

Ge oss kraft
att förändra
Pg.901909-2



Naturskyddsföreningen

Challenges and experiences, a national perspective - Eva Eiderström

Standardisation and the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation

- Since 2002
- Member of ECOS
- Member of the board of Swedish Standards Consumer Council
- Necessary evil?
- (Large activity in standardisation outside of ISO/CEN system; under ISEAL Alliance: IFOAM, MSC, FSC, ASC, Global Ecolabelling Network)

Pre-2002

- ISO 14020-25
- Participation through gov fund for travel, for comittée fee
- The alternative would have been worse.....

2002 - ongoing

- 2004 tire recycling
- 14025 - environmental declarations (sc type 3)
- After Green Wishes for standardisation (2003)
- Swedish standardisation strategy proposal
- Seminars, conferences - aim to highlight the role of standards in legislative work
- Funding from Swedish Consumer Board 2008, 2009, 2010
- Funding from Swedish Standards Consumer Council 2010
- Coordinator - 200812-201006 (30% of full time)
- Education of technical expertise from within the organisation, of the organisation itself, strategic planning of input
- Watchdog, national and international participation

Priorities

Links to organisational priorities:

Envirotoxins/Ecolabelling:

- Toys (Tk392) - chemicals
- Nano (Tk 512) - chemicals
- Leather and shoes (Tk 158) - chemicals

Ecolabelling:

- Textiles (Tk160) - greenwashing
- Greenhouse gas/Carbon footprint (Tk 312) - greenwashing

Necessary evil?

- Increased use of standards in areas of political contingency -CSR, environment, "forces" participation in strategically defined areas - not all, not all the time
- Always subject to availability of resources - should common good perspectives be upheld with voluntary means?
- Common good representatives bring wider perspective which supports qualitatively better grounds for decisions
- Public good representatives have to be financed with "earmarked" funds to ensure consistency - either publically or by "taxing" private bodies
- Results obtained without participation are worse than results obtained with participation
- What would it take to reach a societally beneficial result?

Aim with participation

- If standards are where the decisions that matters are taken, then NGOs will participate
- If there is a window of opportunity for influence - the likelihood of NGO participation is greater
- If legislation is forwarded to private bodies - NGO representation will be a contribution to ensure democracy and that societally defined goals are met
- If set up of the process ensures societal goals being met - standardisation would be an efficient and quick way to develop detailed legislation
- Participation is not about having the possibility of taking part in the technical committée - needs resources to maintain cooperation and coordination, both EU-wide and nationally
- Resources for coordination of technical expertise not enough

Experiences

- The voice of the Environment is always underrepresented
- 18 months is not sufficient
- Impossible to plan with 12 month funding
- Technical expertise exists, but needs training in standardisation
- Necessary to have coordination
- Participation is not about having the possibility of taking part in the technical committee - needs resources to maintain cooperation and coordination, both regionally, globally and nationally
- Resources for coordination of technical expertise is not enough
- Strategic link to other work areas of the organisation

The future?

- Without more permanence not worthwhile to participate
- Member of ECOS?
- Member of the board of Swedish Standards Consumer Council?
- Necessity to rely on earmarked funding source
- Necessity to have coordination capacity
- Possibility to create mirror ECOS organisation nationally? German example

Ge oss kraft
att förändra
Pg.901909-2



Naturskyddsföreningen

www.naturskyddsforeningen.se

Eva.Eiderstrom@naturskyddsforeningen.se