

Motions for the 2014 FSC General Assembly

AMENDED: 11 September 2014			
Title: High Conservation Value 2 (HCV2) – Intact forest landscapes (IFL) protection		Policy Motion Number: 65	
Original language of the motion: English			
PROPOSED BY:			
Name:	Judy Rodrigues		
Organization:	Greenpeace International		
Chamber:	Environmental North		
1. SECONDED BY:		2. SECONDED BY:	
Name:	Roberto Waack	Name:	Jens Holm Kanstrup
Organization:	AMATA S/A	Organization:	Verdens Skove / Forests of the World
Chamber:	Economic South	Chamber:	Environmental North
Policy Motion (high-level action request):			
<p>To ensure the implementation of Principle 9 and the protection of Intact Forest Landscapes - the world's remaining large undisturbed forest areas contained in HCV2 - across FSC certified operations , FSC will direct Standard Development Groups (SDGs) and Certification Bodies (CBs), where no SDG exists, to develop, modify, or strengthen (according to standards revision processes) indicators within National Standards and CB standards that aim to protect the vast majorities of IFLs. Taking into account scale, intensity and risk as well as respecting the activities, customary and legal rights of traditional forest communities, this process will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Be based on best available, independent, peer-reviewed science and other information; 2) Take into consideration IFL degradation in FSC FMUs since 2000; 3) Respect Free Prior and Informed Consent of indigenous Peoples, traditional peoples and forest dependent communities in affected FMUs; 4) Within IFL cores ensure that Certificate Holders implement protection measures (for example, set-asides, legal protected areas, conservation reserves, deferrals, community reserves, indigenous protected areas etc.) ensuring management for intactness, in areas within their control; 5) Require a comparative assessment of the viability and effectiveness of alternative land use options, in maintaining and enhancing intactness of IFLs including in areas outside FSC FMUs (landscape level); 6) In limited circumstances, allow limited development of IFL cores if such operations produce clear, substantial, additional, long-term conservation and social benefits; 7) Where applicable, address the need to reduce timber harvesting rates to reflect any reduction in the timber volume due to removal of IFL areas from harvesting; 8) Prioritize development of low-impact/small scale forest management, non-timber forest products in unallocated IFL areas, and provide first access to local communities an taking into consideration section iii; 9) Promote alternative models for forest management/conservation (for example, ecosystem services etc.) within the IFLs, <p>If by the end of 2016 a relevant standard has not been implemented, a default indicator will apply that mandates the full protection of a core area of each IFL within the management unit. <i>For this purpose, the core area of the IFL will be defined as an area of forest comprising at least 80% of the intact forest landscape falling within the FMU</i></p>			