



*20 September 2017
M65 Steering Committee*

Questions and Answers on the International Generic Indicators (IGI) developed for Intact Forest Landscapes (Motion 65 GA 2014)

- 1. Why did FSC secretariat develop IGIs for M65?**
- 2. Why did FSC secretariat launch the Advice Note?**
- 3. What do the draft IGIs for M65 say?**
- 4. How the draft IGIs create flexibility for SDGs for defining their national rules?**
- 5. How do the draft IGIs relate to the proposed motions?**
- 6. What is the current status of the draft IGIs for M65?**

Annex 1 How are the elements of the Motion 65 addressed in the draft IGIs?
Annex 2 Instruction for setting threshold to 'vast majority'



1. Why did FSC secretariat develop IGIs for M65?

The Motion requested the FSC secretariat to “...direct Standard Development Groups (SDGs) and Certification Bodies (CBs), where no SDG exists, to develop, modify, or strengthen... indicators within National Standards and CB standards that aim to protect the vast majorities of IFLs”

Developing International Generic Indicators (FSC-STD-60-004) for addressing the Motion 65, was essential to reach that goal. The IGIs are the “starting point” for developing the national indicators for transferring the National Forest Stewardship Standards to P&C V5.

2. Why did FSC secretariat launch the Advice Note?

The Advice Note for M65 was introduced as a temporary, global solution to address the M65, as the Motion states “If by the end of 2016 a relevant standard has not been implemented, a default indicator will apply that mandates the full protection of a core area of each IFL within the management unit. *For this purpose, the core area of the IFL will be defined as an area of forest comprising at least 80% of the intact forest landscape falling within the FMU*”

- Advice Note allows the certificate holders to continue forest management in 20% share of the IFLs within their management units
- Advice Note for M65 is targeted to the certificate holders and certification bodies. It does not bind the standard developers.
- The global Advice Note will be replaced by the national indicators as soon as the National Forest Stewardship Standard or Interim National Standard becomes effective in each country

3. What do the draft IGIs for M65 say?

The IGIs for Motion 65 turn the Motion phrasing into indicators and guidance to the standard developers, as described point by point in the **Annex 1**.

The key elements of the IGIs include identification and management of IFLs, through FPIC:

Identification of IFLs – not limited only to GFW maps:

- Instructions for Standard Developers state that identification of IFLs is based on Global Forest Watch maps, or “*other maps based on a more recent and accurate IFL inventory using a refined methodology*”

Management of IFLs – allowing limited industrial activity:

- Instructions for Standard Developers state that the portions of IFLs not designated as Core Areas are managed as HCV2



- IGI 9.2.7 state that “Management strategies allow limited industrial activity within core areas only if all effects of industrial activity including fragmentation:
 - 1) Are restricted to a very limited portion of the core area;
 - 2) Do not reduce the core area below 50,000 ha, and
 - 3) Will produce clear, substantial, additional, long-term conservation and social benefits”

Ensuring FPIC through “Affected Rights Holder” concept:

- IGLs specify that the engagement is properly targeted to the “Affected Rights Holders”, which are defined as “Persons and groups, including Indigenous Peoples, traditional peoples and local communities with legal or customary rights whose free, prior and informed consent is required to determine management decisions (C3.1; C3.4; C3.5; C4.1 and IGI 7.6.3; IGI 9.1.3; IGI 9.2.3).”

4. How the draft IGLs create flexibility for SDGs for defining their national rules?

IGIs will enable the standard developers to adjust the 80% protection requirement to the national conditions:

- IGLs in general are provided as a ‘starting point’ to the Standard Development Groups. SDGs have the option to adopt, adapt or drop them – or create new indicators, when well-justified
- IGLs to Motion 65 do not set threshold for the protection of “vast majorities” of IFLs within the Management Unit. The Instructions for Standard Developers provide wide range of options for that purpose, as described in **Annex 2**
- IGLs to Motion 65 will enable the SDGs to define refined methodologies for the identification of IFLs in addition to GFW maps

5. How do the draft IGLs relate to the proposed motions?

In general, there is a wide overlap between several motions to GA2017 and the IGLs drafted for Motion 54 (GA2014), as indicated below:

GA2017/24: *Compliance with the law outlined in Motions 7 and 65:*

- As the IGLs are designed to respond to the P&C, they will also comply with national regulations and FSC Principle 1

GA2017/32: *Mapping Intact Forest Landscapes from a View Below the Canopy:*

- IGLs allow refined methodologies to be used for mapping the IFLs: National Standard Development may take this into consideration when drafting the indicators to the National Forest Stewardship Standard (NFSS)



GA2017/34: *Assessment of the economic viability of IFLs:*

- This can be done in connection for “Forest testing” of the NFSS, with the national indicators for IFLs

