

The following motions have been submitted for debate and voting by the FSC membership at the FSC General Assembly scheduled to take place in Manaus, Brazil, from 7th to 9th December 2005.

The motions have been organised as follows:

- Part 1: Motions to change the FSC Statutes and By-laws
- Part 2: Motions to change the FSC Principles and Criteria
- Part 3: Policy Motions
 - 3.1: General accreditation/certification issues
 - 3.2: Forest management issues
 - 3.3: Chain of custody and trademark issues
 - 3.4: Standards development
 - 3.5: Miscellaneous

The order of motions within each Part does not reflect prioritisation. Motions in Part 1 follow the order of paragraphs in the FSC Statutes. Motions in Part 2 follow the order of the FSC Principles and Criteria. Motions in Part 3 have been grouped together in terms of subject areas, but without any intentional order in terms of the detail of content or priority. The motions have been numbered to help people refer accurately and easily to specific motions. All the motions are available in English and Spanish,.

Every effort has been made to ensure that the motions on this list are correct at the time of writing, and are proposed and seconded in accordance with the intentions of proposers and seconders. If FSC members identify any mistakes they are requested to send an Email to motions2005@fsc.org explaining the concern identified.

Part 1: Motions to change the FSC Statutes and By-laws

<p>Title: Motion to Establish a Deliberative Stage by National Initiatives (NI) in the Dispute Resolution Protocol</p>	<p>Category and number 1 Statutory</p>
<p>Statutory Motion: To establish, based on FSC IC statutes and National Initiative (NI) statutes and procedures, a deliberative stage in the dispute resolution protocol, especially concerning certified management operations.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Antonio Claret de Oliveira Organisation: V & M Florestal Ltda Chamber: Southern Economic Email: florestal@vmtubes.com.br</p>
<p>Changes to Statutes: In the document Statutes, November, 2002, Title Six: Dispute and Accreditation Appeals Committee. Actual text: "... The Board shall establish a Dispute and Accreditation Appeals Committee to (i) deal with disputes and grievances from Associates and (ii) review accreditation decisions." Proposal text: (i) deal with disputes and grievances from Associates that were not resolved by the National Initiative in the first instance and...</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Jose Aldezir de Lucca Pucci Organisation: Klabin SA Chamber: Southern Economic Email: fsagacy@klabin.com.br aldezir@klabinpr.com.br 2) Name: João Carlos Augusti Organisation: Suzano Bahia Sul Papel e Celulose S/A Chamber: Southern Economic Email: joaoaugusti@suzano.com.br</p>

<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p> <p>Proposed changes to Interim Dispute Resolution Protocol:</p> <p>1. In the document: Interim Dispute Resolution Protocol, Paragraph 3^o Executive Summary: Actual text: "Complaints involving management practices in a certified forest..., if necessary, the body's independent committee."</p> <p>Proposed text: ..., if necessary, the body's independent committee established and managed by the National Initiative.</p> <p>This procedure would formally establish the conduction of dispute resolution process by National Initiative (IN), through a specific committee formation, leading the whole trial proceedings, such as hearing the accusation appeal and defense appeal, choosing a third party, capable, independent and with credibility to analyze and emit the final seeming on the conflict, and finally sending the final report to FSC IC.</p>	
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalized by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalized by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalized with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalized in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

<p>Title: Motion that FSC employees shall not also be FSC members</p>	<p>Category and number 2 Statutory</p>
<p>Statutory Motion: FSC employees at International, Regional and National levels may not also be FSC members.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Matthew Wenban-Smith Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: m.wenbansmith@fsc.org</p>

<p>Changes to Statutes (required): TITLE 2: SEVENTH ...Government owned legal entities or entities with governmental participation will not be admitted as members of the Association. EMPLOYEES OF FSC AT THE INTERNATIONAL, REGIONAL OR NATIONAL LEVELS WILL NOT BE ADMITTED AS MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.</p> <p>Changes to By-laws (required): 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. EMPLOYEES OF FSC AT THE INTERNATIONAL, REGIONAL OR NATIONAL LEVELS MAY NOT ALSO BE FSC MEMBERS.</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Carolina Hoyos Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Social Email: metaforas@yahoo.com</p> <p>2) Name: Anna Jenkins Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: anna-jenkins@lineone.net</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: FSC staff make a critically important contribution to the success of FSC's mission. FSC would not be possible without the dedication of its staff at the international, regional and national levels. FSC staff have vital roles in the management and oversight of all FSC's systems: for policy development; standards development; accreditation; marketing; trademark control; training; etc.</p> <p>It is essential to many of these tasks that FSC staff are, and are perceived to be, independent of any particular chamber interest. Membership of an FSC chamber creates the perception that a member of staff is more closely associated with the interests of one particular chamber.</p> <p>There must be a clear separation of powers between the FSC membership as the ultimate authority of FSC, and the FSC staff as the 'civil servants' of the FSC system. FSC staff at international, regional and national levels should be properly involved in strategic and management planning, but there is no necessity for them to be FSC members in order to carry out such roles.</p>	
<p>Cost implications:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) Loss of membership fees individual staff members - total cost less than USD1000</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) None.</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to enable FSC decision making</p>	<p>Category and number 3 Statutory</p>
<p>Statutory Motion: FSC is an association made up of three equal chambers; FSC members seek the goal of decision-making by consensus; and, consensus requires, at a minimum, the consent of each of the three chambers; The General Assembly resolves to enable decision making by consensus and to revise the By-Laws as proposed below:</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Hannah Scrase Organisation: FERN Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: hannahs@gn.apc.org</p>
<p>Changes to By-laws: Change the By-Laws as follows: 15. General Assembly decisions, including decisions by postal ballot, with the exception of Board elections (see paragraph 58), are adopted by consensus.</p> <p>Consensus is defined as the absence of sustained opposition but does not require unanimity. In the case of a vote, decisions shall require both the affirmative vote of a simple majority of members within each () chamber, and 66.6% of the total voting power registered by Associates in good standing (calculated as provided for in these By-laws) with exception of Board elections. Abstentions shall not count as votes cast. A <i>quorum</i> of 50% + 1 of votes from 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 case such <i>quorum</i> 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 <i>quorum</i> 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 66.6% of the total voting power registered by Associates in good standing.</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Grant Rosoman Organisation: Greenpeace New Zealand Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: grant.rosoman@diab.greenpeace.org</p> <p>2) Name: Chris Van Dam Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Social Email: cvandam@elsitio.net</p> <p>3) Name: Olof Johansson Organisation: Sveaskog Forvaltnings AB Chamber: Northern Economic Email: Olof.Johansson@sveaskog.se</p> <p>4) Name: Dawn Robinson Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Social Email: dawnrobinson@onetel.com</p>

<p>Purpose and/or additional information: At the last GA, a motion was passed that was submitted by WWF – “A motion to clarify FSC decision making”. It has some useful elements but it also has one element which we think may turn out to be unworkable and which we believe many people voted for without realising the practical implications. That is the section which requires that motions can only be passed with a majority not just in each chamber but also in every sub chamber. While this sounds good on paper we are concerned that the practical outcome will be that virtually no motion can ever be passed and that FSC may be unable to develop and change to meet future challenges as a result.</p> <p>Hopefully we are wrong - that would be great - and if that is the case we will readily withdraw the motion - but just in case – we would like to table a motion that can be used if necessary to reverse this decision. We won't use it if it seems that at least the most well supported motions can succeed using the new rules which we have not yet tried. But if it turns out that the whole system is paralysed by this potential surfeit of democracy then we want to have a mechanism for rescuing the situation. I am not sure what the exact wording should be but at least want to put down a marker at this stage. I have based it on the section of the original motion that covers this aspect and simply remove the word SUB where it prefixes chamber. The places where the sub has been removed are shown by (). The rest of the text simply repeats what is currently in the By-laws. We don't want to marginalise any sub chamber it is simply that the cumulative thresholds of quora, overall majorities and sub chamber majorities may be too much and may actually prevent us from taking any decisions at all.</p> <p>NB: The FSC Statutes Title 3, Seventeenth paragraph, section e) refers to the requirements for quorum and states that "... the affirmative vote of 66% of the voting power shall be required, in the understanding that the By-laws of the Association will provide for the manner in which such voting power will be calculated".</p>	
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

Part 2: Motions to change the FSC Principles and Criteria

<p>Title: Motion to review FSC's P&C: Removal of specified Criteria</p>	<p>Category and number 4 Statutory</p>
<p>Statutory Motion: According to FSC's definition, a criterion is "a means of judging whether or not a Principle (of forest stewardship) has been fulfilled, the following criteria clearly are not compatible to the definition:</p> <p><i>Criterion 1.4:</i> Conflicts between laws, regulations, and the FSC Principles and Criteria shall be evaluated for the purposes of certification, on a case-by-case basis, by the certifiers and the involved or affected parties.</p> <p><i>Criterion 9.2:</i> The consultative portion of the certification process must place emphasis on the identified conservation attributes, and options for the maintenance thereof.</p> <p><i>Criterion 10.9:</i> Plantation established in areas converted from natural forests after November 1994 normally shall not qualify for certification. Certification may be allowed in circumstances where sufficient evidence is submitted to the certification body that the manager/owner is not responsible directly or indirectly of such conversion.</p> <p>These are guidelines for the certification process and therefore should be removed from the Principles and announced in a specific instruction of the FSC's P&C application which also includes the statements of paragraph 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the Introduction.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Pham Hoai Duc Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: duc-dkht@netnem.vn</p>
<p>Changes to FSC Principles and Criteria</p> <p>Criteria 1.4, 9.2 and 10.9 shall be removed from the FSC Principles and Criteria. They shall be included in a separate and specific instruction on the application of the FSC Principles and Criteria, together with the statements of paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Introduction.</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Nguyen Ngoc Lung Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: lungnn@yahoo.com</p> <p>2) Name: Hoang Hoe</p>

<p>Purpose and/or additional information: [a short paragraph providing additional information which the proposer/seconders consider would be useful to the membership when making its decision]...</p>	<p>Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: hoanghoe@netnam.vn</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p> <p>USD\$ 1,000 for republishing the FSC's P&C</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p> <p>USD\$10-100 for photocopying and distribution of the new FSC's P&C by national initiatives</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to explicitly add in a public document the long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria</p>	<p>Category and number: 5 Statutory</p>
<p>Motion: This motion seeks to ensure the long-term commitment of adherence to the FSC Principles and Criteria. A new wording for FSC Criteria 1.6 is suggested.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Ana Young Downey Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: ana.young@oikoschile.cl</p>
<p>Changes to FSC Principles and Criteria: Criterion 1.6: Forest managers shall EXPLICITLY demonstrate IN A PUBLIC DOCUMENT a long-term commitment to adhere to the FSC Principles and Criteria.</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Luis Astorga Organisation: Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo Chamber: Southern Social</p>

<p>Purpose and/or additional information: Often, the statement of adherence to the FSC Principles and Criteria is neither direct nor evident. The purpose of this motion is that FSC certificate holders have a public document where they explicitly state their commitment to FSC in order to support and promote FSC certification among third parties, since it is not always required that the FSC initials be stated in the commitment of responsible forest management.</p>	<p>Email: luis.astorga@vtr.net 2) Name: Hernán Verscheure Organisation: CODEFF Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: bosque1@codeff.cl</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest the costs involved for the implementation the motion; but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) Cost implications: Costs to FSC: USD\$0-1 000 [the proposer may suggest the costs involved for the implementation the motion, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to include in the FSC Principles and Criteria stakeholder consultation when defining training opportunities and other services</p>	<p>Category and number: 6 Statutory</p>
<p>Motion: This motion seeks to incorporate consultation to the community when offering opportunities to provide other services. A new wording for FSC Criteria 4.1 is suggested.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Ana Young Downey Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: ana.young@oikoschile.cl</p>

<p>Changes to FSC Principles and Criteria:</p> <p>Criterion 4.1: The communities within, or adjacent to, the forest management area should be given opportunities for employment, training and other services; TO ACHIEVE THIS, THE PARTIES' VIEWS OR CONSULTATION SHALL BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Luis Astorga Organisation: Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo Chamber: Southern Social Email: luis.astorga@vtr.net</p> <p>2) Name: Hernán Verscheure Organisation: CODEFF Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: bosque1@codeff.cl</p>
<p>Objective and/or additional information:</p> <p>Sometimes in certification assessments it becomes evident that service or support opportunities offered to communities only contain the view of a single party, and that the needs of the community are not taken into account because the consultation process does not always take place. This motion aims at incorporating the parties involved in the definition of the actual opportunities to be offered. Thus, in order to maintain and enhance the long-term social well being of the communities, it should be clearly stated that employment, training and other services have taken into consideration the views of the parties involved or that a consultation took place.</p>	
<p>Cost implications:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC)</p> <p>Cost implications: Costs to FSC: USD\$0-1 000 [the proposer may suggest the costs involved for the implementation the motion; but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest the costs involved for the implementation the motion; but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Title: Motion to add a new criterion to Principle 4 in relation to a Social Management and Accountability Plan</p>	<p>Category and number: 7 Statutory</p>
<p>Statutory Motion: The General Assembly passes a motion to add a Criterion to Principle 4, defined as follows: Criterion 4.1 "The Forest Management Unit (FMU) will have a Social Management and Accountability Plan which will include the following: a) The FMU social objectives in relation to its workers and the relationships with local communities; b) Forest Management social impact assessments and steps taken to eliminate or mitigate negative impacts, as jointly agreed upon with local communities or groups;</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Luis Astorga Organisation: Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo Chamber: Southern Social Email: luisastorga@entelchile.net</p>

<p>c) Actions taken by the FMU to strengthen, diversify and develop the local economy; d) Actions taken by the FMU to open local employment opportunities and to generate local service providers through training of local people.</p> <p>SLIMF operations will be excluded from complying with this criterion. The FSC Secretariat will establish the guidelines to develop the Social Management and Accountability Plan.</p>	<p>Name: Chris van Dam Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Social Email: cvandam@elsitio.net</p>
<p>Changes to FSC Principles and Criteria:</p> <p>1. Criterion 4.1 “The Forest Management Unit (FMU) will have a Social Management and Accountability Plan which will include the following:</p> <p>a) The FMU social objectives in relation to its workers and the relationships with local communities; b) Forest Management social impact assessments and steps taken to eliminate or mitigate negative impacts, as jointly agreed upon with local communities or groups; c) Actions taken by the FMU to strengthen, diversify and develop the local economy; d) Actions taken by the FMU to open local employment opportunities and to generate local service providers through training of local people.</p> <p>2. Once this motion is passed, it is necessary to delete the existing Criteria 4.1 and 4.4 since they are already included in this proposal.</p> <p>3. The numbering of the criteria will be changed accordingly</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Sergio Madrid Organisation: CCMSS Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: smadrid@laneta.apc.org</p> <p>2) Name: Fernando Aguilar Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: Fernandoaguilar@cotas.net</p> <p>3) Name: Pablo Antelo Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: pantelo@lachonta.com</p>
<p>Purpose</p> <p>1. A Management and Social Accountability Plan is required to give a consistent, functional and harmonic relation to the social component of forest certification which is scattered within various principles and criteria. 2. Over the past two decades, several productive sectors have included the business concept of social accountability, and this has contributed to an improvement of the conditions of local communities and forest workers, thus advancing the actions towards sustainability. 3. This business concept of social accountability through a “Social Management System” is not included in any other forest certification scheme, and would, therefore, strengthen once again FSC leadership in this process.</p>	<p>4) Name: Claudia Mayer Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Social Email: Claudia.mayer@gtz.de</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) Costs to FSC would only imply a change to the documents.</p>	

Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC)

1. For companies that are becoming certified, these changes have no major additional cost because the cost of the Social Management and Accountability Plan is already included in various parts of the Criteria that have to be complied with at present. However, depending on the size of the operation, the need of an expert in social sciences might arise.
2. For Certification Bodies, it may have an additional cost if the assessment team does not already include an expert in social sciences.

