



Report of the 2011 General Assembly Motions Committee

10 June 2011

This is a corrected version of the document circulated on May 20, 2011. Please consider this document as including the accepted motions for the 2011 FSC General Assembly and replace the earlier circulated document and any excerpts accordingly. The following amendments have been made:

- a. Motion 1, motion text, section SEVENTEENTH, paragraph g:
"~~person other member~~" to read "person other member";
- b. Motion 28, Secunder 2, name and e-mail address:
"Alessandro Leonardi" to read "Javier Fernandez Candela";
"alessandro.leonardi@copade.org" to read "javierfernandez@copade.org"
- c. Motion 36, motion text, last sentence:
"fulfill implement" to read "fulfill and implement";
- d. Motion 37, Secunder 1, e-mail address:
"Joerg.Krueger@NABU.de" to read "uwe@sayer-online.de";
- e. Motion 42, Proposed by, organization:
"- (individual member) member" to read "- (individual member)".

- 1) **69** motions were originally submitted to the GA Motions Committee. All motions were reviewed to ensure that they were proposed and seconded by FSC members in good standing. Proposers and persons seconding the motions were contacted where problems were identified and time was allowed to correct any problems such as late payment of membership fees or to find additional seconders.
- 2) When there was an overlap identified between different motions, the submitters were advised to assess the possibility of merging their motions. **6** motions were withdrawn as a result of this process.
- 3) Another **4** motions were withdrawn because submitters did not find it necessary to uphold their motions.
- 4) Several motions originally did not comply with formal requirements. In most cases it was possible to resolve this through communication with the motion movers and seconders. However, in **3** cases the motion movers did not react to any communication from FSC. **1** other motion mover was not coming up with the requested seconders.
- 5) **1** original placeholder motion was split into **2** separate motions with agreement by the FSC Board of Directors.



- 6) **56** motions are therefore presented to the General Assembly (see Annex 1). **3** are Statutory Motions (Part 1) and **53** have been classified as Policy Motions (Part 2).¹ **3** motions imply changes to the Principles & Criteria (see Annex 1, Section 2.6) and **6** motions relate to the implementation of the Principles & Criteria (Section 2.7).
- 7) Motions have been grouped together according to general subject areas. The order of motions within these areas does not reflect any prioritization. The motions have been numbered to help people refer accurately and easily to specific motions.
- 8) Comments have been included for motions relating to or replicating motions that had been passed at previous General Assemblies.
- 9) All motions have been translated and are available in English and Spanish.
- 10) The General Assembly (GA) Motions Committee was selected by the FSC Board and comprised the following members:
Ana Young, Economic South, FSC Board Member
Chris van de Goot, Social North, FSC Board Member
Margareta Renström, Environmental North, FSC Board Member
Hans-Joachim Droste, Policy Director, FSC International Center
- 11) The Terms of Reference of the Motions Committee are attached as Annex 2.
- 12) A representative of the Motions Committee will present this report to the 2011 General Assembly.
- 13) A general introduction into the subject of General Assembly motions is included as Annex 3.

¹ See "Annex 3: Introduction to General Assembly Motions" for the difference between Statutory and Policy Motions.

– Contents –

Annex 1: Compilation of Motions for the 2011 General Assembly	5
1 Statutory Motions.....	5
1.1 <i>Changes to the FSC Statutes</i>	5
1) Motion to improve and update the FSC Statutes	5
1.2 <i>Changes to the FSC By-Laws.....</i>	9
2) Motion to improve and update governance in FSC.....	9
3) Statutory motion regarding the role of the Accredited Certification Bodies within the Economic Chamber	18
2 Policy Motions	20
2.1 <i>GA Motion implementation.....</i>	20
4) Motion to improve transparency and reliability of the General Assemblies outcomes	20
2.2 <i>FSC Governance</i>	21
5) Representativeness of Board Members	21
6) FSC membership application process streamlining	22
7) Improving Equity in FSC Membership.....	23
2.3 <i>FSC Network.....</i>	23
8) FSC Global Network Financing	23
2.4 <i>FSC Global Strategy</i>	24
9) Inclusion of forest workers in the FSC Global Strategy.....	24
2.5 <i>FSC Scope and competence development</i>	25
10) Due diligence for using FSC certification in combination with carbon-related claims and financing	25
11) Embedding Climate Change into FSC Core Business *).....	26
12) Certification of Protected Areas and Conservation Areas *)	27
13) Certification of Silviculture	29
14) Creation of FSC Urban Forestry Standards	31
15) The Need to have a Biotechnology Stewardship Group at FSC: Reviewing Research and Scientific Developments on Forestry Biotechnology	32
2.6 <i>Principles & Criteria: Evolution.....</i>	34
16) Recognition of forest carbon by the FSC Principles & Criteria	34
17) Acknowledging carbon storage as a Principle 9 High Conservation Value	34
18) Potential certification of post 1994 converted plantations	35
2.7 <i>Principles & Criteria: Implementation.....</i>	36
19) Establishment of P3 Committee to Review Indigenous Peoples' Involvement in FSC	36
20) Certification of large-scale forest operations.....	37
21) Clarifying FSC requirements for mitigating the impacts of intensive management	38
22) Biomass Sustainability	39
23) Derogation procedures and national initiatives	39
24) Insertion of Environmental Risk Assessment in FSC Pesticides Policy.....	40
2.8 <i>National Standards and Certification Bodies' Interim Standards</i>	41
25) Use of interim standards for forest management certification *)	41
26) Inquiry into impact of special standards applied to certification of any category of land (government, tribal, private, state, or other) on affected rural communities.....	43
2.9 <i>Support for smallholders and communities.....</i>	44
27) Motion to reduce unnecessary costs to SLIMF operations by the adoption of regional risk assessments.....	44
28) Incentives for obtaining and maintaining certification for communities and SLIMF forest operations.....	45



29) Motion to include a new eligibility criterion for Small and Low Intensity Managed Forests (SLIMF) FSC-POL-20-100	46
2.10 Stakeholder involvement.....	48
30) Motion to promote transparency.....	48
31) Improve the processes for stakeholder participation and consultation in the FSC's certification processes	49
2.11 Accreditation system	50
32) Addressing inconsistent interpretations in audits	50
33) Motion for ASI to standardize training of auditors	51
34) Focus on field performance in the FSC system	52
2.12 Policy development.....	53
35) Policy development revision *).....	53
36) Annual Policy Manual for the FSC System, for use by accredited certifiers, National Initiatives, ASI auditors, both candidate and certified operations, and stakeholders *)	54
2.13 Chain of Custody and Labelling	55
37) Motion on recycled material *)	55
38) Certified Reclaimed (PAPER) Material by FSC-STD-40-004.....	55
39) FSC Labeling – Recycled fiber exclusive to ‘Mix’ label	57
40) Recognizing Salvaged Urban Wood as Reclaimed	58
41) Development of an FSC Volume Tracking System.....	59
42) Species and origin as chain of custody requirement.....	60
43) Requirement for FSC-certification of name-giving Species in FSC-mix-products	61
44) Improving access for small enterprises to Chain of Custody certification through standards and support services *).....	62
45) Development of an FSC Standard for Multi-site Certification of Retail Chain of Custody Operations.....	64
46) Clarify intent of Credit System and revise as necessary.....	65
47) Increase of FSC-material within FSC-mix-processes	67
2.14 Controlled Wood	68
48) Motion to transform the Controlled Wood system	68
49) Controlled wood sunset provisions.....	69
50) Phase-out of Company-based Controlled Wood Risk Assessments.....	70
51) Strengthening the Controlled Wood System Through Issuance of FSC-Developed Risk Assessments	71
52) Efficient use of virgin fibres by turning the exemption for co-products from non-controlled/uncertified material permanent	72
2.15 Market development.....	73
53) Motion to promote FSC certified products and local markets through government procurement	73
54) Motion to Actively Promote Certified Wood Products Over Competing Products.....	74
55) Promotion of wood as building material of choice	75
56) Improving the Economic Viability of FM Certificate Holders	76
Annex 2: Terms of Reference for the 2011 Motions Committee	77
Annex 3: Introduction to General Assembly Motions	78

*) Indicates that a comment has been included for motions relating to or replicating motions that had been passed at previous General Assemblies.



Annex 1: Compilation of Motions for the 2011 General Assembly

Every effort has been made to ensure that the motions in this compilation are correct at the time of writing, in accordance with the intentions of proposers and seconders. If FSC members identify any mistakes they are requested to send an e-mail to ga2011@fsc.org explaining the concern identified.

1 Statutory Motions

1.1 Changes to the FSC Statutes

No. / Title: 1) Motion to improve and update the FSC Statutes		Category: Statutory
Proposed by: FSC Board of Directors Name: Organization: Chamber: E-mail:		
1) Seconded by: Name: Organization: Chamber: E-mail:	2) Seconded by: Name: Organization: Chamber: E-mail:	
MOTION: In order to improve and update the FSC Statutes, the FSC Board of Directors recommends that the General Assembly approves the following changes to this document. These changes are expected to increase the recognition of ecosystem services within FSC, strengthen and ensure the continuous multi-stakeholder balance in the FSC Board of Directors and simplify the Statutes and minimize its overlap with the FSC By-Laws.		
Changes to the Statutes: [New wording: insertions indicated as <u>underlined</u> , deletions as striketrough]		
TITLE ONE CORPORATE NAME, DOMICILE, DURATION AND PURPOSE		
FOURTH The purpose of the Association shall be: to promote an adequate management of forests, providing the assistance required to achieve an environmentally appropriate, <u>socially beneficial</u> and economically viable <u>use</u> exploitation of natural resources <u>and provision of ecosystem services</u> , avoiding deterioration or affectation of such resources, of the ecosystems, or of the surrounding communities. To promote a viable management of the forest resources and a forestry production that preserves the environment;		
TITLE TWO ASSOCIATES		
SEVENTH The individuals or legal entities willing to become Associates shall deliver a written application to the Board of Directors, in which they shall explain their reasons for supporting the Association, as well as their purposes, principles and criteria which must be consistent with those of the Association. Such application must be seconded by two Associates.		
Non-profit entities must include documentation to evidence their nature in accordance with the legal requirements applicable thereto in the country of origin of the respective entity. Should the applicant perform any kind of acts of commerce, additional documentation must be presented to describe their		



No. / Title: 1) Motion to improve and update the FSC Statutes	Category: Statutory
<p>commercial and forestry related activities, if any.</p> <p>Legal entities must attach to their applications the information which may periodically be determined by the Board of Directors, which may include, but not be limited to, their By-laws, annual reports, any non-confidential financial or accounting information, and a list of its members.</p> <p>The Association reserves the right to request any additional information, and to investigate any grievances filed by Associates in connection with the operations and activities of any applicant. The Board and the General Assembly will not be entitled to issue any resolution in this regard until all investigations are completed.</p> <p>Government owned legal entities or entities with governmental participation will not be admitted as members of the association except for government owned or controlled companies which can be admitted under specific conditions.</p> <p>EIGHT The General Assembly will have to comply with the criteria and requirements set forth below in order to approve any of the applications referred to in the above paragraph:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a the authenticity of the organization; b the recommendation regarding any grievance or complaint filed against the applicant in environment related matters; c the support of two Associates; d payment of the corresponding membership fees. <p>NINTH ———— In case the Board of Directors accepts any application filed, it shall publish its resolution in the Association’s Information Bulletin, and allow the members of the Association, for a six month period counted as of the date the resolution is published, the opportunity to challenge before the Secretary of the Association any part of such resolution. The challenges must be submitted in writing and must be supported by two Associates. If no objection or challenge is received during such term, the applicant will become an Associate on provisional basis, until the General Assembly ratifies the acceptance resolution. Should a challenge be filed against the Board of Directors resolution, the definitive resolution in this regard will be adopted by majority vote of the General Assembly.</p> <p>TENTH Associates shall have the following rights and obligations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 to pay Ordinary and Extraordinary dues set forth by the General Assembly. The payment of the dues must be done the first day of the corresponding year; 6 to annually present a report of its activities and any accounting or financial information available before the Executive Director of the Association; 7 in case of Associates admitted in terms of Ninth Clause of these Statutes, to publish a copy of its admission letter in a daily newspaper of large circulation in the domicile of the Association, in order to make of public knowledge the purpose and objectives of the Association, and in case it is considered convenient by the Associate, to publish that same letter in a daily newspaper of its domicile. <p>THIRTEENTH The Associates will be subject to a destitution process in any of the following cases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 due to the issuance by the General Assembly of a destitution resolution provided sufficient reasons to justify such destitution are considered. The following shall be considered as destitution causes: (i) to participate in activities contrary to the interests of the Association, <u>as outlined in the FSC Policy for Association</u>, or (ii) that the Associate no longer meets the requirements needed to be an Associate, or (iii) that payment of the annual dues is not made on time and therefore the rights of the Associate have been suspended, including voting rights, until such contributions are paid; 	



No. / Title: 1) Motion to improve and update the FSC Statutes	Category: Statutory
--	----------------------------

3 due to the death of an Associate, when the Associate is an individual. In such event, the capacity of Associate may not be assigned to another individual, not even by will or in any other form. All the contributions made during the lifetime of the Associate will be considered as part of the patrimony of the Association. ~~In the case referred to in paragraph 2 above, as per the request of the Board of Directors, the Executive Director will request the respective Associate to file an statement within a term of 4 (four) months counted as of the date the destitution notice is mailed, to provide the Board of Directors with reasons not to confirm the destitution process. Once the Board of Directors has examined the statement, it shall inform the Associate of the suggestions that would be made to the General Assembly to destitute or not such Associate. If within a term of two months, counted as of the date such Associate is informed of the suggestion, the Associate does not file an objection thereto, the Executive Director, as per the request of the Board of Directors, will send all the relevant information to the General Assembly, for a final decision to be adopted.~~

[NEW] due to the non payment of the annual dues for two consecutive years:

TITLE THREE GENERAL ASSEMBLIES

SIXTEENTH Extraordinary Meetings of Associates shall resolve exclusively on any of the following matters:

- ii dissolution of the Association ~~prior to the duration stipulated in the Statutes;~~
- iii ~~extension of the duration stipulated in these Statutes.~~

SEVENTEENTH The meetings of Associates shall be held in accordance with the following provisions:

b the notice for any meeting shall be sent to every Associate, either by telefax ~~or~~, mail or electronic means, at least 15 (fifteen) days prior to the date of the respective meeting, to the latest address that such Associate registered before the Executive Director of the Association;

e for a quorum to exist at any Ordinary or Extraordinary meeting a quorum of more than 50% of the voting power of the members of each of the chambers referred to in the By-laws of the Association shall be required. In order to validly adopt resolutions at any Ordinary or Extraordinary Meeting, the affirmative vote of both a simple majority of the voting power in each chamber and at least 2/366.6% of the voting power by associates in good standing present at the time of the vote shall be required. The By-laws of the Association will provide for the manner in which such voting power will be calculated;

f in case the above mentioned quorum is not met at any legally convened Ordinary or Extraordinary meeting, all matters included in the agenda for such meeting should be resolved in a second ballot within a two months term. The following matters must always be voted in a legally convened assembly: I. Definitive admission and rejection of Associates; II. Dissolution of the Association ~~prior to the duration stipulated in the Bylaws and Statutes and extension of the duration of the Association;~~ III. Definitive appointment of the directors or members of the Board of Directors, when not appointed during the incorporation ceremony; IV. revocation of appointments. For approval of resolutions by means of a second ballot, the affirmative vote of at least 2/366.6% of the voting power of the assembly will be required, without the need for quorum, in the understanding that the By-laws of the Association will provide for the manner in which such voting power will be calculated;

g the Associates may be represented at any General Assembly by any ~~person other member~~, designated in writing before two witnesses, in the understanding that at a specific General Assembly each member can only represent a maximum number of other members as defined by the FSC Board;



No. / Title: 1) Motion to improve and update the FSC Statutes	Category: Statutory
<p>i notwithstanding the foregoing, written consent resolutions may be adopted by the Associates without holding a General Assembly. Such resolutions shall have the same validity as if approved during a General Assembly. The Executive Director shall gather the documents evidencing the vote of all Associates and will determine if such resolutions are validly adopted by the Associates of the Association in accordance with these Statutes and the By-laws of the Association. The By-laws of the Association will set forth the circumstances under which officers of the Association will be entitled to request the Associates to vote on certain matters by postal ballot <u>or by electronic means</u>. The By-laws of the Association will provide for the quorum necessary to validly adopt resolutions by written consent.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">TITLE FOUR MANAGEMENT OF THE ASSOCIATION</p> <p>EIGHTEENTH The Association shall be managed by a Board of Directors composed of twelve <u>nine</u> members appointed by the General Assembly. The members of the Board of Directors may be individual Associates or delegates duly appointed by the Associates. Members of the Board of Directors may not be substituted in their capacity, except in case such substitution is approved by the General Assembly.</p> <p>Four <u>Three</u> Board members shall represent each chamber. There shall be two <u>at least one</u> northern and two <u>one</u> southern representatives on the Board within each chamber. The additional positions will alternate between northern and southern representatives.</p> <p>NINETEENTH The members of the Board of Directors shall be elected for a four <u>three</u>-year term from the date of their respective appointment. Notwithstanding the above, six <u>three</u> members of the Board shall be appointed every <u>two</u> years in order to substitute the members of the Board ending their office. The members of the Board of Directors may be removed at any time by the General Assembly, and in such case the General Assembly shall appoint their successors to complete the term of those removed.</p> <p>Directors are allowed to serve two consecutive, four <u>three</u>-year terms, subject to re-election by the membership according to the existing statutes.</p> <p>TWENTIETH The Board of Directors may meet at any place either within the United Mexican States or abroad, designated in the notice for the meeting. The living and travel expenses of Directors in connection with the meeting shall be borne by the Association. The Board of Directors may meet as frequently as deemed necessary or convenient by its Chairman or a majority of its acting members. Written notice of any such meeting shall be sent to all Board members at least fifteen days prior to the meeting, by telegram, <u>express mail, fax or electronic means</u>, confirmed by prepaid certified mail (airmail in case of the recipients living abroad or ordinary mail in case the recipient lives within the United Mexican States), to the latest address registered with the Secretary of the Association by each recipient.</p> <p>TWENTY FIRST A quorum shall exist at any meeting of the Board if at least seven <u>nine</u> of its members are present, <u>with at least two from each chamber</u>. Resolutions of the Board of Directors shall be validly adopted by the affirmative vote of at least eight <u>six</u> of the acting members of the Board present at the meeting, <u>with at least one affirmative in each chamber</u>. The Chairman of the Board of Directors or his alternate shall not be entitled to cast an additional tie-breaking vote. Minutes of all meetings of the Board of Directors shall be prepared and transcribed in the corresponding Minutes Book, signed by at least the Chairman and Secretary of the meeting. Spanish and English versions of such Minutes shall be prepared and distributed among all the members of the Board of Directors.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">TRANSITORY CLAUSES</p> <p>FIRST TRANSITORY The amended Section Thirty First of these Statutes as approved by the General Associates Assembly held on June 27 and 28, 1996, shall be effective upon</p>	



No. / Title: 1) Motion to improve and update the FSC Statutes	Category: Statutory
<p>fulfillment of the following condition precedent: that the Association have at least (i) 15 members corresponding to the Northern perspectives representing social interests of the Social/Environmental Chamber, (ii) 15 members corresponding to the Southern perspectives representing social interests of the Social/Environmental Chamber, (iii) 15 members corresponding to the Northern perspectives representing environmental interests of the Social/Environmental Chamber and (iv) 15 members corresponding to the Southern perspectives representing environmental interests of the Social/Environmental Chamber. Once the above mentioned condition precedent is complied with, the Executive Director of the Association shall issue a certification stating such event. Upon the issuance of such certification by the Executive Director, the Social/Environmental Chamber shall be divided into two different Chambers: the Social Chamber and the Environmental Chamber, provided that both chambers shall be divided into Northern and Southern sub-chambers respectively.</p> <p>As long as the condition precedent above mentioned is not fulfilled, the effective text of Section Thirty First of these Statutes is the following:</p> <p>THIRTY FIRST The Committee shall be appointed by the Board and shall be made up of six representatives, provided such committee shall be formed by one member from the Northern sub-chamber and one from the Southern sub-chamber of the Economic Chamber. Likewise, two members shall be from the Northern sub-chamber and two members from the Southern sub-chamber from each of the Social/Environmental Chamber, provided further, that at least one of the members of the Committee shall be from: North America, South America and the Caribbean, Europe, Australia and Oceania, Asia and Africa.</p>	
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p> <p>Most of the changes proposed are editorial in nature and aim at bringing more consistency and less overlap between the FSC Statutes and By-Laws. A background document containing the rationale for all the changes proposed to the FSC Statutes will be published before the 2011 FSC General Assembly.</p>	
<p>Document(s) to be revised / developed: FSC Statutes, Doc. 1.3, Feb. 2009</p>	
<p>Timeline:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: The inclusion of 3 new FSC Board of Directors is expected to increase costs but these are expected to be significantly offset by conducting elections every 2 years, instead of annually as currently.</p>	

1.2 Changes to the FSC By-Laws

No. / Title: 2) Motion to improve and update governance in FSC	Category: Statutory	
<p>Proposed by: FSC Board of Directors</p> <p>Name:</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Chamber:</p> <p>E-mail:</p>		
<p>1) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name:</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Chamber:</p> <p>E-mail:</p>	<p>2) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name:</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Chamber:</p> <p>E-mail:</p>	



No. / Title: 2) Motion to improve and update governance in FSC	Category: Statutory
<p>MOTION:</p> <p>The FSC General Assembly approves the following changes to the FSC By-Laws, in order to improve governance of the organization and bring them in line with the FSC Statutes as necessary.</p>	
<p>Changes to the By-Laws:</p> <p>[New wording: insertions indicated as <u>underlined</u>, deletions as strikethrough]</p>	
<p>MISSION STATEMENT</p> <p>2 Environmentally appropriate forest management ensures that the <u>production harvest</u> of timber, and non-timber products <u>and ecosystem services</u> maintains the forest's biodiversity, productivity, and ecological processes.</p>	
<p>ACTIVITIES</p> <p>5 FSC shall promote Principles and Criteria of Forest Stewardship through a voluntary accreditation <u>and certification programme</u> for certification of forest management. FSC shall evaluate and accredit Certification Bodies based upon adherence to FSC <u>policies</u> Principles and adherence to FSC's <u>requirements</u> Guidelines for Certification Bodies.</p>	
<p>TENETS</p> <p>8 The FSC Principles and Criteria are intended to apply without discrimination to tropical, temperate and boreal forests worldwide which are managed for production of forest products <u>and provision of ecosystem services over the long term</u>. FSC values equally the environmental, social and economic aspects of forest management included in the Principles and Criteria. FSC shall be a non-profit non-governmental organization, and shall remain independent from control by commercial interests, and government, multilateral and bilateral agencies, although collaboration with these entities will be sought.</p>	
<p>FINANCE</p> <p>10 FSC shall have six <u>the</u> sources of revenue <u>authorized by the FSC Board of Directors, including, but not limited to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a <u>ab</u> evaluation fees paid by Certification Bodies to cover the costs of the accreditation process; accreditation <u>license</u> fees charged to accredited Certification Bodies; 	
<p>GENERAL ASSEMBLY</p> <p>12 The General Assembly shall be made up of three chambers: The purpose of the chamber structure is to maintain the balance of voting power between different interests without having to limit the number of members. The votes within each chamber are divided equally between the members, while respecting the provisions of paragraph 13. If additional members join a chamber, the voting power of existing members declines accordingly. The first chamber shall be made up of social and indigenous organizations and assigned individuals. This chamber shall have <u>1/333.3%</u> of the voting power in the General Assembly. The second chamber shall be made up of environmental organizations and assigned individuals. This chamber shall have <u>1/333.3%</u> of the voting power in the General Assembly. The third chamber shall be made up of individuals and organizations with an economic interest in the forest products trade. It shall have <u>1/333.3%</u> of the voting power in the General Assembly.</p> <p>14 <u>The FSC Board of Directors will decide on a set of criteria to differentiate Northern organizations and individuals between North and South, are those based in High Income countries (according to United Nations criteria) and Southern organizations are those based in Low, Middle and</u></p>	



