



survey title:

Governance Review Process [Edit Title](#)
[design survey](#)[collect responses](#)[analyze results](#)[View Summary](#)[Browse Responses](#)[Filter Responses](#)[Download Responses](#)[Share Responses](#)current report: [Default Report](#) [Add Report](#)

Response Summary

Total Started Survey: 108

Total Completed Survey: 108 (100%)

Page: Introduction - FSC Governance Review

1. Please provide the following information about yourself and/or your organization:

		Response Percent	Response Count
view	Name/Organization:	100.0%	108
view	E-mail:	100.0%	108
	<i>answered question</i>		108
	<i>skipped question</i>		0

2. Are you an FSC member?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	<input type="text"/>	69.4%	75
No	<input type="text"/>	30.6%	33
	<i>answered question</i>		108
	<i>skipped question</i>		0

3. What chamber (and region) do you belong to?

		Response Percent	Response Count
	<i>answered question</i>		108
	<i>skipped question</i>		0

3. What chamber (and region) do you belong to?

Social South	<input type="checkbox"/>	2.8%	3
Social North	<input type="checkbox"/>	4.6%	5
Environmental South	<input type="checkbox"/>	10.2%	11
Environmental North	<input type="checkbox"/>	13.9%	15
Economic South	<input type="checkbox"/>	22.2%	24
Economic North	<input type="checkbox"/>	24.1%	26
I do not have a clear interest group	<input type="checkbox"/>	22.2%	24
answered question			108
skipped question			0

4. Please select the categories applicable to you and/or your organization:

		Response Percent	Response Count
Environmental NGO	<input type="checkbox"/>	17.6%	19
Social NGO	<input type="checkbox"/>	5.6%	6
Indigenous People Organization		0.0%	0
Forest or Wood based industry	<input type="checkbox"/>	23.1%	25
Retailer	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.9%	2
Certification Body	<input type="checkbox"/>	10.2%	11
Member of FSC accredited National Initiative	<input type="checkbox"/>	12.0%	13
Staff of FSC accredited National Initiative	<input type="checkbox"/>	9.3%	10
Staff of FSC International Center, Regional Offices and Accreditation Services International	<input type="checkbox"/>	8.3%	9
Consulting firm	<input type="checkbox"/>	8.3%	9
Governmental agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.9%	1
Research institute	<input type="checkbox"/>	9.3%	10
answered question			108
skipped question			0

4. Please select the categories applicable to you and/or your organization:Other (please specify)

15.7%

17

answered question**108****skipped question****0****5. The Board agrees that certain features of FSC's existing governance system are desirable. On a scale of 1 -4 how important are these current elements of FSC's governance structure to you?**

	Not important	Neutral	Important	Very Important	Rating Average	Response Count
* Equally balanced 3-chamber system	0.0% (0)	1.9% (2)	17.6% (19)	80.6% (87)	3.79	
* Tri-annual General Assembly	0.9% (1)	24.3% (26)	46.7% (50)	28.0% (30)	3.02	
* National Initiatives	1.9% (2)	10.2% (11)	15.7% (17)	72.2% (78)	3.58	
* Elected Board of Directors	0.0% (0)	7.5% (8)	30.8% (33)	61.7% (66)	3.54	
* Independent accreditation of CB's	0.0% (0)	6.5% (7)	13.9% (15)	79.6% (86)	3.73	
* Country or region level standard setting	1.9% (2)	5.6% (6)	29.6% (32)	63.0% (68)	3.54	
* Individual and organizational memberships	2.8% (3)	16.0% (17)	34.9% (37)	46.2% (49)	3.25	
					answered question	
					skipped question	

6. Based on consultation, the FSC Board has identified four (4) broad categories of governance issues: 1) National Initiatives, 2) the FSC Membership, 3) the FSC Board, and 4) Decision-Making Structures. (More specific questions will be asked about proposals for each category later.) However, are there other broad categories that should be identified and addressed based on your experience?