<p>Title: Motion to unfold Principle 4</p>	<p>Category and number: 8 Statutory</p>
<p>Statutory Motion: The FSC General Assembly passes the motion to unfold Principle 4 so that the two dimensions it contains: “Workers’ rights” and “Community Relations” may have the importance that they each deserve. The FSC will create a Committee in charge of studying, carrying out consultations and proposing the criteria to be included in this Principle, in accordance to the usual approval mechanisms. Principle 4A will address “Workers’ rights” and a Principle 4B called “Local Sustainable Development” will be developed to clearly establish how the FMU will contribute in making local communities more dynamic</p> <p>Principle 4B will include – among others – criteria related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The need to have FMUs, according to their size and possibilities, and eventually in a joint manner with other local actors (other FMUs, municipalities, organisations, companies, government institutions) contributing to the definition of objectives, actions and projects aimed at promoting local development.• The need to have FMUs, according to their size and possibilities, generating opportunities for employment, training and service provision for the communities within or adjacent to the forest management area.• The need to have FMUs, according to their size and possibilities, promoting the creation of small local production businesses or service providers. <p>Principle 4B will also include Criteria 5.2 and 5.4 which are part of Principle 5, the purpose of which is also to attain local sustainable development.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Chris van Dam Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Social Email: cvandam@elsitio.net</p>

<p>Changes to FSC Principles and Criteria:</p> <p>The title of Principle 4 is modified as follows::</p> <p>Currently: PRINCIPLE #4: COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND WORKERS' RIGHTS</p> <p>From now on: PRINCIPLE #4: LOCAL DEVELOPMENT AND WORKERS' RIGHTS Forest management shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and promote local sustainable development.</p> <p>Principle 4 has two Sub-Principles, Sub-Principle A "Workers' Rights" and Sub-Principle B "Local Sustainable Development".</p> <p><i>Sub-Principle A criteria., Workers' Rights</i></p> <p>4.1 Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.</p> <p>4.2 The rights of workers to organize and voluntarily negotiate with their employers shall be guaranteed as outlined in Conventions 87 and 98 of the International Labour Organisation (OIT).</p> <p><i>Sub-Principle B, Local Sustainable Development (provisional draft)</i></p> <p>4.3. According to their size and possibilities, and eventually in a joint manner with other local actors (other FMUs, municipalities, organisations, companies, government institutions) FMUs shall contribute to the definition of objectives, actions and projects aimed at promoting local development.</p> <p>4.4. The communities within, or adjacent to, the forest management area should be given opportunities for employment, training and other services.</p> <p>4.5. Forest management and marketing operations should encourage the optimal use and local processing of the forest's diversity of products. (e.g. 5.2)</p> <p>4.6. Forest management should strive to strengthen and diversify the local economy, thus avoiding dependence on a single forest product. (e.g. 5.4)</p> <p>4.7 Management planning and implementation shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups directly affected by management operations.</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Sergio Madrid Organisation: CCMSS Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: smadrid@laneta.apc.org</p> <p>2) Name: Luis Astorga Organisation: Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo Chamber: Southern Social Email: luis.astorga@vtr.net (NB joint proposer)</p> <p>3) Name: Jaime Guillén Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: pranajai@yahoo.es</p> <p>4) Name: Pablo Antelo Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: pantelo@lachonta.com</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) Costs to FSC would only imply a change to the documents.</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to strengthen the conservation of biodiversity</p>	<p>Category and number: 9 Statutory</p>
<p>Motion: This motion seeks to strengthen the conservation of biodiversity. A new wording is suggested for Criterion 6.2.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Ana Young Downey Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: ana.young@oikoschile.cl</p>
<p>Changes to FSC Principles and Criteria:</p> <p>Criterion 6.2 Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas). WITH THE HELP OF EXPERTS, conservation zones and protection areas shall be established, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources.</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Luis Astorga Organisation: Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo Chamber: Southern Social Email: luis.astorga@vtr.net</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: Sometimes, the definition of conservation zones and the identification of plant or animal species are done without the help of experts. In order to strengthen the conservation of biodiversity, the proposal is to include experts in Criterion 6.2. Without their support, species or situations are relevant to biodiversity may be overlooked.</p>	<p>2) Name: Hernán Verscheure Organisation: CODEFF Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: bosque1@codeff.cl</p>
<p>Cost implications:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC)</p> <p>Cost implications: Costs to FSC: USD\$0-1 000</p> <p>[the proposer may suggest the costs involved for the implementation the motion; but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC)</p> <p>[the proposer may suggest the costs involved for the implementation the motion; but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making the decision]</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to change the wording of Criterion 6.10</p>	<p>Category and number 10 Statutory</p>
<p>Statutory Motion:</p> <p>Changes to P&C</p> <p>To change the wording of Criterion 6.10 from:</p> <p>6.10 Forest conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and b) does not occur on high conservation value forest areas; and c) will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long term conservation benefits across the forest management unit. <p>to:</p> <p>6.10 Conversion of Natural or Semi-natural Forest to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) entails a very limited portion of the forest management unit; and b) does not occur on high conservation value forest areas; and c) will enable clear, substantial, additional, secure, long term conservation benefits across the forest management unit. 	<p>Proposed:</p> <p>Name: Michal Brink Organisation: SGS Qualifor Chamber: Southern Economic Email: Michal.Brink@sgs.com</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p> <p>The establishment of plantations often requires the conversion of native vegetation and in the past the decision to effect this conversion may have been done without due consideration for the impacts on the bio-physical environment. Through the process of ongoing evaluation of the impacts of plantations on said environment, it often becomes clear that certain areas need to be restored to the original native vegetation to mitigate or negate such impacts.</p> <p>In terms of current FSC policy on this matter (FSC-POL-20-003, 29 March 2004 and further FSC-ADV-30-602 of 29</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Chris Burchmore Organisation: Mondi Business Paper South Africa Chamber: Southern Economic Email: chris.burchmore@mondibp.com</p>

March 2004), such areas may be deforested provided that in compliance with Criterion 6.10, the following is met:

- a) *it must entail a 'very limited' portion of the forest management unit;*
- b) *it must not include conversion of high conservation value forest areas;*
- c) *it must enable 'clear, substantial, additional, secure, long term conservation benefits across the whole forest management unit'.*

To comply with indicator a) under criterion 6.10, the FSC document defines an acceptable conversion as:

Conversion of more than 5% of a forest management unit to non-forest land use over a five-year period cannot be considered 'very limited', except in exceptional circumstances and with the clear support of environmental and social stakeholders at the national and local levels. Specific provisions within an endorsed national/regional forest stewardship standards should be considered sufficient demonstration of such support.

The policy furthermore provides that where timber is harvested from such a "limited conversion" it may be sold as certified. Should the conversion not meet this criterion, the area considered for conversion must be excluded from the scope of the certificate and the timber may not be sold as certified. This creates the difficulty that this motion is attempting to address.

It is quite clear that this policy decision is limited by the wording of the FSC Criteria requiring that only a "very limited portion of the FMU" may be converted. If it is accepted that such conversion will have conservation benefits and do not compromise the following as per FSC-ADV-30-602:

- a) *the non-forest vegetation that is being restored has "High Conservation Values". (This would apply, for example, where vegetation with a HCV had been cleared from the site when the plantation was established, and the HCV could be restored by clearing the plantation);*
- b) *the certificate covers a forest management unit (FMU) in which natural forests and plantations will continue to be managed, while only some parts of the plantations are cleared. (A certificate implies a commitment to long-term management planning and implementation. Long-term forest management objectives are mentioned repeatedly in the FSC P&C. These could not apply if the whole FMU would cease to carry forest);*
- c) *the areas to be cleared of plantations will be managed to restore a mixture of forest and non-forest vegetation, characteristic of the natural vegetation and landscape of the region;*
- d) *the system and techniques of restoration of natural forest or non-forest vegetation have been proven successful on that management unit, or on directly comparable areas.*

Then it would seem logical that there is no reason, other than the actual wording of C6.10, to restrict the conversion of plantations to native vegetation and allow the timber thus harvested to be sold as certified. The current policy is counter

2)
Name: Shaun McCartney
Organisation: Global Forest Products
Chamber: Southern Economic
Email: smccartney@globalforestproducts.net

<p>productive in terms of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Forest managers are reluctant to effect large scale conversions as they are not allowed to sell the timber as certified. Where they have no choice in terms of the conversion decision, they are forced to introduce very expensive and organizationally complex procedures to ensure that such timber is not mixed with certified material. b) Environmental NGOs and other stakeholders find it difficult to understand how FSC an environmental NGO in own right, cannot by virtue, support such conversions. This brings about confusion as to what FSC is supposed to be about and it dilutes the influence that FSC may have in terms of promoting and supporting good environmental stewardship, <i>per se</i>. c) Forest Managers find this equally confusing and are disillusioned with FSC and its objectives. <p>It needs to be noted that in its current form and in the case of a plantation forest, C6.10 would have to be read in a non-sensical form as:</p> <p>“Plantation” conversion to plantations or non-forest land uses shall not occur, except in circumstances where conversion: etc.</p> <p>The proposed change in the wording of this criterion will remove this contradiction and allow FSC to support conversions that have clear conservation benefits.</p>	
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to clarify the requirement of a publicly available forest management plan</p>	<p>Category and number: 11 Statutory</p>
<p>Motion: This motion seeks to clarify the requirement of a publicly available forest management plan. A new wording is suggested for</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Ana Young Downey</p>

<p>Criterion 7.4.</p>	<p>Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: ana.young@oikoschile.cl</p>
<p>Changes to FSC Principles and Criteria:</p> <p>Change the wording of Criterion 7.4 from:</p> <p>“While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the primary elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1”.</p> <p>To:</p> <p>“Forest managers shall have a publicly available summary of the main elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1. The confidentiality of this information will be respected.</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Luis Astorga Organisation: Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo Chamber: Southern Social Email: luis.astorga@vtr.net</p> <p>2) Name: Hernán Verscheure Organisation: CODEFF Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: bosque1@codeff.cl</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p> <p>FSC Criterion 7.4 (forest managers shall have a summary of the main elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1. The confidentiality of this information will be respected.) and FSC Criterion 8.5 (“Forest managers shall have a summary publicly available of the result of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.”) are not clear with regards to the requirement of making the Forest Management Plan (FMP) publicly available. The FMP allows stakeholders to be informed regarding the scope of forest operations; furthermore, if the results of monitoring are required to be publicly available, it is necessary, to understand them, to know the framework of forest operations. Also, what is set forth in both criteria (7.4 and 8.5) can lead to misunderstandings.</p>	
<p>Cost implications:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) Cost implications: Costs to FSC: USD\$0-1 000</p> <p>[the proposer may suggest the costs involved for the implementation the motion; but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC)

[the proposer may suggest the costs involved for the implementation the motion; but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]

Title: Motion to improve people's protection against forest fires	Category and number: 12 Statutory
Motion: The motion seeks to provide greater protection to the people around areas with high-risk of forest fires. A new wording is suggested for Criterion 8.5:	Proposed: Name: Ana Young Downey Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: ana.young@oikoschile.cl
Changes to FSC Principles and Criteria Change Criterion 8.5 from: 8.5 While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2. To: 8.5 Forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of the monitoring indicators, including those listed in the criteria, AS WELL AS COMMUNICATION INFORMATION FOR FIRE WARNINGS AND FOR FIRE PREVENTION BRIGADES EXISTING IN THE AREA, ESPECIALLY IN HIGH-RISK FIRE AREAS AND IN AREAS CLOSE TO POPULATION CENTRES, IN ACCORDANCE TO THE SCALE AND INTENSITY OF FOREST MANAGEMENT.	Seconded: 1) Name: Luis Astorga Organisation: Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo Chamber: Southern Social Email: luis.astorga@vtr.net 2) Name: Hernán Verscheure Organisation: CODEFF Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: bosque1@codeff.cl

<p>Purpose and/or additional information: The risk of forest fires with serious consequences for the population is high (the population has increased and global warming is not helping), and this measure might help protecting the population in these situations. The publicly available monitoring results (or in the FMP, if it is made public) should include information from the communications systems for forest fire warnings and for the fire prevention brigades existing in the high-risk fire areas and in areas close to population centres, in accordance to the scale and intensity of forest management.</p>	
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC)</p> <p>Cost implications: Costs to FSC: USD\$0-1 000</p> <p>[the proposer may suggest the costs involved for the implementation the motion; but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC)</p> <p>[the proposer may suggest the costs involved for the implementation the motion; but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to review FSC's P&C: clarification of should/shall</p>	<p>Category and number 13 Statutory</p>
<p>Statutory Motion: "SHALL" and "SHOULD" used in the FSC's P&C means that the action must be performed <i>in the future</i> (shall is the strong form, and should- the weak one), while the certification process <i>can evaluate only what is being or has been done</i>.</p> <p>Therefore it is recommended that all "shall + infinitive" and "should + infinitive" in the FSC's P&C be replaced accordingly by the present tense or the present perfect. So, for example, Criterion 1.5 should become: "Forest management areas have been (instead of SHOULD be) protected from illegal harvesting; or 2.2: "Local communities with legal or customary tenure or use rights are maintaining (instead of SHALL maintain) control, to the extent necessary to protect their rights...."</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Pham Hoai Duc Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: duc-dkht@netnem.vn</p>

<p>Changes to FSC Principles and Criteria All "shall + infinitive" and "should + infinitive" in the FSC's P&C will be replaced by the present tense or the present perfect. So, for example, Criterion 1.5 should become: "Forest management areas have been (instead of SHOULD be) protected from illegal harvesting; or 2.2: "Local communities with legal or customary tenure or use rights are maintaining (instead of SHALL maintain) control, to the extent necessary to protect their rights...."</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Nguyen Ngoc Lung Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: lungnn@yahoo.com</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p>	<p>2) Name: Hoang Hoe Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: hoanghoe@netnam.vn</p>
<p>Cost implications:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p> <p>USD\$ 1,000 for republishing the FSC's P&C</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p> <p>USD\$10-100 for photocopying and distribution of the new FSC's P&C by national initiatives</p>	

Part 3: Policy Motions

Part 3.1: General accreditation/certification issues

<p>Title: Motion on Accreditation Manual</p>	<p>Category and number 14 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: FSC Accreditation Manual Part 3 dep. 7 article 7.2.4.</p> <p>The following requirement to be added:</p> <p>"Stakeholders MAY PARTICIPATE IN main assessments as observers ON THE CB TEAM OF ASSESSORS. The stakeholders MAY BE REQUIRED TO FOLLOW THE SAME CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS AS CB ASSESSORS. THE STAKEHOLDER MUST BE AN FSC MEMBER OF GOOD STANDING AND BE ENDORSED BY THE NATIONAL INITIATIVE. THE KEY PURPOSE OF THE OBSERVER ROLE IS TO MAKE THE CERTIFICATION PROCESS MORE TRANSPARENT AND ALLOW STAKEHOLDERS TO BETTER UNDERSTAND IT, AND TO BUILD TRUST BETWEEN STAKEHOLDERS AND CBS".</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Vladimir Tchouprov Organisation: Greenpeace Russia Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: vladimir.tchouprov@ru.greenpeace.org</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: The existing rules for certification bodies' activity regulate relationships between certification bodies and stakeholders only for the stage before main assessment. The main instrument of such a regulation is the consultation process. This is a very important and useful tool which is used by stakeholders. But this process is done mostly in writing rather than through direct observation. In some certifications this is not enough as stakeholders would like to know about implementation of their comments by the certification body and to observe how certification bodies' experts evaluate the company.</p> <p>There are some examples when stakeholders learn about the results of main assessment which differ from their own point of view. This leads to conflicts and appeals to the FSC Secretariat as the sides try to prove their positions through their own knowledge and experience.</p> <p>To avoid misunderstanding at this stage FSC could implement requirements which allow stakeholders be near the certification body experts during the main assessment. This motion will allow certification bodies and stakeholders to find solutions during difficult certifications more easily as they will have the same objects to discuss and criticize.</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Mikhail Karpachevskiy Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: forest@biodiversity.ru</p> <p>2) Name: Albert Loginov Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Social Email: n.a.</p>
<p>Cost implications:</p>	

Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC)

[the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]

Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC)

[the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]

Title: Motion to ensure that forest operations have access to the results of consultations carried out by certifiers	Category and number: 15 Policy
Motion: This motion aims at ensuring that forest operations have access to the results of the consultation, and to support the seriousness of the process. It is suggested that the procedures of FSC accredited certification bodies indicate the requirement to inform the assessed party about the results of the external parties consulted, providing the information received from them, and safekeeping the confidentiality of the information when the consulted party so requests.	Proposed: Name: Ana Young Downey Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: ana.young@oikoschile.cl
Purpose and/or additional information: Sometimes, the assessment processes for certification are carried out by the certifiers in such a diverse manner, that stakeholder consultation is not always communicated or undertaken in a serious form. This motion aims at having certifiers informing forest operations regarding the positive or negative views expressed by the consulted parties. This is beneficial in terms of transparency and social accountability. The confidentiality of Information should be kept when the consulted party so requests.	Seconded: 1) Name: Luis Astorga Organisation: Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo Chamber: Southern Social Email: luis.astorga@vtr.net 2) Name: Hernán Verscheure Organisation: CODEFF Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: bosque1@codeff.cl
Cost implications:	

<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC)</p> <p>Cost implications: Costs to FSC: USD\$0-1 000</p> <p>[the proposer may suggest the costs involved for the implementation the motion; but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC)</p> <p>[[the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>

<p>Title: Motion to Establish a Standard Certification Procedure for FSC IC Accredited Certification Bodies</p>	<p>Category and number 16 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: FSC should establish a standard operational procedure in order to guide the accredited certification bodies in relation to: auditor leader's hiring, training and qualification; standardising certification recommendations; standard evaluation criteria; two interested parties hearings; elaborating independent revision criteria; pre-selection technical criteria; and standard spreadsheet costs.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Jose Aldezir de Lucca Pucci Organisation: Klabin SA Chamber: Southern Economic Email: fsagacy@klabin.com.br aldezir@klabinpr.com.br</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p> <p>Operational evaluation process and procedures for forest management certification has been carried out in distinctive ways by accredited certification bodies, interfering with the results of certification, generating doubts about the severity of verification criteria when comparing one company to another, in addition generating a lack of interest in the process from concerned parties and the certified companies.</p> <p>Denying this motion could compromise the credibility of FSC, certification bodies and auditors, and could characterize a fragile certification process due to the non-standard evaluation and recommendation criteria.</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: João Carlos Augusti Organisation: Suzano Bahia Sul Papel e Celulose S/A Chamber: Southern Economic Email: joaoaugusti@suzano.com.br</p> <p>2)Name: Antonio Claret de Oliveira Organisation: V & M Florestal Ltda Chamber: Southern Economic Email: florestal@vmtubes.com.br</p>
<p>Cost implications:</p>	

Cost to FSC: (to be finalized by FSC)

[the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalized by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]

Cost to other parties: (to be finalized with FSC)

[the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalized in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]

Title: Motion to decrease unnecessary cost differences of certification in different countries	Category and number 17 Policy
Policy Motion: Substitute the need for translating Public Summaries for Forest Management Certification Reports into English or Spanish for a simple fact sheet with essential information on the certified operation, which can be in English or Spanish.	Proposed: Name: Luis Fernando Guedes Pinto Organisation: IMAFLORA – Instituto de Manejo e Certificação Florestal e Agrícola Chamber: Southern Economic Email: luisfernando@imaflora.org
Purpose and/or additional information: The current FSC system requires that public summaries for Forest Management certificates be translated into English or Spanish. Unfortunately, this requirement puts an unfair burden for forest management operations that are not located in English or Spanish speaking countries, increasing the cost of FSC certification with little additional value. The most important stakeholders are local ones, which will continue having access to information through the Public Summary in the local language. Interested parties from other countries will have access to the public summary in the local language and to the fact sheet in one of the official FSC languages.	Seconded: 1) Name: Rubens Gomes Organisation: OELA – Oficina Escola de Lutheria da Amazonia Chamber: Southern Social Email: rubensgomes@oela.org.br 2) Name: Peter Feilberg Organisation: Nepcon Chamber: Northern Economic Email: pf@nepcon.dk
Cost implications:	

<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) Staff time to define information needed in fact sheets</p>
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) Decreased cost of certification in non English or Spanish speaking countries. Punctual cost for foreign interested parties.</p>

<p>Title: Motion to emphasize the importance of field performance</p>	<p>Category and number 18 Policy</p>
<p>Policy 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.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Rubens Gomes Organisation: OELA Chamber: Southern Social Email: rubensgomes@oela.org.br</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: We, the members of FSC, express our concern that the FSC board, the Policy and Standard Unit and the Accreditation Business Unit have been increasingly emphasising procedural and administrative requirements in the FSC certification system, for both forest management certification and accreditation standards for certifiers. As a result, the relative importance of field performance has been reduced and the costs of certification have been raised, particularly for small and medium sized enterprises.</p> <p>Whilst we recognize that systems, policies, procedures and plans might be a good tool for achieving good performance in forest management, these should never be a goal in itself. Therefore we, the members of FSC, hereby state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> That the primary emphasis of the FSC shall be to ensure that forest management performance, true to the FSC principles and Criteria for responsible forest management, is the primary focus of FSC certification; <input type="checkbox"/> The FSC accredited certification bodies verifying FMU's compliance with the FSC requirements shall focus primarily on evaluating the FMU's compliance with the standards based on field performance. <input type="checkbox"/> The first priority of the FSC Accreditation Business Unit (ABU) responsible for developing accreditation of certification bodies shall be to pay special attention to the quality of certification bodies' verification of field compliance of certified operations. <input type="checkbox"/> The FSC National Initiatives responsible for developing regional or national standards, as well as the ABU responsible for endorsing national and regional standards, shall focus on developing indicators that promote and favour good field 	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Luis Fernando Guedes Pinto Organisation: IMAFLORA – Instituto de Manejo e Certificação Florestal e Agrícola Chamber: Southern Economic Email: luisfernando@imaflora.org</p> <p>2) Name: Richard Z. Donovan Organisation: Rainforest Alliance Chamber: Northern Economic Email: rzd@smartwood.org</p> <p>3) Name: Peter Feilberg Organisation: Nepcon Chamber: Northern Economic</p>

<p>performance of the FMU's,</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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 favouring good field performance.</p>	<p>Email: pf@nepcon.dk</p>
Cost implications:	
Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC)	

<p>Title: Motion to increase the practical experience of certification body auditors</p>	<p>Category: 19 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion</p> <p>This motion will increase the practical experience of certification body auditors in order to ensure a better quality of their work and to avoid that auditors impose unreasonable costs and requirements to forest owners/managers, especially in developing countries where it is frequent that forest owners/managers have little understanding of their rights and possibilities regarding FSC certification.</p> <p>Current wording of the FSC-STD-20-004 (Qualifications for FSC certification body auditors) section 1.2.3:</p> <p>1.2.3 a) A university level education qualification (or equivalent), or five (5) years of disciplinary experience in a subject relevant to the evaluation (e.g. ecology, forestry, anthropology), and in addition,</p> <p>b) at least five (5) years professional experience in an area of work relevant to the evaluation (e.g. forest management, postgraduate research, consultancy).</p> <p>The proposed formulation for FSC-STD-20-004 (Qualifications for FSC certification body auditors) section 1.2.3:</p> <p>1.2.3 a) A university level education qualification (or equivalent), or five (5) years of disciplinary experience in a subject relevant to the evaluation (e.g. ecology, forestry, anthropology), and in addition,</p> <p>b) at least five (5) years professional experience in an area of work relevant to the evaluation (e.g. forest management, postgraduate research, consultancy). <i>The team leader shall in addition demonstrate prior PRACTICAL experience related to the specific type of forest management unit under evaluation (e.g. Plantation, group certification scheme, community forestry) and the context in which it operates (country specific experience).</i></p>	<p>Proposed:</p> <p>Name: Jens Kanstrup Organisation: Rainforest Group Nepenthes Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: jka@nepenthes.dk</p>

<p>Purpose and/or additional information: When auditors with scarce experience undertake certification, there is a high risk that they lack a full understanding of the frequently complex situations of FMUs, especially in developing countries where political unsteadiness and defective legislation represent significant obstacles to FSC certification. However, an experienced auditor, will often find creative solutions to the obstacles, and may help the FMU in finding simple and reasonable solutions to the problems. Furthermore, and especially in developing countries, there is a great need of small and community FMUs to get training during the certification process in order to learn how to comply with FSC requirements, without introducing costs out of reach for the FMU.</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Jesper Lund-Larsen Organisation: SID - BAT Chamber: Northern Social Email: jl@3f.dk</p> <p>2) Name: Kasper Kopp Organisation: KoppWood Chamber: Northern Economic Email: kk@koppwood.com</p> <p>3) Name: Saskia van Vuuren Organisation: Asociación Fuente Verde Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: fuentes@ibw.com.ni</p> <p>4) Name: Jaime Guillén Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: pranajai@yahoo.es</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to phase out the use of certifiers' interim standards</p>	<p>Category and number 20 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: The General Assembly mandates and requests the secretariat to devise an appropriate way to phase out certifications using certifiers interim standards before 2010. Also to devise the bridging mechanisms for countries where no national standards exist after 2010.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Michal Rezek Organisation: Friends of the Earth Czech Republic Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: michal.rezek@ecn.cz</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: Most controversial forest management certifications (and most complaints and disputes) relate to certificates based on interim standards developed by certifiers in the absence of agreed national standards. It is not longer acceptable that certification bodies certify according to their own standards. Serious cases of improper performance of certification bodies are seriously undermining the credibility of the whole unique FSC system.</p> <p>FSC FM certificates were issued in more than 65 countries but only 11 countries (April 2005) have their national or regional standards while FSC has its national initiatives working in about 35 countries.</p> <p>The need for more national standards is shared among stakeholders within and outside the FSC system but until now there has been no strong incentive for development of national standard in more countries or regions. Through implementation of FSC Preliminary Accreditation Policy (FSC-POL-01-012) FSC has recently done important steps to make the development of FSC standards quicker but the certain deadline for phasing out the use of certifiers interim standards is needed to initiate dynamic standard setting processes with active involvement of all kinds of stakeholders (driving forces could be NGOs as well as forest industry) in many countries or regions.</p> <p>Where no national or regional standard will exist after 2010, FSC should take over this role on regional level (FSC regional offices in cooperation with FSC National Initiatives) by developing national or regional standards adapted for a country or region, considering any available local draft standards in the country concerned and in neighbouring countries, as well as carrying out limited consultation with key stakeholders.</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Martha Núñez Organisation: Fundación Ambiente y Sociedad Chamber: Southern Social Email: marthan@interactive.net.ec</p> <p>2) Name: Hannah Scrase Organisation: FERN Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: hannahs@gn.apc.org</p> <p>3) Name: Grant Rosoman Organisation: Greenpeace New Zealand Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: grant.rosoman@dialb.greenpeace.org</p>
<p>Cost implications:</p>	

Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC)

[the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]

Cost to FSC: USD\$100 000 - \$1 000 000 (regional offices staff time on drafting and consultation. Probably requirement for consultants to support development)

Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC)

[the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]

In the longer term there should be savings to certification bodies as they would not carry the cost of supporting and updating their own standards. Savings could be passed on to clients. Obviously there will be costs for FSC regional offices and national initiatives developing national/regional FSC standards.

<p>Title: Motion to readjust the SLIMFs eligibility</p>	<p>Category: 21 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion This motion seeks to modify the eligibility criteria in order to identify small Forest Management Operations (FMO) in developing countries.</p> <p>A new wording for criteria 2.2.2 and 2.3 of the SLIMF Eligibility Criteria is suggested.</p> <p>Current wording: 2.2.2 An international maximum threshold of 1000 ha, which national or sub national thresholds may not exceed. 2.3 FSC National Initiatives may approve size thresholds for SLIMFs which are above 100 ha but which do not exceed 1000 ha.</p> <p>Proposed wording: 2.2.2 An international maximum threshold of 1000 ha, which national or sub national thresholds may not exceed, <i>except in the case of community forests in developing countries, where the maximum threshold is of 4,500 ha.</i> 2.3 FSC National Initiatives may approve size thresholds for SLIMFs which are above 100 ha but which do not exceed 1000 ha, <i>except for community forests in developing countries, where they may not exceed 4,500 ha.</i></p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Jens Kanstrup Organisation: Rainforest Group Nepenthes Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: jka@nepenthes.dk</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: Community forest operations are managed by forest farming groups constituted by neighbours in rural areas who are part of the most vulnerable population in developing countries. Today, the income generated by forest management is hardly enough to</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Jesper Lund-Larsen</p>

<p>cover the costs of certification. Notwithstanding these limitations, forest management expectations have improved in several certified community operations, because they have found market niches where they have been able to obtain better prices and to use other species for their products, as in the case of the community operations in Petén, Guatemala and Honduras's Atlantic coast.</p> <p>The size of the granted forests managed by these communities range between 300 and 4500 hectares, and the membership of the community groups goes from 10 to 200 members. Simultaneously, this type of management is relatively extensive, and this implies that the forest areas must often be relatively large in order to succeed in having a viable business (e.g., the indigenous community forests in Nicaragua, Honduras and Guatemala). Furthermore, most community forests lack valuable species and base their operation on low-market value non-traditional species,</p>	<p>Organisation: SID - BAT Chamber: Northern Social Email: jll@3f.dk</p> <p>2) Name: Kasper Kopp Organisation: KoppWood A/S Chamber: Northern Economic Email: kk@koppwood.com</p> <p>3) Name: Saskia van Vuuren Organisation: Asociación Fuente Verde Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: fuelle@ibw.com.ni</p> <p>4) Name: Jaime Guillén Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: pranajai@yahoo.es</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to promote transparency of the FSC system</p>	<p>Category and number: 22 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: The general assembly recognizes the importance of preserving the FSC system as a transparent system. We, the members of FSC, therefore resolve that the Board of Directors is to ensure that all replies which have been submitted by stakeholders during a hearing are to be made publicly available, along with a report explaining the conclusions made by the FSC staff based on the hearings.</p> <p>To be implemented immediately after the GA.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Jens Kanstrup Organisation: Rainforest Group Nepenthes Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: jka@nepenthes.dk</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: It is normal procedure for the FSC to have a hearing when new standards are being developed or old ones are being revised. However, it is currently not possible for a stakeholder to obtain the replies submitted by other members of the FSC. Obtaining this information is important, if a stakeholder is to understand the ongoing process and the viewpoints of the other members.</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Jesper Lund-Larsen Organisation: SID - BAT Chamber: Northern Social Email: jll@3f.dk</p> <p>2) Name: Kasper Kopp Organisation: KoppWood A/S Chamber: Northern Economic Email: kk@koppwood.com</p>
<p>Cost implications:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to promote the transparency of the performance of Accredited Certification Bodies (CB's)</p>	<p>Category and number: 23 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: The General Assembly recognises the importance of maintaining the FSC system as a transparent, democratic, and performance based system. Thus, the membership of FSC, as a consequence hereby resolve that the Board of Directors shall ensure that a summary of the audit reports, including a list of Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and observations, performed by the Accreditation Business Unit, when they evaluate the certification body's performance, shall be made publicly available (pdf file on the webpage of the FSC).</p> <p>Deadline for implementation: 2 months from this date</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Jens Kanstrup Organisation: Rainforest Group Nepenthes Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: jka@nepenthes.dk</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: One of the factors making the FSC a leader and the frontrunner among the world's certifications systems is the emphasis in the system on transparency, democracy, unique stakeholder engagement and on the ground performance. However, it is currently impossible for stakeholders to obtain information about the performance of individual certification bodies. Thus it is impossible for a forest owner or a business to choose and thus reward the best performing certification bodies, and impossible for NGO's to put pressure on the "black sheep" among them.</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Kasper Kopp Organisation: KoppWood A/S Chamber: Northern Economic Email: kk@koppwood.com</p> <p>2) Name: Jesper Lund-Larsen Organisation: SID – BAT Chamber: Northern Social Email: jll@3f.dk</p>
<p>Cost implications:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