No. / Title: 2) Motion to improve and update governance in FSC	Category: Statutory
<p>Upper middle income countries (again according to United Nations criteria). In case of doubt the Board will have the final say on whether a member is Northern or Southern. A periodically updated list of countries classified as North or South according to Gross National Product per capita will be available upon request attached to the Statutes and periodically updated.</p>	
<p>15 The General assembly shall strive to adopt decisions by consensus. In the case of a vote, the approval of motions shall require the affirmative vote of both a simple majority of the voting power registered by associates in good standing in each chamber, and of <u>2/366.6%</u> of the total voting power registered by associates in good standing, calculated as provided for in these by-laws (with the exception of board elections).</p>	
<p>Abstentions shall not count as votes cast. A quorum of more than <u>of 50% +1 of the total voting power registered votes from by</u> associates in good standing (calculated as provided for in these by-laws) in each chamber is required for a decision to be taken in a first ballot. In such case quorum or voting percentage is not obtained in any first ballot, the motions on the agenda shall be voted on by the associates by postal ballot within two months. In the case of a second ballot, a quorum shall not be required and the resolutions shall be considered as validly adopted when approved by both the affirmative vote of a simple majority of members within each chamber, and <u>at least 2/366.6%</u> of the total voting power registered by associates in good standing.</p>	
<p>16 The General Assembly will be chaired by the Chairperson of the FSC Board. The General Assembly will adopt its own rules of procedure which will be proposed by the Board. If members are unable to attend a General Assembly due to financial reasons they may apply to the FSC Secretariat for financial support. The Secretariat shall seek to provide essential support according to the funds available, <u>in accordance to the FSC Statutes and as approved by the FSC Board</u> with priority going to Southern members.</p>	
<p>18 The General Assembly will delegate operational activities and most decision making to the Board. The General Assembly will normally restrict its decisions to revising the Statutes and Principles and Criteria, admitting and destituting members, <u>and electing the Board</u> and being the final authority in dispute resolutions.</p>	
<p>20 An Extraordinary General Assembly may be convened at the request of the Board, or if requested by 1/3 of the members of each chamber.</p>	
<p>21 Postal ballots: Postal ballots shall be held each <u>every two</u> year to elect Board members (see paragraph 58). The Board may organize additional ballots at its discretion.</p>	
<p>MEMBERS</p>	
<p>22 All members are entitled to vote in the Ordinary and Extraordinary General Assembly and in the Postal Ballot. It should be noted that the weight of the members' vote will depend on the chamber <u>and sub-chamber they are in and type of membership (individual or organizational members).</u></p>	
<p>23 Members must pay their dues for any year <u>upon receipt of the annual invoice</u> by the first day of that calendar year.</p>	
<p>26 Prospective members must not be currently promulgating statements opposing FSC or certification.</p>	
<p>[NEW] <u>In order to prevent a conflict of interest, staff of FSC or its subsidiaries, FSC Regional Offices and FSC endorsed National Offices, and FSC Representatives shall not be FSC members.</u></p>	
<p>MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA</p>	
<p>Economic Interest Chamber</p>	



No. / Title: 2) Motion to improve and update governance in FSC	Category: Statutory
<p>28 — Organizations and individuals with a commercial vested interest in commercial forest product organizations, including employees, consultants or representatives of forest product companies, Certification Bodies, industry Associations (whether for profit or not-for-profit), wholesales, retailers, traders, end-users, and consulting companies and government owned or controlled companies may apply for membership of this chamber.</p> <p>28 <u>Membership in the Economic Chamber is open to individuals, companies and organizations who principally have a commercial interest in forests, the production of forest products or the activities of FSC, including but not limited to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>a forest management and forest product companies</u> <u>b manufacturing companies</u> <u>c wholesalers, retailers, traders and brokers</u> <u>d consulting firms</u> <u>e communally-owned forest enterprises</u> <u>f industry associations</u> <u>g research organizations and academics whose primary interests are the economic or technical aspects of forestry or the trade of forest products</u> <u>h certification bodies</u> <u>l employees, consultants and representatives of the above</u> <p>Social Chamber</p> <p>Membership of the social chamber is limited to indigenous organizations and social movements and assigned individuals active in promoting environmentally appropriate, socially beneficial and economically viable forest management.</p> <p>31 <u>Membership in the Social Chamber is open to individuals and not-for-profit organizations whose principal purpose and interest is socially beneficial forestry, including but not limited to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>a indigenous organizations</u> <u>b community groups</u> <u>c trade unions</u> <u>d development NGOs</u> <u>e social justice NGOs</u> <u>f socio-environmental NGOs</u> <u>g research organizations and academics whose primary interest are social issues within forestry</u> <u>h individuals, employees, consultants and representatives of the above</u> <p><u>Furthermore, cooperatives and small communally-owned forest enterprises may also be eligible for membership in the social chamber if they can demonstrate that their profit motivation has a strong emphasis on social benefits.</u></p> <p>31 — Bis Environmental Chamber</p> <p>Membership of the chamber environmental is limited to not-for-profit non-governmental organizations and assigned individuals with a demonstrated commitment to environmentally appropriate, socially beneficial and economically viable forest management.</p> <p>32 — Prospective members must conform to the laws of the State in which their seat is located. They must have a governing Board which is independent from government bodies and which is periodically renewed by election or appointment. Organizations such as academic and research institutions, law Associations or forest product Associations shall be assigned to the appropriate chamber by the Board, according to the nature of their activities.</p> <p>32 <u>Membership in the Environmental Chamber is 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:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>a environmental NGOs</u> <u>b development NGOs</u> <u>c environmental interest groups</u> 	



No. / Title: 2) Motion to improve and update governance in FSC	Category: Statutory
<p>d <u>research organizations and academics whose primary interest is the protection, preservation or conservation of the natural environment</u></p> <p>e <u>individuals, employees, consultants and representatives of the above</u></p>	
<p>33 Organizations such as academic and research institutions, law Associations or forest product Associations shall be assigned to the appropriate chamber by the Board, according to the nature of their activities.</p>	
<p>[NEW] <u>In case of doubt, the Board will have the final say on whether a member belongs to the Economic, Social or Environmental Chamber.</u></p>	
<p>MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION PROCESS</p>	
<p>34 All applications for FSC membership must be submitted in writing <u>or by electronic means</u> to the Board. The Board may establish a membership committee. Applications must be accompanied by:</p>	
<p>d in the case of prospective members of the economic interest-chamber, detailed documentation will be needed, describing the organization or individual's commercial activities, details of forest operations or sources (and how active commitment to FSC's and the Principles and Criteria is being implemented) and identity of directors, parent company and other relevant commercial relationships. At the request of the prospective member, the Board may treat financial information from the prospective member as confidential;</p> <p>e statement of support for the application from two FSC members <u>in good standing</u>.</p>	
<p>36 If the opinion of the Board is favorable on these matters the organization or individual is admitted to membership on a provisional basis. Every three months the Board publishes new applications for membership and allows the opportunity for existing members to challenge any applications recommended by the Board. Challenges must be supported by written documentation and endorsed by at least two FSC members. If no challenge has been received six months after the first publication of the member's application, the membership application is considered to be confirmed. In the case of a challenge the final decision will be taken by a vote of the General Assembly. In the case of prospective members which are transnational corporations with national organizations in several countries, applications must be received from each of the national organizations.</p>	
<p>39 Each year members shall provide the Executive Director with a report o their annual activities and any publicly available accounts for the previous year.</p>	
<p>DESTITUTION, SUSPENSION, WITHDRAWAL AND READMISSION OF MEMBERS</p>	
<p>42 Any proposed destitution or suspension of a member must be presented to the Board in writing accompanied by a justification. The Board will consider the matter and if it considers that the complaint is substantial it shall request the member to present within four<u>one</u> months a written explanation of the reasons why, in its opinion, suspension or destitution is not justified.</p>	
<p>44 If within <u>one</u> two months of the notification of this proposal the member does not inform the Executive Director in writing of its opposition, the member is considered to have withdrawn from the membership of FSC. If the member does oppose the proposal, the Executive Director shall submit the proposal together with the arguments of the member to a postal ballot of the General Assembly which will be final.</p>	
<p>BOARD OF DIRECTORS</p>	
<p>50 The Board of Directors is made up of nine individuals who are elected for a three year term. They shall either be individual members of FSC or duly designated delegates of member</p>	



No. / Title: 2) Motion to improve and update governance in FSC	Category: Statutory
<p>organizations. Directors shall seek to take decisions which benefit the association as a whole and represent the views and concerns of the <u>sub-chamber</u>category which they represent (e.g. South/Social) in Board deliberations rather than simply reflecting the views of the organization with which they are affiliated.</p> <p>Directors who are duly designated representatives of member organizations may not be substituted or replaced by another person. If a Director leaves an FSC member organization and becomes affiliated with another organization in the same category, the Director may remain a member of the Board if both organizations agree to this in writing.</p> <p>If the Director becomes affiliated with an organization in another <u>sub-chamber</u>category he or she must resign from the Board. Commercial interests not demonstratively committed to FSC <u>and</u>, certification bodies and industry Associations may not be represented on the Board.</p> <p>Individuals shall not simultaneously hold a staff position in the Secretariat and retain a seat on the Board of Directors.</p> <p>51 Three <u>Four</u> Board members (twoincluding one from the North and twoone from the South) shall come from and shall represent <u>each FSC chamber economic interests</u>, but shall not be duly designated delegates of Certification Bodies.</p> <p>52 Three Board members shall come members in the environmental chamber and three from members in the social chamber. There shall be one northern and one southern representative within each chamber. The additional positions will alternate between northern and southern members.</p> <p>53 In electing the Board, the General Assembly shall aim for regional and gender balance.</p> <p>A nomination committee will <u>may</u> be appointed by the General AssemblyBoard to seek sufficient candidates for all Board positions. This committee should be made up by of three experienced members e.g. ex-Board members, one from each chamber and at least one from each North and South. The committee may not exclude potential candidates nominated by other members but are charged with ensuring that at least two candidates stand for each position vacant.</p> <p>54 Directors are allowed to serve two consecutive, 3-year terms, subject to re-election by the membership according to the existing Statutes. If a Board member ends his or her term prematurely for whatever reason, a new member will be elected by postal ballot from the appropriate <u>sub-chamber</u>category (e.g. Northern/Environmental) <u>for the remainder of the term</u>, using the process described in paragraph</p> <p>55 If a Board member acts against the interest of FSC, he or she may be destituted if no improvements are noted after receiving a written warning from the Chairperson of the Board. Destitution requires a majority vote by the Board and then a vote by the General Assembly.</p> <p>56 The Board shall elect a Chairperson and <u>two</u> Vice-Chairs, by majority vote at the first meeting each calendar year and may also elect a Treasurer and Secretary. The Board will <u>strive to make decisions by consensus and all resolutions shall be adopted in accordance with the provisions of Section Twenty First of the FSC Statutes.</u> In the case a vote is taken, decisions shall require both the affirmative vote of six members and at least one favorable vote from each chamber representative. Votes will be recorded in the Minutes. The quorum for Board meetings is seven. Minutes from Board meetings will be distributed to all members in English and Spanish.</p> <p>57-BOARD OFFICERS AND DUTIES</p> <p><u>57 The duties of the Board Officers shall be the following:</u></p>	



<p>No. / Title: 2) Motion to improve and update governance in FSC</p>	<p>Category: Statutory</p>
<p>f) <u>All other duties set forth in the Statutes or entrusted by the General Assembly or the FSC Board.</u></p> <p>58 To ensure continuity, six three Directors, <u>one from each sub-chamber, will be elected every two years, either retire at the end of each calendar year. They will be replaced by postal ballot or a General Assembly vote.</u> The Board will receive seconded nominations of candidates and will prepare a written ballot classifying each candidate into the appropriate sub-chamber<u>category</u> (e.g. Northern/Environmental). <u>The quorum for Board elections shall be calculated according to the provisions in the FSC Statutes and in paragraph 15.</u> Each member of FSC will then cast their vote by post or in the General Assembly, and the votes will be weighted according to the provisions of paragraphs 12 to 14. The Board will prepare the ballot, keeping in mind the eligibility of candidates as defined by paragraph 53. Whenever elections coincide with a General Assembly, Board elections will be arranged by a combination of postal ballot (for members not represented by delegates at the General Assembly) and votes at the General Assembly according to procedures determined by the Board.</p> <p>59 Board members shall be reimbursed by FSC for travel, Board and accommodation costs associated with FSC Board meetings and other activities authorized by the Board.</p> <p>THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND THE SECRETARIAT</p> <p>62 The Executive Director will be responsible for the finances, accounting and administration of FSC.</p> <p>64 The Executive Director shall appoint the staff of the Secretariat in accordance with <u>established staff rules, formulated by the Executive Director and approved by the Board.</u> The staff shall be selected on as wide a geographical basis as possible and there shall be no discrimination on gender, ethnic or religious grounds.</p> <p><u>FSC NETWORK OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL BODIES AND INITIATIVES</u></p> <p>71 FSC shall encourage and support national and regional initiatives which are in line with the FSC mission. The objectives of this are to decentralize the work of FSC and to encourage local participation in a manner consistent with the structure and purpose of FSC. Guidelines and minimum requirements for national and regional initiatives that are consistent with the vision of the Founding Assembly shall be published by FSC and shall require that national initiatives will seek consensus in their decisions. These decisions shall be taken in a manner which demonstrates the support of each chamber following the model described in paragraph 15 and as defined by FSC. If an FSC body is established in a country or region it will fit into one of the following categories:</p> <p>a FSC Representative Contact Person: <u>The FSC Representative Contact Person shall be appointed by collaborate with FSC to work closely with the FSC membership in the development of FSC certification in its country or region, including the distributeion of information regarding the organization and its mission and to the promoteion of discussions on certification within the country or region concerned.</u> The FSC Representative Contact Person works in close collaboration with the FSC Secretariat and will be provided with a mutually agreed set of tasks for a specific period. shall be an individual member of FSC or a duly designated delegate of a member organization.</p> <p>ab FSC National Office Working Group: <u>In countries or regions with a high level of interest in certification and strategic importance for the achievement of FSC’s mission, an FSC National Office Working Group, representing social, economic and environmental interests, may be established. The functions of the National Office will be to promote FSC and its mission, to maintain ongoing consultations on certification, to facilitate and oversee the process of developing national forest stewardship standards in accordance with the FSC</u></p>	

<p>No. / Title: 2) Motion to improve and update governance in FSC</p>	<p>Category: Statutory</p>
<p><u>Principles and Criteria and to implement FSC strategies for engagement with relevant stakeholder groups to facilitate a consultative process on certification through meetings and workshops. The consultative process should be open and transparent and involve all relevant stakeholder groups. The composition of the Board and the structure of the assembly of the National Office shall be similar to those of FSC as outlined in these By-laws. The relationship between a National Office and its Board will parallel the relationship between the FSC Secretariat and Board of Directors as outlined in these By-laws.</u></p> <p>b FSC Advisory Board: Once a consultative process has been completed in a country or region, a national or regional Assembly of stakeholders may be called to formally elect a national or regional Advisory Board. The composition of the Board and the structure of the assembly should be similar to those of FSC as outlined in these By-laws. The functions of the Board will be to promote FSC and its mission, to maintain ongoing consultations on certification, to facilitate and oversee the process of developing national forest stewardship standards in accordance with the FSC Principles and Criteria and to review and make recommendations on applications by Certification Bodies to the FSC Secretariat for accreditation.</p> <p>c FSC National or Regional Office: Where an FSC National Offices Advisory Board exists and national and/or international Certification Bodies are operational, FSC may encourage the establishment of an national or FSC Regional Office. The relationship between a national office and its Board will parallel the relationship between the FSC Secretariat and Board of Directors as outlined in these By-laws. FSC Regional Offices are initiatives of FSC A.C. to support FSC certification and the strategic development of FSC in the region.</p> <p>Irrespective of the nature of FSC's presence in a country or region, the International FSC International will retain the final say in approving National Standards and accrediting Certification Bodies. FSC will retain strict control of the use of FSC's name and logo throughout the world and the establishment of any national body will be subject to formal written authorization by the FSC Secretariat defining which category the particular national or regional body has been placed in and clearly specifying its rights and responsibilities. The FSC Board reserves the right to withdraw FSC recognition from a national body if the terms set forth herein and in the corresponding of this agreement are not respected. The FSC Secretariat will not undertake <u>action</u> activities in a country or region without consulting the relevant FSC body.</p> <p>COMMITTEES</p> <p>72. — Dispute Resolution and Accreditation Appeals Committee.</p> <p>The Board shall establish a committee of members to (i) deal with disputes and grievances from members and (ii) review accreditation decisions. In connection with matters regarding accreditation, the committee shall make recommendations to the Board based on the extent to which Certification Bodies are considered to adhere to the FSC Principles ad Criteria, and FSC Guidelines for Certification Bodies.</p> <p>The committee shall be named by the Board and shall be made up of six representatives, provided such committee shall be formed by one member from the North sub-chamber and one from the South sub-chamber from each of the Social, Environmental and Economic Chambers, and provided further, that at least one of the members of the committee shall be from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North America (including Mexico) • Central and South America and the Caribbean • Europe • Australia and Oceania • Asia 	



No. / Title: 2) Motion to improve and update governance in FSC	Category: Statutory
<p data-bbox="268 309 363 331">Africa</p> <p data-bbox="188 367 1391 488">73. — Members may submit grievances or disputes concerning (i) the performance of the Executive Director, the Secretariat or the Board or (ii) accreditation decisions, to the dispute resolutions and accreditation appeals committee with a copy to the Chairperson of the Board. Grievances regarding (i) above must be submitted in writing and must be seconded by two other members.</p> <p data-bbox="188 519 1391 672">74. — If the committee (which shall have similar decision-making procedures to the Board) decides that the grievance has merit, the Chairperson of the Board will be asked to consider the matter in consultation with the Board (and Secretariat, if necessary) and propose a solution within two months. If the committee is satisfied by the proposed solution, it shall submit it to the plaintiff. The committee may propose an alternative solution if it is not satisfied with the one proposed by the Board.</p> <p data-bbox="188 703 1391 766">75. — If the plaintiff is not satisfied with the solution proposed by the committee, the matter will be referred to the General Assembly for a vote by the committee in consultation with the Board.</p> <p data-bbox="188 797 1391 887">76. In addition to the Dispute Resolutions and Accreditation Appeals Committee, the Board may establish a number of committees to assist FSC with both operational and management tasks, (on which both members and outside experts may be invited to serve), including for example:</p> <p data-bbox="284 918 1391 1070">a. — Technical Committee This committee would be responsible for reviewing and making recommendations upon the FSC Principles and Criteria, national and regional standards and other matters determined by the Board. All final decisions regarding changes in the Principles and Criteria will be made by the Board of Directors and the General Assembly.</p> <p data-bbox="188 1128 386 1160">AMENDMENTS</p> <p data-bbox="188 1191 1391 1281">81 The Board shall consider any amendment to these By-laws proposed by a member in writing and seconded by two other members. If the Board agrees to the proposal the amendment shall be submitted to vote by the next General Assembly.</p> <p data-bbox="188 1312 600 1344">85 — TRANSITORY CLAUSES</p> <p data-bbox="188 1375 1391 1774">The amended Sections 12, 32 and 73 of the By-laws of FSC as approved by the General Associates Assembly held on June 27 and 28, 1996, shall be effective upon fulfillment of the following condition precedent: that the FSC have at least (i) 15 members corresponding to the Northern perspectives representing social interests of the Social/Environmental Chamber, (ii) 15 members corresponding to the Southern perspectives representing social interests of the Social/Environmental Chamber, (iii) 15 members corresponding to the Northern perspectives representing environmental interests of the Social/Environmental Chamber and (iv) 15 members corresponding to the Southern perspectives representing environmental interests of the Social/Environmental Chamber. Once the above mentioned condition precedent is complied with, the Executive Director of the FSC shall issue a certification stating such event. Upon the issuance of such certification by the Executive Director, the Social/Environmental Chamber shall be divided into two different Chambers: the Social Chamber and the Environmental Chamber, provided that both chambers shall be divided into Northern and Southern sub-chambers respectively.</p> <p data-bbox="188 1805 1391 1868">As long as the condition precedent above mentioned is not fulfilled, the effective text of Sections 12, 32 and 73 of the By-laws is the following:</p> <p data-bbox="188 1899 1391 2011">12 — The General Assembly shall be made up of two chambers: The purpose of the chamber structure is to maintain the balance of voting power between different interests without having to limit the number of members. The votes within each chamber are divided equally between the members, while respecting the provisions of paragraph 13. If additional members join a chamber, the voting</p>	



No. / Title: 2) Motion to improve and update governance in FSC	Category: Statutory
<p>power of existing members declines accordingly. The first chamber shall be made up of social, environmental and indigenous organizations. This chamber shall have 66.6% of the voting power in the General Assembly.</p> <p>12-Bis The second chamber shall be made up of individuals and organizations with an economic interest in the forest products trade. It shall have 33.3% of the voting power in the General Assembly.</p> <p>Social and Environmental chamber</p> <p>32 Membership of this chamber is limited to:</p> <p>a not for profit non governmental organizations with a demonstrated commitment to environmentally appropriate, socially beneficial and economically viable forest management.</p> <p>b indigenous organizations and social movements active in the promoting of environmentally appropriate, socially beneficial and economically viable forest management.</p> <p>73. COMMITTEES</p> <p>Dispute resolution and accreditation appeals committee</p> <p>The Board shall establish a committee of members to (i) deal with disputes and grievances from members and (ii) review the accreditation decisions. In connection with matters regarding accreditation, the committee shall make recommendations to the Board based on the extent to which Certification Bodies are considered to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria, and FSC Guidelines for Certification Bodies.</p> <p>The committee shall be named by the Board and shall be made up of six representatives, provided such committee shall be formed by two members from the North sub-chamber and two from the South sub-chamber from the Social/Environmental Chamber, and one member from the North Sub-chamber and one member from the South sub-chamber of the Economic Chambers, provided further, that at least one of the members of the committee is from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North America (including Mexico) • Central and South America and the Caribbean • Europe • Australia and Oceania • Asia • Africa 	
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p> <p>A background document containing the rationale for all the changes proposed to the FSC By-Laws will be published before the 2011 FSC General Assembly.</p>	
<p>Document(s) to be revised / developed: FSC By-Laws, Doc. 1.1, Feb. 2009</p>	
<p>Timeline:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: The above proposed changes to the FSC By-laws bring them in line with the FSC Statutes and are not expected to create additional costs.</p>	

No. / Title: 3) Statutory motion regarding the role of the Accredited Certification Bodies within the Economic Chamber	Category: Statutory
<p>Proposed by:</p> <p>Name: Martin Holmgren</p> <p>Organization: Stora Enso Skog AB</p> <p>Chamber: Economic North</p> <p>E-mail: martin.holmgren@storaenso.com</p>	



