, mentioning countries like Guatemala or biodiverse countries as example.
- Strong National Offices can influence national policy and ensure FSC is responsive to local priorities. This is particularly important in regions where certification is growing or critical.

Concerns and Objections

- Some participants felt the motion should be framed more globally; there are needs for network support in the North too.
- Concern about FSC's capacity to support many new offices. There is a need to balance between national and regional support, and avoid overwhelming the system.
- Several members requested a clear strategy, prioritization criteria, and implementation plan—without which, the motion might be too vague to execute effectively.
- Some questioned whether Regional Offices might be more effective than proliferating National Offices, especially in homogeneous areas.

Proposed Alternatives or Additions

- Widen the motion's scope to consider network development across both North and South, with tailored approaches for each.
- Regional strategy first: Strengthen Regional offices and Strategies as a precursor or complement to establishing new National Offices.
- Office creation should be driven by member interest and local context, not imposed based on fixed criteria like forest area or market size.

KEYWORDS: Governance, Network Partners, Global South



Motion 22/2025



Include Solutions for Biodiversity and Circularity as FSC Strategic Priorities (2027–2032)

Policy motion: TO INCORPORATE BIODIVERSITY AND CIRCULARITY INTO FSC'S STRATEGIC PRIORITIES TO ACHIEVE ITS MISSION OF ENSURING HEALTHY AND RESILIENT FORESTS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS.

It proposes actionable, science-based solutions to help meet new regulatory and market demands. It calls to expand initiatives like ~~such as~~ the Restoration Toolbox and ~~the use of~~ technologies to improve data collection and operational efficiency. It recognises ~~that~~ biodiversity and circularity are top priorities for regulators, investors and stakeholders, and calls for intensified efforts ~~action~~, the development of practical, measurable tools and frameworks, and continued ~~interdisciplinary~~ cross-learning spaces that drive collaboration and innovation across the FSC Network.



From the Feasibility Assessment

Feasible, as FSC considers biodiversity and circularity in its future strategy. Lack of concrete definitions increases complexity and resource demands. Could delay the development of the Climate and Biodiversity Framework. Implementation would cover the entire strategic cycle 2027-2032. High costs.

Members' key discussion points

Key Arguments in Favor

- The motion strengthens FSC's global leadership in forest sustainability by making biodiversity and circularity strategic priorities.
- It supports regulatory compliance and anticipates market demands through measurable tools and frameworks.
- Stakeholders see it as a way to link local implementation with global frameworks (e.g., TNFD (Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures), ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance), GRI (Global Reporting Initiative)).
- Emphasizes regenerative ecosystems, climate resilience, and livelihood support.

Concerns and Objections

- Lack of specificity: the motion is seen as too general, with unclear definitions and goals.
- Potential overlap or conflict with other FSC processes (new strategy, P&C revision, other motions).
- High estimated costs (annual >€500,000) without detailed implementation plans.
- Some believe circularity may not be FSC's core competency.

Proposed Alternatives or Additions

- Combine this motion with related ones (e.g., Motion 32 on streamlining the framework, Motion 43 on HCV).
- Consider external collaborations for circularity initiatives.
- Clarify responsibilities, timelines, and systems for monitoring outcomes.
- Include member inputs and align with ongoing FSC frameworks

KEYWORDS: Biodiversity, Circularity



Motion 26/2025



Improving Auditor Competence and Audit Quality in FSC Certification

Policy motion: TO STRENGTHEN THE INTEGRITY OF THE FSC SYSTEM, FSC SHALL TAKE MEASURES TO IMPROVE THE COMPETENCE AND QUALIFICATION OF AUDITORS INVOLVED IN FOREST MANAGEMENT (FM) CERTIFICATION.

This includes:

1. Clarify and strengthen the skills and experience requirements...
2. Facilitating and designing structured FM auditor training programs...
3. Reinforcing oversight mechanisms through the ASI.
4. Assessing *Evaluating* cost-effective solutions to improve audit quality without creating excessive financial burdens for certificate holders.
5. Examining the governance relationship between FSC and ASI.



From the Feasibility Assessment

Valid objective, but implementation is complex and ill-defined. Can be partially addressed by Motion 31/2020. Increased requirements could discourage new auditors and aggravate the current shortage. The Secretariat has already updated competency and training standards, and ASI monitors through a register and code of conduct.

Members' key discussion points

Key Arguments in Favor

- The motion addresses growing concerns about the competence and consistency of FSC auditors, especially in tropical regions.
- It calls for clearer standards, more targeted training, and better oversight, which could lead to improved credibility and trust in FSC certifications.
- Emphasizes the importance of local expertise and alignment with FSC's values, avoiding mechanistic audits disconnected from real contexts.
- Received broad support from members who recognized the systemic relevance.