Part 3.2: Forest management issues

<p>Title: Motion to ensure legal compliance of forest operations</p>	<p>Category and number: 24 Policy</p>
<p>Motion: The FSC accredited certification bodies' procedures or the FSC Accreditation Manual shall include a list of the legal requirements applicable to the forest operation before the certification assessment takes place.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Ana Young Downey Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: ana.young@oikoschile.cl</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: The purpose of this motion is to ensure legal compliance by forest operations.</p> <p>Criterion 1.1 establishes that: "forest management shall respect all national and local laws, as well as all the administrative requirements". However, the legal scope applicable to forest operations is too extensive and diverse, and depends on the situation of each country. It is therefore very difficult for foreign – and even for national – verifiers to be knowledgeable about it, and to be familiar with the operations with less resources. For certification assessment purposes, and to inform and train as part of the forest certification process, a list should be generated with the legal requirements applicable to the forest operation before the certification assessment takes place.</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Luis Astorga Organisation: Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo Chamber: Southern Social Email: luis.astorga@vtr.net</p> <p>2) Name: Hernán Verscheure Organisation: CODEFF Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: bosque1@codeff.cl</p>
<p>Cost implications:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest the costs involved for the implementation the motion; but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC)

Cost implications: Costs to FSC: USD\$0-1 000

[the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]

Title: Motion to take precautions against the preventive character included in the assessment of social and environmental impacts	Category and number: 25 Policy
Policy Motion: The procedures of FSC accredited certification bodies shall indicate the obligation for the assessments of the social and environmental impacts established in Criteria 4.4 and 6.1, to be delivered beforehand, or to be made available for review during the forest certification inspection.	Proposed: Name: Ana Young Downey Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: ana.young@oikoschile.cl
Purpose and/or additional information: This motion seeks to take precautions against the preventive character included in the assessment of social and environmental impacts. In many cases, it becomes evident in the certification assessment processes that the evaluations of social and environmental impact remain pending. Furthermore, and as a consequence of this, it becomes evident that the degree of impact management by forest operations on forest services varies. This motion seeks to highlight the preventive character of the assessment of social and environmental impacts.	Seconded: 1) Name: Luis Astorga Organisation: Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo Chamber: Southern Social Email: luis.astorga@vtr.net 2) Name: Hernán Verscheure Organisation: CODEFF Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: bosque1@codeff.cl
Cost implications:	

<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) Cost implications: Costs to FSC: USD\$0-1 000</p> <p>[the proposer may suggest the costs involved for the implementation the motion; but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>

<p>Title: Moratorium on Plantation Certification</p>	<p>Category and number: 26 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: The General Assembly decides that FSC-Certification of Plantations stops till the "plantations-review" is finalized.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Rudolf Fenner Organisation: Robin Wood Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: tropenwald@robinwood.de</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: Since the requirements for plantations to get certified are still not defined properly, all certification operations in plantations must be stopped until the revision of the standard is finalised.</p> <p>In order not to risk the credibility of FSC all certification in plantations must be stopped, because there is no clear basis for these certifications which guarantees an equal and high standard of plantations management.</p> <p>NGOs in countries of the South complain about FSC-Certified Plantations. For example in South Africa: In this country, the industrial plantation model has led to a severe impact on water quantity with literally thousands of springs and streams having dried up completely in areas where plantations were established. Furthermore, the water retention and soil erosion prevention services provided by the original (climax) grassland vegetation has been severely compromised, leading to more acute soil erosion, citation and flash floods. In South Africa, timber plantations have been established in the high rainfall areas, consisting primarily of grassland. Grassland is home to an estimated 4000 plant species, and is the most threatened biome world wide, more than 80% destroyed. Having certified more than a million hectares of industrial plantations in South Africa, the FSC is sanctioning grassland destruction.</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Gerd Billen Organisation: NABU e.V. Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: gabi.garus@nabu.de</p> <p>2) Name: Laszlo Maraz Organisation: Pro Regenwald e.V. Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: laszlo@wald.org</p>

Cost implications:
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>

Title: Motion to readjust the eligibility criteria for the SLIMF initiative – low intensity	Category: 27 Policy
<p>Policy Motion This motion aims at modifying the eligibility criteria in order to identify low intensity Forest Management Operations in developing countries.</p> <p>The suggestion is to request from the FSC Board a change in the criteria that define Low Intensity Forest Management Units as follows:</p> <p>At present, the SLIMF eligibility criteria are:</p> <p>Criterion The rate of harvesting as a proportion of the estimated mean annual increment for the total production forest area of the FMU.</p> <p>International maximum threshold The rate of harvesting is less than 20% of the mean annual increment within the total production forest area of the FMU.</p> <p>National or sub-national variation National or sub-national thresholds may be less than 20% of mean annual increment, or may be based on alternative measurements to MAI where this is not available.</p> <p>The following change in the definition of the SLIMF eligibility criteria is suggested:</p> <p>Criterion The rate of harvesting as a proportion of the estimated mean annual increment for the total production forest area of the FMU, and the use of heavy machinery.</p> <p>International maximum threshold The rate of harvesting is less than 20% of the mean annual increment within the total production forest area of the FMU, or 50% of the FMU's total permissible annual felling, provided that it is less than 5000 cubic meters and logging in the area is only done with small-scale methods and techniques of low-impact to the ecosystem (e.g., logging carried out with oxen, mules, controlled logging, etc.)</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Jens Kanstrup Organisation: Rainforest Group Nepenthes Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: jka@nepenthes.dk</p>

<p>National or sub-national variation National or sub-national thresholds may be less than 20% of mean annual increment, or less than 50% of the permissible annual felling provided that it does not exceed 5000 cubic meters and if the logging in the area is only done through small-scale methods and techniques of low impact to the ecosystem or may be based on other specific generally accepted alternative definitions in a country where MAI data is not available.</p>	
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: The current wording of the SLIMF's eligibility criteria is virtually impossible to use in developing countries where data on the annual increment of natural forests is still limited. The idea behind this motion is to make it easier for SLIMF's FMUs in developing countries to document that their forest practices are of low intensity, and to base the eligibility criteria on other indicators different to MAI but equally important for the impact on biodiversity and on the ecological role of forests.</p> <p>The purpose of this motion is that based on the information available in most Southern countries (Central America, for instance), where there is a lack of data on the mean annual increment, the eligibility criteria for low intensity SLIMFs be determined through the permissible annual felling (PAF). PAF is determined by calculating the total volumetric stocks in the area in relation with the felling intensity in the total area and the felling cycle. The formula and parameters used to calculate the PAF are conservative, thus ensuring the productive base of a low intensity managed forest.</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Kasper Kopp Organisation: KoppWood A/S Chamber: Northern Economic Email: kk@koppwood.com</p> <p>2) Name: Jesper Lund-Larsen Organisation: SID - BAT Chamber: Northern Social Email: jll@3f.dk</p> <p>3) Name: Saskia van Vuuren Organisation: Asociación Fuente Verde Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: fuelle@ibw.com.ni</p> <p>4) Name: Jaime Guillén Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: pranajai@yahoo.es</p>
<p>Cost implications:</p>	

Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC)

[the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]

Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC)

[the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]

<p>Title: Motion on the problem of issuing of Corrective Action Requests to large certified forest management enterprises</p>	<p>Category and number 28 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The General Assembly requests the Board of Directors to develop and implement changes/ clarifications in FSC's Accreditation requirements for forest management certificates for large certified forest management enterprises in order to avoid different performance levels in parts of the certified enterprise. - Potential solutions should be developed in consultation with the membership. 	<p>Proposed: Name: Per Larsson Organisation: WWF Sweden Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: Per.Larsson@wwf.se</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: Certification in some countries (e.g. Sweden) with large relative homogenous forest management enterprises has resulted in a situation with single FM certificates covering very large areas of forests. All large forest company lands are today in Sweden covered with one single certificate per company. These certificates are covering up to 3,5 million hectares of forests and harvesting levels of up to 6 million cubic metres per year. This needs in itself not to be a problem but recent years discussions amongst stakeholders in Sweden reveal some unclarities in FSC requirements which have to be clarified in order to maintain the credibility of FSC in such situations.</p> <p>Problems in these situations occur when weaknesses in relation to FSC-standards are identified in one or few districts / regions in the forest enterprise but not in the majority of districts / regions. Even if problems might be clear and obvious in these parts of the enterprise have CB tended to look at the performance over the whole enterprise and with that compensating weak performance in one region with good performance in other regions. The result of this is sometimes that weaknesses which should result in a CAR are downgraded to observations, Major CAR's to Minor CAR's etc. There is also an obvious and easy to understand hesitance to suspend very large certificates due to clear weaknesses on only smaller parts of the area that the certificate is covering. We believe that FSC has to adopt and clarify how CB's should handle situation like this which get extra important for large FM-certificates covering several districts / regions of the same forest enterprise. One potential solution is to require that CAR's can be issued for specific districts which are parts of a bigger certificate and that non fulfilled CAR's can result in the suspension of the certification status of this are. Another potential action is to limit the maximum size of larger FM certificates covering forest enterprises with sub units / districts.</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Åke Persson Organisation: Sveriges Ornitologiska Förening / Birdlife Sweden Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: ake.persson@borlange.se</p> <p>2) Name: Tomas Ekström Organisation: Kinnarps AB Chamber: Northern Economic Email: tomas.ekstrom@kinnarps.se</p> <p>3) Name: Nils Hager Organisation: WWF International Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: NHager@wwfint.org</p>

Cost implications:
Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]
Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]

Title: Motion to produce clear policies and guidelines for Non Timber Forest Products (NTFPs) certification in the FSC System	Category and number: 29 Policy
Policy Motion: That FSC develop clear guidelines and standards relating to the certification of Non Timber Forest Products (NTFPs) including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Standards for forest management certification of NTFPs and their Chain of Custody. ▪ Procedures to be implemented by certification bodies for the evaluation of NTFP forest management operations. ▪ Guidelines for National Initiatives regarding the development of national standards which include NTFPs. ▪ Simple information (expressed in clear language) about NTFP certification, aimed at NGOs, communities and foresters and available in several languages (including at least Spanish, French and Bahasa Indonesian). 	Proposed: Name: Dawn Robinson Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Social Email: dawnrobinson@onetel.com
Purpose and/or additional information: The certification of NTFPs such as nuts, resins, fruits and medicinal plants is of global importance: as much for the small communities which depend on the forest as a source of income, as for the large industries which export forest-derived products. While some forest operations have achieved FSC certification for NTFPs, such as palm heart, maple syrup and brazil nut, the procedures followed to achieve this certification have been based almost exclusively on the criteria of the particular certification body, using a trial 'case by case' approach proposed as a temporary measure by FSC in 1998, and which has not since been revised. The lack of information about certifying NTFPs both for certification bodies, and for those who harvest and market NTFPs leads to	Seconded: 1) Name: Martha Núñez Organisation: Fundación Ambiente y Sociedad- Ecuador Chamber: Southern Social Email: marthan@interactive.net.ec 2) Name: Ma. Ofelia Arboleda Organisation: Individual member

<p>confusion about the requirements and procedures. For example there is uncertainty about a) whether specific national standards are required for each product, or whether generic forest management standards can and should cover NTFPs, b) whether NTFPs can be evaluated at the same time as timber harvesting, or requires a separate evaluation, and c) whether the FSC logo can be used on NTFPs and how it should be used. There is also uncertainty about the standards and procedures which should be used for the Chain of Custody certification of NTFPs, and which products can be classified as NTFPs.</p> <p>In many cases, FSC has answers to these questions, but they are not available in an accessible form for those who seek them and they are not incorporated into the existing guidance documents which regulate FSC certification. One specific example is the need to include specific instructions for certification bodies about NTFP certification in the new accreditation standards.</p>	<p>Chamber: Southern Environmental. Email.: moarboleda@fsccolombia.org y mariaofeliaarboleda@yahoo.es</p> <p>3) Name: Fernando Aguilar Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: Fernandoaguilar@cotas.net</p> <p>4) Name: Luis Fernando Guedes Pinto Organisation: IMAFLORA – Instituto de Manejo e Certificação Florestal e Agrícola Chamber: Southern Economic Email: luisfernando@imaflora.org</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to improve the FSC standard for non FSC-certified controlled wood</p>	<p>Category: 30 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: We, the members of the FSC, ask for an immediate revision of the FSC standard for non FSC-certified controlled wood (FSC-STD-40-005), in order to ensure that the accredited certification bodies are able to verify the origin of ALL the controlled wood or wood fibre (including residues) entering the production chain of FSC-certified products.</p> <p>Deadline for the termination of the review process: 6 months from the conclusion of this GA.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Jens Kanstrup Organisation: Rainforest Group Nepenthes Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: jka@nepenthes.dk</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: The third party verification of the origin of certified products, which is a cornerstone of the FSC system, is crucial for</p>	<p>Seconded: 1)</p>

<p>the credibility of FSC label. The FSC standard for non FSC-certified controlled wood (FSC-STD-40-005) in its current form, do not guarantee that all the wood in FSC certified products can be traced back to its origin. There are three main issues that need to be solved immediately:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Compliance with the FSC-STD-30-010 is not required before 2007. <i>“Forest management enterprises wishing to supply non FSC-certified wood from high-risk forest areas as controlled wood will be required to meet this standard from 1st January 2007”</i> quote from FSC-STD-30-010. This effectively means that enterprises operating e.g. in HCVF –enterprises can supply “controlled” wood into FSC certified supply chains without complying with the rules until 2007. 2. First party verification of controlled wood is accepted according to the interpretation of the new standards. Companies sourcing from high risk areas can effectively at this very moment, without any risk of control, state that it comes from a district considered as low risk. And the CB’s are left without any tools to control the origin of the so called “controlled” wood entering into the supply chain for FSC certified mixed products. 3. Wood from e.g. HCVF can be classified as “Other reclaimed” and used for FSC certified production without any control. Up to 60% of wood origination from high risk areas (HCVF) can enter into the supply chain for FSC certified mixed products without any control as “other reclaimed” material can be classified as controlled without any documentation of origin. Currently millions of metric ton of sawdust and chips from sawmills are commercialized yearly from high risk areas, and this material can without any problems end up in FSC mixed products, stating that the wood in the product either originates from certified or controlled sources – a clearly false statement. 	<p>Name: Kasper Kopp Organisation: KoppWood A/S Chamber: Northern Economic Email: kk@koppwood.com</p> <p>2) Name: Jesper Lund-Larsen Organisation: SID - BAT Chamber: Northern Social Email: jll@3f.dk</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

<p>Title: Broadening horizons: The certification of bamboo</p>	<p>Category and number 31 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: To urge the FSC to define its specific policy on bamboo certification building on recent efforts made by the FSC Secretariat with</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Margaret Stern</p>