No. / Title: 3) Statutory motion regarding the role of the Accredited Certification Bodies within the Economic Chamber	Category: Statutory
1) Seconded by: Name: Klara Helstad Organization: Södra Skogsägarna ek för Chamber: Economic North E-mail: klara.helstad@sodra.com	2) Seconded by: Name: Björn Lyngfelt Organization: SCA SKOG AB Chamber: Economic North E-mail: bjorn.lyngfelt@sca.com
MOTION: To increase the credibility of the Accredited Certification Bodies for the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), Certification Bodies should not be eligible for membership.	
Changes to the By-Laws: [New wording: insertions indicated as <u>underlined</u> , deletions as strikethrough] 12 The General Assembly shall be made up of three chambers: The purpose of the chamber structure is to maintain the balance of voting power between different interests without having to limit the number of members. The votes within each chamber are divided equally between the members, while respecting the provisions of paragraph 13. If additional members join a chamber, the voting power of existing members declines accordingly. The first chamber shall be made up of social and indigenous organizations and assigned individuals. This chamber shall have 33.3% of the voting power in the General Assembly. The second chamber shall be made up of environmental organizations and assigned individuals. This chamber shall have 33.3% of the voting power in the General Assembly. The third chamber shall be made up of individuals and organizations with an economic interest in the forest products trade. It shall have 33.3% of the voting power in the General Assembly. <u>Accredited Certification Bodies for the Forest Stewardship Council are exempt from the chamber structure, and participate in the General Assembly as observers only.</u> 17 Non members may attend the General Assembly as observers at the discretion of the Board. 22 All members are entitled to vote in the Ordinary and Extraordinary General Assembly and in the Postal Ballot. It should be noted that the weight of the members' vote will depend on the chamber they are in. 28 Organizations and individuals with a commercial vested interest in commercial forest product organizations, including employees, consultants or representatives of forest product companies, Certification Bodies , industry Associations (whether for profit or not-for-profit), wholesales, retailers, traders, end-users, and consulting companies and government owned or controlled companies may apply for membership of this chamber.	
Purpose and/or additional information: Undisputedly, the role of the Accredited Certification Bodies for the Forest Stewardship Council is important. To strengthen their role, they should not be accepted as members in any specific chamber. The reason for this is that membership in one chamber may lead to conflict of interests, or suspicions of conflict of interests. Consequently, it is important to admit a membership that grants the Certification Bodies the rights of observers, which will give them a good understanding of the processes they are set to audit, without undermining their credibility.	
Document(s) to be revised / developed: FSC By-Laws	
Timeline:	
Cost to FSC: None	

2 Policy Motions

2.1 GA Motion implementation

No. / Title: 4) Motion to improve transparency and reliability of the General Assemblies outcomes		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Mauricio de Almeida Voivodic Organization: IMAFLORA Chamber: Economic South E-mail: mauricio@imaflora.org		
1) Seconded by: Name: Jens Holm Kanstrup Organization: Nepenthes Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: jhk@nepenthes.dk	2) Seconded by: Name: Rubens Gomes Organization: OELA Chamber: Social South E-mail: rubensgomes@oela.org.br	
MOTION: FSC shall develop and implement procedures to improve the management and implementation of approved motions, ensuring that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The FSC members will be able to follow, in a transparent way and during the whole period in between General Assemblies, the updated status of implementation of each motion; - The FSC staff, responsible for the motion’s implementation, will not interpret or change, in any form, the meaning of the approved motions. Instead, the FSC staff shall be in dialogue with the persons who proposed the motion, in order to ensure a correct understanding and good implementation of the motion. 		
Purpose and/or additional information: The FSC’s credibility relies deeply on its governance system and on the way how decisions are taken through a very participatory and democratic form. The General Assembly and the procedure for the approval of motions by consensus is one of the key factors that differentiate FSC from other certification systems and is probably the main reason that maintains such a high level of support from multiple actors divided into the 6 sub-chambers. We, FSC members, support FSC and participate in the General Assemblies because we strong believe that we´re part of the system, taking decisions all together in a process of negotiation and search for consensus. When a motion is approved in a GA, it means that the issue was presented by one of the FSC members, seconded by two others, and exhaustively negotiated with members from all sub-chambers. When it’s approved, we, FSC members, believe that the motion is important and that its implementation will be positive for the entire system. However, when we go back home after the GA, we have very limited access of information about the status of motion’s implementation. Most of the time, the only moment we receive such information is during the next GA, three years later. Even in this opportunity, due to time constrains, the information is generally presented with very low level of details. At the 4th GA 2005, the report presented by the FSC IC indicated that 5 motions approved in 2002 (5 on 22 approved = 22%) were only partially implemented. At the 5th GA 2008, the report presented by the FSC IC indicated that 11 motions approved in 2005 (11 on 23 approved = 47%) were only partially implemented. No information was presented about the status of the 5 motions that were not fully implemented at the moment of the previous GA.		

No. / Title: 4) Motion to improve transparency and reliability of the General Assemblies outcomes	Category: Policy
<p>At the same time, there are some evidences that motions can be interpreted by FSC staff during its implementation, changing the meaning of what was discussed and approved by FSC members. As an example, this is the case of the Policy Motion 19, approved at the 5th GA 2008, regarding the differentiation of community forest products from other FSC certified products. At the draft policy sent out by FSC in November 2010, it was deliberately included SLIMF in the policy definition, while the motion was clear that this should be targeted for communities, recognizing the important differences between SLIMFs and communities. This differentiation was an important point of discussion among the members during the 2008 GA and therefore the FSC staff should not change it.</p> <p>The facts presented above represent a risk for the effective functioning of the FSC governance. If this situation is not changed, the trust on the participatory and democratic decision making process will be undermined. We should better take care of our approved motions. They are essential for the FSC's credibility.</p>	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline: By the end of 2011 and applicable for the approved motions at the 6 th GA 2011.	
Cost to FSC:	

2.2 FSC Governance

No. / Title: 5) Representativeness of Board Members	Category: Policy
<p>Proposed by: Name: Chris van Dam Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Social South E-mail: chris.vdam@gmail.com</p>	
<p>1) Seconded by: Name: Jaime Levy Organization: Fundacion Altropico Chamber: Social South E-mail: jrlevy@altropico.org.ec</p>	<p>2) Seconded by: Name: Luis Astorga Organization: Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo Chamber: Social South E-mail: luisastorga@bosquenativo.cl</p>
<p>MOTION: To ensure a better representation of the members of the Board of Directors with regard to the sub-chamber and chamber to which they belong, the statutes will be modified in order to give a larger weight to the votes of the members of their corresponding sub-chamber and chamber.</p>	
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: The governance system of the FSC is founded on the existence of six sub-chambers, such that the interests of the social economic, economic and environmental actors, in the north and the south, are duly represented and in an egalitarian fashion.</p> <p>However, in the election of the persons who will represent the sub-chambers and chambers in the Board of Directors, the voting system does not authorize a greater weight to the votes from the members of the sub-chamber or chamber which the Board member will represent.</p> <p>The proposal is to modify the statutes as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the votes of the members of the specific sub-chamber have a weight of 3 - the votes of the other members of the specific chamber have a weight of 2 - the votes of the other members of the FSC (the other chambers) have a weight of 1 	



No. / Title: 5) Representativeness of Board Members	Category: Policy
<p>Example: if up for vote is a representative of the Environmental Chamber North, the votes of this sub-chamber will have a weight of 3, while the votes of the Environmental Chamber South will have a weight of 2, and the votes of the other four sub-chambers will have a weight of 1.</p>	
Document(s) to be revised / developed: FSC Statutes, Doc. 1.3, Feb. 2009	
Timeline:	
Cost to FSC: None	

No. / Title: 6) FSC membership application process streamlining	Category: Policy
Proposed by:	
<p>Name: Fran Price Organization: The Nature Conservancy Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: fprice@tnc.org</p>	
1) Seconded by:	2) Seconded by:
<p>Name: Brent Stinnett Organization: Potlatch Corp. Chamber: Economic North E-mail: brent.stinnett@potlatchcorp.com</p>	<p>Name: Bill Wilkinson Organization: BBW Associates, Inc. Chamber: Social North E-mail: bwilkinson@bwassociates.com</p>
MOTION:	
<p>FSC-IC, in concert with National Offices, shall review FSC's international membership application process with the intent of streamlining and simplifying the application process. Such review will include the benchmarking of membership application procedures of other reputable multi-stakeholder organizations. FSC International will submit a revised membership application (as well as relevant by-laws changes) for approval by the FSC-AC Board of Directors by its November 2011 meeting.</p>	
Purpose and/or additional information:	
<p>Since the founding of FSC, individual and organization membership growth has remained low, especially compared to the growth of certification, FSC's global market share, and increased stakeholder collaboration. This lackluster membership growth is due in part to the onerous requirements of the FSC membership application process. In order for FSC and its National Offices to better engage new stakeholders, strengthen and manage current membership, as well as expand membership revenue for FSC National Offices, the membership application requirements outlined in the FSC Statutes and By-Laws should be reviewed and simplified wherever reasonable without creating undue risk to the integrity of the system.</p>	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
<p>Membership application procedures By-Laws (if relevant)</p>	
Timeline: Implemented by December 1, 2011.	
Cost to FSC: None, other than staff time of FSC-IC and NI's	



No. / Title: 7) Improving Equity in FSC Membership		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Brent Stinnett Organization: Potlatch Corporation Chamber: Economic North E-mail: brent.stinnett@potlatchcorp.com		
1) Seconded by: Name: Bill Wilkinson Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Social North E-mail: bwilkinson@bbwassociates.com		2) Seconded by: Name: Jeff Howe Organization: Dovetail Partners Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: jeff@dovetailinc.org
MOTION: FSC will conduct a review and revision of membership policy as it pertains to equity and fairness of access across all chambers. The review shall consider the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSC currently has differing membership requirements for landowners based on the chamber they have enrolled in. For example, only economic chamber members or applicants are required to have all lands certified or under a process of getting certified. • National Offices should determine the local conditions surrounding membership access. For example, the rationale regarding the prohibition of public agencies being members may not be appropriate in all countries. 		
Purpose and/or additional information: FSC is founded on a three chamber system that should be equitable to all three interests. FSC's current membership policies discriminate against economic participants in that only economic participants are required to have all lands owned by the member either certified or in a process of certification. National offices are in a position to provide details of membership requirements including if a class of landowner (e.g. public agency) should be allowed access to membership in their country. FSC membership eligibility currently restricts government entities from applying to become an FSC member. However, public land managers (e.g., government agencies) are responsible for the management of significant areas of FSC-certified forestlands (51% of FSC certified area is identified as "public ownership" according to the December 2010 report on "Global FSC certificates: Type and distribution"; an additional 4% is identified as "government ownership"). Public land managers are a significant stakeholder group for FSC due to their management of FSC-certified lands. They are currently restricted from the benefits of membership, including opportunities to better understand FSC programs and contribute to FSC activities. Other FSC certificate holders are allowed to apply for membership in the Economic Chamber and this same opportunity should be available to public land managers that are current FSC certificate holders in good standing.		
Document(s) to be revised / developed: Membership policy		
Timeline: December 31, 2011		
Cost to FSC:		

2.3 FSC Network

No. / Title: 8) FSC Global Network Financing		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Fran Price Organization: The Nature Conservancy Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: fprice@tnc.org		



No. / Title: 8) FSC Global Network Financing		Category: Policy
1) Seconded by: Name: Brent Stinnett Organization: Potlatch Corporation Chamber: Economic North E-mail: brent.stinnett@potlatchcorp.com		2) Seconded by: Name: Bill Wilkinson Organization: BBW Associates, Inc. Chamber: Social North E-mail: bwilkinson@bbwassociates.com
MOTION: The FSC International Center shall contract with external experts to conduct analysis of capital and operational needs across FSC global network (IC, NIs and regional offices). Such analysis will include review of the FSC's existing and potential earned income sources (and pricing) as well as current and potential global and regional charitable revenue sources. Based on this analysis, FSC-IC will establish a financial revenue and expense structure that responsibly funds both the strategic and basic operational needs across the global network by beginning of Fiscal Year 2012.		
Purpose and/or additional information: The FSC Network is inadequately capitalized to manage the extensive and growing demand for services to its stakeholders (members, chain of custody and forest management certificate holders, non-certified license holders, governments, and general consumers). Until 2009, the FSC International Center was in a position of constant financial struggle and nearly all National Offices had to independently fundraise for their entire annual budgets. Charitable sources of funding have diminished for many of FSC's key national offices, in part because of FSC's chain-of-custody certification and the market success. With the 2009 increase of the Annual Accreditation Fee, there now exists an adequate base of financial resources for the International Center, as well as a minor stream of revenue dedicated to National Offices. However, the growth of the FSC system continues to far exceed the capacity of both the International Center and National Offices to deliver necessary services and support the integrity of the FSC standards, certification process, and brand. To achieve necessary scale and to provide the minimum requisite level of system integrity, professionalism and brand support, FSC-IC must consider the fiscal needs of the entire global FSC network when determining necessary annual funding.		
Document(s) to be revised / developed:		
Timeline: Implemented by January 1, 2012		
Cost to FSC: \$100,000 for management consulting services. Staff time of FSC-IC and NI's to support.		

2.4 FSC Global Strategy

No. / Title: 9) Inclusion of forest workers in the FSC Global Strategy		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Luis Astorga Organization: Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo Chamber: Social South E-mail: luisastorga@bosquenativo.cl		
1) Seconded by: Name: Bob Ramsay Organization: BWI Building and Wood Workers International Chamber: Social North E-mail: bob.ramsay@bwint.org		2) Seconded by: Name: Chris van Dam Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Social South E-mail: chris.vdam@gmail.com



No. / Title: 9) Inclusion of forest workers in the FSC Global Strategy	Category: Policy
<p>MOTION:</p> <p>The FSC shall include forest workers and their organizations in the FSC Global Strategy</p> <p>Procedure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The FSC-IC will prepare a proposal to include forest workers and their organizations in the Global Strategy, in consultation with workers' organizations that are FSC members. 2) The document will be sent to the membership for comments. 3) The document and comments will be discussed and approved/rejected in a special, sub-chamber balanced meeting that will be convened by FSC-IC with the support of the Social Chamber members of the Board of Directors. 4) The decisions made at that meeting will be presented to the Board of Directors and will be included in the "Forest Stewardship Council Global Strategy" document. 	
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p> <p>Despite the importance of forest workers and their organizations, this social group is not included in the "FOREST STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL GLOBAL STRATEGY" document approved in 2007. In that document, no objectives or indicators are stated related to forest workers and their organizations. This social group – which is fundamental to Responsible Forest Management – should be included, especially in order to strengthen compliance with the Conventions of the International Labor Organization (ILO) and issues related to health, safety, wages and freedom of organization and collective bargaining.</p> <p>The purpose of this motion is to correct this situation by explicitly including the social group of forest workers and their organizations in the FSC Global Strategy.</p>	
<p>Document(s) to be revised / developed: FSC Global Strategy</p>	
<p>Timeline: High priority shall be given to including this proposal. It should be implemented no later than within a period of 1 year.</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC:</p>	

2.5 FSC Scope and competence development

No. / Title: 10) Due diligence for using FSC certification in combination with carbon-related claims and financing	Category: Policy
<p>Proposed by: FSC Forest Carbon Working Group</p> <p>Name:</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Chamber:</p> <p>E-mail:</p>	
<p>1) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name:</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Chamber:</p> <p>E-mail:</p>	<p>2) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name:</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Chamber:</p> <p>E-mail:</p>
<p>MOTION:</p> <p>FSC certified forest operations planning to obtain, or obtaining financial support for additional carbon sequestration and storage, or avoided deforestation or degradation as part of their certified management objectives shall demonstrate compliance with a credible carbon standard and accounting protocol. Such operations shall clearly demonstrate how carbon financing complements other FSC Principles and Criteria, particularly social safeguards regarding the protection, respect and exercise of the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities.</p>	



No. / Title: 10) Due diligence for using FSC certification in combination with carbon-related claims and financing	Category: Policy
<p>FSC shall establish an advisory body charged with determining initial criteria for recognition of credible carbon standards and accounting protocols, designing an FSC approval mechanism and re-evaluating such criteria no less than once a year.</p>	
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p> <p>Substantial new public and private capital is flowing into forest carbon projects and as such represents powerful new source of financing for investments in well-managed forests and conserved forests. In many parts of the world, FSC certified operations are already being used and recognized in voluntary carbon markets and in compliance markets (on UNFCCC registries), or as a platform for potential payments under an avoided deforestation (REDD) programme.</p> <p>There is a reputational risk for FSC to become associated with weak carbon accounting schemes through incomprehensive carbon standards or methodologies used and inaccurate claims made by FSC certified operations. To address this, the FSC Forest Carbon Working Group recommended that if carbon financing becomes an operational driver in a forest operation seeking FSC certification, a specific new criterion should be evaluated. This new criterion should include a reference to the integrity of carbon accounting systems, especially when FSC's brand is being associated with such systems.</p> <p>There is also a reputational risk for FSC to become associated with forest carbon financed projects if the potential strong economic driver of carbon financing is not carefully balanced with environmental standards and respecting core social safeguards. Adding carbon financing as a management objective affects the social, environmental and economic balance of the operation, hence a reconfirmation of compliance with all relevant FSC Principles and Criteria in the light of this addition will be necessary.</p>	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	FSC-STD-01-001 FSC Principles & Criteria Standard and procedure for the evaluation of carbon accounting methodologies
Timeline:	Completion of the ongoing review of the FSC Principles & Criteria
Cost to FSC:	15,000 to 30,000 EUR; depending on the number of meetings required to develop the standard and procedure for the evaluation of carbon accounting methodologies

No. / Title: 11) Embedding Climate Change into FSC Core Business ^{*)}	Category: Policy
<p>Proposed by:</p> <p>Name: Martin Carver Organization: Kootenay Centre for Forestry Alternatives Chamber: Social North E-mail: aqua@netidea.com</p>	
<p>1) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name: John Bergenske Organization: Wildsight Chamber: Environment North E-mail: john@wildsight.ca</p>	<p>2) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name: Jean Arnold Organization: Falls Brook Centre Chamber: Social North E-mail: ja@fallsbrookcentre.ca</p>
<p>MOTION:</p> <p>Instruct FSC IC to develop a Climate Change Working Group to review and revise FSC guidance and training documents to recognise the need for forest managers and landowners to adapt now to the potential consequences of climate change on water and other ecosystem goods and services upon which human communities and forest ecosystems depend.</p>	



No. / Title: 11) Embedding Climate Change into FSC Core Business *)	Category: Policy
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p> <p>Climate change will be the largest issue facing forest managers in the coming decades. As global climates continue to change, forest ecosystems will respond, bringing about alterations to the ecosystem goods and services provided by these forests (ref: Impacts, Adaption and Vulnerability Working Group component of the 4th report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). Communities around the world depend on these goods and services and will suffer if forest management does not begin planning today. Best science and guidance is needed for landowners and managers to make informed decisions about adapting to the effects of climate change thereby building resiliency into our ecosystems and communities.</p> <p>Forests vary in their inherent resistance and resilience to imposed changes in environmental conditions. Climate change will exacerbate other problems already stressing forests such as forest fragmentation, acid deposition, and invasion by exotic species. Forest management recommendations that prepare forests for climate change must deal holistically with the full range of forest threats and, as a result, climate-change adaptation responses must be integrated with other forest management responses to be successful.</p> <p>Forest certification must recognize these changes in its guiding documents. Unfortunately FSC, in its Principles and Criteria and its associated guidance and training documents, does not provide direction on how to prepare. In addition, the present P&C revision process does not include amendments to address this climate change omission.</p> <p>Full and appropriate recognition of climate change within the P&C is a potentially lengthy process. In the immediate term, it is important to flag to the FSC certification community that climate change is a factor of concern to FSC International that should be considered at every step of the forest certification process. To this end, this motion directs FSC International to begin the process of revising its guidance and training documents so that FSC staff and other agents are alerted to the significance of climate change in all interpretations and actions they undertake. Through time, as processes allow, changes can be considered to relevant FSC statutory and governing documents.</p>	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline: To be completed in all FSC processes by June 30, 2013.	
Cost to FSC: \$40,000. Cost also to include a representative on the Board of Directors.	

*) **FSC comment:**

A similar motion had been passed at the 2008 General Assembly (Policy Motion No. 43). The motion has been implemented with requested actions taken by the FSC Secretariat; details will be provided by the report of the Executive Director at the General Assembly.

No. / Title: 12) Certification of Protected Areas and Conservation Areas *)	Category: Policy	
<p>Proposed by:</p> <p>Name: Grant Rosoman Organization: Greenpeace New Zealand Chamber: Environment North E-mail: grosoman@greenpeace.org</p>		
<p>1) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name: Martha Nunez Organization: Fundación Ambiente y Sociedad Chamber: Social South E-mail: marthan@uio.satnet.net</p>	<p>2) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name: Richard Donovan Organization: Rainforest Alliance Chamber: Economic North E-mail: rdonovan@ra.org</p>	



No. / Title: 12) Certification of Protected Areas and Conservation Areas *)	Category: Policy
<p>MOTION:</p> <p>In consideration of the outcomes of the pilot phase of certification of protected areas and conservation areas (following the GA 2008 motion), FSC shall proceed with developing the appropriate system change to support and promote certification of protected areas and conservation areas.</p>	
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p> <p>FSC has historically focused on forest and plantation operations that harvest wood, largely because it has been a market-based initiative and the most publicly visible product from most commercial forests is wood. Significant and growing areas of forest are being allocated to forest conservation and protection (including to meet CBD protected area targets - now 17% by 2020 agreed at the recent CBD meeting in Nagoya), and coupled with new international financing for ecosystem services such as forest carbon it is expected that this will continue at an expanded rate. Conservation lands and protected area managers, donors and financers have an interest in independent auditing of forest conservation and protection on both public and private lands to desired standards to ensure that both the natural values are being maintained and that financial and other support being provided is achieving desired outcomes. While there are numerous global checklists and standards for protected areas and conservation (e.g. WWF/WB Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool, Global Conservation Standard), currently there is only one international scheme for the third party auditing of forest conservation (PanParks) and protected areas and it is focused solely on Europe. FSC has the infrastructure and systems to provide such a service on a global basis if there is a need and it is viable.</p> <p>Being able to carry out certification activities over a wider range of types of forest management other than logging offers an additional opportunity for FSC to achieve its mission and goals, in particular biodiversity conservation, indigenous peoples' rights and local community benefit. It could also generate additional revenue to support the FSC global network and system, and offer an additional business, forest conservation and social benefit opportunity to FSC's global partners. While certification for ecosystem services such as watershed management and non-wood forest products is already carried out in a minor way, there are no specific innovations in the system for protected areas and conservation. PA & CA Certification Project Spec Draft v2. / March 2011</p> <p>At the 2008 General Assembly a Policy Motion was passed that stated: <i>FSC will prioritize the development of procedures, guidance and system (including accreditation) adaptations to support the FSC certification of forest conservation and forest protected areas. This will include particular consideration of indigenous peoples' rights, local community benefit and co-management, and the monitoring of forest carbon and other ecosystem services. Within 12 months FSC carries out a feasibility assessment for the viability of offering an adapted certification and accreditation system for forest conservation and forest protected areas. If viability is positive, within a further two years the FSC develops generic standards, protocols, procedures and guidance to support and encourage the certification of forest conservation and forest protected areas.</i></p>	
<p>Document(s) to be revised / developed:</p>	
<p>Timeline:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC:</p>	<p>Initially there will be an upfront cost to FSC for it organize the policies and procedures in such a system and format, but depending on feasibility outcomes these will be recouped through additional business activity.</p>

*) **FSC comment:**
*A related motion had been passed at the 2008 General Assembly (Policy Motion No. 44). Activities to implement the motion have not commenced, yet, due to interdependencies with or prioritization of other work areas.
 It should be noted that the General Assembly's rejection of a Policy Motion repeating or re-emphasizing another motion that had been passed at a previous General Assembly but has not yet been fully implemented indicates that the General Assembly no longer considers the corresponding initiative a priority.*



