# TPAC_logoRESPONSE FORM - TPAC Stakeholder Forum

STIP

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | |
| Name: | Gé Gerritzen |
| Organisation: | Timmerfabriek A. Gerritzen en Zonen B.V. |
| Country: | Netherlands |
| Date: | 22 August 2019 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Chain of Custody (CoC) | |
| Chain of Custody system | P 1. A Chain of Custody (CoC) must be in place from the forest unit of origin to the final point of sale, which provides a link between the certified material in the product or product line and certified forest units. |
|  | |
| Chain of Custody group certification | P 2. If Group certification of the CoC is allowed, the standard must require that the group as whole must comply with the same requirements which are posed on individual companies. |
|  | |
| Logos and labels | P 3. Logos and labels that belong to the certification system and occur on products and documents shall have an unambiguous meaning and shall be applied in accordance with the rules established by the certification system. |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Development, Application and Management of certification systems (DAM) | |
| Standard development | P 1. The process of standard development and the standard itself shall fulfil the requirements as established by international umbrella organisations (such as ISO and ISEAL). |
|  | |
| System manager | P 2. The certification system shall be managed by a legal entity (system manager). The tasks and responsibilities shall be clearly distributed among the organisations, which form an organisational and/or functional part of the system. |
|  | |
| Decision-making bodies and objection procedures | P 3. Decision-making bodies shall reflect the interests of stakeholders and shall provide for adequate procedures for objection and appeal regarding the decisions made and the functioning of the decision-making bodies. |
|  | |
| Certification bodies and procedures | P 4. Certification bodies shall be independent and shall be competent to assess sustainable forest management and the chain of custody system. |
|  | |
| Accreditation | P 5. The accreditation agencies that grant the accreditations for certification of sustainable forest management and/or the chain of custody shall be competent and independent, national or international organisations that are preferably member of the IAF. |
|  | |

|  |
| --- |
| General comments |
| A few days ago the Dutch FSC and PEFC organisations issued a joint post on this forum. Both parties seem to forget that they went through a decades-long process of thinking, refining and evolving. The current FSC and PEFC standards documents do not even resemble the original version 1 documents. STIP is new and should be given time and space to evolve much like the elder others. Instead FSC and PEFC focus on the sole fact that STIP does not have a Forest Management certification scheme yet. I have on good authority that that argument has already been deemed irrelevant by the Board of Appeal and also that it is a work in progress.  Apparently FSC and PEFC feel the need to influence the debate by claiming that they “invest a lot in forests”, and thereby imply that STIP does not. By using these terms it appears they want the public to think that they invest in forests, as if they own or buy them. That is of course not the case. No certification standard owns forest, logs wood or replants trees. Certification standards do nothing, except make rulebooks, check the books of others and then find fault.  But the real zinger is that their “investments are done with … the fee contributes by CoC certified companies.” Okay. Alright. There we have it. So the real complaint is the fear of losing money to a competing local upstart. Now that’s just sad. I applaud the efforts of anyone making the world more sustainable, including FSC and PEFC, but I expect at least the same from them. |