GA2017/36: *Clarification of the term “vast majority of IFLs” in Motion 65:*

- This is covered by the Instructions for Standard Developers (Annex H in FSC-STD-60-004 V1-1)

GA2017/37 *Landscape Approach to Protect Intact Forest Landscapes:*

- The Instructions for Standard Developers (Annex H in FSC-STD-60-004 V1-1) guides the SDGs to take national or eco-regional aspects into consideration when defining the ‘vast majority’

6. What is the current status of the draft IGIs for M65?

The IGI were developed in consensus by the HCV Technical Working Group and the Policy and Standard Committee recommended in consensus their approval for the Board of Directors. However, the board could not reach consensus on the issue, because a number of board members wanted to give the members the chance to discuss and decide on a range of IFL issues, as put forward in the proposed motions, before finally approving new normative rules for IFLs.

How are the elements of the Motion 65 addressed in the draft IGLs?

Motion 65	Response in IGLs
<p>'To ensure the implementation of Principle 9 and the protection of Intact Forest Landscapes – the world's remaining large undisturbed forest areas contained in HCV2 - across FSC certified operations, FSC will direct Standard Development Groups (SDGs) and Certification Bodies (CBs), where no SDG exists, to develop, modify, or strengthen (according to standards revision processes) indicators within National Standards and CB standards that aim to protect the vast majorities of IFLs. Taking into account scale, intensity and risk as well as respecting the activities, customary and legal rights of traditional forest communities, this process will:'</p>	<p>"Annex H: Principle 9, Instructions for Standards Development Groups to develop indicators for Intact Forest Landscape Core Areas."</p> <p>"9.2.4 Management strategies are developed to protect core areas.</p> <p>9.2.5 The vast majority of each Intact Forest Landscape is designated as core area.</p> <p>9.2.7 Management strategies allow limited industrial activity within core areas only if all effects of industrial activity including fragmentation: 1) Are restricted to a very limited portion of the core area; 2) Do not reduce the core area below 50,000 ha, and 3) Will produce clear, substantial, additional, long-term conservation and social benefits</p> <p>9.3.3 Core areas are protected consistent with Criterion 9.2.</p> <p>9.3.4 Limited industrial activity in core areas is consistent with Indicator 9.2.7."</p>
<p>"1) Be based on best available, independent, peer-reviewed science and other information;"</p>	<p>"9.1.1 An assessment is completed using Best Available Information.....</p> <p>9.1.2 This assessment includes identification of Intact Forest Landscapes, as of January 1, 2017. "</p>
<p>"2) Take into consideration IFL degradation in FSC FMUs since 2000;"</p>	<p>Annex H-A "Threshold for vast majority":</p> <p>"The threshold for vast majority may be established below 80% providing it achieves the greatest amount of conservation gains based on national or eco-regional considerations and still meets or exceeds the definition of Intact Forest Landscape. "</p> <p>..."Thresholds above 80% shall be considered in nations and/or eco-regions where Intact Forest Landscapes are relatively rare and/or fragmented, and/or where large amounts of Intact Forest Landscapes have been lost since 2000."</p>
<p>"3) Respect Free Prior and Informed Consent of indigenous Peoples, traditional peoples and forest dependent communities in affected FMUs;"</p>	<p>"3.1.2 ...the following issues are documented and/or mapped: ...the aspirations and goals of Indigenous Peoples related to management activities, Intact Forest Landscapes and Indigenous cultural landscapes."</p> <p>"7.6.1 ...affected stakeholders are proactively and transparently engaged in Identification of rights (Criterion* 3.1, Criterion* 4.1), Indigenous cultural landscapes (Criterion 3.1) sites (Criterion 3.5, Criterion 4.7) and impacts (Criterion 4.5);"</p> <p>"7.6.3 Affected rights holders ...are provided with an opportunity for culturally appropriate engagement in monitoring and planning... on management activities that affect their interests."</p> <p>"Principle 7, ANNEX E: Elements of the Management Plan.. Indigenous cultural</p>