No. / Title: 13) Certification of Silviculture		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Luis Fernando Pereira Rodas Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Environmental South E-mail: lpereirarodas@gmail.com		
1) Seconded by: Name: Raúl López Gilberto Recinos Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Social South E-mail: glee@occidentecorp.com.gt	2) Seconded by: Name: Blanca Beatriz Aragón Castillo Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Environmental South E-mail: blanca.aragon@gmail.com	
MOTION: <p>The choice of sustainable forest management requires strong investment in social and environmental matters in order to achieve the use, recovery and persistence of forests.</p> <p>In order to allow economic benefits from these investments, it is needed to have large areas of forest, among other strategies, to achieve economies of scale to generate enough income to cope with all requirements and environmental commitments.</p> <p>If the investments needed for the implementation of forest management is added the current cost of forest certification process, it is not very attractive for owners of small areas to incorporate their forest land for this purpose.</p> <p>As an alternative to reduce the costs of certification, the FSC body developed the policy of grouped certification and small and low intensity managed forest (SLIMF). However, neither group certification policy nor SLIMF, become feasible options when having very small extensions of forest land.</p> <p>Given the realities of forest owners "really small ones", both private and communal as well as indigenous people, it is needed to generate a policy that conforms to these conditions and constitutes an option for these forest lands. Owners are interested in maintaining and improving the condition of the forest and at the same time to satisfy its own needs from those forest uses.</p> <p>As a personal opinion, an alternative which has not been adequately explored is the chance to certify the technical side of forest management, specifically the "Silviculture".</p> <p>For a better explanation of the purpose of this motion, here are some definitions of basic concepts.</p> <p>Forest management as a division of forestry, is responsible for studying and implementing the intervention forms of a forest property, through the application of administrative methods and technical forestry principles, in order to obtain in a permanent way the goods and services they offer, to achieve the optimum benefit of available forest resources and at the same time, to achieve its conservation, considering aspects such as dasometric, silvicultural, biological, ecological, industrial, economic, administrative, financial, social and legal.</p> <p>In this sense, forest management involves the application of the dasonomic disciplines in an ecological, physiographic, political, economic and social context. This demands all the capacity and ability from forest planners to harmonize and handle a number of variables that lead to achieve production with some economic or social return, but without damaging the overall forest resource.</p> <p>In general terms, the intervention of the forest and forest areas requires to define silvicultural treatments to be applied to a forest mass biological considerations (concerning the biology of the</p>		



No. / Title: 13) Certification of Silviculture	Category: Policy
<p>species) and ecological (for forest ecosystems).</p> <p>In forest management, for the designation of silvicultural treatments applied to a forest, in addition to the biological and ecological characteristic of Silviculture is required economic, financial, social and technological considerations as well as dasometric-silvicultural considerations, so that silvicultural treatments to be applied, in addition to being biologically and ecologically appropriate, should be economically, financially, socially and technologically feasible.</p> <p>In practice, the first case corresponds to the Silviculture study, and the second is part of the field of Forest Management.</p> <p>Thus, although the Silviculture and Forest Management are part of the Forestry Sciences, both of them analyzed the feasibility of forest use from different points of view, in the first case, considering only the biological and ecological aspects, and in the second case, considering the economic, financial, technological and social aspects, as well as the biological and ecological issues, i.e., holistically.</p> <p>Thus, Silviculture is a fundamental tool of forest management.</p> <p>With the theoretical explanation of the process, implementing Silviculture practices has a lower cost than implementing all activities demanded by the forest management due to the breadth of technical and administrative elements that must be met.</p> <p>Forest areas of Central America are characterized by smaller size less than 100 hectares (minimum threshold defined in the SLIMF system), so that the implementation of forest management is almost impossible, not the Silviculture.</p> <p>Through the implementation of Silviculture seeks to use in a sustainably manner the forest areas, considering the ecology of development sites and species biology; the economic, financial, technological and social aspects are not considered in the global context.</p>	
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p> <p>The purpose of the motion is to evaluate the possibility to develop a scheme of "Silvicultural certification" to sites where it is not possible to implement sustainable forest management, due to reduced forest area subject to intervention.</p> <p>What happen if it is not taken into account this possibility?</p> <p>Simply in developing countries, where traditionally the size of production units is less than that suggested by the SLIMF standard, they would not be encourage to implement a responsible management system, consequently they may not have access to certification, even though they might have the interest and desire to incorporate the FSC Principles and Criteria. In addition, the economic cost of implementing management and certification is not feasible for these small users</p> <p>Specifically, the motion suggests assessing the need to create specific standards to certify the implementation of Silviculture (biological and ecological issues) in small units, where the implementation of sustainable forest management is not viable.</p>	
<p>Document(s) to be revised / developed: Standards for certification of silviculture</p>	
<p>Timeline:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: \$50,000. Drafting of the standard, validation workshops, writing of the final proposal.</p>	



No. / Title: 14) Creation of FSC Urban Forestry Standards		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Karen Steer Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Social South E-mail: karennsteer@gmail.com		
1) Seconded by: Name: Jeff Howe Organization: Dovetail Partners Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: jeff@dovetailinc.org		2) Seconded by: Name: Robert Hrubes Organization: Scientific Certification Systems Chamber: Economic North E-mail: rhrubes@scscertified.com
MOTION: That the FSC resolves to designate Urban Forests as a new forest type for inclusion under FSC Forest Management Standards and that the products and services derived from FSC-certified urban forests carry the rights and privileges of being FSC-certified. Items that may need to be developed include a definition of urban forest, as well as guidance and policy documents for urban forestry standards.		
Purpose and/or additional information: Urban forests are currently excluded from FSC because they do not fully meet the definitions of natural or plantation forestry. Nevertheless, they are managed in many cities throughout the world for long term social, economic, and ecological benefits. FSC standards could provide a much needed framework and mechanism to measure and recognise environmental and social performance in this realm. Urban Forestry standards and promotion would help make FSC far more visible to urban consumers of forest products and beneficiaries of urban forest ecosystem services. It also could provide a more accessible means for underserved communities to voice their concerns and needs in urban forestry. For the first time in human history, more people live in urban than rural areas. Humans depend on the natural world for raw materials and ecosystem services. Urban environments oftentimes require a combination of artificial and natural amendments to treat waste and pollution, and mitigate other negative effects of the built environment. The ecosystem service benefits of urban ecosystems as street trees, parks, remnant natural areas, and bioengineered systems are well documented and include the reduction of storm water runoff, treatment of suspended particles and volatile organic compounds, sequestration of carbon, reduction of noise pollution, shade, savings on building energy costs, wildlife habitat, psychological and physical health, and others. Urban trees can also be sources of forest products such as lumber, firewood, medicines, dyes, fruit, and nuts. Although these benefits may vary by degree and importance from city to city, they extend to both the global north and south. Many cities throughout the world have established urban forest management and/or urban wood utilization programs, including Bogotá, Belo Horizonte, New York, and Johannesburg. The planting of trees in urban centres of West Africa has been proposed to modify urban microclimate. An FAO meeting on urban forestry in 2008 in Bogotá, Colombia saw representatives from Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, England, India, Italy, and the United States sharing experiences and visions for the future of urban forestry. Clearly, the world is ready for action on providing a framework to manage urban forests and their derived products and services.		
Document(s) to be revised / developed:		
Timeline: June 2012		
Cost to FSC:		



No. / Title: 15) The Need to have a Biotechnology Stewardship Group at FSC: Reviewing Research and Scientific Developments on Forestry Biotechnology	Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Luciana Rocha Antunes Organization: IPEF – Forestry Science and Research Institute (Instituto de Pesquisas e Estudos Florestais) Chamber: Economic South E-mail: luciana@ipef.br	
1) Seconded by: Name: Lineu Siqueira Jr. Organization: Suzano Papel e Celulose S/A Chamber: Economic South E-mail: lineusiqueira@suzano.com.br	2) Seconded by: Name: David Rhodes Organization: NZFOA – New Zealand Forest Owners’ Association Chamber: Economic North E-mail: david.rhodes@nzfoa.org.nz
3) Seconded by: Name: Antonio Joaquim de Oliveira Organization: DURATEX S/A Chamber: Economic South E-mail: antonio.oliveira@duratex.com.br	4) Seconded by: Name: Organization: Chamber: E-mail:
MOTION: <p>The General Assembly should require FSC to start an open and participatory process through a Working Group composed by one FSC IC member, two members from each chamber, and one from each region (Northern and Southern). This group will be responsible for studying the "state of the art" of biotechnology, based on science and supported by experts at recognized international research institutes, scientific academies and universities. The group will be charged with getting to know and collect and review information about current advances in biotechnology, including genetically modified organisms (GMOs), their potential benefits and risks, biosafety measures, controls and conditions for safe use; as well as for ensuring that the FSC community is kept up to date on advances in technology and the forest sector.</p> <p>Ultimately, the Working Group should develop a science-based position on forest biotechnology and provide that to the advisory group, which will be composed by 30 members of FSC (10 from each chamber: five Northern and five Southern).</p>	
Purpose and/or additional information: <p>Ensure that FSC and its members are updated regarding the state-of-the-art on the biotechnology development, current lines of research, advances in scientific knowledge on the topic and results.</p> <p>FSC Criterion 6.8 prohibits any use of genetically modified organisms, which was implemented by FSC some time ago. Since this criterion was introduced, there has been a significant increase in the research, knowledge, development and safety record of genetically modified organisms in trees. More than 100 million hectares of genetically modified crops were grown in more than 20 countries in 2009, with nearly one billion hectares grown cumulatively since 1996. Risk assessment adopted by universities, research institutions, companies and regulatory systems and rules from national and international agencies are proven effective at managing, monitoring and avoiding negative impacts from GMOs and at ensuring biosafety.</p> <p>Worldwide studies prove that the adoption of biotechnology can contribute to reduced water and chemical use, yield improved productivity and mitigate CO2 emissions and contribute significant social, environmental and economic benefits:</p> <p>Social benefits: For trees, biotechnology will allow trees to be planted in areas with degraded lands, including poor soils, high salinity, severe drought or changing climate conditions. These trees in turn provide fuel, shelter and soil and watershed management benefits to people. The application of biotechnology in forestry will ensure a healthy, sustainable forest industry, which in turn vitalizes rural</p>	



No. / Title:	15) The Need to have a Biotechnology Stewardship Group at FSC: Reviewing Research and Scientific Developments on Forestry Biotechnology	Category: Policy
<p>areas where job creation and infrastructure are much needed to keep people in these rural areas keeping people in the countryside reducing rural exodus.</p>		
<p>Environmental benefits: In industrial applications, trees may lower the use of chemicals and energy consumption, reduce water use, effluents and waste generation, and aid soil remediation. Since biotechnology could allow the production of greater quantities of wood and fiber with improved quality, on less land, improved productivity per hectare will, decrease the pressure on native forests and limit the need to open new areas to planting.</p>		
<p>Planted forests have been highlighted as one of major available resources to reduce the consequences of climate change, due to the high capacity of trees to fix atmospheric carbon. In addition, in areas where species are under attack from pests and disease, biotechnology provides a more direct method of breeding resistance, in a much shorter time frame than could be accomplished through conventional breeding techniques.</p>		
<p>Economic benefits: The economic benefits of planted forests in supplying raw materials for industrial development are undisputed. In addition, the increased production of forest products, directly increase tax collection, provide raw material for global trade and significantly to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the development of the country</p>		
<p>A list of current studies, reports and findings that would be relevant to this FSC study group are as follows:</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD) Forest Biodiversity Decision IX/5 – COP9, where a consensus was reached in 2010 in regard to modifying the precautionary principle to a precautionary approach, clearly recognizing the benefits of forest biotechnology. • The Pontifical Academy of Sciences, Study Week at Vatican City, May 2009. While primarily focused on agriculture, its conclusions are equally important for the planted forest sector: more than one billion of the world 6.8 billion population is currently undernourished, a condition that urgently requires the development of new agricultural systems and technologies. The expected growth in population to nine billion people by 2050 adds even greater urgency to this problem of hunger, shelter and fuel. The predicted consequences of climate change and associated decreases in the water availability for agriculture will also affect our ability to feed a growing world population, and the appropriate application of Genetic Engineering and other modern molecular techniques in agriculture is addressing some of these challenges. • The Institute of Forest Biotechnology (IFB) based in Raleigh, North Carolina, revealed its <i>Responsible Use of GM Trees in 2011, a significant multi-stakeholder consensus on clear ethical and responsible guidelines for the stewardship of biotech trees. These principles were developed over the last 2-1/2 years with input from hundreds of stakeholders worldwide, including conservation groups, the world’s leading university researchers in forest biotechnology, government experts, tree growers and users. The IFB Principles were made to establish guidelines for the ethical and responsible stewardship of biotech trees.</i> 		
<p>Based on these points and more, it is important that FSC starts a process for an open and participatory study group, supported by science, about biotechnology and its responsible use in forests. As it is FSC’s mission is to promote environmentally appropriate, socially beneficial, and economically viable management of the world’s forests, it is critical for FSC members to be engaged in the process or risk unplanned and uncontrolled spread of GM trees in forestry.</p>		
<p>Document(s) to be revised / developed:</p>		
Timeline:	Two years - one year for overall study, six months to advisory group consultation and six months to present recommendation to the FSC Board.	
Cost to FSC:	The cost of a part-time moderator and writer from FSC-IC; costs of travel to the meetings (four meetings in a 12-month period to develop the Working Group and two meetings to consult with the Advisory Group.; cost of honoraria to members of the Working Group (six members from each chamber.).	



2.6 Principles & Criteria: Evolution

No. / Title: 16) Recognition of forest carbon by the FSC Principles & Criteria		Category: Policy
Proposed by: FSC Forest Carbon Working Group Name: Organization: Chamber: E-mail:		
1) Seconded by: Name: Organization: Chamber: E-mail:		2) Seconded by: Name: Organization: Chamber: E-mail:
MOTION: The FSC Principles & Criteria shall be revised to the effect that the carbon stock is recognized as environmental value that needs to be maintained and/or restored over the long term.		
Purpose and/or additional information: Forest ecosystems play a critical role in regulating the Earth's climate. They store and cycle enormous amounts of carbon in their biomass, in dead wood, litter and soil, their total carbon stocks exceeding the carbon in the atmosphere. The circumstance that the world's forests, as sinks and sources, have strong effects on the levels of CO2 in the atmosphere and that their ongoing conversion and degradation severely contributes to increasing CO2 levels at global scale, clearly makes forest carbon stocks an important environmental value and the maintenance and/or restoration thereof imperative for responsible forest stewardship. Just as for other resources such as water and soils, forest operations need to have a clear understanding of the impacts of their management practices on stocks of forest carbon. The reference to 'biogeochemical cycles' in the Explanatory Notes for the revised Criterion 6.1 seem to acknowledge this, but an explicit inclusion of 'carbon stocks' in the list of Environmental Values as defined by the Glossary and listed e.g. as part of the text of the revised Principle #6 or the new Explanatory Note #1 under Criterion 6.1 is vital to ensure that the carbon value of forests is adequately recognized and sustained.		
Document(s) to be revised / developed: FSC-STD-01-001 FSC Principles & Criteria		
Timeline: Completion of the ongoing review of the FSC Principles & Criteria		
Cost to FSC: None; possibly hosting a specific meeting on this subject.		

No. / Title: 17) Acknowledging carbon storage as a Principle 9 High Conservation Value		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Kerry Cesareo Organization: WWF US Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: kerry.cesareo@wwfus.org		
1) Seconded by: Name: Fran Raymond Price Organization: The Nature Conservancy Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: fprice@tnc.org		2) Seconded by: Name: Lewis Fix Organization: Domtar Corp Chamber: Economic North E-mail: lewis.fix@domtar.com



No. / Title: 17) Acknowledging carbon storage as a Principle 9 High Conservation Value	Category: Policy
MOTION:	
The GA requests FSC to develop, through appropriate stakeholder consultation, a proposal for how to include globally, regionally and nationally significant carbon stocks as High Conservation Values in Principle 9, taking account of potential consequences for a wide range of uses and users.	
Purpose and/or additional information:	
As climate change tops the global environmental agenda, many stakeholders expect climate concerns to be reflected in FSC standards and procedures. An FSC Carbon Working Group was set up in early 2010 to examine the issue and make recommendations. Although the P&C Working Group adopted some of the Carbon WG's proposals, the suggestion to incorporate carbon stocks as a new High Conservation Value was not taken onboard. The issue was discussed at a stakeholder meeting convened in November to assist the P&C WG, and a meeting on interpretation of the HCVs convened by FSC in January, but there was not agreement on specific recommendations. Nonetheless, we believe that significant carbon stocks should be included as a High Conservation Value on par with other critical ecosystem services, but without changing the essential character and utility of the HCV concept for its wide range of users within and outside FSC.	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline:	
Cost to FSC:	

No. / Title: 18) Potential certification of post 1994 converted plantations	Category: Policy
Proposed by:	
Name: Aisyah Sileuw Organization: Daemeter Consulting Chamber: Social-South E-mail: aisyah.sileuw@daemeter.org	
1) Seconded by:	2) Seconded by:
Name: Grant Rosoman Organization: Greenpeace New Zealand Chamber: Environment North E-mail: grant.rosoman@greenpeace.org	Name: Timothy Synnott Organization: Estudios Forestales Synnott A.C. Chamber: Economic South E-mail: timsynnott@prodigy.net.mx
3) Seconded by:	4) Seconded by:
Name: Ed Krasny Organization: Kimberley-Clark Corporation Chamber: Economic North E-mail: ekrasny@kcc.com	Name: Lewis C Fix Organization: Domtar Corporation Chamber: Economic North E-mail: lewis.fix@domtar.com
5) Seconded by:	6) Seconded by:
Name: Dale Kavalew Organization: Proctor & Gamble Chamber: Economic North E-mail: kavalew.dg@pg.com	Name: Organization: Chamber: E-mail:
MOTION:	
A chamber balanced working group shall be established to consider under what circumstances and conditions post 1994 converted plantations may be able to be FSC certified.	



No. / Title: 18) Potential certification of post 1994 converted plantations	Category: Policy
Purpose and/or additional information: Opening an appropriate avenue for plantation companies, that are committed to responsible plantation management and no further conversion, but that have legally converted natural forest to tree plantations after 1994, to be FSC-certified under certain conditions may provide important social and environmental benefits. Experience from for example Latin America indicate that FSC certification has had a positive impact on plantation management and shifted the paradigm towards transparency, better conservation, increased restoration of native ecosystems, and respect for indigenous peoples' and workers rights'. This motion respects the recommendations of the FSC Plantation Review as well as the FSC Global Strategy and motion 28 from the GA 2008 to increase certification in the tropics.	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline:	
Cost to FSC:	

2.7 Principles & Criteria: Implementation

No. / Title: 19) Establishment of P3 Committee to Review Indigenous Peoples' Involvement in FSC	Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Harry Bombay Organization: National Aboriginal Forestry Association Chamber: Social North E-mail: hbombay@nafaforestry.org	
1) Seconded by: Name: Martha Nuñez Organization: Fundacion Ambiente y Sociedad Chamber: Social South E-mail: marthan@uio.satnet.net	2) Seconded by: Name: Lynn Jungwirth Organization: Watershed Research and Training Center Chamber: Social North E-mail: Lynnj@hayfork.net
MOTION: That FSC International establish and support a committee to examine Indigenous peoples' involvement in FSC and the application of P3 in certifications with a view to upholding the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and ensuring that FSC effectively supports Indigenous peoples' rights in the application of FSC standards.	
Purpose and/or additional information: Previous studies of Indigenous peoples' involvement have not resulted in improved application of P3 [outline past studies P2/P3 study]. Explore intent of P3 in FSC standards around the world. Review challenges in application of P3 in various jurisdictions around the world. Conduct a sampling of Indigenous peoples whose territories are covered by FSC certifications to assess the satisfaction of Indigenous peoples with FSC certification. Ensure that committee members are the most knowledgeable people available to conduct this study, i.e. Indigenous people themselves, those who have been involved in Aboriginal/social chambers, those who have been involved in FSC standards development around P3.	
References: Here is a listing of relevant FSC documents:	



No. / Title: 19) Establishment of P3 Committee to Review Indigenous Peoples' Involvement in FSC	Category: Policy
See also United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, ILO Convention 169, other relevant treaties and conventions	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline: Committee to be struck be July 1 st 2011 with work to be completed by July 1 st 2012	
Cost to FSC: \$50,000-100,000	

No. / Title: 20) Certification of large-scale forest operations	Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Chris van Dam Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Social South E-mail: chris.vdam@gmail.com	
1) Seconded by: Name: Luis Astorga Organization: Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo Chamber: Social South E-mail: luisastorga@bosquenativo.cl	2) Seconded by: Name: Grant Rosoman Organization: Greenpeace New Zealand Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: grant.rosoman@greenpeace.org
MOTION: Formation of a Working Group balanced by sub-chambers (6 people) to study and present a proposal to the FSC's Board of Directors about specific aspects of certification of large-scale forest operations. This study should place emphasis on large operations in the South, plantations, and native forest management. In this study the following topics should be reviewed, as a minimum: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define the areas and circumstances in which an operation is considered to be a large-scale operation. The rules based on this motion would be applicable to these operations. 2. Analysis of the environmental impacts – positive or negative – that occur in large-scale operations. For example, in the soil, water, biodiversity, landscape, etc. 3. Analysis of the social impacts – positive or negative – that occur in large-scale operations. For example, impacts related to employment, local communities, relations with the indigenous people, the local economy, etc. 4. Analysis of local or regional political aspects and how they should be considered in FSC certification. 5. Analysis and proposal of the functions related to this topic that would correspond to National Initiatives and Certifiers. 6. Analysis of other relevant aspects that are identified during the course of the work. 	
Purpose and/or additional information: Certification of large-scale operations – and also small-scale certification – have special characteristics. In the case of small-scale certification, special procedures and standards have been developed. In the case of large-scale operations, the mere application of the standards and procedures for field review and consultations with stakeholders is not sufficient to ensure that the operation fully meets the letter and spirit of FSC certification. There have been frequent complaints of large-scale operations, especially in the south. Moreover, the size of the operation often has an influence on whole towns and on local, regional or national policies and development. Therefore, it is necessary to analyze the certification of these large operations in more detail to see whether or not it	



No. / Title: 20) Certification of large-scale forest operations	Category: Policy
is necessary to add some elements to the standards and procedures that make it possible to guarantee a proper FSC certification.	
The selection of the members of the Working Group should be done carefully in order to choose people with experience in this field.	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline:	The Working Group should be created and begin its work in the second half of 2011 and have a maximum period of one year to present its report.
Cost to FSC:	The costs of 2 meetings a year and a visit to two or three cases should be considered.