<p>respect to the management of bamboo species (e.g., Advice Note 30-502-bamboo, May 2004).</p>	<p>Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: pstern@access.net.ec</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: Bamboos (Bambusoideae: Poaceae) are grasses, not trees. With reference to the potential certification of bamboo, confusion reigns regarding whether large woody bamboos should be considered as <i>timber species</i> due to their substantial biomass, their frequent dominance in the forest, and the use of raw bamboo material for construction and its products as wood alternatives; or if products derived from the timber bamboos should be considered as <i>non-timber forest products</i> (NTFPs) as they do not come from trees.</p> <p>The FSC states explicitly¹ that the Principles and Criteria are properly applicable to forests and other vegetation types while specific indicators are being developed for these other types of vegetation. In the case of bamboo, the Working Group for Voluntary Forest Certification in Colombia has developed national standards for bamboo certification, similar to the development of national standards for NTFPs in other countries and regions. A clarification by the FSC regarding the specific case of bamboo certification would emphasize management of natural bamboo forests and increase market recognition and value for the bamboo products made from them.</p> <p>Bamboo has a broad geographic distribution and people from many developing countries in the east and west could benefit from a clear FSC policy on certification of this forest resource. It is precisely the production and sale of products made from natural materials such as bamboo, which allow forest dwelling communities greater opportunity to generate and improve their income and compete successfully with larger commercial enterprises.</p> <p>¹FSC-DIS-01-001, The scope of application of the FSC Principles and Criteria for Forest Stewardship, May 2005.</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Jaime Levy Organisation: Fundación Altrópico Chamber: Southern Social Email: jrlevy@altropico.org.ec</p> <p>2) Name: Cristian Vallejos Organisation: Asociación para la Conservación de la Cuenca Amazonica (ACCA) Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: cvallejos@amazonconservation.org</p>
<p>Cost implications:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

Part 3.3: Chain of custody and trademark issues

<p>Title: Motion on chain of custody and FSC trademark requirements</p>	<p>Category and number 32 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: In circumstances in which a chain of custody certificate holder supplies a product to a third party who will use or sell such product, and where the product in question clearly identifies such third party user or seller in a manner that allows anyone to contact them to ask for certification details, then such a product need carry only the FSC logo, on condition that the said third party agrees, when asked for certification details or the meaning of the logo, to send the questioner a leaflet to be provided by FSC that explains the FSC concept, principles and other relevant information.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Simon Dyer Organisation: Alpac Chamber: Northern Economic Email: dyersi@alpac.ca</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: When a corporation or a law firm purchases from a COC holder such products as corporate stationery, that clearly identify them and include contact information, and where the invoice from the COC supplier to the corporation or law firm contains all the requisite information regarding the trademark, the composition and the chain of custody, then the integrity of the brand is more than sufficiently protected by the simple inclusion of the FSC logo during the printing process. Major corporations and law firms, who are so brand and image-conscious, may well agree to include the FSC logo on their letterhead but many of them would not agree to do so if they were also forced to include all the verbiage that is now required. The current verbiage requirement may be justified when the product that carries the logo does not carry the name and contact information of the organization that is making the FSC claim but when it does, the verbiage is redundant and in many cases will result in a lost opportunity for both FSC and our certificate holders.</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Arnold Bercov Organisation: Pulp, Paper and Woodworkers Canada Chamber: Northern Social Email: arnold_bercov@telus.net</p> <p>2) Name: John Wiggers Organisation: Wiggers Custom Furniture Ltd. Chamber: Northern Economic Email: jwiggers@wiggersfurniture.com</p> <p>3) Name: William George Organisation: Domtar Chamber: Northern Economic Email: william.george@domtar.com</p>

Cost implications:
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>

<p>Title: Motion to establish a Working Group to discuss and propose a set of simplified certification procedures for small Chain of Custody (COC) operations</p>	<p>Category and number 33 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: FSC shall establish a Working Group to discuss and propose a set of simplified certification procedures for small Chain of Custody (COC) operations, to be approved by the Board of FSC.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Luis Fernando Guedes Pinto Organisation: IMAFLORA – Instituto de Manejo e Certificação Florestal e Agrícola Chamber: Southern Economic Email: luisfernando@imaflora.org</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: Currently, the rules for Chain of Custody certification can probably be considered unnecessarily strict for small industries. The SLIMF approach to forest management has proved to be successful in making FSC certification processes more adequate to the reality of small and low intensity managed forests. We believe that the same rationale used to develop the SLIMF approach is valid for small COC operations.</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Pierre Hauselmann Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Economic Email: phauselm@piec.org</p> <p>2) Name: Nancy Vallejo Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Social Email: nvallejo@piec.org</p> <p>3) Name: Peter Feilberg</p>

	<p>Organisation: Nepcon Chamber: Northern Economic Email: pf@nepcon.dk</p> <p>4) Name: Rubens Gomes Organisation: OELA – Oficina Escola de Lutheria da Amazonia Chamber: Southern Social Email: rubensgomes@oela.org.br</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) The working group represents some costs, which will depend on its format and composition. FSC might be able to minimize costs by exploring possibilities like establishing a virtual working group. Some staff time as well.</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) None</p>	

<p>Title: Motion on recycled material</p>	<p>Category and number 34 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: The FSC will develop a means to include sustainability criteria, necessary to ensure the integrity of FSC's social, environmental and economic values, are included in the Chain of Custody certification for recycled products.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Simon Dyer Organisation: Alpac Chamber: Northern Economic Email: dyersi@alpac.ca</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: While policies regarding the inclusion of recycled materials in mixed source products, and the labelling of mixed source and 100% recycled products are steps towards meeting marketplace norms, they create both market confusion and imbalance with regard to FSC's brand.</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Arnold Bercov Organisation: Pulp, Paper and Woodworkers Canada</p>

<p>The lack of requirements to understand the possible sources of recycled materials potentially can result in a loss of integrity regarding FSC's mission, values and brand. The controlled wood standard was developed to take into regard the source of "non-FSC certified fibre" materials, yet with regard to recycled materials, there is no similar control mechanism.</p>	<p>Chamber: Northern Social Email: arnold_bercov@telus.net</p> <p>2) Name: Steven Price Organisation: WWF Canada Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: sprice@wwfcanada.org</p> <p>3) Name: William George Organisation: Domtar Chamber: Northern Economic Email: william.george@domtar.com</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Title: Motion to increase transparency in chain of custody certification</p>	<p>Category and number 35 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: A public fact sheet shall be provided with key information on the company and its certified production, to be available in the local language and at least one official FSC language.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Luis Fernando Guedes Pinto Organisation: IMAFLORA – Instituto de Manejo e Certificação Florestal e Agrícola Chamber: Southern Economic Email: luisfernando@imaflora.org</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: Currently, it is very hard for stakeholders and interested consumers to gather information on an FSC COC certified operation. This</p>	<p>Seconded: 1)</p>

<p>motion, with little cost to certificate holders, will help to add transparency to chain of custody certification and possibly contribute to the trade of FSC certified products.</p>	<p>Name: Nancy Vallejo Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Social Email: nvallejo@piec.org</p> <p>2) Name: Peter Feilberg Organisation: Nepcon Chamber: Northern Economic Email: pf@nepcon.dk</p> <p>3) Name: Rubens Gomes Organisation: OELA – Oficina Escola de Lutheria da Amazonia Chamber: Southern Social Email: rubensgomes@oela.org.br</p> <p>4) Name: Pierre Hauselmann Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Economic Email: phauselm@piec.org</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) Time to develop fact sheet information.</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) Cost to certificate holders might be minimized by adapting a section of Certification Bodies reports.</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to disseminate market trends for certified products</p>	<p>Category and number: 36 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion To create a database which includes information on market trends for certified forest products, such as: information regarding the volume of marketed certified wood, the main producing countries, the main buying countries, the main traded products, in order to evaluate the consumption trends of certified wood around the world.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Manoel Pereira Dias Organisation: Cikel Brasil Verde Chamber: Southern Economic Email: manoel@cikel.com.br</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information (optional): At present, the CBMF (FSC – Brazil) only disseminates statistics regarding certified areas in Brazil and around the world. Producers would also like for FSC to disseminate information on certified products market trends through the development of a database or the distribution of fact sheets.</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Rubens Gomes Organisation: OELA Chamber: Southern Social Email: rubensgomes@oela.org.br 2) Name: João Carlos Augusti Organisation: Suzano Bahia Sul Papel e Celulose S/A Chamber: Southern Economic Email: joaoaugusti@suzano.com.br</p>
<p>Cost implications:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest the costs involved for the implementation the motion; but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p> <p>Communication costs (format of “on-line” information or other form of distribution such as bulletins): USD\$20.000 Cost of a person working “full time” in the processing of data: USD\$ 20.000</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

<p>Title: Motion on Recycling</p>	<p>Category: 37 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: The General Assembly requests the Secretariat for the implementation environmental standards in the FSC-recycled label. This request shall consider as well the recycled content of recycling material that is part of the FSC-mixed label. An analysis shall be carried out and completed within the first six months of 2006 and its results shall be implemented into the existing Chain of Custody (COC)-regulations no later than end of 2006.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Rudolf Fenner Organisation: Robin Wood Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: tropenwald@robinwood.de or wald@robinwood.de</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: With the new COC-regulations, FSC reduced a lot of existing barriers for FSC-certified wood in the wood processing industry. At the same time FSC introduced a label for recycled material which combined the two aspects of responsible behaviour as responsible production and using recycling material. The use of recycling material opened a totally new field for FSC. Whereas in the wood processing part FSC shows his responsibility regarding the production of wood in the forest in the recycled part FSC only shows his responsibility in using recycled material. With allowing and defining environmental standards for the production of recycled paper FSC could go a big step forward in demonstrating the world what responsible products are. In Europe there exist some different systems that integrate environmental issues in labelling-systems for the production of paper (Blue Angel, EU-Umweltzeichen Euroblume, Nordic Swan). Some of these approaches could be used as examples for FSC and could be used in pilot tests where the environmental standards of these systems could be combined with the control system of the FSC chain of custody. In the first step this could be done initially only for the production for recycled paper to expand it in a second step to other recycled (wood-based) products.</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Gerd Billen Organisation: NABU e.V. Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: gabi.garus@nabu.de 2) Name: Mr Uwe Sayer Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: sayer@fsc-deutschland.de</p>
<p>Cost implications:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: Can't be assessed Up to USD\$20 000 (the cost would depend on the intensity of the analysis. It would likely be carried out by consultants, and be around USD\$20, 000). Additionally costs for pilot testing</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: Including environmental standards in the COC-regulations for the FSC recycled label could create higher costs for companies for fulfilling the requirement of FSC.</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to adapt the requirements for employing an FSC-credit system in companies supplying and manufacturing FSC-certified products</p>	<p>Category and number 38 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: The General Assembly requests the Secretariat to review Part 4, Clause 12.5, of the FSC STD-40-004 FSC Chain of Custody Standard for companies supplying and manufacturing FSC-certified products in the following way: <i>12.5 a) A minimum rolling average of 10% FSC material (pure or mixed) shall be maintained for the product group from a specified starting date to the date on which a claim is made in order for any on-product labelling to occur.</i> <i>12.5 b) This minimum of the rolling average of FSC material input will be increased to 50% on a continuous way until 31 December 2007.</i></p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Guido Fuchs Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Economic Email: guido.fuchs@bluewin.ch</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: On the General Assembly 2002, Policy Motion no. 3 on the review of the percentage based claims policy has passed. The GA requested the Secretariat to review how larger, highly mechanized sawmills and related industries in environments where they have to deal with small amounts of certified wood can participate in the FSC system. In relation with Policy Motion no. 5 on labelling recycled timber/fibre, the result of the review was a total renewal of the Chain-of-Custody certification requirements, whereby the percentage based claims policy was abandoned completely. The outcome of the Chain-of-Custody review process was the new FSC Standard STD-40-004 FSC Chain-of-Custody Standard for companies supplying and manufacturing FSC-certified products, and some related new standards. The undersigned members of this motion acknowledge that the review of the Chain-of-Custody standards is in principle addressing the former difficulties large sawmills and related industries had with physical separation of certified and uncertified timber, where availability of certified timber was scarce. However, by making it possible that a company can reduce its purchases of (generally more expensive) FSC certified raw material to the absolute minimum of 10% to enter the volume credit system, these companies compete with strongly committed small (and also large) sawmills that, in a joint effort with harvesting contractors and (small) forest owners, have reached a level where most timber is actually from FSC certified sources. The current standard FSC STD-40-004 does in fact open the door to free riders that will never increase their FSC material input. It does not provide any incentive to increase the proportion of FSC certified material to more than 10%, let alone to 100%, as it is intended according to the foreword of the standard.</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Christoph Metzler Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: c.metzler@dfr-orgelbau.ch 2) Name: Christoph Wiedmer Organisation: Greenpeace Switzerland Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: christoph.wiedmer@ch.greenpeace.org 3) Name: Yves Burkhardt Organisation: Sorex AG Chamber: Northern Economic Email: burkhardt@sorex.ch</p>
<p>Cost implications:</p>	

<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Title: Motion to diminish costs of the use of the FSC logo for Small and/or Low Intensity Managed Forest (SLIMF) operations and small Chain of Custody (COC) operations</p>	<p>Category and number 39 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: Small and/or Low Intensity Managed Forests (SLIMFs) and small Chain of Custody (COC) operations shall be exempt from the payment of FSC Brandpacks.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Luis Fernando Guedes Pinto Organisation: IMAFLORA – Instituto de Manejo e Certificação Florestal e Agrícola Chamber: Southern Economic Email: luisfernando@imaflora.org</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: FSC has recently instituted a Brandpack, which contains the FSC logo and information necessary to its adequate use. Every new certificate holder has to purchase a Brandpack, at the cost of USD 50. As this is done through the FSC Accredited Certification Bodies, the final cost to certificate holders is usually higher. The cost of a Brandpack is the same for all operations. SLIMF and small COCs operations usually have few financial resources, aside from using the FSC logo in few products. Making them exempt of the payment for Brandpacks will be in line with FSC's goal of making certification more accessible to small operations.</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Nancy Vallejo Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Social Email: nvallejo@piec.org</p> <p>2) Name: Pierre Hauselmann Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Economic Email: phauselm@piec.org</p> <p>3) Name: Peter Feilberg Organisation: Nepcon Chamber: Northern Economic</p>

	Email: pf@nepcon.dk 4) Name: Rubens Gomes Organisation: OELA – Oficina Escola de Lutheria da Amazonia Chamber: Southern Social Email: rubensgomes@oela.org.br
Cost implications:	
Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) Small loss of revenue due to the exemption of brandpack payment by SLIMF and small COC operations	
Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) None	

Title: Motion to recognize the value of companies committed to FSC	Category and number 40 Policy
Policy Motion: FSC shall require the clear and obvious indication of the percentage of certified timber in a product carrying the FSC logo.	Proposed: Name: Luis Fernando Guedes Pinto Organisation: IMAFLORA – Instituto de Manejo e Certificação Florestal e Agrícola Chamber: Southern Economic Email: luisfernando@imaflora.org
Purpose and/or additional information: To recognize the commitment of companies producing products with high percentages of FSC material, and to provide a market based incentive for increasing this percentage over time. The new COC standards do not recognize the commitment of companies working with high percentages of FSC material. As a result, a company that has, for example 85% of FSC certified material, will compete with the same label as a company working	Seconded: 1) Name: Pierre Hauselmann Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Economic Email: phauselm@piec.org

