

**MTCC**

---

**From:** "Andy Roby" <ajroby@tff.co.uk>  
**To:** <hnychew@thestar.com.my>  
**Cc:** <startwo@thestar.com.my>; "Liz Betser" <lbetser@tff.co.uk>; "John White" <jwhite@tff.co.uk>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 31, 2007 4:36 PM  
**Attach:** CPET\_MTCC[1].pdf; UKmarketconditions\_Mar07.doc  
**Subject:** Timber Article in The Star on Tues 17th July

Dear Hilary Chew,

I appear to have been quoted erroneously in the above article and would like to know where you got my quote from, as it is very misleading. The quote from the article reads as follows:

“Andy Roby of the British Timber Trade Federation clarified that MTCC timber was paid a lower premium because it only guaranteed legality and was not verified for sustainability practices which include the recognition of indigenous rights. “

**On the matter of price premiums in the UK:**

In the UK market there is a small premium of between 1 and 3% being paid for MTCC timber because it offers customers greater assurance of legality and sustainability than uncertified timber (see attached report by Rupert Oliver, Forest Industries Intelligence on behalf of TTF and DFID).

**On the matter of verification of sustainability practices by the UK government:**

At present the UK government, as a buyer, has recognised MTCC timber as providing assurance of legality but not sustainability. The reasons for this can be found on the CPET website (<http://www.proforest.net/cpet/cpet-s-assessment-of-evidence/assessment-of-certification-schemes-category-a>) and I attach the full report, but in summary MTCC does meet UK government's sustainability criteria under two criteria - 1.3.3 (standard setting process) and 4.4 (mixing of uncertified and certified material). **Neither of these criteria relate directly to the rights of indigenous people so it is not true to say that MTCC failed to meet the UK governments sustainability criteria because of lack of respect for indigenous people in the MTCC standard.**

In fact the UK government procurement standard for sustainable forest management currently does not include any specific social criteria, such as whether a scheme requires respect of the rights of indigenous people, although this is currently under review and may change in the near future.

Finally I understand that the MTCC scheme does include recognition of indigenous rights. For example, Indicator 6.7 deals with *Extent to which tenure and user rights over the forest are documented and recognised*; Indicator 6.8 deals with *Extent to which forest planning and management practices and processes consider and recognise legal or customary rights with respect to indigenous people and local communities, forest dwellers and other forest-dependent communities*, and Indicator 6.9 covers *Extent of participation by indigenous people and local communities, forest dwellers and other forest-dependent communities in forest-based socio-economic activities*.

I would be grateful if you would issue a correction as soon as possible so that your readers are fully aware of the UK timber market situation for MTCC certified products.

Regards,

Andy

Andy Roby  
 Head of Environment and Corporate Social Responsibility  
 Timber Trade Federation

*Building Centre,  
 26 Store Street,  
 London WC1E 7BT.*

**Direct Line: 020 7291 5377 (NEW)**  
**Switchboard: 020 3205 0067 (NEW)**

Fax: 020 7291 5379 (NEW)

Web: [www.ttf.co.uk](http://www.ttf.co.uk) <<http://www.ttf.co.uk>>

+++++

This email is confidential and intended solely for the addressee and others authorised to receive it. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or action taken in reliance on the contents of this email is prohibited. The Timber Trade Federation cannot accept liability for statements made which are clearly the sender's own and not made on behalf of the Timber Trade Federation.

Registered in England No 2515034