No. / Title: 21) Clarifying FSC requirements for mitigating the impacts of intensive management	Category: Policy
Proposed by:	
Name: Christoph Thies	
Organization: Greenpeace International	
Chamber: Environmental North	
E-mail: Christoph.Thies@greenpeace.org	
1) Seconded by:	2) Seconded by:
Name: Kerry Cesareo	Name: Ed Krasny
Organization: WWF US	Organization: Kimberly-Clark Corporation
Chamber: Environmental North	Chamber: Economic North
E-mail: Kerry.Cesareo@wwfus.org	E-mail: ekrasny@kcc.com
MOTION:	
The FSC shall develop operational guidelines and minimum performance requirements for mitigating the impacts of intensive management in line with the recommendations from the Plantations Policy WG, including quantitative and qualitative requirements for the protection and/or restoration of representative natural ecosystems and other measures, on or off site. The FSC shall carry this out via a process with stakeholder consultation and expert input.	
Purpose and/or additional information:	
There are a number of situations in the FSC P&C where scale, intensity, level of impact and risk are required to be considered. This is one of the most challenging aspects of national/regional standards setting and requires guidance and clarification from FSC to ensure a consistent global application of the standards. Using an impact-based approach to intensively managed plantations was a specific recommendation of the Plantation Policy Working Group. The proposed Principle 6.5 "The Organization shall identify, conserve and/or restore representative sample areas of natural ecosystems within the Management Unit. The size, design and connectivity of these areas, and the management measures applied in them, shall be proportionate to the uniqueness, vulnerability, conservation status and value of these ecosystems at the landscape level, and to the scale, intensity and risk of management activities in the Management Unit as a whole" would have the need to clarify the requirements of scale and intensity and therefore impact and risk.	
Document(s) to be revised / developed: International Generic Indicators, Guidance Notes	
Timeline:	Within 12 months
Cost to FSC:	approx. 50,000 EUR for expert and consultative process



No. / Title: 22) Biomass Sustainability		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Mike DeBonis Organization: Forest Guild Chamber: Social North E-mail: mike@forestguild.org		
1) Seconded by: Name: Bill Wilkinson Organization: BBW Associates Chamber: Social North E-mail: bwilkinson@bbwassociates.com	2) Seconded by: Name: Martin Carver Organization: Kootenay Centre for Forestry Alternatives Chamber: Social North E-mail: aqua@netidea.com	
MOTION: FSC shall establish a working group to assess the applicability of Principles and Criteria to address ecological and social impacts of biomass harvesting and removal on FSC certified forests.		
Purpose and/or additional information: Woody biomass removal and utilization for energy can provide ecosystem benefits by improving forest health and productivity and helping to meet community social and economic goals. While woody biomass holds tremendous promise as a source of renewable energy, considerable risks are also associated with biomass removal including adverse effects on biodiversity, soil productivity, wildlife habitat, water and air quality. A finite supply of forest biomass exists that can be produced sustainably. Future demands for both existing and new competitive uses of woody biomass may lead to an unsustainable market demand on FSC certified forests. FSC principles and criteria should limit the use of biomass to the amount that can be grown, harvested, and supplied sustainably.		
Document(s) to be revised / developed:		
Timeline: The assessment will be completed and its findings prepared within three years of motion passage		
Cost to FSC: \$10,000		

No. / Title: 23) Derogation procedures and national initiatives		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Mike Jani Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Economic North E-mail: mjani@hrcllc.com		
1) Seconded by: Name: Bill Wilkinson Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Social North E-mail: bwilkinson@bbwassociates.com	2) Seconded by: Name: Gordon Mouw Organization: NewPage Corporation Chamber: Economic North E-mail: Gordon.Mouw@newpagecorp.com	
MOTION: FSC shall develop a policy that establishes a framework for national initiatives to process derogations for pesticides and other necessary and substantiated temporary exemptions from elements of the forest management standards. If no national initiative exists for the location or where the national initiative does not have the capacity to uphold rigorous FSC processes, the evaluation and determination will be made by the International Center.		



No. / Title: 23) Derogation procedures and national initiatives	Category: Policy
Purpose and/or additional information: There are situations where environmental, social, and economic benefits are prevented by FSC FM requirements. In cases where forest managers can demonstrate additional conservation, social, and/or economic benefit from exemption from requirements, temporary exemptions from the forest management standards can best be handled through a chamber-balanced derogation process. Pesticide derogations are examples of this process. Issues relative to the timeliness and understanding of the local issues involved have hampered the process at the International Center. National initiatives that have a demonstrated capacity to uphold FSC processes are better suited to provide experts who understand the local issues. The national initiatives are also better suited to provide a timely response since it is likely they will not be handled nearly as many derogation requests.	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline: December 2011	
Cost to FSC:	

No. / Title: 24) Insertion of Environmental Risk Assessment in FSC Pesticides Policy	Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Luciana Rocha Antunes Organization: IPEF – Forestry Science and Research Institute (Instituto de Pesquisas e Estudos Florestais) Chamber: Economic South E-mail: luciana@ipef.br	
1) Seconded by: Name: Mauricio Voivodic Organization: IMAFLORA – Instituto de Manejo e Certificação Florestal e Agrícola Chamber: Economic South E-mail: mauricio@imaflora.org	2) Seconded by: Name: Antonio Joaquim de Oliveira Organization: Duratex S/A Chamber: Economic South E-mail: antonio.oliveira@duratex.com.br
MOTION: The General Assembly requires FSC to create a Working Group, which should be chamber balanced, to discuss the inclusion of the Environmental Risk Assessment approach in the evaluation of FSC list of 'highly hazardous' pesticides.	

Purpose and/or additional information:

The purpose of this Motion is to ensure that FSC can adopt the Environmental Risk Assessment on your Pesticide Policy to evaluate the FSC list of 'highly hazardous' pesticides formulated for the forest management, through the work of a Working Group which shall review the Pesticide Policy considering this approach. The Policy Motion enables that FSC use not only the aspects of hazard that are considering in the Pesticide Policy to identify the "highly hazardous" pesticides, but also takes into account the process of Risk Assessment which allows the proper identification and categorization of the substances according to their risks to the environment.

The lack of criteria in applying the 'Precautionary Principle' can take to undesirable results. Establishing indicators and thresholds for the identification of 'highly hazardous' pesticides is an important contribution from FSC. FSC recently walking in this direction by reviewing the FSC-PRO-01-004 (V3-0) – Processing Pesticide Derogation Applications, which was revised and placed on consultation. Among other proposals, this document puts that prevention of negative social and



No. / Title: 24) Insertion of Environmental Risk Assessment in FSC Pesticides Policy	Category: Policy
<p>environmental impacts shall always take priority over minimization and mitigation measures and this only could be attended efficiently with the Risk Assessment.</p> <p>Risk Assessment is an attractive tool for better measuring and understanding the nature and extent of the risk posed by the contaminants and for informed decision-making about potential mitigation strategies. The process of pesticide Risk Assessment allows the proper identification and categorization of these substances according to their risks to the environment (Solomon, 2001). Risk Assessment is also used in a number of forms by pesticide regulatory agencies in many countries as well as internationally through the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) of the World Health Organization (WHO).</p> <p>The criteria employed in the selection of indicators and thresholds in the “highly hazardous” pesticides classification of FSC Pesticide Policy is based on the toxicological evaluation of products, taking into account only the “hazard” level, whereas exposure and product utilization procedures are not discussed at all. Toxicity data should not be considered in an isolated form, but evaluated within a broader context in which exposure data will provide important elements for this assessment.</p> <p>Besides, Risk Assessment to the human health is defined by IUPAC (1996) as a process where the risk is associated with the usage profile. The risk quantification requires i) hazard identification; ii) the establishment of dose-response relationship in individual-targets and/or populations targets, and iii) exposure assessment (HOLLAND, 1996).</p> <p>Thereby, the assessment made only by the hazard of pesticides restricts the analysis to a single parameter. An example can be found in conditions where a product has a high toxicity and does not represent a risk to the worker and/or the environment, because of the exposure conditions, such as dose, concentration and/or form not result in exposure levels that could bring any prejudice to these targets.</p> <p>Based on all points mentioned above, FSC should create a Working Group to analyze the adoption of Environmental Risk Assessment considering both the specific and real hazard potential of the “highly hazardous” pesticides, establishing in its Pesticide Policy Guidance, in addition with currently indicators, as established in the FSC Criterion 6.6.</p> <p>References:</p> <p>Solomon, K.R. Ecotoxicological risk assessment of pesticides in the environment. In: Handbook of Pesticide Toxicology. Vol. 1. Principles. Academic Press. p. 353-373. 2001. Holland, P. T. Glossary of terms relating to pesticides. Pure & Applied Chemistry, v.68, n.5, p. 1167-1193, 1996. Available in: http://old.iupac.org/publications/pac/1996/pdf/6805x1167.pdf</p>	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline:	One year
Cost to FSC:	Honoraries of four worldwide specialists – Brazil, Oceania, USA and EU

2.8 National Standards and Certification Bodies' Interim Standards

No. / Title: 25) Use of interim standards for forest management certification *)	Category: Policy
<p>Proposed by:</p> <p>Name: Fran Price</p> <p>Organization: The Nature Conservancy</p> <p>Chamber: Environmental North</p> <p>E-mail: fprice@tnc.org</p>	



No. / Title: 25) Use of interim standards for forest management certification *)		Category: Policy
1) Seconded by: Name: Robert Hrubes Organization: Scientific Certification Systems Chamber: Economic North E-mail: rhurbes@scscertified.com		2) Seconded by: Name: Karen Steer Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Social North E-mail: karennsteer@gmail.com
MOTION: FSC shall review and revise the policies associated with use of interim standards to ensure system integrity and consistency of application. The review shall consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing a set of generic standards that will be used instead of, or as a foundation to, interim standards developed by Certifying Bodies; • Establishing policy about conditions where interim standards may be applied and conditions where National Initiatives must be formed to develop FSC approved national or regional standards; and, • While interim standards are still in use, establishing an area of the FSC website where all interim standards are publicly accessible. 		
Purpose and/or additional information: Interim standards, developed by Certifying Bodies, are used in areas where National Initiatives have not yet developed approved forest management standards. Their use has resulted in situations where it is believed that FSC system integrity is challenged or compromised. For example, in some cases (e.g., Honduras) prominent non-profit organizations claim they were not consulted in the development of interim standards being used in their region. There are also regions (e.g., Indonesia) where multiple Forest Management certificates have been issued under multiple interim standards – in some cases these interim standards vary significantly. Overall, interim standards are not subject to the level of detail as are approved FM standards. While interim standards have been quite useful to date in facilitating the expansion of certification into new areas, it is time to assess their continued utility, overall consistency, and their potential to compromise FSC system integrity.		
Document(s) to be revised / developed:		
Timeline: The review shall be completed prior to Dec. 31, 2011, and any recommendations implemented by Dec. 31, 2012.		
Cost to FSC:		

*) **FSC comment:**
*A related motion had been passed at the 2005 General Assembly (Policy Motion No. 48). First actions have been taken to implement the motion; details will be provided in the report of the Executive Director at the General Assembly.
 It should be noted that the General Assembly's rejection of a Policy Motion repeating or re-emphasizing another motion that had been passed at a previous General Assembly but has not yet been fully implemented indicates that the General Assembly no longer considers the corresponding initiative a priority.*



No. / Title: 26) Inquiry into impact of special standards applied to certification of any category of land (government, tribal, private, state, or other) on affected rural communities	Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Lynn Jungwirth Organization: Watershed Research and Training Center Chamber: Social North E-mail: Lynni@hayfork.net	
1) Seconded by: Name: Harry Bombay Organization: National Aboriginal Forestry Association Chamber: Social North E-mail: hbombay@nafaforestry.org	2) Seconded by: Name: Chad Davis Organization: Sustainable Northwest Chamber: Social North E-mail: cdavis@sustainablenorthwest.org
MOTION: <p>FSC IC should conduct an investigation to determine if any classes of lands (public, private, indigenous) are being discriminated against by the policies of a National Initiative and to develop recommendations, guidelines or clarifying policies if any instances of discrimination are found. The investigation should be completed within one year of passage of this motion; Any National Initiative found to have policies that result in discrimination should be required to take action on the recommendations within six months of the completed investigation.</p>	
Purpose and/or additional information: <p>To determine if the policies of any National Initiative that apply special standards or procedures for any class of lands create inequitable access to certification.</p> <p>In the United States the National Initiative has required special qualifying procedures to the U.S. Forest Service to apply for FSC certification. We believe these procedures are designed to prevent the certification of lands by those that do not want active management of these lands. The lack of an authentic opportunity for U.S. Forest Service to apply for FSC certification has negative implications for: 1) improving the supply of certified wood in the U.S. market, 2) ability of rural communities and enterprises to engage in the green market place, and 3) improving government procurement policies and standards related to worker wages and safety.</p> <p>Further the traditional communities surrounded by public lands are among the poorest in the American West. We have hoped that our responsible stewardship of public lands, our ability to create social consensus for that work, and our attempts to build small local wood products businesses suited for this work would receive support from FSC and, finally, in the marketplace. We are disheartened by our inability through FSC to use green markets to reward and encourage exemplary forestry practices on U.S. Forest Service lands. We feel even greater frustration in the fact that the opportunity to have a neutral, third-party assessment of our U.S. Forest Service lands, based on standards that define exemplary forestry, is being denied. In addition to supporting environmental goals, FSC might play the critically needed role of ensuring that federal land management is carried out in a socially-equitable way, addressing the human and economic conditions of high-poverty communities adjacent to federal lands, as it does in other countries across the globe.</p> <p>The United States is the only country within the FSC system that does not currently have any of the lands that are dedicated to forest management certified. The United States Forest Service manages 193 million acres (78 million hectares, 297,000 mi²/769 000 km²) of land and has 155 individual national forest units, and countless collaborative groups comprised of diverse stakeholders and local people that are involved in consensus processes to develop forest management projects. These lands comprise 8.5 percent of the total land area of the United States.</p>	
Document(s) to be revised / developed: Policy regarding equitable application of standards and procedures	



No. / Title:	26) Inquiry into impact of special standards applied to certification of any category of land (government, tribal, private, state, or other) on affected rural communities	Category: Policy
Timeline:	January 2012	
Cost to FSC:	Include another representative in the Board of Directors meetings. \$10,000	

2.9 Support for smallholders and communities

No. / Title:	27) Motion to reduce unnecessary costs to SLIMF operations by the adoption of regional risk assessments		Category: Policy
Proposed by:	Name: Mauricio de Almeida Voivodic Organization: IMAFLORA Chamber: Economic South E-mail: mauricio@imaflora.org		
1) Seconded by:	Name: Ricardo Camargo Cardoso Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Economic South E-mail: ricardo@imaflora.org	2) Seconded by:	Name: Rubens Gomes Organization: OELA Chamber: Social South E-mail: rubensgomes@oela.org.br
MOTION:	<p>FSC shall reduce the unnecessary costs that have been preventing the certification of communities and small forest operations around the world. To do so, FSC shall develop a procedure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Define a risk assessment mechanism to re-classify SLIMF operations according to regional criteria; - The risk assessment mechanism shall be implemented primary by National Initiatives, where it exists. In the absence of NI’s, the mechanism can be implemented by FSC Regional Offices or National Working Groups, according to the interest and importance of communities and small operations in each country; - Based on the risk assessment classification, FSC procedures and certification requirements shall be revised and streamlined by the NI (or FSC Regional Office or National WG), including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Procedures for group certification o Requirements for certification reports and public summaries formats and contents; o Criteria for the allowance of desk audits; o Definition of certification criteria that may be considered as non applicable; o Others, according to regional characteristics; 		
Purpose and/or additional information:	<p>We, FSC members, need to recognize the fact that the FSC system is not yet applicable for communities and small forest owners, especially in the tropics. The system is still too bureaucratic and too costly to be adopted by the large majority of communities and small forest owners in developing country. This is a big deal since this situation prevents FSC to fully achieve its institutional objectives, considering that more than 50% of the tropical forest area in the world is under the domain of communities and small land owners. This is one of the reasons of why the FSC is not increasing the forest stewardship in the tropics.</p> <p>The FSC policy for SLIMF was an important step but has not changed much of the situation. Since the eligibility criteria still includes a large group of very different situations around the world, including forest managers that represent very different levels of social and environmental risks, the SLIMF streamlined procedures may be effective for some situations, but not for the others.</p>		



No. / Title: 27) Motion to reduce unnecessary costs to SLIMF operations by the adoption of regional risk assessments	Category: Policy
<p>This is why there's still room for more simplification, reducing unnecessary requirements and procedures and lowering the overall certification costs. And this is why such simplification should be done in a national or regional level, recognizing the different realities around the world and adapting the FSC system to the national or regional contexts.</p> <p>Passing the responsibility for this kind of definition to national groups of FSC stakeholders is the most effective way to face the challenge of certification for local communities and small land owners.</p>	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline: By the end of 2011 and applicable for the approved motions at the 6 th GA 2011.	
Cost to FSC:	

No. / Title: 28) Incentives for obtaining and maintaining certification for communities and SLIMF forest operations	Category: Policy
<p>Proposed by: Name: Cándido López Organization: Cooperativa Agroforestal Colon Atlántida Honduras Limitada (COATLAHL) Chamber: Economic South E-mail: coatlahl@gmail.com</p>	
<p>1) Seconded by: Name: Jens Holm Kanstrup Organization: Nepenthes Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: jhk@nepenthes.dk</p>	<p>2) Seconded by: Name: Javier Fernandez Candela Organization: COPADE Chamber: Social North E-mail: javierfernandez@copade.org</p>
<p>MOTION: The FSC shall create incentives for communities and small and low-intensity management operations to obtain certification and remain in the FSC system.</p> <p>This motion is directed towards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Having the FSC create a fund to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facilitate incentives and training for communities and SLIMF FMUs in countries in the South in order to increase certification of a larger number of community forests and SLIMFs. - Train national auditors to make evaluations and audits of small, low-impact operations (SLIMFs) and communities; auditors must be accredited by the FSC for this type of work. - Support the development of SLIMF standards and community management in countries that require support. 2. Having the FSC give more committed support to promoting and marketing certified products from communities and SLIMF operations by linking them to potential buyers. 3. Having the FSC identify and apply alternatives that encourage certifying bodies to establish more representation in the countries where they operate and to promote the application of the SLIMF system, which would contribute to reducing costs. 4. Having the FSC develop generic indicators for SLIMF operations within a period of one year. 	



No. / Title: 28) Incentives for obtaining and maintaining certification for communities and SLIMF forest operations	Category: Policy
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p> <p>Small and community forests are managed by people with very low incomes and a high degree of vulnerability. These areas are preserved because of the low-impact, traditional management that is practiced by these communities. Markets do not widely recognize certified products from communities; nevertheless, little by little these certified products are being identified by consumers, especially those with a high level of environmental and social awareness. Therefore, forest certification offers an opportunity to market these products in differentiated markets, achieving better prices and ensuring market niches and the long-time permanence of these forests. However, the high costs of certification and meeting its requirements are an obstacle to access it, so it is necessary for the FSC to make forward-looking decisions that will help to create conditions that favor access to certification and maintaining certification by communities and SLIMF FMUs.</p> <p>Training national auditors accredited by the FSC would reduce the cost of evaluations and monitoring by having trained, accredited personnel in the respective countries.</p>	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline: 30 July 2012	
Cost to FSC:	

No. / Title: 29) Motion to include a new eligibility criterion for Small and Low Intensity Managed Forests (SLIMF) in FSC-POL-20-100	Category: Policy
<p>Proposed by:</p> <p>Name: Damián Villacrés Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Social North E-mail: dvillacres@hotmail.com</p>	
<p>1) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name: Marvin Centeno Solórzano Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Environmental South E-mail: centenomarvin@yahoo.com.mx</p>	<p>2) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name: Isis Lagos Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Social South E-mail: lagosisis@yahoo.com</p>
<p>MOTION:</p> <p>The proposal is for the FSC to review the eligibility criteria and include a new one for FMUs to be classified as SLIMFs, by meeting the following two variables:</p> <p><i>*See table structured according to the FSC International Criteria and the maximum values for defining the SLIMF categories.</i></p>	



No. / Title: 29) Motion to include a new eligibility criterion for Small and Low Intensity Managed Forests (SLIMF) in FSC-POL-20-100 **Category:** Policy

SLIMF CLASSIFICATION	CRITERIA (WITHOUT THRESHHOLD VALUES)	MAXIMUM INTERNATIONAL THRESHHOLD	NATIONAL OR SUB-NATIONAL VARIATION	COMMENTS
LOW INTENSITY FOREST MANAGEMENT UNITS	An average maximum harvested volume during the period of the certificate's validity that can be verified in harvest reports and surveillance audits. AND FMU with non-mechanized haulage	No more than 5,000 m3 /year from the total area of forest production during the period of the certificate's validity that is verified in harvest reports and follow-up audits. Haulage activities in forest harvesting are not mechanized.	The maximum annual volume must be less than 5,000 meters. The international threshold shall apply at the national or sub-national level.	To qualify, management units must show through forestry projections the levels of annual and total harvesting during the period of the certificate's validity. Prior to this and in every audit, the FMUs must submit reports and means for verifying yearly harvests. In order for the FMU to qualify under this criterion, it must show through an environmental impact evaluation of forest harvesting the haulage method used and its impacts. It should show through annual reports the evolution of impacts generated by the use of other means of haulage.

Purpose and/or additional information:

This proposal to include and add the MAXIMUM YEARLY HARVEST VOLUME and the concept of NON-MECHANIZED HARVESTING is intended to provide access to forest groups that do not have concrete information about forest growth through the MAI and that perform low-intensity activities in the tropical forests of the Americas.

It is important to stress that since these are small-scale management activities, they reflect low dependence on the forest and therefore mechanization is not part of the production process. The use of other haulage methods definitely shows that the forest harvesting level is low impact and is at a lower productivity level than a business model.

The problems of mechanization must be added to this. For example, in areas with a rugged topography, such as the case of the northern zone of Honduras or the northern zone of Ecuador where there are certified forest management activities, if mechanization were to be introduced, it would generate larger effects than what is stated in the eligibility criterion.



No. / Title: 29) Motion to include a new eligibility criterion for Small and Low Intensity Managed Forests (SLIMF) in FSC-POL-20-100	Category: Policy
<p>This proposal is based on a review of public summaries of forest certification, in which it can be seen that there are forest operations that were qualified as SLIMFs based on the intensity criteria and that also included small-scale forest operations with non-mechanized haulage. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The APAS forest management area located in Brazilian Amazonia has 1,638 hectares certified for management of latex and timber and it does timber cutting and haulage manually. • The forest management area covering 800 hectares in the Chachi Capuli Center, certified in March 2009 in Ecuador, with production of sawn lumber and manual haulage of dimensional wood in the forest. • The forest management area administered by the COATLAHL group, 19,588.40 hectares, is managed by collective associations that produce dimensional wood from the forest and use non-mechanized methods for haulage and transportation. <p>This is also complemented by the forestry experience acquired in Ecuador through the regulations currently in force, which differentiate industrial forest management from management practiced by small-scale producers.</p> <p>The standard establishes a criterion of non-mechanized haulage that applies only to forest units that usually are small producers. This should result in more individual producers becoming involved in forest management and timber legality.</p> <p>In general, this proposal should be supported by complementary studies to verify the level of impact of this type of operation. An element that should be included to support this proposal should be the impact evaluation and follow-up reports that every forest operation must keep in its forest certification system. These reports would be the basis to sustain this proposal.</p>	
Document(s) to be revised / developed: Eligibility Criteria for SLIMFs FSC-POL-20-100	
Timeline: 30 August 2012	
Cost to FSC:	

2.10 Stakeholder involvement

No. / Title: 30) Motion to promote transparency	Category: Policy
<p>Proposed by: Name: Christoph Thies Organization: Greenpeace International Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: Christoph.Thies@greenpeace.de</p>	
<p>1) Seconded by: Name: Peter K. Kristensen Organization: Dalhoff Larsen & Horneman A/S Chamber: Economic North E-mail: peter.k.kristensen@dlh-group.com</p>	<p>2) Seconded by: Name: Kasper Kopp Organization: Tracer Chamber: Economic North E-mail: kk@tra-cer.com</p>
<p>MOTION: In order to promote transparency all audit reports pertaining to audits carried out under the FSC system shall be available on the internet. This includes all audits carried out by the ASI and FSC accredited Certification Bodies. The reports shall be available no later than 90 days after the audit has been carried out. Confidential information, such as information regarding customers, suppliers, clients etc. may be removed from the reports before they are uploaded on the internet.</p>	



No. / Title: 30) Motion to promote transparency	Category: Policy
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p> <p>The FSC is known to be an open and transparent system, but unfortunately the transparency is limited to the forest. FSC stakeholders are able to gain insight in the audits carried out in FSC certified forests, as certification bodies and the ASI are required to upload summary reports of FM audits to the FSC/ASI webpage.</p> <p>In comparison it is impossible for FSC stakeholders to get any information about chain of custody audits, controlled wood audits or field verifications carried out by the CBs and chain of custody audits, controlled wood audits or field verifications and office assessments carried out by the ASI.</p> <p>Furthermore, the current FM reports available on the internet are of limited use for the FSC stakeholders, as they mostly contain generic information. True transparency comes from making everything public except the few things that are strictly confidential, not from hiding everything except the few things that direly needs to be made public.</p>	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline:	
Cost to FSC:	

No. / Title: 31) Improve the processes for stakeholder participation and consultation in the FSC's certification processes	Category: Policy
<p>Proposed by:</p> <p>Name: Luis Astorga Organization: Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo Chamber: Social South E-mail: luisastorga@bosquenativo.cl</p>	
<p>1) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name: Chris van Dam Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Social South E-mail: chris.vdam@gmail.com</p>	<p>2) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name: Paula Montenegro Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Social South E-mail: pam@cablenet.net</p>
<p>MOTION:</p> <p>The FSC shall develop procedures to improve the processes for stakeholder participation and consultation in forest certification, recertification and annual review of certificates.</p> <p>For these purposes, the following procedure will be followed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) FSC-IC will form a Working Group of 6 people by Sub-Chambers to analyze and evaluate the current systems, selected experiences and complaints. It will also prepare proposals to meet three objectives: (1) Improve processes for participation by stakeholders in Responsible Forest Management of FMUs; (2) Improve the systems for stakeholder consultation by certifiers; and (3) Give the National Offices a more active role in participation and consultation processes. 2) The Working Group's proposal shall be submitted for public consultation. 3) The Working Group will prepare a final report for approval by the Board of Directors. 4) FSC-IC, ASI, Certifiers and National Offices will implement the approved proposals. 	