<p>with 11% of FSC certified material. Thus, the current policy, depending on the market scenario constitutes a disincentive for companies to increase the percentage of FSC material in their products.</p> <p>This requirement would make the FSC claims more compatible with consumers organization expectations, worldwide, who require transparent and non misleading claims.</p> <p>Options to fulfil this requirement could include to either have an explanatory statement placed in the vicinity of the logo, or to have the percentage indication as part of the logo itself. These two examples are not exhaustive and FSC should carry on a small study to identify best options and the timeframe for implementation.</p>	<p>2) Name: Nancy Vallejo Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Social Email: nvallejo@piec.org</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) Staff time</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) Minimal, depending on the options for implementation</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to promote control of the FSC logo</p>	<p>Category: 41 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion The general assembly recognizes the importance of keeping a thorough control of the use of the FSC logo. We, the members of the FSC, hereby resolve that the Board of Directors is to ensure a yearly investigation of the yearly reports submitted by the FSC certified companies, in order to ensure that the amounts of FSC certified timber being sold, does not exceed the amounts entering the Chain of Custody. This investigation should every year include a minimum of 5% by number of the FSC certified companies. The selection shall be based on the number of outstanding CAR's, previous identified problems, and specific suspicion.</p> <p>This control system shall be implemented within 3 months from the final day of this General Assembly, and shall be maintained until another superior control mechanism has been implemented by the FSC</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Jens Kanstrup Organisation: Rainforest Group Nepenthes Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: jka@nepenthes.dk</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: It is important for the FSC system, that the consumers regard the FSC logo as reliable. Currently the national initiatives are to a large extent responsible for controlling the validity and proper use of FSC logos on the market while the CBs are mainly controlling the CoC. Since not all national initiatives have a nominated agent controlling the logos and there often is a lack of funding, this</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Scott Poynton Organisation: Tropical Forest Trust</p>

control can sometimes be insufficient.	Chamber: Northern Economic Email: s.poynton@tropicalforesttrust.com 2) Name: Jesper Lund-Larsen Organisation: SID - BAT Chamber: Northern Social Email: jll@3f.dk
Cost implications:	
Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]	
Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]	
Title: Motion to strengthen the credibility of FSC certified teak and other tropical timbers	Category and number: 42 Policy
Policy Motion The general assembly recognizes the importance of avoiding fraud with FSC logos and upholding the credibility of the FSC logo. We, the members of FSC, therefore resolve that the board of directors is to arrange for a thorough investigation of the FSC certified teak market and garden furniture market, to ensure that there are no more false FSC logos in circulation and to regain the credibility to FSC certified teak. The investigation shall consist of a comparison between the different yearly reports submitted by the FSC certified companies in the supply chain, in order to ensure that the amounts of FSC certified timber being sold does not exceed the amounts being purchased. The investigation shall be initiated as the next garden furniture season starts in 2006, no later than April 15 th .	Proposed: Name: Jens Kanstrup Organisation: Rainforest Group Nepenthes Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: jka@nepenthes.dk
Purpose and/or additional information: In 2003 a large amount of teak garden furniture with false FSC logos that did originate in FSC certified forests were found on the European market. Today there are still many rumours of fraud with FSC-certified teak and other tropical timbers. This has	Seconded: 1) Name: Scott Poynton

<p>damaged the credibility of FSC certified teak products and garden furniture made from tropical hardwood.</p>	<p>Organisation: Tropical Forest Trust Chamber: Northern Economic Email: s.poynton@tropicalforesttrust.com</p> <p>2) Name: Jesper Lund-Larsen Organisation: SID - BAT Chamber: Northern Social Email: jll@3f.dk</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to evaluate the effects of the implementation of FSC-STD-40-004 (FSC chain of custody standard for companies supplying and manufacturing FSC-certified products), FSC-STD-40-005 (FSC standard for non FSC-certified controlled wood) and FSC-STD-30-010 (FSC standard for forest management enterprises supplying non FSC certified controlled wood) replacing the percentage based-claims system FSC-POL-40-001</p>	<p>Category and number: 43 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: The General Assembly recognises the importance of following the implementation of the new standards (FSC-STD-40-004, FSC-STD-40-005 and FSC-STD-30-010) and continuously evaluates their effectiveness in solving the identified problems and to make sure that they do not have any adverse effects. We, the members of FSC, therefore resolve that The Board of Directors shall arrange an independent analysis of the effects of the implementation of the new standards (FSC-STD-40-004, FSC-STD-40-005 and FSC-STD-30-010) to be initiated before the end of 2006.</p> <p>This analysis shall include an evaluation of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether or not, the economic and logistical barriers facing industries wanting to supply FSC certified products has been 	<p>Proposed: Name: Jens Kanstrup Organisation: Rainforest Group Nepenthes Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: jka@nepenthes.dk</p>

<p>reduced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether or not, the flow of FSC certified material through the supply chain has been improved. • Whether or not, the new standard (FSC-STD-40-005) successfully excludes wood from controversial sources. • Whether or not, the new standards favour larger Western European enterprises in the competition on the world market for certified products. • Whether or not, the new standards have a negative effect on the competitiveness of enterprises from developing countries in the marketplace for certified products. • Whether or not the complexity of the new standards presents a barrier for small and medium sized enterprises effectively excluding them from entering the market for mixed products. 	
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: FSC-STD-40-004, FSC-STD-40-005 and FSC-STD-30-010 has been introduced as a solution to a list of identified problems, including to reduce the economic and logistical barriers facing industries wanting to supply FSC certified products; improve the flow of FSC certified material through the supply chain and to exclude wood from controversial sources.</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Kasper Kopp Organisation: KoppWood A/S Chamber: Northern Economic Email: kk@koppwood.com</p> <p>2) Name: Jesper Lund-Larsen Organisation: SID - BAT Chamber: Northern Social Email: jll@3f.dk</p>
<p>Cost implications:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

Title: Motion to improve the access of small-scale shops and other wood transformation centres to chain of custody certification.		Category and number: 44 Policy
Policy Motion: FSC shall develop guidelines and adapt its chain of custody certification norms and procedures in order to facilitate fairer access for small-scale shops and other wood processing centres.	Proposed: Name: Fernando Aguilar Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: fernandoaguilar@cotas.net	
Purpose and/or additional information: Improving access of small and low-intensity forest operations to certification is an important task adopted by FSC five years ago. FSC P&C recommend the application of standards taking into consideration the scale and intensity of forest management units. This leads to a more fair access of small forest operations to certification. Numerous Southern and Northern small-scale shops and small carpenter's shops could benefit from forest certification and from the markets of certified products provided by the FSC system. However, these small forest operations still face serious limitations in order to achieve and maintain forest certification. The FSC may facilitate a more fair access of small wood processing operations to chain of custody certification through several mechanisms, including the development of guidance and the adjustment of standards and procedures according to the scale and intensity of these operations.	Seconded: 1) Name: Maria Ofelia Arboleda Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: moarboleda@fsccolombia.org 2) Name: Henry Moreno Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: cfvbol@scbbs-bo.com	
Cost implications:		
Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest the costs involved for the implementation the motion; but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]		
Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]		

<p>Title: A Motion on the Inclusion of Labour in FSC</p>	<p>Category and number 45 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: In future, all FSC Certificates (Forest Management and Chain of Custody) will be issued on the condition that the ILO Convention apply to all workers involved in production, trading, processing, manufacturing, or otherwise handling of certified timber and timber products.</p> <p>The FSC Board of Directors is herewith requested to develop a strategy ascertaining the involvement of all stakeholder groups in the decision-making process and standard definitions.</p> <p>The new standards should be effective at the very latest by 2009.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Gisbert Schlemmer Organisation: IG Metall Chamber: Northern Social Email: Gisbert.Schlemmer@t-online.de</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: The International Labour Organisation (ILO) Conventions, which have attained worldwide acceptance and which have been ratified by 170 countries, are the most important expression of worker's rights. Our principles (for example 1 and 4) require the compliance with and the application of employee rights. Consequently, the General Assembly resolved in 1999 to apply the ILO Conventions to forest certification.</p> <p>At this point, other certifications (i.e. COC) do not incorporate the ILO conventions. From a social standpoint, this is not a balanced approach and it could undermine FSC's credibility. If the ILO Conventions are important for forest certification and compliance is required, this is equally true for saw mills and other processing industry.</p> <p>In an increasingly globalised economy, social minimum standards are quickly gaining recognition, to safeguard competitive opportunities on one hand and to protect living and working conditions on the other hand. Moreover, the ILO Conventions do provide important support to workers and their families, particularly in Global South. Child labour, fatal accidents at work resulting from a lack of training, incomes of USD\$ 30.00 per month and inadequate healthcare are just a few examples of ongoing practices.</p> <p>FSC will sustain its credibility only if it is in a position to ascertain that employees work under humane conditions. Applied minimum standards are essential for all stakeholder groups, because they have positive ecological and economical effects. Well-trained workers have the skills required to recognize and take into account environmental aspects in forestry and in production. Employees who know they have statutory and financial security at work identify with their companies, strive for productivity and reduce the number of accidents, thereby decreasing downtimes.</p> <p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Marion Karmann Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Social Email: m.karmann@fsc.org</p> <p>2) Name: Barbara Lang Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Social Email: barbara.lang.privat@gmx.de</p>

[a short paragraph providing additional information which the proposer/seconders consider would be useful to the membership when making its decision).	
Cost implications:	
Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]	
Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]	

Title: Motion to increase and strengthen the market for FSC products around the world	Category and number: 46 Policy
Policy Motion: FSC will prioritize in its work plan the development of a market strategy together with other organizations in order to ensure an effective link between supply and demand for FSC certified forest products around the world.	Proposed: Name: Ana Alicia Eid Chajtur Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: woodgroup2005@yahoo.com
Purpose and/or additional information: During its ten years of existence, FSC has focused its efforts on sustainable forest management, and has achieved the certification of around 45 million hectares. However, to achieve the sustainability and increase of this area, it is necessary for FSC to play an active role in developing the demand of certified forest products globally, thus confirming its value as a market tool. At present there are various projects around the world in charge of promoting the consumption of certified products. Together with these efforts and with the support of experts on the matter, FSC shall develop the following activities: a) Establishment at the International Centre (IC) of an information system that groups and disseminates market intelligence information. National Initiatives will collect and provide information to the Regional Office, who will in turn send it to the IC. b) The information shall contemplate, in addition to that already included in the Website:	Seconded: 1) Name: Jon Pampush Organisation: Metafore Chamber: Northern Economic Email: jpampush@metafore.org 2) Name: Chris van der Goot Organisation: Ecohout Chamber: Northern Social Email: ecohout.cg@12move.nl

<p>Permanent customer service, which means dedicating one person to interact with FSC members or with potential buyers, not yet certified, who require information on supply and demand of products and the required specifications (species, volumes, quality, contact details, etc.)</p>	<p>3) Name: Jörg Linke Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Social Email: joerg.linke@gtz.de</p>
<p>Cost implications:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest the costs involved for the implementation the motion; but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

Part 3.4: Standards development

<p>Title: Motion to Regional Standards Utilization Only After FSC IC Final Certification Approval</p>	<p>Category and number 47 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: Regional standards under development should not be used to recommend certification, since there could be significant changes during the process for review and approval, affecting the whole certification process as well FSC credibility towards its stakeholders.</p> <p>Certification process run by accredited certification bodies should not use regional standards as evaluation criteria until after FSC IC final approval of the standards.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: João Carlos Augusti Organisation: Suzano Bahia Sul Papel e Celulose S/A Chamber: Southern Economic Email: joaoaugusti@suzano.com.br</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: Regional standards under development should follow FSC IC requirements, and also, while under development should be validated <u>on field trials and approved in public hearings</u>. But they should never be validated during the Forest Management Certification Process.</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Antonio Claret de Oliveira Organisation: V & M Florestal Ltda Chamber: Southern Economic Email: florestal@vmtubes.com.br</p> <p>2) Name: Jose Aldezir de Lucca Pucci Organisation: Klabin SA Chamber: Southern Economic Email: fsagacy@klabin.com.br aldezir@klabinpr.com.br</p>
<p>Cost implications:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalized by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalized by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalized with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalized in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to phase out the use of locally adapted certification body's generic Forest Stewardship Standards (Interim Standards)</p>	<p>Category and number 48 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: The General Assembly mandates and requests the secretariat to devise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) an appropriate way to phase out certifications using certifiers interim standards by five years after the respective FSC policy will be effective or by five years after a first certificate will have been awarded in a respective country after the FSC policy effective date. 2) a bridging mechanisms for countries where no national standards will be existing by the dates as defined under point 1. 	<p>Proposed: Name: Nils Hager Organisation: WWF International Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: NHager@wwfint.org</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: Most controversial forest management certifications (and most complaints and disputes) relate to certificates based on interim standards developed by certifiers in the absence of agreed national standards. This is seriously undermining the credibility of the whole unique FSC system.</p> <p>At the same time FSC FM certificates have been issued in more than 65 countries but only 11 countries (April 2005) have a national or regional standard in place. FSC has national initiatives working in about 35 countries, though many of these are not advancing in a significant or rigorous manner. The importance of, and the need for more national standards is shared among stakeholders within and outside the FSC system but until now there has been no strong incentive for development of national standard in more countries or regions. One of the brakes on national standard development is the use of interim standards.</p> <p>Recent changes to the FSC Preliminary Accreditation Policy (FSC-POL-01-012) and the Local adaptation of certification body generic Forest Stewardship Standards (FSC-STD-20-003 Version 2-1) have recently provided important steps to overcome these weaknesses. However, a stronger incentive is needed to facilitate the development of national standards.</p> <p>The purpose is to maintain Interim Standards as a means of facilitating the spread of FSC to new countries, and to allow a reasonable time for FSC to develop a critical mass of support across a broad range of stakeholders within the country, but then to introduce an incentive for those stakeholders to initiate <u>and finalise</u> a National Standard which will take over from the Interim Standard.</p> <p>Where no national or regional standard will exist by five years after the respective FSC policy will be effective or by five years after a first certificate will have been awarded in the respective country after the FSC policy effective date, FSC should take over this role on regional level (FSC regional offices in cooperation with FSC National Initiatives) by developing national or regional standards adapted for a country or region, considering any available local draft standards in the country concerned and in neighbouring countries, as well as carrying out limited consultation with key stakeholders.</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Name: Martin Fürstenberg Organisation: Westeifel Werke Chamber: Northern Economic Email: m fuerstenberg@westeifel-werke.de 2) Name: Robert Oetjen Organisation: Estonian Fund for Nature Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: elf@elfond.ee 3) Name: Robert Knysak Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: robertknysak@fsc.pl 4) Name: Karl D. Büchel Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Economic Email: karl.buechel@freesurf.ch

Cost implications:
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p> <p>Cost to FSC: Staff time in redrafting policies and communicating them Support to establishment of National Working Groups (though this is not additional) Oversight of National Working Groups (though lower cost of overseeing certifiers)</p>
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p> <p>Stakeholders in Countries - Operations of National Working Groups Certification bodies would save money as they would not carry the cost of supporting and updating their own standards.</p>

<p>Title: Motion to exclude the possibility to go from a national forest management standard to the FSC Principles & Criteria for Forest Stewardship</p>	<p>Category and number 49 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: The General Assembly requests the Board of Directors that a text with the following content is added to paragraph 13 of FSC-STD-60-006 "Requirements for procedures for the development of FSC Forest Stewardship Standards": <i>If a regional, national or sub-national forest management standard has been accredited by FSC International it is not possible to be certified against the FSC Principles & Criteria for Forest Stewardship. An accredited forest management standard is valid until a revised standard is accredited by FSC International.</i></p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Per Larsson Organisation: WWF Sweden Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: Per.Larsson@wwf.se</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: During the revision of the Swedish forest management standard WWF Sweden and Birdlife Sweden identified a weakness in the FSC system regarding regional, national or sub-national forest management standards and the FSC Principles & Criteria for Forest Stewardship (P&C). The FSC Secretariat stated that if the revision of the Swedish forest management standard would fail the current Swedish standard would become invalid. Despite that the certified Swedish forest owners would be able to stay certified, and would then be certified against the FSC P&C.</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Marc-Alexander Groß Organisation: WWF Austria Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: marc.gross@wwf.at</p>