	Response Percent	Response Count
yes, please explain <input type="text"/>	29.8%	31
	answered question	104
	skipped question	4

6. Based on consultation, the FSC Board has identified four (4) broad categories of governance issues: 1) National Initiatives, 2) the FSC Membership, 3) the FSC Board, and 4) Decision-Making Structures. (More specific questions will be asked about proposals for each category later.) However, are there other broad categories that should be identified and addressed based on your experience?

no, these categories are the major ones to focus on	<input type="checkbox"/>	70.2%	73
Other (please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	view	33
answered question			104
skipped question			4

7. National Initiatives have been instrumental to the development of the FSC in many parts of the world. However, their current relationship to the FSC International Center (FSC-IC) is not well defined, and in some cases strained. Going forward, what best describes the appropriate relationship of national initiatives to FSC-IC?

		Response Percent	Response Count
NIs should be independent organizations with no particular obligations to the FSC-IC	<input type="checkbox"/>	14.8%	16
Given their different capacity from place to place, NIs should have a "franchise" relationship the FSC-IC with a clearly defined contract of responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	67.6%	73
NIs should be part of the formal staff of FSC	<input type="checkbox"/>	14.8%	16
Other, please explain	<input type="checkbox"/>	12.0%	13
Additional comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	view	35
answered question			108
skipped question			0


8. The FSC Board has proposed to strengthen NIs in two fundamental ways: 1) through the formation of Regional NI Networks that set annual budget and program priorities within major regions in consultation with FSC-IC, and 2) through allocating a share of revenues from the Global Development Company (GDC) to regional networks (note: revenues from the GDC are expected to be small to start but then grow over time). Do you agree with this general approach to empowering national initiatives?

	Response Percent	Response Count
--	------------------	----------------

8. The FSC Board has proposed to strengthen NIs in two fundamental ways: 1) through the formation of Regional NI Networks that set annual budget and program priorities within major regions in consultation with FSC-IC, and 2) through allocating a share of revenues from the Global Development Company (GDC) to regional networks (note: revenues from the GDC are expected to be small to start but then grow over time). Do you agree with this general approach to empowering national initiatives?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	87.9%	94
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	12.1%	13
Comments 			30
answered question			107
skipped question			1

9. A key element of creating Regional NI Networks, is supporting the exchange of ideas and priority setting WITHIN regions, as opposed to having FSC-IC make decisions about NIs individually, or be seen as choosing NI priorities from the central office. However, even if revenues grow dramatically, it is expected that the needs of the network will still exceed the level of support available. Therefore, it is assumed that prioritization of such needs is better served by supporting that discussion and process at the Regional NI network level, rather than at the FSC-IC level. Do you generally agree with this approach?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	91.3%	95
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	8.7%	9
Comments 			38
answered question			104
skipped question			4

10. Proposed seven (7) regions for the purposes of creating Regional NI Networks. Important Note: We use the term Regional NI Networks very deliberately. These are NOT regional FSC-IC offices. However, over time and with proper resources, regional FSC-IC offices should align with and support Regional NI Networks. (In the short run, not every Regional NI Network will have regional FSC-IC staff, but that is a goal for the long run.) *Latin America (South American, Mexico & Central America) *Oceania (Australia-New Zealand, Pacific Islands) *Asia (China, Japan, South Korea) *Africa *North America (US & Canada) *Western Europe (Germany, France, UK, Spain, Italy, western Baltic countries, etc.) *Eastern Europe (Russia, Poland, Finland, Bulgaria, etc.) Do you agree with these suggested major regions for the purposes of forming Regional NI Networks?

10. Proposed seven (7) regions for the purposes of creating Regional NI Networks. Important Note: We use the term Regional NI Networks very deliberately. These are NOT regional FSC-IC offices. However, over time and with proper resources, regional FSC-IC offices should align with and support Regional NI Networks. (In the short run, not every Regional NI Network will have regional FSC-IC staff, but that is a goal for the long run.) *Latin America (South American, Mexico & Central America) *Oceania (Australia-New Zealand, Pacific Islands) *Asia (China, Japan, South Korea) *Africa *North America (US & Canada) *Western Europe (Germany, France, UK, Spain, Italy, western Baltic countries, etc.) *Eastern Europe (Russia, Poland, Finland, Bulgaria, etc.) Do you agree with these suggested major regions for the purposes of forming Regional NI Networks?