No. / Title: 31) Improve the processes for stakeholder participation and consultation in the FSC's certification processes	Category: Policy
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p> <p>One of the fundamental aspects of the FSC System's credibility, transparency and strictness is the importance given to stakeholder relations with the FMU and consultation about stakeholder participation as part of the certification assessment and annual audit process.</p> <p>However, numerous problems are found in the two situations, both in the participation and consultation process, which places doubt on the system's credibility and transparency. It is therefore of fundamental importance to improve both the relations between stakeholders and the FMUs and the consultation process during the certification assessment and annual audit. In addition, it is seen that the National Initiatives (IN) do not play a very active role in consultations.</p> <p>Therefore, the objectives of this motion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve the processes of participation by the groups of people affected (stakeholders) by forest management and the relations between these groups (workers, neighboring communities, and indigenous people) and the FMUs. 2. Improve the systems for consultations by certifiers with stakeholders. 3. Give National Offices a more active role in public consultation in certification processes. 	
<p>Document(s) to be revised / developed:</p> <p>FSC Global Strategy: In addition to reviewing the implications of the new P&C on stakeholders' participation and consultation, at least the following standards should be reviewed: FSC-STD 20-006 (V3-0) FSC-STD 20-007 (Version 2-1) FSC-POL-20-002 (2000)</p>	
<p>Timeline: The group's formation and work should begin as soon as possible and its proposals should not take more than one year so that the FSC-IC can present an evaluation of the implementation at the next FSC Assembly in 2014.</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC:</p>	

2.11 Accreditation system

No. / Title: 32) Addressing inconsistent interpretations in audits	Category: Policy
<p>Proposed by:</p> <p>Name: Brent Stinnett Organization: Potlatch Corp. Chamber: Economic North E-mail: brent.stinnett@potlatchcorp.com</p>	
<p>1) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name: Mike Jani Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Economic North E-mail: mjani@hrcllc.com</p>	<p>2) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name: Fred Souba, Jr Organization: NewPage Corporation Chamber: Economic North E-mail: fred.souba@newpagecorp.com</p>
<p>MOTION:</p> <p>FSC establish a policy to address inconsistencies between FM audits. FSC shall establish a policy to ensure that when an interpretation of FSC requirements is established during an initial or re-certification assessment, the interpretation shall be maintained for the five-year life of the certificate. This policy applies to cases where the requirements, as written in the standards and associated policies, do not explicitly change.</p>	



No. / Title: 32) Addressing inconsistent interpretations in audits	Category: Policy
Purpose and/or additional information: Changes in interpretations of FSC standards by audit teams (including by changes of members of an audit team) leads to significant planning challenges and economic loss for forest managers. Forest managers must make a long-term commitment to FSC, and must establish long-term planning and modeling to forest management models, yet there is no protection of the stability of this commitment on the part of Certification Bodies. Forest managers need to be able to understand and have confidence that they understand what their long-term commitment to FSC entails. This motion relates to changes in interpretation of the requirements where management regimes and plans do not change. It does not affect where new evidence is found leading to a new determination of non-conformance. Interpretations established by CBs should be subject to the same level of commitment that forest managers are subject to in their planning.	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline: Within 12 months.	
Cost to FSC:	

No. / Title: 33) Motion for ASI to standardize training of auditors	Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Paula Montenegro Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Social South E-mail: pam@cableat.net / paula.montenegro1@hotmail.com	
1) Seconded by: Name: Martha Núñez Organization: Fundación Ambiente y Sociedad Chamber: Social South E-mail: marthan@uio.satnet.net	2) Seconded by: Name: Luis Astorga Organization: Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo Chamber: Social South E-mail: luisastorga@bosquenativo.cl
MOTION: Through ASI, the FSC-IC should standardize auditor training. It is proposed that: ASI shall conceptualize and submit training standards based on the accreditation requirements for qualification of the CB auditors. These standards should specify – among other items – the auditors' experience, period of theoretical and field training, training contents and evaluation.	
Purpose and/or additional information: The intention of the motion is to standardize auditors' training for the purpose of improving their performance in follow-up audits. The fact that each CB trains its auditors is causing discrepancies in the results of audits by different certifiers regarding the same audited aspects. These discrepancies are manifested in: 1. A limited ability to define adequately and consistently for each situation the thoroughness and rigor of the review. 2. The quality of the resulting reports with regard to their contents and detail. 3. The speed, consistency and resolution of consultations by certificate holders.	
Document(s) to be revised / developed: FSC Global Strategy: Goal 3b	
Timeline: It is expected that this motion will be implemented by July 2012.	
Cost to FSC:	



No. / Title: 34) Focus on field performance in the FSC system		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Jens Holm Kanstrup Organization: Nepenthes Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: jhk@nepenthes.dk		
1) Seconded by: Name: Mauricio de Almeida Voivodic Organization: IMAFLORA Chamber: Economic South E-mail: mauricio@imaflora.org		2) Seconded by: Name: Kasper Kopp Organization: Tracer Chamber: Economic North E-mail: kk@tra-cer.com
MOTION: We, the members of FSC, hereby encourage the FSC boards and all the FSC institutions at all levels to emphasize the importance of field performance as the primary emphasis in implementing the FSC certification program. Therefore we, the members of FSC, hereby state that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The FSC shall ensure that forest management performance, true to the FSC principles and Criteria for responsible forest management, is the primary focus of FSC certification; ▪ The FSC accredited certification bodies verifying an FMU's compliance with the FSC requirements shall focus primarily on evaluating the FMU's compliance with the standards based on field performance. ▪ The first priority of Accreditation Services International (ASI) responsible for accrediting the certification bodies shall be to pay special attention to the quality of the certification bodies' verification of field compliance of certified operations. ▪ The FSC National Initiatives responsible for developing regional or national standards, as well as the ASI responsible for endorsing national and regional standards, shall focus on developing indicators that promote and favor good field performance of the FMU's, ▪ The Policy and Standard Unit (PSU), FSC Board and others involved in developing policies, guidance, standards and other FSC requirement shall ensure that FSC requirements are primarily focused on favoring good field performance. ▪ Auditor training shall be focused on field performance and the core issues that are most important to the mission and the credibility of the FSC system. 		
Purpose and/or additional information: The ASI and PSU are increasingly emphasizing procedural and administrative requirements in the FSC certification system, for both forest management certification and accreditation standards for certifiers. This is furthermore reflected in the audits carried out by the ASI, which often focus on systems and procedures rather than actual performance in the field. The result of this is that the relative importance of field performance is reduced, as the certification bodies are forced to focus on the same issues as ASI and PSU in order to avoid receiving corrective action requests. Systems, policies, procedures and plans might be a good tool for achieving good performance in forest management, but these should never be a goal in itself. The aim of the FSC is to promote sustainable forest management in the field, not just on paper.		
Document(s) to be revised / developed:		
Timeline:		
Cost to FSC:		



2.12 Policy development

No. / Title: 35) Policy development revision *)		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Brent Stinnett Organization: Potlatch Corporation Chamber: Economic North E-mail: brent.stinnett@potlatchcorp.com		
1) Seconded by: Name: Bill Wilkinson Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Social North E-mail: bwilkinson@bbwassociates.com	2) Seconded by: Name: Karen Steer Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Social North E-mail: karennsteer@gmail.com	
MOTION: FSC PSU must develop a transparent, deliberate, and consistent process for the development and implementation of new policies. This process for policy development and implementation shall be communicated to stakeholders (including FSC Members & Certificate Holders) and made publically available. The process will address the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FSC PSU shall not produce any new or revised policy (including guidance) without study of the effect of the policy decision, public consultation, and documented rationale for any new or revised policy - Public consultation and outreach shall be designed to understand the implications of proposed policy changes on system integrity and potential harm to the system - Public consultation and outreach shall include efforts to understand the best timing of policy changes and best mechanisms for implementation of policy - PSU shall be transparent and shall present documented justification for any new policy - Advice notes shall be discontinued. They are not advice, they are regulatory policy. 		
Purpose and/or additional information: The number of, timing of, and quality of policy changes is damaging to our system's integrity and function. PSU issues very regular policy changes in the form of guidance and advice notes that are not accompanied by any justification, are issued without any forewarning, are issued without opportunity to view or comment on a draft, and are issued without a sufficient understanding of the impacts on our system. FSC members and partners, including certificate holders, regularly view FSC certification as a moving target – FSC asks forest managers and COC certificate holders to install policies, management plans, and tracking systems that are costly and designed for long-term planning and use. The continuous change in policy is damaging to our program.		
Document(s) to be revised / developed:		
Timeline: December 2011		
Cost to FSC:		

*) **FSC comment:**
A related motion had been passed at the 2008 General Assembly (Policy Motion No. 35). First actions have been taken to implement the motion; details will be provided in the report of the Executive Director at the General Assembly.
It should be noted that the General Assembly's rejection of a Policy Motion repeating or re-emphasizing another motion that had been passed at a previous General Assembly but has not yet been fully implemented indicates that the General Assembly no longer considers the corresponding initiative a priority.



No. / Title: 36) Annual Policy Manual for the FSC System, for use by accredited certifiers, National Initiatives, ASI auditors, both candidate and certified operations, and stakeholders *)	Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Richard Z. Donovan Organization: Rainforest Alliance Chamber: Economic North E-mail: rdonovan@ra.org	
1) Seconded by: Name: Grant Rosoman Organization: Greenpeace New Zealand Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: grant.rosoman@greenpeace.org	2) Seconded by: Name: Ray Baker Organization: Kingfisher Chamber: Economic North E-mail: ray.baker@kingfisher.com
MOTION: FSC shall implement, beginning for calendar year 2012, the development and distribution of an annualized policy and procedures manual for use by all FSC related entities, including FSC International Center, ASI, National Initiatives, Certification Bodies and candidate or certified operations, and stakeholders. All policies and procedures to be implemented for each calendar year shall be finalized by November of the previous year, so that all entities have sufficient time to ensure full understanding, the training and orientation necessary to fulfill and implement FSC requirements.	
Purpose and/or additional information: Currently there is no defined timing or schedule for the release of FSC policies and procedures. Policies and procedures come out in an unpredictable fashion. There is constant confusion amongst various FSC-related entities and interested parties as to what specific policies are applicable. As a result there is constant confusion, and sometimes conflict, between various FSC-related entities as to which requirements are in place or applicable. In addition, FSC members, staff, ASI auditors, and stakeholders of all kinds find it virtually impossible to keep up with all of the various dialogues on specific policies and procedures, much less consistently implement them.	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline:	
Cost to FSC: Initially there will be an upfront cost to FSC for it to organize the policies and procedures in such a system and format, but in the near-term this will reduce costs, and improve policy clarity, throughout the FSC system.	

***) FSC comment:**

A related motion had been passed at the 2008 General Assembly (Policy Motion No. 35). First actions have been taken to implement the motion; details will be provided in the report of the Executive Director at the General Assembly.

It should be noted that the General Assembly's rejection of a Policy Motion repeating or re-emphasizing another motion that had been passed at a previous General Assembly but has not yet been fully implemented indicates that the General Assembly no longer considers the corresponding initiative a priority.

2.13 Chain of Custody and Labelling

No. / Title: 37) Motion on recycled material ^{*)}		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Jörg-Andreas Krüger Organization: NABU e.V. Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: Joerg.Krueger@NABU.de		
1) Seconded by: Name: Uwe Sayer Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: uwe@sayer-online.de		2) Seconded by: Name: Nina Griesshammer Organization: WWF Deutschland Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: nina.griesshammer@wwf.de
MOTION: This motion asks for feasibility-study of the option for incorporation of environmental criteria in the CoC standards applicable to the production of FSC-certified paper, including the processing of fibre (pulp, recycled fibre, and related products), in order to safeguard the values and integrity of the FSC brand. The study should include an analysis of existing environmental certification systems (such as the European Eco-label, the Blue Angel and the Nordic Swan, ISO 14000, EMAS) and the possibility to incorporate such systems in the FSC C-o-C requirements for pulp/paper producers on a global level. The study should also evaluate the implication for economic, and operational impacts and market uptake. Consideration should also be given to small producers of pulp or paper products.		
Purpose and/or additional information:		
Document(s) to be revised / developed:		
Timeline: End of 2011		
Cost to FSC: No external costs		

***) FSC comment:**

An identical motion had been passed at the 2005 General Assembly (Policy Motion No. 34). Activities to implement the motion have not commenced, yet, due to interdependencies with or prioritization of other work areas.

It should be noted that the General Assembly's rejection of a Policy Motion repeating or re-emphasizing another motion that had been passed at a previous General Assembly but has not yet been fully implemented indicates that the General Assembly no longer considers the corresponding initiative a priority.

No. / Title: 38) Certified Reclaimed (PAPER) Material by FSC-STD-40-004		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Ulrich Leberle Organization: Confederation of European Paper Industry Chamber: Economic North E-mail: u.leberle@cepi.org		
1) Seconded by: Name: Glen N. Johnson Organization: FutureMark Paper Chamber: Economic North E-mail: glen.johnson@futuremarkpaper.com		2) Seconded by: Name: Coen van der Veer Organization: FNV Bouw Chamber: Social North E-mail: coen.vanderveer@fnvbouw.nl



No. / Title: 38) Certified Reclaimed (PAPER) Material by FSC-STD-40-004		Category: Policy
3) Seconded by: Name: Brent Stinnett Organization: Potlatch Corp Chamber: Economic North E-mail: Brent.stinnett@potlatchcorp.com		4) Seconded by: Name: Dale Kavalew Organization: Procter & Gamble Chamber: Economic North E-mail: Kavalew.dg@pg.com
5) Seconded by: Name: Maria Tysiachniouk Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Social South E-mail: tysiachn@yandex.ru		6) Seconded by: Name: Mike Jani Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Economic North E-mail: mjani@hrcllc.com
MOTION: FSC shall revise FSC-STD-40-004 (Version 2-0) with a view to include all Reclaimed PAPER materials as input towards FSC credit or input percentage for the production of FSC Mixed Product groups (PAPER) or FSC Recycled (PAPER) credit.		
Purpose and/or additional information: Maximize Reclaimed PAPER materials (post-consumer and pre-consumer sources) for paper production, and increase the availability of FSC certified paper with responsibly sourced fiber content. The objective of certifying reclaimed materials is to incentivize the use of recycled fiber and thereby contribute to a more responsible use of the forest resources along the lifecycle. This is in alignment with <u>A Common Vision for Transforming the Paper Industry</u> . Pre-consumer fiber (reclaimed paper generated by commercial, industrial and media facilities “in their role as end-users of the product which can no longer be used for its intended purpose”) is of the same eligible character as valuable, sustainable, local input as post-consumer fiber (for paper production). Excluded, and not accepted as reclaimed PAPER material, are inputs that can be reused on site within the same manufacturing process that generated it (commonly known as mill broke). Background: An increasing amount of paper products are produced from reclaimed material as technology progresses. To produce high quality end-products from reclaimed material, the quality of the raw material input is crucial. While recovered paper is purchased according to international standards and classification systems, FSC only distinguishes pre- and post-consumer reclaimed material. The proportion of pre-consumer in the total collection of recovered paper is in the range of 10 to 15% on average. However, this fraction is crucial for paper recycling, since its composition is homogeneous and exactly known by the buyer of the material. It is the backbone for paper recycling, allowing for the growing volume of (heterogeneous) household materials to be recycled. The vast majority of recovered paper used in the paper industry is post-consumer (85-90%), originating from end-users in industry, shops or households. Historically, the distinction between pre- and post-consumer reclaimed material has been introduced to increase collection from households. Collection levels from households have significantly increased in all parts of the world. The recovered paper collection rates in 2008 have reached 50% in Asia, 57% in North America and 66% in Europe. Keeping in mind the scarcity of land and pressures on food, fuel and fibres, it becomes clear that the global demand for recovered paper will remain high and all recycled fibre will be needed. Therefore the simplistic distinction of reclaimed materials in two groups does not serve any environmental purpose any longer. Non-accountability of pre-consumer reclaimed material is an unnecessary discrimination of a part of the reclaimed material, which is needed to make the recycling of post-consumer materials possible. The rule is de facto preventing some high-quality recovered paper based products from being certified.		



No. / Title: 38) Certified Reclaimed (PAPER) Material by FSC-STD-40-004	Category: Policy
<p>Certain paper products like boxes and newspapers have been produced from recovered paper for a long time. To produce higher qualities of paper products based on recycled fibre, the industry needs to enhance its raw material basis. And to use post-consumer material for high-quality end-products, it needs to be blended with pre-consumer to refine the raw material mix. Thereby an efficient use of the reclaimed material can be ensured.</p> <p>The foreword of FSC-STD-40-004 (Version 2-0) EN claims that the new standard version aims to make the overall FSC policy framework for Chain of Custody certification more feasible by introducing new concepts ... by considering pre-consumer reclaimed material as eligible input in "FSC Recycled" product groups. This policy change was an important step, since it has made the use of the FSC standard more feasible for paper products based on recovered paper. Based on the encouraging experience, FSC should continue the work and overcome fully the distinction between pre- and post-consumer reclaimed PAPER material.</p> <p>Suggested Revision to FSC STD 40-004 V2 EN 8.3.1: The calculation of input percentage shall be:</p> $\% \text{ input} = [Q(\text{FSC}) + Q(\text{Reclaimed PAPER material})]/Q(\text{Total})$	
Document(s) to be revised / developed: FSC STD 40-004 V2 EN 8.3.1	
Timeline: December 31, 2011	
Cost to FSC:	

No. / Title: 39) FSC Labeling – Recycled fiber exclusive to 'Mix' label	Category: Policy
<p>Proposed by: Name: Lewis Fix Organization: Domtar Corp Chamber: Economic North E-mail: lewis.fix@domtar.com</p>	
<p>1) Seconded by: Name: Chris McDonell Organization: Tembec Chamber: Economic North E-mail: chris.mcdonell@tembec.com</p>	<p>2) Seconded by: Name: Jason Grant Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Economic North E-mail: Jason@jasongrantconsulting.com</p>
<p>MOTION: Reduce the number of on-product labels to 2, FSC Pure, and FSC Mix. Products containing recycled fiber would use the Mix label, and the percentage of FSC Certified recycled fiber would be noted within the mobius loop OUTSIDE the FSC label. Only the percentage of Post-Consumer fiber, as designated by the laws of the destination country, can be claimed as the recycled content.</p>	
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: The laws, designations, and classifications of recycled fiber differ across countries. Currently, the FSC standards for recycled attempt to classify post consumer, post industrial, and pre-consumer. The standards are complex, and take resources away from the original intent of FSC, supporting better management of the world's forests. The FSC label should represent world class forest management, and the use of recycled fiber can be supported within the Mix label, and identified alongside the FSC label.</p>	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline: Within 12 months	
Cost to FSC: Should free up resources to devote towards increased forest certification.	



No. / Title: 40) Recognizing Salvaged Urban Wood as Reclaimed		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Jeff Howe Organization: Dovetail Partners Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: jeff@dovetailinc.org		
1) Seconded by: Name: John Gunn Organization: Manomet Center for Conservation Science Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: jgunn@manomet.org	2) Seconded by: Name: Robert Hrubes Organization: Scientific Certification Systems (SCS) Chamber: Economic North E-mail: rhrubes@scscertified.com	
MOTION: FSC to establish a policy recognizing salvaged urban trees and materials as reclaimed material, including a process to review and amend Annex 1 of FSC-STD-40-007 V1-0 <i>Sourcing Reclaimed Material for Use in FSC Product Groups or FSC-Certified Projects</i> to clarify recognition of the recovery of urban trees and parts of urban trees as post-consumer wood sources for reclaimed wood material. The policy shall continue to include all relevant aspects of Chain of Custody and labeling to guarantee product traceability. Definitions for acceptable urban areas, urban trees and/or urban wood may need to be adopted.		
Purpose and/or additional information: Annex 1 of FSC-STD-40-007 V1-0 <i>Sourcing Reclaimed Material for Use in FSC Product Groups or FSC-Certified Projects</i> currently identifies “Defibrillated and solid wood recovered from landfills, transfer stations, and Material Recovery Facilities (MRFs)” within the category of “Post-consumer wood sources”. However, the footnote for this entry reads “Wood Waste generated at MRFs, Landfills and Transfer Stations originated from other municipal sources listed above, but is mentioned separately for clarification. This source may contain pre-consumer reclaimed wood.” The interpretation of this annex has been that only materials from construction and demolition are recognized as post-consumer. The purpose of this motion is to amend Annex 1 of FSC-STD-40-007 V1-0 <i>Sourcing Reclaimed Material for Use in FSC Product Groups or FSC-Certified Projects</i> to clarify recognition of the recovery of urban trees and materials from urban trees as post-consumer wood sources for reclaimed wood material. The basis for this clarification is threefold: 1) the primary consumer purpose of urban trees is in their living form and when removed due to damage, disease or for public safety they have completed their primary consumer purpose; 2) urban trees are treated as a waste product similar to other post-consumer materials; 3) urban wood can be salvaged and diverted from landfills similar to other post-consumer materials. Today, urban trees are typically managed primarily for their living benefits and value. Felled urban trees are rarely harvested with an eye toward additional uses, even though timber from urban areas in the U.S. alone could produce 3.8 billion board feet of lumber annually. The failure to manage trees from seed to sawdust leads to the unnecessary loss of valuable natural resources and unnecessary expenses for communities and homeowners. In addition, a wonderful opportunity to connect people with the natural cycles and benefits of the urban forest is lost. A growing body of research shows that urban wood utilization can provide community economic development opportunities. Unlike commercial logging of timberlands or plantation management, urban wood and materials come from trees felled for reasons unrelated to logging or commercial production. Diverting urban wood to higher value purposes makes the best, most valuable, and most imaginative use of this resource. Trees and wood from urban areas can acquire a second life as urban forest products ranging from building materials, to furniture to art at the initiative of individual entrepreneurs, wood artists, and urban forest products companies.		



