



Joint Statement by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC) recommending ISO members to vote against the *New work item proposal Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products – Requirements*

Forest certification arose in response to concerns about the preservation of the world's forests. It developed as a result of the 1992 UN Earth Summit in Rio, which defined "sustainable development" as a common goal of human development.

Two global forest certification systems have emerged in the past twenty years, the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC) and the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC). Together, FSC and PEFC account for some 98% of the world's certified forests and chain of custody certificates.


With this statement, FSC and PEFC wish to express their sustained opposition to the New work item proposal Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products – Requirements and recommend ISO Member Bodies to vote against the new work item proposal.


Both PEFC and FSC strongly believe that an ISO chain of custody standard would not add value to global efforts to promote sustainable forest management through forest certification. The existing chain of custody standards by FSC and PEFC are already widely accepted, with more than 35.000 certificates in existence today, supporting, in 2012, about 27% of global roundwood production¹.

The fundamental principles of PEFC and FSC chain of custody certification are closely aligned, allowing companies to obtain dual certification to both FSC and PEFC in an efficient and straightforward manner at minimal additional costs. PEFC and FSC have a long history in multi-stakeholder chain of custody standards development to meet the ever evolving expectations of all stakeholders along the value chain. The strengths of FSC and PEFC in offering sustainable forest management certification, in addition to chain of custody certification, cannot be underestimated as this creates synergies that ensure complementarity of these two elements. A separated chain of custody delivered by another institution such as ISO cannot deliver similar synergies and will lead to uncertainty due to its dislocated nature with respect to forest management certification. Dividing the supply and production chains results in sub optimal results.

PEFC and FSC are both committed to working with stakeholders to identify and, where possible and relevant, remove differences between the two chain of custody systems. Given this, the added value that an ISO chain of custody can offer is highly questionable.

Both PEFC and FSC appreciate and benefit from the excellent work of ISO and its member bodies, however for the purpose of Chain of Custody of Forest Based Products, we urge you to vote against the proposal.


Kim Carstensen
Director General, FSC


Ben Gunneberg
Secretary General, PEFC