Concerns and Objections

- The motion is seen as too broad and unspecific in defining 'improvement' and lacks concrete implementation plans.
- Risk of reducing the pool of auditors by increasing requirements without sufficient incentives.
- Potential overlap with existing initiatives (e.g., Motion 31/2020, revised training procedures).
- Questions about how skills would be measured, especially if scope is expanded to Chain of Custody (CoC) and Controlled Wood (CW).

Proposed Alternatives or Additions

- Expand scope to include CoC and CW audits.
- Integrate with Motions 32 and 43 into a streamlined normative framework.
- Clarify objectives, metrics for measuring improvement, and existing Secretariat efforts.
- Introduce incentives and support systems to attract and retain qualified auditors, especially with local and social expertise.

KEYWORDS: Auditor competence, Oversight



Motion 32/2025

FSC Streamlining Simplification of the Normative Framework

Policy Motion: FSC SHALL LAUNCH A TIME BOUND PROCESS TO REVIEW, STREAMLINE, AND SIMPLIFY THE OVERALL FSC NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK, TO ENSURE IT IS FIT FOR PURPOSE, EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT. This should include the policies and procedures that govern the normative framework (development and revision of FSC requirements, standards development, incorporating a risk-based approach...), and ensuring that the roles of various entities within FSC that have responsibilities for overseeing and implementing the normative framework are aligned.



From the Feasibility Assessment

The motion as aligned with FSC's Global Strategy, especially the goal of streamlining policies and shifting toward outcome-oriented standards. The Secretariat emphasized that several strategic initiatives—like risk-based approaches and a digital interface for easier access—are already underway but noted that these require time to fully take effect. Lastly, the motion's broad scope leaves room for interpretation in defining an effective streamlining process.

Members' key discussion points

Key Arguments in Favor

- Widespread perception of complexity: Members across chambers view the current system as bureaucratic, confusing, and difficult to navigate.
- Need for accessibility and efficiency: Simplification could lower entry barriers and improve clarity for certificate holders, auditors, and stakeholders.
- Strategic alignment: The motion supports FSC's global strategy, particularly Goal 1.2, focusing on outcome-oriented policies and standards.
- Reinforcement of ongoing work: Many see this as a needed push to accelerate and scale existing streamlining efforts.
- Support for an external review: Several members proposed involving an independent party to assess the normative framework impartially.

Concerns and Objections

- Lack of specificity: Critics argue the motion is too broad, lacking concrete steps, responsible actors, and measurable goals.
- Risk of oversimplification: Some worry simplification could compromise rigor or quality if not carefully managed.
- Overlap with existing work: Secretariat staff and some members noted that ongoing internal initiatives already target streamlining.
- Unclear scope: Debate exists over whether the motion should cover governance structures or just normative standards and certification processes.

Proposed Alternatives or additions

- Combine the motion with initiatives on biodiversity, circularity, and HCVs to strengthen systemic relevance.
- Involve certificate holders through surveys to identify specific burdens and procedural pain points.
- Clarify the scope to avoid redundancy with ongoing revisions (e.g., P&C and IGIs).
- Provide members with updates on current streamlining work to inform their decisions.

KEYWORDS: Simplification, Normative Framework



Motion 43/2025



General
Assembly
2025 Panama

Strengthening Identification, Protection and Monitoring of Forest HCVs

Policy Motion: FSC shall systematically review and strengthen protection of HCVs, improve monitoring, and decrease variability in the requirements on HCVs through the National FM standards, the International Generic Indicators (IGIs), and, depending on the scale of the forest management operation, make HCV maps and analysis mandatory part of the public summary Management Plans. HCV assessments, authors, local experts and reviewers, and revisions over time shall be made public, except when making information on a particular HCV would endanger it (e.g., location of antiquities, etc.)...



From the Feasibility Assessment

The Secretariat sees the motion as strategically aligned with efforts to strengthen HCV protection but stresses the need to clearly define “sufficient improvement” to guide implementation. It advises coordinating this work with ongoing revisions to avoid duplication and ensure efficient use of resources.

Members’ key discussion points

Key Arguments in Favor

- Strategic alignment: Supports FSC’s 2025 and 2050 Global Strategy vision to prioritize areas of High Conservation Value.
- Improved consistency: Reduces variability across national standards and enhances reliability of HCV identification and monitoring.
- Greater transparency: Promotes public access to HCV maps and processes, increasing stakeholder trust and accountability.
- Support for smallholders: Proposes incentives, enabling environments, and landscape-level approaches to reduce the burden on smallholders.