No. / Title: 40) Recognizing Salvaged Urban Wood as Reclaimed	Category: Policy
<p>Including urban wood as part of the definition of post-consumer wood is consistent with the intent of the standards for reclaimed material. In addition, by including urban wood as a post-consumer wood source, the FSC will promote greater recovery and higher-value uses of this material while helping to reduce landfill disposal of recyclable materials. Assuring that urban trees obtain their highest and best use provides many environmental, economic and social benefits for people and communities in urban areas and beyond.</p>	
<p>Document(s) to be revised / developed: FSC-STD-40-007 V1-0 <i>Sourcing Reclaimed Material for Use in FSC Product Groups or FSC-Certified Projects</i></p>	
<p>Timeline: December 31, 2011</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC:</p>	

No. / Title: 41) Development of an FSC Volume Tracking System	Category: Policy
<p>Proposed by: Name: Jens Holm Kanstrup Organization: Nepenthes Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: jhk@nepenthes.dk</p>	
<p>1) Seconded by: Name: Mauricio de Almeida Voivodic Organization: IMAFLORA Chamber: Economic South E-mail: mauricio@imaflora.org</p>	<p>2) Seconded by: Name: Kasper Kopp Organization: Tracer Chamber: Economic North E-mail: kk@tra-cer.com</p>
<p>MOTION: FSC shall develop a volume tracking system enabling FSC to track FSC-certified and FSC-controlled wood through the supply chains. Information shall be gathered through a real time online system through which companies can enter information on purchase and sales of FSC certified wood. Where necessary, a system can be set up to allow FSC accredited certification bodies to collect and enter data from small operations in developing countries during the annual audits. The developed tracking system shall be part of ASI's efforts to ensure that the amounts of FSC-certified wood being sold match the amounts entering the FSC system. The development of the volume tracking system shall be coordinated with relevant stakeholders and shall to the extent possible be based on or be compatible with existing volume tracking systems in the timber industry.</p>	
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: Under the current FSC CoC system the FSC accredited CBs only control single links in the supply chain and the entire supply chain may therefore be controlled by various different CBs. This makes it practically impossible to verify that the amounts of wood being sold with an FSC label actually concur with the amounts of FSC certified wood entering the system. This makes the system vulnerable to fraud. Volume tracking systems already exist in other sectors - including the agricultural sector - and these may serve as a good source of inspiration when developing such a system for the FSC.</p>	
<p>Document(s) to be revised / developed:</p>	
<p>Timeline:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC:</p>	

No. / Title: 42) Species and origin as chain of custody requirement		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Uwe Sayer Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: uwe@sayer-online.de		
1) Seconded by: Name: Nina Grieshammer Organization: WWF Germany Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: nina.griesshammer@wwf.de	2) Seconded by: Name: Olaf Bandt Organization: Bund für Umwelt und Naturschutz Deutschland e.V. Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: olaf.bandt@bund.net	
MOTION: The membership mandates the Board of Directors to evaluate the feasibility of incorporating the declaration of species and geographical origin of wood as obligatory requirements of FSC's chain of custody system.		
Purpose and/or additional information: Due to ongoing processes within legal requirements in a growing number of countries (U.S. Lacey Act; Swiss regulation; EU legislation, 2012), there is a growing demand from politicians, companies and from consumers for more transparency in the supply chain. Increasing problems around raw material resources lead to a growing awareness of consumers and an increasing demand for sustainable origin and transparency in the supply chain. FSC certification ensures and shows that wood or wood based products derive from responsibly managed forests (and possibly other controlled sources) - irrespective of the geographical origin of the material. Recent developments suggest that - whether certified or not - an indication of species and geographical origin is necessary: 1. For export to the United States among other details the scientific name of the species and country of origin need to be declared (U.S. Lacey Act, in force since 1 April 2009). Certification is not a criterion. 2. According to EU legislative resolution laying down the obligations of operators who place timber and timber products on the market (European Parliament of 7 July 2010) primary distributors have to declare as part of due diligence: - description, including the trade name and type of product as well as the common name of tree species and, where applicable, its full scientific name - country of harvest, and where applicable: sub-national region where the timber was harvested and concession of harvest; Again, no exception for certified product is intended. 3. In Switzerland (regulation of June 2010) wood based products need to be marked with species name and geographical origin of the wood. This applies to the Swiss retail trade, however, concerns the entire supply chain, and that across borders, to be able to provide the information. These rules apply regardless of certification. The new regulation of Switzerland reflects the trend in critical consumer countries. Determination of species and geographical origin of wood is the easier the closer the purchasing company is located at the forest the material origins from (beginning of the product chain). But often the companies close to the consumers (manufacturing or trading final products, at the end of the product chain) require the information. Regarding the above obligations FSC certified companies do not have many competition advantages compared to non-certified companies. However, there is already a certified chain of custody, of which the necessary information could be easily monitored and documented through the whole production chain.		



No. / Title: 42) Species and origin as chain of custody requirement	Category: Policy
<p>Recording of species is already a chain of custody requirement, but only “if information on species composition is commonly used to designate the product characteristics” (FSC-STD-40-004 V2.0, 2.1.1). This exemption leads to the fact that species are mainly captured for solid wood products or by companies close to the forests, at the beginning of the product chain. Anyway, the specific transmission of the information to the companies handling final products is currently not obligatory required.</p>	
<p>For buyers at the beginning of the product chain, buying round wood directly from the forest enterprise, the information about geographical origin is already there and easily recordable. Transferring it through the certified chain of custody could be arranged with clear rules and schemes for declaration. Specification of the country of origin would be a reasonable first step, going deeper to the district should be discussed. For FSC Controlled Wood this is already a requirement and basis for the whole concept of Mixed products. But the data transfer through the chain of custody is missing.</p>	
<p>Technically the information could be transmitted by short, simple and commonly used codes. Concerning species an adequate list is already provided by FSC (FSC-STD-40-004b Species Terminology). It needs to be updated and extended, maybe transferred into an online species database. For specification of the country of origin international recognized codes can be used (e.g. according to ISO 3166 Country Codes). To reduce the administrative burden for certified companies it should be considered that the data does not need to be stated on each invoice (as it is for example a requirement for the FSC Claims and COC/CW codes). As an alternative it could be declared for specific articles, over certain production periods or for the whole purchase situation of a company, provided that it is a clear and precise statement.</p>	
<p>An on-product declaration of species and geographical origin on the final products (as in Switzerland) is not intended with this motion, but the necessary data should be provided to certified companies who want or need to do that.</p>	
<p>This motion was initiated by HORNBACH-Baumarkt AG, Germany.</p>	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	Revision of FSC-STD-40-004 (Chain of custody standard), update and extension of FSC-STD-40-004 b (Species terminology), development or adaption of country/district code scheme (e.g. according to ISO 3166 Country Codes)
Timeline:	2011 (European directive will be put into national legislation until 2012)
Cost to FSC:	Internal costs for evaluation, a potential standard revision process and document developments. No external investments necessary. Additional cost may arise by developing and providing a database to manage species and countrycodes which would be recommended.

No. / Title: 43) Requirement for FSC-certification of name-giving Species in FSC-mix-products	Category: Policy
<p>Proposed by: Name: Uwe Sayer Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: uwe@sayer-online.de</p>	
<p>1) Seconded by: Name: Jörg-Andreas Krüger Organization: NABU e.V. Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: Joerg.Krueger@NABU.de</p>	<p>2) Seconded by: Name: Martin Schwenninger Organization: Industriegewerkschaft Bauen-Agrar-Umwelt Chamber: Social North E-mail: martin.schwenninger@gmx.de</p>



No. / Title: 43) Requirement for FSC-certification of name-giving Species in FSC-mix-products	Category: Policy
<p>MOTION:</p> <p>The membership mandates FSC to change existing COC-requirements in a way, that If FSC-products are characterized by species names (for example oak-kitchens, merbau-parquet), where the name-giving specie is only part of the whole product (for example the visible veneer), this name-giving material has to be FSC-certified and can not only be verified against controlled wood-requirements.</p>	
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p> <p>This motion seeks for improvements within the labeling of FSC-Mix-products to protect consumer-interests.</p> <p>Currently it is possible to label FSC-Products with FSC-Mix-Labels, where the characterizing (name-giving) specie has to be only controlled wood verified and not FSC-certified. For example an FSC-certified oak-kitchen is according to current rules possible when the visible oak-veneer is controlled wood and the remaining rest (mainly chip or particle board) is FSC-Mix as long as the whole production process of the kitchen follows COC-requirements.</p> <p>A consumer would expect that the oak-veneer of an FSC-certified oak-kitchen is FSC-certified. Especially with products of controversially discussed species (some tropical timer species) it is confusing that the name-giving and visible specie of a product has not necessarily to follow FSC-requirements for this specie.</p> <p>Comparable regulations are already implemented within the COC-requirements, where it is currently not allowed to use uncertified components as visible faces as veneer on top of other materials (FSC-STD 40-004; Part IV: Supplementary Requirements, 13 Minor components, 13.1.2). This motion aims to extend this concept and restrict the use of Solid wood veneer used as visible face veneer on top of the other materials only to FSC-certified materials in cases where the product is sold under the name of this visible face veneer.</p>	
<p>Document(s) to be revised / developed: FSC-STD 40-004</p>	
<p>Timeline: End of 2011</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: No external costs</p>	

No. / Title: 44) Improving access for small enterprises to Chain of Custody certification through standards and support services *)	Category: Policy
<p>Proposed by:</p> <p>Name: Chad Davis Organization: Sustainable Northwest Chamber: Social North E-mail: cdavis@sustainablenorthwest.org</p>	
<p>1) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name: Jeff Howe Organization: Dovetail Partners Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: jhowe@dovetailinc.org</p>	<p>2) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name: Mauricio Voivodic Organization: Imaflora Chamber: Economic South E-mail: Mauricio@imaflora.org</p>
<p>MOTION:</p> <p>That FSC shall develop a working group to review and, if necessary revise, its Chain of Custody standards (FSC-STD-40-004) as they pertain to small and/or custom businesses. The review shall consider the congruence of standards with small, custom enterprises and whether a specific standard should be developed for the unique conditions of custom businesses (similar to SLIMF).</p>	



No. / Title: 44) Improving access for small enterprises to Chain of Custody certification through standards and support services *)	Category: Policy
<p>The working group shall also consider the need to develop general support services – including tools and templates – that promote and facilitate the uptake of Chain-of-Custody certification among micro-enterprises worldwide.</p>	
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p> <p>Similar to the condition of managers of small, low-intensity forests (SLIMFs), small Chain of Custody businesses that produce custom wood products experience difficulty in remaining economically viable while also producing FSC-certified products for the marketplace. While group certification provides invaluable technical assistance for conforming to the FSC standards and is a tremendous asset for spreading auditing costs among small enterprises, most of the Chain of Custody standard was developed for operators with high volumes and a consistent product mix. As a result, several specific aspects of the standard inequitably impact small and custom sawmill operations. Yet, the additional effort needed to conform to the standard does not provide additional assurance within production of certified products but dramatically increases administrative burden and costs. There may be a need for the standard to be modified for small enterprises in a way that takes into account the size and scale of their operations while still maintaining a high level of integrity and credibility in the standard.</p> <p>For example, custom businesses produce products as prompted by the orders they receive and do not operate with high production volumes. Typically, these types of enterprises do not pre-process any products or maintain product inventories. FSC products are also typically a small proportion of total sales for custom enterprises. Therefore, the ratio of product volume by Product Group varies tremendously due to the compounding impacts of low volume production, high variability in product demand, and the relative percentage of their business that is FSC-certified. These businesses also do not exclusively purchase logs specific to Product Group and often in-process inventory is much higher than finished product inventory.</p> <p>Group Chain of Custody has the potential to rapidly increase access for small, community-scaled wood products businesses across the world and further develop critical supply chains for high-value products. There is a strong correlation between these types of small and micro-enterprises and SLIMFs and there is strong potential that the expansion of group Chain of Custody certification could return increased value to SLIMFs and to the FSC system as a whole. Yet in order to achieve this, the CoC standard might need to be revised in order to take into account the unique attributes of their operations.</p> <p>Similarly, to round out the ‘package’ for increasing uptake of the standard with smaller operations, the development of tools and other support services may be necessary and should be considered. Collectively, the standard and associated procedures and tools will ensure the integrity of the system while minimizing the impact on small, custom enterprises.</p>	
<p>Document(s) to be revised / developed: FSC-STD-40-004: FSC Standard for Chain of Custody</p>	
<p>Timeline:</p>	<p>Review completed by Fall 2012; any resulting revisions to be completed by Summer 2013</p>
<p>Cost to FSC:</p>	

*) **FSC comment:**

A similar motion had been passed at the 2005 General Assembly (Policy Motion No. 33). Activities to implement the motion have not commenced, yet, due to interdependencies with or prioritization of other work areas.

It should be noted that the General Assembly's rejection of a Policy Motion repeating or re-emphasizing another motion that had been passed at a previous General Assembly but has not yet been fully implemented indicates that the General Assembly no longer considers the corresponding initiative a priority.



No. / Title: 45) Development of an FSC Standard for Multi-site Certification of Retail Chain of Custody Operations		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Ray Baker Organization: Kingfisher plc. Chamber: Economic North E-mail: Ray.baker@kingfisher.co.uk		
1) Seconded by: Name: Richard Donavon Organization: Rainforest Alliance Chamber: Economic North E-mail: RDonovan@ra.org		2) Seconded by: Name: Grant Rosoman Organization: Greenpeace New Zealand Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: grant.rosoman@greenpeace.org
MOTION: FSC shall develop a Chain of Custody (CoC) standard specifically for retail organizations selling to customers who wish to make an FSC claim. This standard shall take account of the unique nature of major multi-site retail operations, who do not make any physical changes to certified products and have full centralized control of purchasing, distribution and marketing.		
Purpose and/or additional information: FSC's Global Strategy (2008) outlines in Goal 4 "Products from FSC Certified Forests Will Create More Business Value than Products from Non-FSC Certified Forests", with specific objectives focusing on understanding the needs of top businesses (4a) and ensuring strong market value (4b). Unfortunately, the delivery of "consistent value in the FSC brand and services in the markets" is disrupted by a CoC system poorly designed for retailers. Retailers, selling finished or packaged FSC labeled products to final users, largely fall outside the scope of CoC certification. However, those retailers who sell to customers who either want to make a claim or meet a procurement policy (such as a government department or local government office), may need to demonstrate full CoC to meet their customers' requirements. For example, in the UK public procurement accounts for 30% of all timber purchases and often requires a valid CoC (CPET, 2010). Construction contractors also require a valid CoC and play an important role in many retailer customer bases. This means that in order to support and strengthen FSC's value in the markets, it is important that retailers are able to implement CoC requirements in an effective and efficient manner Retailers with multiple outlets who wish to sell to customers not recognized as end-consumers are treated as multi-site operators and fall within the scope of the FSC Standard for Multi-site Certification of Chain of Custody Operations (FSC STD 40-003 V1-0). Consequently, a small number of retailers including B&Q plc have become certified to this standard. However, this standard was originally designed to support CoC certification amongst manufacturers with several sites (e.g. sawmill, moulding and finishing and packing sites) and to ensure that certified and non-certified material is either not mixed, or mixing is controlled. The major difference for a multi-site retailer is that they deal in fully finished product and centrally control purchase, distribution, in-store marketing and sale of certified products. Key areas that require attention in such a situation include adequacy of centralized control measures and administering staff competency. However, due to the original design of the standard, a focus is placed on auditing control documentation and staff competency at a store level. Where centralized control ensures that documentation must be verified centrally prior to placing an order, this focus leads to very inefficient training and auditing programs, which due to the scale of large retailers costs tens of thousands of man hours per annum. This sends an inconsistent message on the value of FSC to major retailers and creates a barrier to increasing the value of FSC in the market.		
Document(s) to be revised / developed:		Will require an amendment to FSC Standard for Chain of Custody Certification FSC-STD-40-004 (Version 2-0), to include a reference to the proposed new standard.
Timeline:		2012



No. / Title: 45) Development of an FSC Standard for Multi-site Certification of Retail Chain of Custody Operations	Category: Policy
Cost to FSC: Initially there will be a cost to FSC to develop the standard. However, this cost will be mitigated by the benefits of such a standard in promoting and strengthening the market value of FSC.	

No. / Title: 46) Clarify intent of Credit System and revise as necessary	Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Robert J. Hrubes Organization: Scientific Certification Systems (SCS) Chamber: Economic North E-mail: rhrubes@scscertified.com	
1) Seconded by: Name: Caroline Pufalt Organization: Sierra Club Forest Certification Team Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: cpufalt@sbcglobal.net	2) Seconded by: Name: Lewis Fix Organization: Domtar Chamber: Economic North E-mail: Lewis.fix@domtar.com

MOTION:

FSC must make clear the intention of the credit system, and if necessary revise portions of the FSC Standard for Chain of Custody Certification (FSC-STD-40-004 V2-0), to improve consistency of interpretation and application of credit system requirements amongst certification bodies and chain of custody certificate holders.

Purpose and/or additional information:

The FSC Credit System is an accounting framework used to track the FSC certified and post-consumer reclaimed material that a company (operating against FSC-STD-40-004) has purchased as well as the FSC products the company has labeled or sold; credit material purchased and FSC products labeled or sold are tracked by each company-defined 'FSC product group'. A company accumulates credits for its account by purchasing FSC Pure, FSC Mixed, FSC Recycled and verified post-consumer reclaimed material and it withdraws credits from the account when it labels or sells products with an FSC claim. A company can sell only as much product with an FSC certified claim as it has credits in its account to do so (by weight or volume). Credits cannot be transferred across product groups so credits must be withdrawn by the product groups associated with each constituent material used in the product; no product group-specific credit balance can be negative. Any non-FSC credit wood/wood fiber (e.g., uncertified virgin wood or pre-consumer reclaimed wood) used in a product carrying a FSC claim must meet FSC Controlled Wood requirements.

Depending on how a company defines its FSC product groups, credit systems can have a very significant impact on the availability of FSC product in the market place and the associated demand for FSC certification of forests and wood products they yield. The current requirement regarding FSC product groups for credit systems are as follows:

Product Group is defined as: A product or group of products specified by the organization, which share basic input and output characteristics and thus can be combined for the purpose of FSC Chain of Custody control, percentage calculations and labeling according to the FSC material categories: FSC Pure, FSC Mixed, FSC Recycled or FSC Controlled Wood.

(2.1.3) For product groups where a credit system is used, the organization shall ensure that all included products share similar specifications in relation to:

- a) quality of inputs,
- b) conversion factors.

A few examples of how varying interpretations of "quality of inputs" and "conversion factors" impact the quantity of FSC products on the market will highlight the current threats to the credibility of the



No. / Title: 46) Clarify intent of Credit System and revise as necessary	Category: Policy
<p>FSC chain of custody system:</p> <p>What does “quality of inputs” mean? A mill has a single credit account for high quality hardwood lumber including walnut and cherry. The company purchases walnut logs as FSC Controlled Wood (never as FSC certified), and purchases cherry logs sometimes as FSC certified and otherwise as FSC Controlled Wood. The company considers walnut and cherry logs to “share similar specification in relation to quality of input” and the conversion factor of turning logs to lumber for each of these species is also similar. The company accumulates credit in its hardwood lumber credit account for the volume of FSC certified cherry it purchases, and then sells walnut and cherry lumber as FSC certified upon customer request, up to the available credit.</p> <p>Is it the intention of the credit system to enable companies to sell a species as FSC certified that is not available (to them or perhaps anyone else) as FSC certified (the walnut in this example)? What if a company was purchasing 8-foot white pine 2x4’s as FSC certified and 12-foot white pine 2x4’s as FSC Controlled Wood – could the company include the 8-foot and 12-foot 2x4’s in the same credit account? The key question is what attributes define “quality” and thus which products can be included in the same credit account, allowing the products to be bought and sold interchangeably.</p> <p>What does “conversion factor” mean? Company A converts logs to lumber using a simple conversion factor of 80% (20% waste) so its log credits are all allocated to a single product group: lumber (e.g. 1500 bd. ft. logs = 1200 bd. ft. lumber). In practice, however, the company makes various grades and dimensions of lumber from each log.</p> <p>Company B uses a conversion factor that takes into account waste as well as the varying grades and dimensions of lumber that a log produces. This company’s log credits are allocated to 3 different product groups: high, medium and low grade lumber (e.g. 1500 bd. Ft. logs = 1200 bd. ft. lumber: 200 high grade, 700 medium grade, and 300 low grade).</p> <p>The manner by which conversion factors are applied significantly impacts the quantity of FSC certified output available for each product specification. In the above example, Company A has the flexibility to apply its credits from the purchase of FSC certified logs to those products which its customer requests as FSC certified. Company A may apply all of its credit for FSC certified logs to its highest grade of lumber, even though the available quantity of FSC certified logs may not be sufficient to produce the desired amount of highest grade lumber. To meet the demand, Company A is, in effect, transferring low grade credits to the sale of high grade FSC-certified product. Company B has allocated credit to 3 different grades of lumber, which more accurately reflects the availability of product based on available input. If Company B takes a large order for a single grade of lumber, it will require more FSC certified logs to fill the order than Company A will need, and thus drive greater demand for FSC logs. Further, Company B is clearly operating at a competitive disadvantage relative to Company A.</p> <p>Currently, certification bodies are interpreting the Credit System product group requirements differently. This has created an uneven playing field for competing chain of custody certificate holders. Companies that have been approved to combine or substitute species, grades or dimensions, or to include several product lines in a single product group, have a competitive advantage over those that have not. This motion is calling for clarification of the intention of the credit system so as to assure consistent interpretation and implementation which, in turn, will enhance fairness, and restore the credibility of this element of the FSC system. In particular, FSC must provide clear guidance on what constitutes “similar” quality of inputs and conversion factors.</p>	
Document(s) to be revised / developed: FSC-STD-40-004 V2-0	
Timeline: Next version of FSC-STD-40-004, by mid 2012.	
Cost to FSC: 1 week of PSU staff time for this issue alone, as part of the standard revision process with a technical Working Group.	