<p>We think that the possibility to fall back on the FSC P&C if a national initiative/working group fails to revise a regional, national or sub-national forest management standard is harmful to FSC. There is a risk that certification against the FSC P&C would be less strict since it is not as adapted to the forest conditions as a national forest management standard, and that the consultation with stakeholders would be less extensive.</p>	<p>2) Name: Jacob Andersen Organisation: WWF Denmark Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: j.andersen@wwf.dk</p> <p>3) Name: Bart Holvoet Organisation: WWF Belgium Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: bart.holvoet@wwf.be</p> <p>4) Name: Åke Persson Organisation: Sveriges Ornitologiska Forening/ Birdlife Sweden Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: ake.persson@borlange.se</p> <p>5) Name: Nils Hager Organisation: WWF International Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: NHager@wwfint.org</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

Part 3.5: Miscellaneous

<p>Title: Mechanism to link consumers of FSC wood from tropical forests to their owners</p>	<p>Category and number 50. Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: For FSC to create a mechanism to transfer a portion of the final consumer price “premium” directly to the owners of tropical forest of origin, especially to small forest owners and local communities, for their efforts and costs in maintaining and conserving their forests under FSC certification in the long run. The source of funds would be those business and consumers involved in the “responsible purchase” programs, as well as other contributions. The payments should be proportional to the wood incorporated in the final product, and timed in such a way that they become an incentive for forest stewardship over time. This would be the way society would recognize the value of FSC certification in promoting the permanence of the tropical forests.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Franz Tattenbach Organisation: FUNDECOR Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: ftattenbach@fundecor.org</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: The FSC has been successfully promoting the sustainable management of tropical forests. Today, many concessionaries, individual owners and communities are managing their forests for the longer run, respecting the ever more demanding “sustainability standards” of the FSC. However, the ultimate contribution of FSC in lowering the loss of tropical forests, will depend more on the width of the adoption of forest management than on the depth of its standards. The challenge is to make sustainable forestry more attractive than the alternative sources of tropical forest wood (e.g. deforestation and illegal logging).</p> <p>Certainly, the FSC campaigns to promote a “green market” or preference for the FSC label among wood product consumers, would increase the value of FSC wood products. However, to expect that a “preference” from a consumer of furniture would act through the markets to increase the stumpage price, and thus make sustainable forestry more attractive than the alternatives is a “tour de force” and somehow misleading. On the one hand, these incentives would only act on the price of harvested timber (where the disloyal competition for the producer of tropical forest timber is almost insurmountable), and not on the permanence of the standing forest after harvest (where competition is scarce). On the other hand, the consumer who may be bothered to choose FSC wood products is typically more concerned with the fate of the forest from where this wood may have come from, than on how strict the management standards were.</p> <p>There is a need to “short-circuit” the markets to more directly transmit an incentive from final consumers of wood products to forests “keepers.” We need to think of a chain of custody of the forest and its associated environmental services. This is ultimately the real value added of FSC certification in the eyes of the responsible consumer. The emphasis should somehow shift from a premium on what was harvested, to a premium on “holding-in-there” until the next harvest. This would align better what</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Héctor Martínez Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: hamartinezh@rtsa.com</p> <p>2) Name: Bastiaan Louman Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: Bastiaan.Louman@wwfperu.org.pe</p>

the consumers is buying, with what the responsible tropical forest owner is promising to give - not only a proper planned and executed first FSC certified harvest, but a stewardship over the forest from where this wood came from. A permanent FSC certification would be the assurance that the producers of FSC wood are effectively safeguarding their forests in the long run.	
Cost implications:	
Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]	
Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]	

Title: A motion to change the FSC governance structure	Category and number 51 Policy
Policy Motion: The General Assembly approves amendment to the FSC Statutes, By-laws and relevant policies/standards to allow changes to the governance structure of FSC to take place, as recommended by the National Initiatives Task Force. To that end FSC will analyse which parts of the Statutes and By-laws, and which policies/standards are necessary to change within 1 year and change them accordingly.	Proposed: Name: Anna Jenkins Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: anna-jenkins@lineone.net
Purpose and/or additional information: Over the past 12 years FSC has grown tremendously in many aspects: membership, complexity of its certification system, certification bodies accredited, area certified and FSC labelled products available. A lot has been learnt over the past decade. Over the last year the question of whether FSC's operating and governance structures are still appropriate and the best option, given what we have learnt, has been examined by the <i>ad hoc</i> group: the National Initiatives Task Force. The Group was formed at the 10 Year Anniversary meeting in September 2004 and included NI representatives from Brazil, Canada, Mozambique, Peru, Russia, Sweden and the USA. The process was co-ordinated by the UK NI. The Task Force recommendations are based on a desire to make sure that FSC is efficient, responsive to the market place, maintains exceptionally high forest management standards, can prove that it is bringing about positive change and can be self	Seconded: 1) Name: Graeme White Organisation: TCT Industrias Florestais, Lda Chamber: Southern Economic Email: tct.dalmann@teledata.mz 2) Name: Alan Knight Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Economic

<p>financing to a much great extent.</p> <p>A full National Initiatives Task Force report is available from anna@fsc-uk.org</p> <p>In order to adopt these recommendations FSC will need to change some of its Statutes and/or By-laws, as well as certain policies/standards (e.g. NI manual).</p>	<p>Email: Alan.Knight@sabmiller.com</p> <p>3) Name: Hubert Kwisthout Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Social Email: hmkwisthout@btconnect.com</p> <p>4) Name: Bastiaan Louman Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: Bastiaan.Louman@wwfperu.org.pe</p> <p>5) Name: Rubens Gomes Organisation: OELA Chamber: Southern Social Email: rubensgomes@oela.org.br</p>
--	---

Cost implications:

<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>

<p>Title: Motion for the implementation changes to the FSC Statutes, By-laws and other documents as recommended by the National Initiatives Task Force</p>	<p>Category and number 52 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: The General Assembly approves amendment to the FSC Statutes, By-laws and relevant policies/standards to allow changes to the operating structure of FSC to take place, as recommended by the National Initiatives Task Force.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Anna Jenkins Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Environmental</p>

<p>To that end FSC will analyse which parts of the Statutes and By-laws, and which policies/standards, if any, are necessary to change within 1 year and change them accordingly.</p>	<p>Email: anna-jenkins@lineone.net</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p> <p>Over the past 12 years FSC has grown tremendously in many aspects: membership, complexity of its certification system, certification bodies accredited, area certified and FSC labelled products available. A lot has been learnt over the past decade.</p> <p>Over the last year the question of whether FSC's operating and governance structures are still appropriate and the best option, given what we have learnt, has been examined by the <i>ad hoc</i> group: the National Initiatives Task Force. The Group was formed at the 10 Year Anniversary meeting in September 2004 and included NI representatives from Brazil, Canada, Mozambique, Peru, Russia, Sweden and the USA. The process was co-ordinated by the UK NI.</p> <p>The Task Force recommendations are based on a desire to make sure that FSC is efficient, responsive to the market place, maintains exceptionally high forest management standards, can prove that it is bringing about positive change and can be self financing to a much great extent.</p> <p>A full National Initiatives Task Force report is available from anna@fsc-uk.org</p> <p>In order to adopt these recommendations FSC will need to change some of its Statutes and/or By-laws, as well as certain policies/standards (e.g. NI manual).</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Graeme White Organisation: TCT Industrias Florestais, Lda Chamber: Southern Economic Email: tct.dalmann@teledata.mz</p> <p>2) Name: Alan Knight Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Economic Email: Alan.Knight@sabmiller.com</p> <p>3) Name: Hubert Kwisthout Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Social Email: hmkwisthout@btconnect.com</p> <p>4) Name: Bastiaan Louman Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: Bastiaan.Louman@wwfperu.org.pe</p> <p>5) Name: Rubens Gomes Organisation: OELA Chamber: Southern Social Email: rubensgomes@oela.org.br</p>
<p>Cost implications:</p>	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC)

[the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]

<p>Title: A motion to change the status of 'FSC' National Initiatives</p>	<p>Category and number 53 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: The General Assembly approves amendment to the FSC Statutes, By-Laws and relevant policies/standards (e.g. NI manual) to allow changes to how 'FSC' National Initiatives work and are perceived to take place, as recommended by the National Initiatives Task Force.</p> <p>To that end FSC will analyse which parts of the Statutes and By-laws, and which policies/standards, if any, are necessary to change within 1 year and change them accordingly.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Anna Jenkins Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: anna-jenkins@lineone.net</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: Over the past 12 years FSC has grown tremendously in many aspects: membership, complexity of its certification system, certification bodies accredited, area certified and FSC labelled products available. A lot has been learnt over the past decade.</p> <p>Over the last year the question of whether FSC's operating and governance structures are still appropriate and the best option, given what we have learnt, has been examined by the <i>ad hoc</i> group: the National Initiatives Task Force. The Group was formed at the 10 Year Anniversary meeting in September 2004 and included NI representatives from Brazil, Canada, Mozambique, Peru, Russia, Sweden and the USA. The process was co-ordinated by the UK NI.</p> <p>The Task Force recommendations are based on a desire to make sure that FSC is efficient, responsive to the market place, maintains exceptionally high forest management standards, can prove that it is bringing about positive change and can be self financing to a much great extent.</p> <p>A full National Initiatives Task Force report is available from anna@fsc-uk.org</p> <p>In order to adopt these recommendations FSC will need to change some of its Statutes and/or By-laws, as well as certain policies/standards (e.g. NI manual).</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>1) Name: Graeme White Organisation: TCT Industrias Florestais, Lda Chamber: Southern Economic Email: tct.dalman@teledata.mz</p> <p>2) Name: Alan Knight Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Economic Email: Alan.Knight@sabmiller.com</p> <p>3) Name: Hubert Kwisthout Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Social Email: hmkwisthout@btconnect.com</p> <p>4) Name: Bastiaan Louman</p>

	<p>Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: Bastiaan.Louman@wwfperu.org.pe</p> <p>5) Name: Rubens Gomes Organisation: OELA Chamber: Southern Social Email: rubensgomes@oela.org.br</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to support local communities and small tropical forest owners and small forest companies in achieving forest certification</p>	<p>Category and number: 54 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: To have FSC establish a strategy to finance the direct costs involved in certification (pre-assessment, assessment and annual audits) for operations owned by local communities (farmers, indigenous people, riverside owners, afro-descendents, extractivists) and small tropical forest owners and small forest companies.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Jaime Levy Organisation: Fundación ALTROPICO Chamber: Southern Social Email: jrlevy@altropico.org.ec</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy Motion 33 passed during the 1999 FSC GA establishes: 	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Jaime Guillén Organisation: Individual member</p>

<p>The General Assembly resolves that the encouragement of community forestry certification should be given high priority within FSC. Activities to achieve this should include:</p> <p>a) Carrying out evaluations of a sample of existing FSC-endorsed community forestry certifications to analyse whether they have been beneficial, how they might be improved and to evaluate whether any changes to FSC policies and regulations might be recommended.</p> <p>b) Reviewing existing studies, and carrying out new ones as needed to evaluate the barriers to certification faced by community forestry enterprises, and to make recommendations about what steps FSC can take to overcome them.</p> <p>c) Develop a strategy for establishing a Community Forestry Fund for community forestry certification and related activities.</p> <p>- Motion 34 passed during the 2002 FSC General Assembly establishes:</p> <p>Resolve that FSC will appeal to international donor agencies to allocate significant financial support for the implementation of the FSC social strategy, the replenishment of the FSC social fund and the improvement of forest management and certification of indigenous peoples' and local communities' operations.</p> <p>- Activity 3.3.2 of the FSC Social Strategy indicates that FSC should "Establish partnerships to encourage financial support for community forestry management and organization and on taking steps toward certification."</p>	<p>Chamber: Southern Economic Email: Pranajai@yahoo.es</p> <p>2) Name: Juana Espasa Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: espasa@hotmail.com</p>
Cost implications:	
Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC)	
Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC)	
The organizations in charge of promoting sustainable management and trade of products derived thereof shall seek funds to implement the motion.	

Title: Motion concerning sustainable funding for FSC	Category and number 55 Policy
<p>Policy Motion: The FSC secretariat is asked to look into the prospects of finding a long term funding mechanism. The findings should be reported back to the FSC Board within 6 months.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Nils Hager Organisation: WWF International Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: NHager@wwfint.org</p>

<p>Purpose and/or additional information: FSC has traditionally depended on grants from foundations, aid agencies and NGOs for much of its funding. These sources are getting harder to access. Unlike PEFC, FSC has no substantial income generated from its own business. It would be good for FSC to, through an innovative mechanisms secure steady and long term funding. This could be done by charging retailers for the use of the logo on products, certificate holders an area fee or other alternative mechanisms. With a steady income generation FSC will be able to focus on its core business (accreditation and standard setting) rather than keep on struggling with a constant difficult economic situation.</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Olof Johansson Organisation: Sveaskog Forvaltnings AB Chamber: Northern Economic Email: Olof.Johansson@sveaskog.se</p> <p>2) Name: Hannah Scrase Organisation: FERN Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: hannahs@gn.apc.org</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to clarify the roles, responsibilities and governance of National Initiatives (NI) within the FSC network</p>	<p>Category and number: 56 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: The Latin-American FSC National Initiatives request the General Assembly to clarify their roles and responsibilities, and their involvement in FSC governance.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Maria Ofelia Arboleda Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: moarboleda@fsccolombia.org mariaofeliaarboleda@yahoo.es</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information:</p>	<p>Seconded:</p>

<p>This motion is in response to Policy Motion 42, passed by an overwhelming majority in favour during the 2002 General Assembly, the text of which says:</p> <p>“The GA mandates the board and Secretariat, together with NIs to recommend ways to better incorporate endorsed FSC NIs into de decision making structure and processes of FSC. This should be completed by November 2003.”</p> <p>This proposal which emanates from the Latin-American NIs, seeks to forward a plan to deal with FSC growth and to support a process through which the organisation will be able make the best decisions regarding the priorities, allocation of resources and the most efficient way to provide services to our stakeholders.</p> <p>The involvement of NIs in FSC governance entities is mandatory because NIs are the ones in direct contact with Forest Certification key players in each country.</p> <p>Without an efficient rationalization of the FSFC system in charge of defining how to generate benefits, what the roles and responsibilities of each party within the system are, the way we participate in the governance and structure – in essence, a truly global vision and a supporting business plan, it will be difficult to fulfil our mission.</p>	<p>1)Name: Álvaro Gómez Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: medioambiente@odecu.cl</p> <p>2) Name: Henry Moreno Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: cfvbol@scbbs-bo.com</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) We request from FSC its support to finalise the information on costs.</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC): None</p>	

<p>Title: Motion for the establishment of Regional Technical Boards</p>	<p>Category and number: 57 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: The General Assembly resolves to establish FSC Regional Technical Boards (RTB) to function as technical instruments in charge of planning and providing follow-up to the actions undertaken by FSC Regional Offices. The RTBs will be constituted by nine (9) FSC member directors from National Initiatives, maintaining the balance between the social, economic and environmental chambers, as well as between the countries in the region. To this effect, the FSC Board of Directors will develop by-laws to define the terms of reference and operating mechanisms of the RTBs. The RTBs should be operating within one year.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Alfonso Argüelles Organisation: Trópica Rural Latinanoamericana A.C. Chamber: Southern Social Email: alfarques@tropicarural.org</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: The purpose of this motion is focused on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing support to FSC in the fulfilment of its objectives and goals in the strategic regions; • Creating spaces for the participation of the National Initiatives network in order to influence FSC’s planning and development; • Creating regional spaces to train regional technical staff to provide input to the Board; 	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Maria Ofelia Arboleda Obando Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: moarboleda@fsccolombia.org mariaofeliarboleda@yahoo.es</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing the sense of belonging to the FSC in strategic forest regions, Providing the Board with regional consultation instruments. <p>This motion seeks to encourage participation of new members and it is important to bear in mind that the RTBs will work in a coordinated manner with the FSC Board of Directors.</p>	<p>2) Name: Henry Moreno Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: cfvbol@scbbs-bo.com</p>
Cost implications:	
Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC)	
<p>Costs: RTBs will meet three (3) times a year with the Regional Office Director. Total annual cost: around USD\$108.000 (An amount of USD \$3.000 was taken into account to cover travel expenses per person per year; therefore it is necessary to obtain USD \$27.000 for RTBs meetings at each Regional Office. Since there are 4 Regional Offices, the total amount needed is of USD \$108.000).</p>	
Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC): None	