		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes, this is a good starting point	<input type="checkbox"/>	78.2%	79
No, we need more and smaller regions	<input type="checkbox"/>	13.9%	14
No, we need fewer, bigger regions	<input type="checkbox"/>	8.9%	9
<i>answered question</i>			101
<i>skipped question</i>			7

11. The FSC Board proposes that FSC-IC supports at least one annual meeting of each Regional NI Network where annual program and budget priorities are determined. Recommendations from each regional network would, in turn, be fed into the annual budgeting and work plan development of the FSC Board and senior FSC-IC staff for the entire organization. In addition to baseline support for each Regional NI Network, additional support would be determined based on regional priorities, available funds, and alignment with the FSC Global Strategy. Do you agree with this approach to planning and budgeting, and support for Regional NI Networks?


		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	94.1%	95
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	5.9%	6
<i>answered question</i>			101
<i>skipped question</i>			7

12. Like many non-governmental organizations, the FSC has a formal membership system that entitles each member (both organization and individual) to vote in Board elections, on major policy issues, and at the General Assembly. However, the Board recognizes that such a system excludes many potential FSC supporters who may not want to feel obligated to vote, or do not want to pay membership fees, or are excluded because they represent government agencies or trade groups. The Board therefore proposes that the FSC create two categories of membership with two different fee levels: FSC members (who vote) and FSC supporters (who do not vote, but receive information and are invited to participate in various FSC events and forums.) Do you agree with this approach to FSC's membership?


12. Like many non-governmental organizations, the FSC has a formal membership system that entitles each member (both organization and individual) to vote in Board elections, on major policy issues, and at the General Assembly. However, the Board recognizes that such a system excludes many potential FSC supporters who may not want to feel obligated to vote, or do not want to pay membership fees, or are excluded because they represent government agencies or trade groups. The Board therefore proposes that the FSC create two categories of membership with two different fee levels: FSC members (who vote) and FSC supporters (who do not vote, but receive information and are invited to participate in various FSC events and forums.) Do you agree with this approach to FSC's membership?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	81.0%	85
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	19.0%	20
	If no, please explain 		29
	answered question		105
	skipped question		3


13. Within the FSC system there are also different membership systems between certain national initiatives and the FSC-IC. In several instances members of one system are not members of the other, suggesting that there are two different FSC organizations, not one. The FSC Board proposes to integrate national level memberships with FSC-IC under a new technology and database platform, PROVIDED THAT: * National initiatives do not lose revenue * National initiatives remain the primary point of contact for members in their country * NI staff have access to all member files in their country, but may not view files of other NI's Do you agree with the need to harmonize national and international membership systems under a shared database that protects confidentiality?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	95.3%	101
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	6.6%	7
	What other concerns or considerations are needed in harmonizing national level and international membership systems? 		26
	answered question		106
	skipped question		2


14. The FSC Board consists of nine (9) members, three from each chamber (Social, Environmental and Economic). For each chamber, there always needs to be members from the south and from the north, with the north/south balance of the whole Board shifting every year. Given the tremendous growth in the FSC system since 1994, the FSC Board has considered expanding the Board to reflect both the growth in volume of FSC product in the market and the geographic diversity now represented in the FSC system. However, there are different ways to change the Board. Which approach best reflects your sense of what the FSC needs at this time?

		Response Percent	Response Count
1) Add three new elected members, one for each chamber	<input type="checkbox"/>	21.6%	22
2) Add three new members, appointed by elected members of the Board	<input type="checkbox"/>	5.9%	6
3) Rather than a chamber based election, move to a regionally based elections, eg. one from each of seven regions, plus 4-5 appointed members	<input type="checkbox"/>	6.9%	7
4) Some combination of options 1 & 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	12.7%	13
5) No, the Board composition and size is fine as is	<input type="checkbox"/>	38.2%	39
6) Other system, please explain	<input type="checkbox"/>	20.6%	21
Other electoral system for Board members			43
answered question			102
skipped question			6