Motion 65	Response in IGLs
	<p>landscapes... Description of the methodology to assess and monitor any development and land use options allowed in Indigenous cultural landscapes..”</p> <p>“Principle 8, Annex G: Monitoring Requirements....”</p> <p>The persistence of Indigenous cultural landscapes and associated values of significance to Indigenous Peoples”</p> <p>“9.1.3 The assessment uses results from culturally appropriate engagement with affected rights holders”</p> <p>“9.2.3 Affected rights holders, affected and interested stakeholders and experts are engaged in the development of management strategies”</p> <p>“9.4.2 The monitoring program includes engagement with affected rights holders, affected and interested stakeholders and experts.”</p>
<p>“4) Within IFL cores ensure that Certificate Holders implement protection measures (for example, set-asides, legal protected areas, conservation reserves, deferrals, community reserves, indigenous protected areas etc.) ensuring management for intactness, in areas within their control;”</p>	<p>Definition:</p> <p>“Core area: The portion of each Intact Forest Landscape designated to contain the most important cultural and ecological values. Core areas are managed to exclude industrial activity. Core Areas meet or exceed the definition of Intact Forest Landscape.”</p> <p>“9.2.4 Management strategies are developed to protect core areas.”</p> <p>“9.2.5 The vast majority of each Intact Forest Landscape is designated as core area.”</p> <p>Annex H-B ...”The Indicators developed for the protection of core areas shall ensure intactness of core areas, considering activities that impact intactness, including commercial logging, mining, and the construction of roads, dams, and other infrastructure. Examples of management that protects the intactness of core areas include conservation zones as well as areas that may or not have legal protection such as set asides, reserves, deferrals, community reserves, and Indigenous protected areas.</p> <p>... the portions of Intact Forest Landscapes not designated as Core Areas shall be managed to protect and/or maintain High Conservation Values Category 2.”</p>
<p>“5) Require a comparative assessment of the viability and effectiveness of alternative land use options, in maintaining and enhancing intactness of IFLs including in areas outside FSC FMUs (landscape level);”</p>	<p>Annex H. section B: “Developing Indicators for Assessing and Protecting Intact Forest Landscapes..... The outcome shall be nationally or eco-regionally appropriate requirements to identify, assess and protect the vast majority of Intact Forest Landscapes as core areas.</p> <p>Core areas are intended to be protected from activities that impact their intactness including commercial logging, mining, and the construction of roads, dams, and other infrastructure.”</p>

Motion 65	Response in IGIs
<p>“6) In limited circumstances, allow limited development of IFL cores if such operations produce clear, substantial, additional, long-term conservation and social benefits;”</p>	<p>9.2.7”Management strategies allow limited industrial activity within core areas only if all effects of industrial activity including fragmentation: 1) Are restricted to a very limited portion of the core area; 2) Do not reduce the core area below 50,000 ha, and 3) Will produce clear, substantial, additional, long-term conservation and social benefits “</p>
<p>“7) Where applicable, address the need to reduce timber harvesting rates to reflect any reduction in the timber volume due to removal of IFL areas from harvesting;”</p>	<p>This requirement is covered by the existing P5 IGIs: “5.2.2 Based on the timber harvesting level analysis, a maximum allowable annual cut for timber is determined that does not exceed the harvest level that can be permanently sustained including by ensuring that harvest rates do not exceed growth.”</p>
<p>“8) Prioritize development of low-impact/small scale forest management, non-timber forest products in unallocated IFL areas, and provide first access to local communities an taking into consideration section iii;”</p>	<p>ANNEX H, 2b: “Indigenous Peoples, traditional peoples and forest dependent communities are given priority to design and implement alternative management and conservation activities compatible with protection of core areas” 9.2.7”Management strategies allow limited industrial activity within core areas ...”</p>
<p>“9) Promote alternative models for forest management/ conservation (for example, ecosystem services etc.) within the IFLs,”</p>	<p>This requirement is covered by the existing IGIs (see Principle 9, Annex I, HCV 4 & Principle 5, Annex C)</p>
<p>“If by the end of 2016 a relevant standard has not been implemented, a default indicator will apply that mandates the full protection of a core area of each IFL within the management unit. For this purpose, the core area of the IFL will be defined as an area of forest comprising at least 80% of the intact forest landscape falling within the FMU”</p>	<p>The Advice Note for Motion 65 was published by the end of 2016 to release SDGs from cut-off date. Advice Note will expire in each country once the NFSS or INS becomes effective. Annex H “The definition of vast majority is 80% of the total area of Intact Forest Landscapes within the Management Unit as of January 1, 2017. The vast majority also meets or exceeds the definition of Intact Forest Landscape. The threshold for vast majority may be established below 80% providing it achieves the greatest amount of conservation gains based on national or eco-regional considerations and still meets or exceeds the definition of Intact Forest Landscape. “</p>

International Generic Indicators (V1-1) – Instruction for setting threshold to ‘vast majority’

- May be below 80% based on national or eco-regional considerations (IGIs do not indicate lower limit)
- May be above 80% where IFLs are rare, or fragmented, or where large amounts of IFLs have been lost since 2000

The more scarce IFL

The quicker the degradation of IFL

The more damaging the human activities to the intactness of IFL

The greater the risk of damage to IFL

The greater the concentration of ecological values



Higher threshold

The more permanent the protection of IFL



Lower threshold

The nature and distribution of cultural values and legal and customary rights within and adjacent to Intact Forest Landscapes

The outcomes of culturally appropriate engagement with affected rights holders, affected and interested stakeholders



Threshold adjusted by FPIC process