Title: Motion to request the use of Spanish in documents, materials and other FSC literature	Category and number: 58 Policy
<p>Policy Motion: The FSC International Centre will make available public documents and other communications, dissemination materials and policy and standards documents open for comments in the two FSC official languages.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Maria Ofelia Arboleda Obando Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: moarboleda@fsccolombia.org mariaofeliarboleda@yahoo.es</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: A third of the countries with projects certified under the FSC scheme are Spanish-speaking nations and there has been a rapid increase in the participation in the work of this scheme of many of these (development of standards, certified area, Chain of Custody Certification, number of participants within FSC membership). Consequently, these countries have much to offer to the FSC system in terms of lessons learned, input for policy development, and most importantly from the perspective of countries with tropical natural forests and plantations, with presence of indigenous peoples and other ethnic groups, with community forestry practices and also from the perspective of countries with illegal logging problems; all of them, issues of great importance for FSC.</p> <p>In the last few years, there has been a tendency to use only one language, English, in documents and official communication means from the FSC IC; this makes it difficult for the Spanish speaking membership to participate, to provide input regarding documents and policies developed by FSC. This motion seeks to strengthen compliance by FSC of its policies, providing equal conditions to the Spanish-speaking countries, facilitating both the access to the information and the involvement in discussions.</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Pablo Antelo Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: pantelo@lachonta.com</p> <p>2) Name: Héctor A. Martínez H. Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: hamartinezh@rntsa.com</p>

	3) Name: Christian van der Goot Organisation: Fundación Ecohout Chamber: Northern Social Email: ecohout.cg@12move.nl
Cost implications:	
Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC)	
Approximate cost for translation of documents: USD 100.000	
Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) None	

Title: Motion to ensure self-sustainability of the FSC network (generating a Seed Fund to support National Initiatives)	Category and number: 59 Policy
Policy Motion: In October 2006, the FSC IC will have generated a financial self-sustainability fund for the whole network, including a Seed Fund and a strategic plan to ensure that National Initiatives are able to fulfil their objectives and goals.	Proposed: Name: Maria Ofelia Arboleda Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: moarboleda@fsccolombia.org mariaofeliarboleda@yahoo.es
Purpose and/or additional information: The purpose of this motion is for FSC to include in its work plan a fundraising strategy and to establish a trust fund aimed at achieving the sustainability of National Initiatives since they are the ones directly responsible of carrying out the functions that lead to FSC recognition and positioning in the countries where it exists. The functions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To promote among the general public the certification scheme, based on training, awareness raising, advisory assistance and accompaniment; • To develop, review and harmonize Forest Certification standards that are applicable to the real situation in each country and region; • To position the FSC trademark in each country by designing and applying dissemination and communication strategies directed to all the segments of the forest chain; • To guarantee reliance and transparency of Voluntary Forest Certification in each country; • To act as mediator in the resolution of disputes with regards to the interpretation of the norms on Voluntary Forest Certification; • To encourage the articulation of Voluntary Forest Certification at the national level; • To provide consultancy services on the various certification possibilities offered by FSC in accordance with the size and intensity of forest operation (SLIMF, Group Certification, etc.). 	Seconded: 1) Name: Álvaro Gómez Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: medioambiente@odecu.cl 2) Name: Henry Moreno Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: cfvbol@scbbs-bo.com 3) Name: Christian van der Goot Organisation: Fundación Ecohout Chamber: Northern Social

Email: ecohout.cg@12move.nl
Cost implications:
Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC)
Costs: Hiring a consultant in charge of high-scale fundraising among the most important donors at the world level.
Total annual cost: around USD 100.000
Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC): None

Title: Motion to facilitate access of traditional communities, owners and companies to forest certification.	Category and number: 60 Policy
Policy Motion: In order to facilitate access of traditional communities, forest owners and companies to forest certification, and take advantage of the opportunity provided by the new controlled wood policy that helps to gain market access, the proposal is for FSC to acknowledge and validate initiatives such as the System for Gradual Approach to Forestry Management and Certification, MIV, and other modular systems as governing systems for controlled sources.	Proposed: Name: Damián Villacrés Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Social Email: vdamian@macas.ecua.net.ec
Purpose and/or additional information: The System for Gradual Approach to Forestry Management and Certification (SGAFMC) is a technical assistance tool towards independent forest certification that seeks to cover the gap between Responsible Forest Management and Certification through directed, sequential and gradual technical assistance that fosters changes to the traditional utilization schemes. Every SGAFMC initiative obtains a direct link to the market because of its immediate recognition by WWF's GFTN (Global Forest & Trade Network). This system allows quicker access to specialized market niches and responds to the requirement of responsible purchase policies (supply phasing in). Information documents on the SGAFMC are herein attached, clarifying how it relates to the controlled wood standard (e.g., in Peru, in the first module in the absence of which there is no access to the SGAFMC) and the proposal on how to use its market recognition (as controlled wood or business-business "regent's" letter).	Seconded: 1) Name: Bastiaan Louman Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: Bastiaan.Louman@wwfperu.org.pe 2) Name: Franz Tattenbach Organisation: FUNDECOR Chamber: Southern Environmental Email: ftattenbach@fundecor.org
Cost implications:	

<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) Implementation of SGAFMC, MIV and others: Field testing and validation. Total cost: to be defined</p>
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC)</p>

<p>Title: Motion to introduce a quality and monitoring system within the FSC network</p>	<p>Category and number 61 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion: The General Assembly assigns the Board of Directors to develop a strategy on building a professional global FSC-network, including a clear defined quality and monitoring system for the FSC-network and -system as a whole.</p> <p>A quality and monitoring system should be developed and ready for implementation by the end of 2006.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Åke Persson Organisation: Sveriges Ornitologiska Förening / Birdlife Sweden Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: ake.persson@borlange.se</p>
<p>Purpose and/or additional information: FSC as a standard setting organisation is demanding of FSC-certified operations to have systems and routines on different matters, e.g. handling of complaints. However, FSC as a network, excluding the Accreditation & Business Unit does not have such a system.</p> <p>FSC, as an organisation/network, is involved in standard setting, service & advice delivery, trademark issuing/surveillance etc on both international and national/regional levels, but has no clear system on how to monitor the quality performed by the different parts of the network, nor does it have a system to monitor the actual success or failure of the FSC-system as a whole, including trademark use, FM- and COC-certification etc.</p> <p>In fact FSC is today an unstable organisation, because it has no clear strategies at different levels of the network, and there is no system to assure that those who represent FSC at different levels have the competence and qualifications needed. The lack of systematic approach in the FSC-network creates a vulnerable organisation which acts ad hoc to criticism.</p>	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Tomas Ekström Organisation: Kinnarps AB Chamber: Northern Economic Email: tomas.ekstrom@kinnarps.se</p> <p>2) Name: Nils Hager Organisation: WWF International Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: NHager@wwfint.org</p>

If FSC is to continue to lead the way in forest management certification in the next decade, FSC needs to develop a clear quality and monitoring system within the network.
Cost implications:
Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]
Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]

Title: Motion to evaluate the results of the SLIMF initiative	Category and number 62. Policy
<p>Policy Motion: That FSC carries out an independent evaluation of the results of the SLIMF Initiative, two years after its endorsement by the FSC Board of Directors. The results should be made public and be available in the two official languages of the FSC.</p> <p>The evaluation should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How and if SLIMF procedures are being offered and implemented by Certification Bodies to small and low intensity forest operations: both single and community operations. 2. The distribution of operations certified as SLIMF by country, including how they meet the criteria (area and volume harvested). 3. Analysis of the changes in the direct costs of certification (taking into account the perception of these costs by the operations themselves, and by CBs). 4. The environmental and economic appropriateness of the volume threshold used for the eligibility criteria of SLIMF, with a view to revising the threshold. 5. The identification of other opportunities to further reduce costs and increase accessibility. 6. Recommendations for improving the SLIMF Initiative. 7. Suggested mechanisms to implement the recommendations identified by the evaluation. 8. Lessons regarding the role of the National Initiatives in the promotion and interpretation of the SLIMF initiative. 9. Aspects relating to Community Forestry Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of community forestry operations certified as SLIMF. • Other proposals for ways to specifically support community forestry operations. 	<p>Proposed: Name: Dawn Robinson Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Social Email: dawnrobinson@onetel.com</p>

Purpose and/or additional information:

A motion was overwhelmingly approved (Policy #10) in the 2002 General Assembly in support of small scale and low intensity forest operations. This led to the creation of the FSC Initiative for Small and Low Intensity Managed Forests (SLIMF). This initiative offers Certification Bodies the option to streamline their evaluation and annual audit procedures reducing costs and the paperwork required. It has also created guidelines in support of the development of national forest stewardship standards which take account of the reality of small and low intensity managed forests. However, it is not known, for certain, whether the SLIMF initiative is making a difference in the field, and how it is being applied in different countries.

Additionally it will be interesting to evaluate the case of the SLIMF initiative in order to reflect on the ideal mechanisms for increasing participation in international policy creation, and specifically on how to incorporate experiences from the South in such policy development in an efficient and cost-effective manner. The SLIMF initiative represents a considerable effort to incorporate voices from different regions and to generate feedback opportunities during policy development. It was the first time in FSC policy development in which a technical committee was formed which had more than 50% of Southern participants, and the first initiative to send periodic reports in Spanish and English to stakeholders, and to channel their comments to the members of the technical committee. On the other hand, the SLIMF initiative also represented a considerable investment of personnel and resources by FSC to attain this level of 'participation' and it would therefore be important to measure the achievements of such an investment.

Finally, while it is hoped that community forest management operations will benefit from this initiative if they fulfil the criteria for 'low intensity' forests, community forests did not form part of the target group for this initiative and in consequence there is still no specific guidance about how communal lands within the FSC system, in recognition of the particular social and economic benefits provided by community forestry.

It would therefore be important, two years following the approval of the SLIMF initiative to be able to review whether the results hoped for were obtained, learn lessons from the initiative and take the opportunity to identify how policies can be strengthened in support of community forestry.

Seconded:

1)

Name: Héctor Martínez
Organisation: Individual Member
Chamber: Southern Economic
Email: hamartinezh@rntsa.com

2)

Name: Paulina Baca
Organisation: Individual member
Chamber: Southern Social
Email: pbaca@fnatura.org.ec

3)

Name: Eric Palola
Organisation: NWF
Chamber: Northern Environmental
Email: PALOLA@nwf.org

4)

Name: Luis Astorga
Organisation: Agrupacion de Ingenieros
Forestales por el Bosque Nativo
Chamber: Southern Social
Email: luisastorga@entelchile.net

5)

Name: David Maingi
Organisation: Individual member
Chamber: Southern Environmental
Email: DMaingi@wwfearpo.org

6)

Name: Luis Fernando Guedes Pinto
Organisation: IMAFLORA – Instituto de
Manejo e Certificação Florestal e Agrícola
Chamber: Southern Economic
Email: luisfernando@imaflo.org

	<p>7) Name: Peter Dam Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: pc_dam@hotmail.com</p> <p>8) Name: Phil Guillery Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Northern Social Email: phil@dovetailinc.org</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) [the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]</p>	

Title: Motion to change the FSC slogan	Category and number: 63 Policy
<p>Policy Motion: The FSC General Assembly agrees to change the slogan currently used on FSC materials "<i>Because Forests Matter</i>" to one reading "<i>Because forests and people matter</i>" and their corresponding translations into Spanish.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Luis Astorga Organisation: Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo Chamber: Southern Social Email: luisastorga@entelchile.net</p>
<p>Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new slogan is more accurate in reflecting the FSC objectives regarding "Responsible Forest Management", and includes more explicitly the social groups involved in the certification process. 2. The certification social component becomes more visible; the FSC certification system has not granted to this social 	<p>Seconded: 1) Name: Maria Ofelia Arboleda Obando Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Environmental</p>

<p>component the same degree of importance or weight as to the other two components: the economic and the environmental.</p> <p>3. All social groups and people involved in FSC forest certification will feel interpreted by the new slogan.</p>	<p>Email: moarboleda@fsccolombia.org mariaofeliaarboleda@yahoo.es</p> <p>2) Name: Héctor A. Martínez H. Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: hamartinezh@rntsa.com</p> <p>3) Name: Henry Moreno Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: cfvbol@scbbs-bo.com</p>
Cost implications:	
<p>Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC) Materials bearing the current slogan should be maintained until the stocks run out. Therefore, the only cost involved would be related to the change of the current logo design and patterns to the design and patterns of the new logo on materials to be manufactured or printed in the future; FSC-IC does not need to estimate this.</p> <p>No additional printing costs.</p>	
<p>Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC) : None</p>	

<p>Title: Motion to add a new type of certification: Responsible Purchase Certification</p>	<p>Category and number: 64 Policy</p>
<p>Policy Motion:– Responsible Purchase Certification The General Assembly resolves to establish a third type of certification denominated Responsible Purchase Certification.</p> <p>To achieve this, the FSC will develop within 'x' number of months the corresponding implementation system.</p>	<p>Proposed: Name: Chris van Dam Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Social Email: cvandam@elsitio.net</p>

Purpose and/or additional information:

Purpose

- To reward buyers who are truly committed to FSC and to forest certification;
- To achieve greater fairness with regards to the distribution between producers and consumers of the costs involved in responsible forest management and certification;
- To have buyers become committed in the development of a market constituted by sources certified for their responsible forest management (FSC);
- To grant special value to responsible forest management carried out by producers in tropical forest and, in particular by communities and small producers.

The document "Responsible Purchase Certification" is attached as supporting material.

Seconded:

- 1) Name: Victor Giraldo
Organisation: Smurfit
Chamber: Southern Economic
Email: victor.giraldo@co.smurfitgroup.com
- 2) Name: Lincoln Quevedo
Organisation: Individual member
Chamber: Southern Environmental
Email: lquevedo@catie.ac.cr
- 3) Name: Martha Núñez
Organisation: Fundación Ambiente y Sociedad
Chamber: Southern Social
Email: marthan@interactive.net.ec
- 4) Name: Alfonso Argüelles
Organisation: Trópica Rural Latinoamerican A.C.
Chamber: Southern Social
Email: alfarguelles@tropicarural.org
- 5) Name: Pablo Antelo
Organisation: Individual member
Chamber: Southern Economic
Email: pantelo@lachonta.com
- 5) Name: Franz Tattenbach
Organisation: FUNDECOR
Chamber: Southern Environmental
Email: ftattenbach@fundecor.org
- 6) Name: Jean Arnold
Organisation: Falls Brook Center
Chamber: Northern Social
Email: ja@fallsbrookcentre.ca
- 7) Name: Pablo Antelo

	Organisation: Individual member Chamber: Southern Economic Email: pantel@lachonta.com
	8) Name: Grant Rosoman Organisation: Greenpeace New Zealand Chamber: Northern Environmental Email: grant.rosoman@dialb.greenpeace.org

Cost implications:

Cost to FSC: (to be finalised by FSC)

[the proposer may suggest the costs involved for the implementation the motion; but this section will be finalised by FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]

Cost to other parties: (to be finalised with FSC)

[the proposer may suggest costs, but this section will be finalised in discussion with FSC, to allow the FSC membership to take the costs into account when making its decision]