15. Since the beginning of the FSC, the Board has been very involved in many technical and operational issues. Several Board committees relating to accreditation, membership applications, dipsutes, and pesticide derogations for example, exist today despite the presence of technical experts on staff and across the FSC network. The early days of the FSC required a higher level of Board oversight since many systems were still being created at that time. Today, however, the FSC Board proposes that it become more strategic in its role and less operational. To do this requires that Board committees that are technical in nature are sunsetted in favor of committees that reflect more typical Board roles, such as financial oversight, strategic relations, and overall performance of each of FSC's three companies. Do you agree with this general shift in Board emphasis?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	94.2%	97
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	5.8%	6
What other governance areas should the Board focus on?			28
answered question			103
skipped question			5

16. Since its fledgling start in Oaxaca, Mexico in 1994, the FSC has grown to include three independent companies based in Bonn, but all under the umbrella of the FSC-AC, a non-governmental organization still chartered in Mexico. These three companies are the FSC International Center (FSC-IC), Accreditation Services International (ASI) and Global Development Company (GDC) Each of these companies is co-located at the FSC-IC headquarters in Bonn, Germany. From a governance standpoint, one of the challenges facing the FSC Board is to ensure that these three companies are both integrated and working together, as well as working with the broader FSC Network (e.g. FSC members, NIs, CBs and certificate holders) in a timely and professional manner. To assist this integration and to foster a higher level of service to the network, the FSC Board proposes the creation of a "Standards and Disputes Committee" (SDC) with the following basic functions. 1) SDC would provide for the technical review of standards where there is high level of uncertainty, controversy, or a matter of dispute at the staff level. 2) SDC would serve as the final appeals body for all formal disputes (following efforts to resolve at the local level) 3) SDC would come together only on an as-needed basis 4) SDC would consist of six(6) members, two from each chamber nominated by their respective chambers, and upon recommendation of the chambers, appointed by the Board


		Response Percent	Response Count
Conceptually agree with the creation of SDC	<input type="checkbox"/>	69.5%	73
Conceptually disagree with the creation of SDC	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.6%	8
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	10.5%	11
Feel this duplicates what the Board should do	<input type="checkbox"/>	9.5%	10
Suggest a different approach, below	<input type="checkbox"/>	8.6%	9
Suggestions			29
answered question			105
skipped question			3

17. In recently appointing a new Executive Director for FSC-IC, the FSC Board made a significant decision to separate what had been two jobs under the previous Executive Director. The previous ED held the titles of BOTH Director of FSC-IC and Director of the parent organization, the FSC-AC. Under the new structure, the head of each of the three companies (FSC-IC, ASI, and GDC) will report to the Director of FSC-AC thereby making the FSC more compliant with international certification norms and principles. This was a proposal in the original February white paper that the Board was able to resolve as part of the recruitment process for the new director of FSC-IC. In particular, this creates needed separation between FSC-IC, the policy setting arm of FSC, and the ASI which is the enforcement arm of the FSC. The Board welcomes any comments or questions on this.

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes, this structure makes sense	<input type="checkbox"/>	94.0%	94
No, additional structural changes should be considered	<input type="checkbox"/>	6.0%	6
Further suggestions			19
answered question			100
skipped question			8

18. This year the FSC community will gather again for the General Assembly in November in Cape Town, South Africa. FSC members are already planning for side meetings and considering potential motions to guide FSC for the next three years. For many members this is one of the most inspirational aspects of the FSC network. What recommendations do you have for improving the General Assembly and the motions process?

18. This year the FSC community will gather again for the General Assembly in November in Cape Town, South Africa. FSC members are already planning for side meetings and considering potential motions to guide FSC for the next three years. For many members this is one of the most inspirational aspects of the FSC network. What recommendations do you have for improving the General Assembly and the motions process?

	Response Count
 view	47
<i>answered question</i>	47
<i>skipped question</i>	61

[We're Hiring!](#) [Terms of Use](#) [Privacy Statement](#) [Opt Out/Opt In](#) [Contact Us](#)

Copyright ©1999-2008 SurveyMonkey.com. All Rights Reserved. No portion of this site may be copied without the express written consent of SurveyMonkey.com. 35