Concerns and Objections

- Ambiguity on social HCVs (5 & 6): Concerns over lack of clarity, different auditing requirements, and potential risks of publishing sensitive data without Indigenous consent.
- Cost & implementation: High costs and technical barriers, especially for smallholders and Indigenous Peoples, may require additional FSC support.
- Data privacy: Sharing HCV maps could endanger sensitive ecological, Indigenous or cultural sites; FPIC must be applied and the consideration of data protection needs is essential.
- Should/are the social HCVs 5 & 6 be included in this motion? The motion wording implies they may not be.
- Overlap with ongoing work: Motion may duplicate or overload current efforts like IGI/P&C revisions or IFL initiatives.
- Broad Scope: Some called for more precise language or clearer expectations on how much change is “enough.”

Proposed Alternatives or additions

- Title Update: Remove the word "Forest" to include all HCVs in forest management units (e.g., wetlands, peatlands).
- Citizen science: Use citizen science to support real-time monitoring and data collection.
- Common tools for smallholders: Propose shared resources or templates (like CNRAS for Controlled Wood) to align HCV practices.
- National-level empowerment: Strengthen National Offices’ roles in supporting local adaptation, audits, and smallholder engagement.
- Clarify motion scope: Further reflect on define inclusion of HCVs 5 & 6 or not and potentially highlight how they differ from HCVs 1–4 to avoid implementation conflicts.

KEYWORDS: HCVs Protection, Monitoring



Motion 47/2025

Promote FSC certification and ecosystem services verification as relevant climate change investment tools by widening the landscape approach to encompass diverse woodland ecosystems.

Policy motion: THE MOTION REQUESTS FSC TO IMPLEMENT THE GLOBAL STRATEGY OBJECTIVE: “GROW OUR REACH” BY ENCOMPASSING DIVERSE WOODLANDS, *aligning with Strategy Goal 1.4 and the Climate, Biodiversity and Restoration (CBR) Strategic Framework. It requests five specific actions and reflects climate action priorities across all chambers, delivering environmental, social, and economic outcomes such as habitat protection, GHG sequestration, and improved wellbeing for indigenous peoples. Although these woodlands fall under FSC-STD-01-001, they remain marginalized. FSC is missing market opportunities, and a clear, effective policy is needed for areas like wetlands, dry forests, mangroves, and savannas.*



From the Feasibility Assessment

The Secretariat strongly supports the motion as “clear and results-oriented,” noting its alignment with FSC’s Global Strategy and related initiatives like the CBR Framework, P&C revision, and IGIs. However, it warned that without clear and scaled implementation, the ecosystems it focuses on may remain niche within FSC.



General
Assembly
2025 Panama

Members’ key discussion points

Key Arguments in Favor

- Urgency of climate action: Members emphasized the need for FSC to strengthen its response to climate change and biodiversity loss through a more proactive and relevant role.
- Inclusivity and adaptability: The motion promotes expanding FSC certification to a wider range of woodland types, increasing ecological relevance and accessibility.
- Market relevance: It offers FSC a way to regain market momentum by tapping into underrepresented landscapes and ecosystem services.
- Environmental and social benefits: Seen as a chance to deliver real benefits, particularly for communities managing non-traditional forest areas.

Concerns and Objections

- Lack of clarity in definitions: Terms like “diverse woodland types” and “landscapes” were seen as vague, raising concerns about scope and consistency..
- System readiness and complexity: Members questioned whether the FSC system is prepared to support this expansion without overcomplicating certification pathways.
- Burden on smallholders: Tying ecosystem services verification to full forest management (FM) certification could make participation too costly or complex for smallholders.
- Risk of diluting standards: Some feared that expanding too broadly could weaken FSC’s credibility or deviate from its core forest-focused mission.
- Need for targeted implementation: Without a focused, phased approach, the motion’s broad ambition could overwhelm FSC’s capacity and lead to limited real-world impact.

Proposed Alternatives or Additions

- Decouple ecosystem services from FM certification: Several members proposed allowing ecosystem services verification independently from full forest management certification to lower barriers for smallholders.
- Use simpler or regionally appropriate terminology: Suggested replacing or clarifying terms like “diverse woodland types” with language aligned to local or FAO definitions.
- Develop scalable or tiered certification models: Proposed creating flexible certification pathways tailored to smallholders and non-traditional forest landscapes.
- Clarify scope and prioritize focus: Recommended narrowing the scope or phasing implementation to focus on high-impact areas and avoid overextending system capacity.
- Align with ongoing frameworks and IGIs: Encouraged integrating this motion with FSC’s existing workstreams (e.g., the Climate and Biodiversity Framework, IGIs) to ensure coherence and efficient rollout.

KEYWORDS: Climate, Biodiversity, Restoration, CBR