No. / Title: 47) Increase of FSC-material within FSC-mix-processes		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Jörg-Andreas Krüger Organization: NABU e.V. Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: Joerg.Krueger@NABU.de		
1) Seconded by: Name: Thomas Rätz Organization: Gemeinde- und Städtebund Rheinland-Pfalz (GStB) Chamber: Economic North E-mail: traetz@gstbrp.de		2) Seconded by: Name: Hermann Hatzfeldt Organization: Hatzfeldt-Wildenburg'sche Forstverwaltung Chamber: Economic North E-mail: hatzfeldt@hatzfeldt.de
MOTION: <p>The motions asks for support from the membership, that FSC incorporates regulations in its COC-requirements, with which demand and supply for FSC-products is better linked and communicated through the production and trading chain of FSC-products. These regulations should incorporate more transparency and binding requirements within the CoC standards for an obligation of CoC certified companies to undertake market analysis to make sure that existing demand for FSC-products is evaluated, communicated to the supply chain (similar regulations are already in place for minor components) and matched as possible and appropriate. Mechanisms should be developed that FSC-production becomes stimulated and preferred through the supply-chain.</p> <p>Developed regulations should also require the development and implementation of action plans for the increase of FSC-products including defined annual targets and related monitoring/reporting tools on progress in cases where companies already have FSC-certification defined in their public strategic plans. This should be considered and implemented within the COC as a whole including procedures to increase volumes of FSC-certified materials within the production of FSC-Mix-products.</p> <p>Within this concepts supply situations of materials and market developments in sourcing regions should be taken into account. Developed procedures should also take care, that increase policies of FSC virgin fiber materials are not undertaken on the costs of decrease of recycling-processes.</p>		
Purpose and/or additional information: <p>This motion seeks for improvements within the COC. FSC is a market driven system based on demand. Driven by market-mechanisms growth of FSC-material should be stimulated by the market itself. Activities on CW in some areas are perceived as a kind of certification which delivers enough safeguards to market products. There is evidence that work and progress towards CW does not lead to growth of FSC-material as it was hoped.</p> <p>Therefore the proposers suggest requirements within the COC-regulations which requires from production sites activities to mach demand and supply for FSC-certified material submitted and communicated through the chain to forest owners wherever possible and appropriate.</p> <p>The motion picks up the old concepts of FSC to increase FSC-contents in mixed products that have very often been part of FSC-requirements in the past (for example the percentage based claims).</p> <p>It also picks up concepts that are already in place for example in regulations for minor components of uncertified materials (FSC-PRO 40-004 (V2-2) EN, Part 4.1 and 4.2) where FSC requires companies to undertake market activities to close existing gaps in the supply chain of FSC-certified materials.</p> <p>Similar regulations could be developed and implemented to make sure, that companies actively evaluate concrete potentials in markets to increase FSC-certified materials in production of FSC-Mix-</p>		



No. / Title: 47) Increase of FSC-material within FSC-mix-processes	Category: Policy
Products without risking companies' competitiveness.	
It is very clear, that the proposed activity and its potential implementation should take care, that companies are only required to do what is possible and only if the market allows growth for FSC-material AND if the regulations does not go to the cost of growth rates of recycling-material.	
Document(s) to be revised / developed: FSC-STD-40-004 (Chain of custody standard)	
Timeline:	as soon as possible
Cost to FSC:	no external costs

2.14 Controlled Wood

No. / Title: 48) Motion to transform the Controlled Wood system	Category: Policy
Proposed by:	
Name: Jens Holm Kanstrup	
Organization: Nepenthes	
Chamber: Environmental North	
E-mail: jhk@nepenthes.dk	
1) Seconded by:	2) Seconded by:
Name: Peter K. Kristensen	Name: Kasper Kopp
Organization: Dalhoff Larsen & Horneman A/S	Organization: Tracer
Chamber: Economic North	Chamber: Economic North
E-mail: Peter.k.kristensen@dlh-group.com	E-mail: kk@tra-cer.com
MOTION:	
During the next five years from this GA the FSC shall give high priority to improving the access to certification for small and medium sized forest operations, in order to solve the supply chain challenges currently dealt with by Controlled Wood and Mixed sources. During the same period, the FSC Controlled Wood system shall be transformed into a permanent but time limited transitional phase-in system allowing especially small and medium sized forest owners to gradually reach full certification, e.g. by a modular approach as already implemented by some CB's.	
Purpose and/or additional information:	
Controlled Wood was introduced as a solution to the supply-problems experienced by large northern wood and pulp industries with a high number of smaller suppliers. However this solution has proven to be a two-edged sword as it has damaged the credibility of the FSC system, by allowing wood of basically unknown sources to be labeled as FSC Mixed and by greatly complicating the Chain of Custody and labeling system and decreasing the transparency for end consumers.	
At he same time the real underlying problem has yet to be solved. Small and medium sized forest operations – particularly in the south - are still having difficulties achieving full FSC certification. With this motion we suggest giving a high priority to solving the problems faced by small and medium forest operations while at the same time transforming the controlled wood system into a permanent part of this long term solution that could rally broad support from the membership.	
Many good initiatives already exist, for example certification of forest contractors, using local forest authorities as group managers and initiatives to improve the SLIMF standard. Let's build on this,	



No. / Title: 48) Motion to transform the Controlled Wood system	Category: Policy
rather than keeping system in place that nobody are happy about and thus cause constant discontent among pretty much all FSC members and users of the FSC certification system, as the number of past GA motions aimed at improving or phasing out the CW system clearly reflects.	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline:	
Cost to FSC:	

No. / Title: 49) Controlled wood sunseting provisions	Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Sean Cadman Organization: The Wilderness Society (Australia) Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: Sean.Cadman@wilderness.org.au	
1) Seconded by: Name: Christoph Thies Organization: Greenpeace International Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: Christoph.thies@greenpeace.org	2) Seconded by: Name: Jim Ford Organization: Climate for Ideas Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: jim@climateforideas.org
MOTION: That FSC imposes a condition on the use of Controlled Wood that limits the use of natural forest as CW by any enterprise for a maximum of 3 years	
Purpose and/or additional information: The use of controlled wood is having a major distortionary impact on improving forest management standards. Further the mechanism is allowing highly controversial sources into the FSC supply chain. The experience in Australia has been that CW has been and continues to be used as a way of providing high conservation value forest into the FSC supply chain despite significant efforts by FSC Australia and FSC international to provide guidance to stop this. By limiting the time for which an enterprise can access CW from natural forest a clear signal is sent to forest managers providing that wood to lift their forest management standards to meet full FSC standards or loose access to the enterprise. Three years provides sufficient time for a processing company to either seek fully FSC certified wood or require it's current supplier to meet full FSC standards.	
Document(s) to be revised / developed: FSC-STD-40-005	
Timeline: Policy change should be completed within 12 months	
Cost to FSC:	



No. / Title: 50) Phase-out of Company-based Controlled Wood Risk Assessments		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Meriel Robson & Kevin Jones Organization: EcoSylva Ltd (runs the Soil Association Woodmark programme) Chamber: Economic North E-mail: mrobson@soilassociation.org		
1) Seconded by: Name: Grant Rosoman Organization: Greenpeace New Zealand Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: grant.rosoman@greenpeace.org		2) Seconded by: Name: Anna Jenkins Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: annajenkins@ethicalchange.com
3) Seconded by: Name: Hannah Scrase Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: hannahs@gn.apc.org		4) Seconded by: Name: Organization: Chamber: E-mail:
MOTION: Company-based Controlled Wood (CW) Risk Assessments are phased out before December 2012. After that date, CW Risk Assessments are only acceptable through one of the following mechanisms: (a) CW Risk Assessments for districts proposed by FSC National Offices and approved by FSC IC will continue to be accepted*. (b) In all other cases CW FM Certification of non-FSC certified sources by Certification Bodies is required. *Note: CW Risk Assessments listed as Approved by FSC on the Global Forest Registry will continue to be accepted as they meet (a) above.		
Purpose and/or additional information: Company based CW risk assessments are not an effective tool. The underlying CW concept is essentially sound, and CW FM audits by Certification Bodies work. FSC National/regional Risk Assessments are also a viable way forward. However company-based assessments are highly variable, difficult to evaluate meaningfully, and FSC Policy /Advice is open to different interpretations by different CBs. The credibility of the CW concept is therefore under threat. CW FM certification by FSC accredited CBs, (and on the basis of NI RAs) would add credibility to the process, and help to develop a market for CW. The Global Forest Registry should also be a useful source of information for CBs carrying out CW FM evaluations. An additional and important benefit to the FSC would be that it would engage forest managers, currently considering themselves far from FSC certification, and invite them on to a path towards FSC, possibly rather than towards other schemes. Note that this is in a context of a recently reducing number of Forest Management certificates internationally and an ever increasing number of COC. It would form a logical early step in a modular verification approach. It could also be a revenue generating opportunity for FSC if a form of AAF were attached. CW RAs are currently typically produced by non-foresters in timber companies dealing with issues outside their comfort zone, they devote significant time and cost and the results are not always accepted by CBs. By contrast a CW FM evaluation is relatively straightforward for an FSC CB and probably would not cost much more than a company RA. In addition one CW FM cert has the potential to serve several supply networks.		



No. / Title: 50) Phase-out of Company-based Controlled Wood Risk Assessments	Category: Policy
Document(s) to be revised / developed: FSC-STD-40-005 Standard for company evaluation of FSC Controlled Wood. (and references to this within FSC-STD-40-004 FSC chain of custody standard for manufacturing companies) FSC-DIR-40-005 – Directive on Controlled Wood	
Timeline: Revised Standards developed and approved by end 2011. Compliance required by end 2012.	
Cost to FSC: Time for system/standard amendments– could be done by in-house staff of FSC	

No. / Title: 51) Strengthening the Controlled Wood System Through Issuance of FSC-Developed Risk Assessments	Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Robert J. Hrubes Organization: Scientific Certification Systems Chamber: Economic North E-mail: rhubes@scscertified.com	
1) Seconded by: Name: Paul Davis Organization: Columbia Forest Products Chamber: Economic North E-mail: pdavis@columbiaforestproducts.com	2) Seconded by: Name: Fran R. Price Organization: The Nature Conservancy Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: fprice@tnc.org

MOTION:

FSC International will promulgate a policy that requires National Initiatives to complete Controlled Wood Risk Assessments for the countries where they operate. In regions/nations where there is no FSC National Initiative, FSC International shall assume the responsibility and retain appropriate experts and stakeholders to complete Controlled Wood Risk Assessments. The policy will include language that requires completion of the Risk Assessments by January 1, 2012.

Purpose and/or additional information:

In the absence of FSC approved risk assessments for a particular region or country, every company operating under FSC-STD-40-005 and sourcing uncertified wood in that /region country for use in a “FSC Mix” product must conduct its own risk assessment, resulting in a lack of consistent application of the Controlled Wood requirements and simultaneously creating a cumulative waste of resources due to independent but duplicative efforts. Additionally, there are few guidelines to ensure rigor, expertise, and unbiased conclusions when companies conduct risk assessments themselves. This is particularly problematic as there is a fundamental conflict of interest for a company with a financial stake in the outcome to conduct a risk assessment. Not surprisingly, given the technical limitations of and inherent conflicts associated with the entities that have thus far been conducting risk assessments, there are countries where multiple risk assessments have been completed with conflicting results. The result is an environmental, social, and economic degradation of FSC system integrity and function.

National Initiatives are in a position to coordinate expert-based and chamber-balanced risk assessments leading to balanced and informed determinations of risk in a country. The current reference to National Initiatives (“*companies can also seek assistance from the FSC accredited national initiative... to establish whether a district of origin is low risk*” source FSC-STD-40-005) has resulted in a total of three approved NI risk assessments (Australia, Chile, and Switzerland). FSC IC must address this lack and provide policy and support where necessary to achieve these goals. And in regions lacking FSC National Initiatives, it is incumbent upon FSC International to devise and



No. / Title: 51) Strengthening the Controlled Wood System Through Issuance of FSC-Developed Risk Assessments	Category: Policy
pursue alternative arrangements for developing risks assessments so as to end the current situation that is only damaging the integrity of the FSC system.	
Document(s) to be revised / developed: Adjunct to FSC-STD-40-005	
Timeline: January 1, 2012	
Cost to FSC: Unknown	

No. / Title: 52) Efficient use of virgin fibres by turning the exemption for co-products from non-controlled/uncertified material permanent	Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Ulrich Leberle Organization: Confederation of European Paper Industries Chamber: Economic North E-mail: u.leberle@cepi.org	
1) Seconded by: Name: Anders Hildeman Organization: IKEA Chamber: Economic North E-mail: anders.hildeman2@ikea.com	2) Seconded by: Name: Colin Maunder Organization: Timberlands Limited Chamber: Economic North E-mail: Colin.Maunder@tll.co.nz
MOTION: To support the efficient use of virgin fibres, FSC shall turn the temporary exception that co-products from virgin material are not required to meet the requirements set out in "FSC-STD-40-005" into a permanent exception by integrating it into the controlled wood standard.	
Purpose and/or additional information: One quarter of the virgin fibre input in the European Paper Industry are residues from other industries (sawmilling industry), thereby ensuring a high level of raw material efficiency. Ending the exemption for co-products from non controlled/uncertified material currently being foreseen for December 2012 by FSC Directive 40-005 would lead to a situation where companies procuring saw-milling by-products would have to prove the district of origin of the fibres used in the saw-mills and shall implement a process to verify the authenticity of the documentation. This is a specific challenge for companies using coproducts as such reclaimed materials are commonly mixed at early stages within the supply chain and are nearly impossible to be linked to transaction-based invoices. It has to be noted in this context that 60% of the European forests are in the private ownership of some 16 million mostly family forest owners and that the large majority of European sawmills are Small and Medium Enterprises. It is also likely that small enterprises will not even apply for FSC Controlled Wood, thus ending the exemption for co-products from non-controlled /uncertified material would create a competitive disadvantage to companies, which use fibres efficiently by using residues from other industries that can not use them any longer. If there continues to be the risk that the exception ends at some stage, mills using this material might consider refraining from FSC Chain of Custody certification. A permanent exception for virgin co-products would ensure that mills continue selling FSC certified products by making efficient use of the resource.	
Document(s) to be revised / developed: FSC-DIR-40-005 EN, FSC-STD-40-005 (Version 2-1) EN	
Timeline:	
Cost to FSC:	



2.15 Market development

No. / Title: 53) Motion to promote FSC certified products and local markets through government procurement		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Martha Nuñez Organization: Ambiente y Sociedad Chamber: Social South E-mail: marthan@uio.satnet.net ; marnuz4@yahoo.com		
1) Seconded by: Name: Margaret Stern Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Environmental North E-mail: pegstern@uio.satnet.net		2) Seconded by: Name: Marvin Centeno Solórzano Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Environmental South E-mail: centenomarvin@yahoo.com.mx
MOTION: The FSC shall establish and develop programs to promote, encourage and facilitate the creation of local markets based on government procurement of certified products – timber and non-timber – at the various levels of government in each country; priority of access to these markets will be given to small producers.		
Purpose and/or additional information: One of the biggest problems in the countries of the South is the lack of markets for certified products. Access to international markets, particularly for small producers, is limited and has not contributed to promoting and encouraging certification. On the other hand, various certified producers are facing difficulties in maintaining their certifications, and in other cases, motivation to undertake the efforts required to obtain certification has been lost. At the same time, in many countries in the South a local market for certified products has not been developed, even though timber production is aimed principally at internal consumption. Therefore, the creation of local markets in each of the countries would serve several purposes: In the first place, it would become a concrete incentive for producers, who would begin to receive the benefits of certification. As a consequence, forest management and the area of FSC certified forests would increase, and would therefore contribute to reducing the volume of illegal timber that circulates and is marketed. The development of local markets is linked to the promotion and development of responsible procurement. The State, both the central government and local governments, is a permanent internal consumer since in carrying out its public administration it invests in various types of infrastructure and must provide itself with furniture, paper, and teaching resources for educational establishments, among other products. These could well be from certified sources. The motivation for governments would be to reduce illegal logging and trafficking in timber, in addition to contributing to the development of domestic production and industry and to improving the living conditions of small producers and local communities. The National Initiatives would be the spokespeople for these programs to be carried out with the Governments of each country, initiating the dialogue and establishing the pertinent strategy for their implementation in each case.		
Document(s) to be revised / developed:		This proposal is fully relevant to the FSC Global Strategy and will contribute to its compliance, especially its objectives: 1e, 2c, 2d, 2f, 4c.
Timeline:	Designing a program and beginning implementation of a pilot case should be accomplished by July 31, 2012.	
Cost to FSC:		



No. / Title: 54) Motion to Actively Promote Certified Wood Products Over Competing Products		Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Colin Maunder Organization: Timberlands Limited Chamber: Economic North E-mail: colin.maunder@tll.co.nz		
1) Seconded by: Name: Brett Gilmore Organization: Pan Pac Chamber: Economic North E-mail:		2) Seconded by: Name: David Rhodes Organization: NZFOA – New Zealand Forest Owners’ Association Chamber: Economic North E-mail: david.rhodes@nzfoa.org.nz
MOTION: <p>FSC promotes the purchase and use of FSC certified wood products over non-certified wood products through various mechanisms. In particular this is taken up by green building standards such as the Green Building Councils and the US LEED program. We support FSC’s endeavors to promote FSC certified products in these programs. However, competing products such as steel, concrete and plastic generally do not have to comply with rigorous standards to achieve equal status under these programs. We are familiar with many cases where this leads to perverse outcomes where these products are preferred by building designers and developers as FSC certified wood products are too expensive or unavailable in the required quantities. If competing products are required to meet equivalent standards to FSC certified wood products the pendulum is most likely to swing back in favour of certified wood products, therefore increasing the demand for certified wood and the uptake of FSC. A positive result for both the environment and society as steel, concrete and plastics will need to meet higher standards and more forests will be well-managed. FSC should take a lead from FSC-US and in particular their open letter by to the US-LEED program that correctly states “<i>When it comes from a well-managed forest, wood is among the most sustainable of building materials</i>” and implement the following initiatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue to lobby green building standards to support FSC certified wood products, but require equivalence with other (competing) construction products. 2. Promote social, environmental, economic and indigenous peoples balance as well as long term raw materials resourcing (to provide economic and social sustainability and stability) and also target for increase recycling and elimination of hazardous compounds e.g. components of galvanising that leach and are Carcinogenic as the best mechanism to achieve inter-product equivalence. 3. Create a database of facts (including a supporting paper) demonstrating the benefits of using certified wood products over products with lesser credentials (the database can serve both FSC and their members to promote certified wood products). 		
Purpose and/or additional information: <p>Too often in green purchasing programs such as the Green Building Council (GBC) certified wood products are placed at a disadvantage with competing products. The environmental and social prerequisites of wood products are considerably higher than for competing products such as steel, concrete, plastic and wool.</p> <p>FSC promotes the purchase and use of FSC certified over non-certified wood products, but this can act in a perverse way to deter purchasers and users from using certified wood and in preference use more available and cheaper alternatives such as concrete, steel or plastics whose environmental and social credentials are much less rigorous than those faced by FSC certified forest managers. For example such systems as the GBC only utilize existing methodology, which are not yet in place for competing products. Thus the GBC have picked up on FSC, but do not require the same level of social, environmental, economic and indigenous peoples performance as well as long term raw</p>		



No. / Title: 54) Motion to Actively Promote Certified Wood Products Over Competing Products	Category: Policy
<p>materials resourcing from concrete, steel, plastics, etc. In the Australian (and New Zealand) Green Star system (accredited to GBC), for example, to obtain 2 points wood products require FSC or PEFC certification, but concrete and steel need only to demonstrate some recycling content and energy reduction at manufacture. Unlike wood there is no performance requirement for the extraction of the raw materials.</p> <p>Furthermore the emphasis on certified wood products is often skewed. For example in the Australian Green Star program developers can earn more points for having a number of cycle stands than for using certified wood, where the carbon stored in wood far outweighs the savings from using cycles over cars.</p> <p>Link to FSC Global Strategy:</p> <p>Goal 1: Provide Leadership in advancing globally responsible forest management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership to ensure certified wood products are treated equably with competing products. <p>Goal 2. Ensure equitable Access to the benefits of the FSC system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure certified wood products can achieve the benefits of FSC – they are not prejudiced from being purchased through replacement by competing products with less onerous environmental and social standards. <p>Goal 3. Will ensure integrity, credibility and transparency of the FSC system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that certified wood products are treated equably against competing products. <p>Goal 4. Products from FSC certified forests will create more business value than products from non-FSC certified forests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create demand for FSC certified wood products rather than the current disincentive to use (certified) wood products in green building standards. 	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline:	
Cost to FSC:	

No. / Title: 55) Promotion of wood as building material of choice	Category: Policy
<p>Proposed by:</p> <p>Name: Brent Stinnett Organization: Potlatch Corp. Chamber: Economic North E-mail: brent.stinnett@potlatchcorp.com</p>	
<p>1) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name: Mike Jani Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Economic North E-mail: mjani@hrcllc.com</p>	<p>2) Seconded by:</p> <p>Name: Paul Harlan Organization: The Collins Companies Chamber: Economic North E-mail: pharlan@collinsco.com</p>
<p>MOTION:</p> <p>FSC shall designate a percentage of its annual revenue to the marketing and promotion of FSC wood and forest products as the building materials of choice.</p>	



No. / Title: 55) Promotion of wood as building material of choice	Category: Policy
Purpose and/or additional information: FSC should use its efforts to improve forest management through making wood the building material of choice. Promotion of certified wood and forests over non-certified wood is important and should continue. The promotion of certified wood and forests for the building materials of choice over non-wood materials will heighten the focus on the environmental beneficial properties wood and the sustainability of the forests that produce the wood.	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline: Within 12 months	
Cost to FSC:	

No. / Title: 56) Improving the Economic Viability of FM Certificate Holders	Category: Policy
Proposed by: Name: Mike Jani Organization: – (individual member) Chamber: Economic North E-mail: mjani@hrcllc.com	
1) Seconded by: Name: Paul Harlan Organization: The Collins Companies Chamber: Economic North E-mail: pharlan@collinsco.com	2) Seconded by: Name: Gordon Mouw Organization: New Page Corporation Chamber: Economic North E-mail: Gordon.mouw@newpagecorp.com
MOTION: FSC develop new policy to allow FM certificate holders to achieve economic viability including recognizing a market rate of return to investors or owners. The policy will include that cumulative impacts of certification may be accounted for and adjusted by CBs to facilitate long-term economic viability.	
Purpose and/or additional information: Without recognizing the challenges of economic viability, including costs of maintaining a certificate, FSC will not recognize its potential as a certification program. Needs of the economic chamber are generally not met with the same acceptance and incorporation into the system as needs of the social and environmental chambers.	
Document(s) to be revised / developed:	
Timeline: December 2011	
Cost to FSC:	



Annex 2: Terms of Reference for the 2011 Motions Committee

To ensure a balanced representation from North and South, the members of the Motions are:

Ana Young, Economic South, FSC Board Member
Chris van de Goot, Social North, FSC Board Member
Margareta Renström, Environmental North, FSC Board Member
Hans-Joachim Droste, Policy Director, FSC International Center

Motions Committee Members are either fluent in English or Spanish language. The northern member shall be an English native speaker and the Southern member a Spanish native speaker in order to make sure that the wording of the motions is correct in both languages.

The Motions Committee shall:

- receive all motions, which are moved by one (1) and seconded by two (2) designated representatives of FSC member organizations or individual members. (Deadline for submission: 15 January 2011. Deadline for revised submission: 25 March 2011)
- check that each proposed motion is submitted in either English or Spanish, and complies with the Protocol for the FSC General Assembly of Associates, Section 2, "Submission of Proposed Motions". When the motion is not provided to the Motions Committee in both official languages, the Committee will provide the official translation to the other language. When a proposed motion does not fully comply with Section 2 of the Protocol, the Motions Committee will return it to the mover, with appropriate suggestions. Deadline: 2 March 2011.
- approach movers and seconders of motions which relate to the same subject, and encourage them to agree to a single motion or common set of motions. Deadline 2 March 2011.
- reject a motion if it would require FSC to violate legal requirements, and if it fails to comply with the protocol requirements or deadlines.
- submit its final report to the Board of Directors. The report shall include the complete text, in both Spanish and English, of each proposed motion and any supporting information, as well as the name and affiliation of each proposer and seconder. Deadline: 15 April 2011.
- appoint a designated representative of the Motions Committee who shall present their report to the General Assembly.

At its own discretion, the Motions Committee may approve motions submitted late, or may reject them for non-compliance with this protocol. Late motions may also be proposed during the General Assembly (Protocol, Section 5.3.)



Annex 3: Introduction to General Assembly Motions

Motions proposing to amend the FSC Statutes, By-Laws or Principles & Criteria by new wording are called Statutory Motions. Such motions must clearly identify the specific title, section and paragraph to be amended. The proposed amendment shall first set forth the current language from the applicable document, and then set forth the proposed new language, additions or deletions. Statutory Motions approved by the General Assembly will become valid and legally binding at the close of the General Assembly, subject to legal confirmation.

Motions to change FSC policies or operational procedures are called Policy Motions. They reflect the right of associates to submit initiatives related to the Association's work, activities, mission and purpose. The motion should be formulated as a clear, concise and concrete action request to the FSC Association. It is important to note that only text in the section 'Motion' will be voted upon and, if ratified, will constitute the basis for subsequent action by the FSC Association.

Policy Motions approved by the General Assembly have the status of initiatives supported by the General Assembly and submitted to the FSC Board of Directors (Statutes Article 10.3). The FSC Board of Directors will make an explicit commitment describing the steps it will take to respond to this initiative. This commitment may indicate priorities, within existing planning priorities and financial constraints.

The General Assembly's rejection of a Policy Motion repeating or re-emphasizing another motion that had been passed at a previous General Assembly but has not yet been fully implemented indicates that the General Assembly no longer considers the corresponding initiative a priority.

All motions should include a brief paragraph which explains the purpose of the motion, and/or which supplies additional information relevant for the overall understanding of motion intent and implications. It is important to ensure that the field 'Purpose and/or additional information' is only used for such explanatory purposes as text in this section will not be voted upon and therefore does not gain any mandatory status. Where text in this section is considered essential for motion implementation, this text should therefore be moved to the 'Motion' field.

Finally, the proposer should include an estimate of the costs to FSC of implementing the motion.