

Letters to the editor

Comments on *Summit*, September 2003

Re: The Chatroom's "certification debate"

I read with interest your article on the great certification debate, which in my mind should not be a debate at all but that accreditation should be recognized and accepted as the universal standard of professional purchasing.

I think the fictional individual "Jean Keene" has it absolutely right and I can't even come to grips with the "P.D. Trainor's" concept that procurement is a trade and not a profession. (I wonder what baffling twilight zone he/she is operating in to even pontificate that absurd notion.)

Realistically, purchasing accreditation is a "no brainer." The debate is whether the federal government will acknowledge and accept purchasing, procurement, supply management etc., as a profession in the same manner as they acknowledge accountants, project management, the legal profession, health professionals etc.

I think the federal government should take the lead in recognizing that purchasing is a profession, but then having said that, how do they (fed. gov't.) implement the standards of accreditation as a basis of that acknowledgement and what purchasing accreditation do they acknowledge? Is it the C.P.P. from PMAC, the CPPO from NIGP, the CPM from the NAPM, or must they develop their own quasi-government certification in concert with any one of the accrediting agencies above (or some other educational institution of higher learning)?

The problem is not a simple one and in the meantime purchasing professionals are pretty much left to their own initiatives to gain the coveted accreditations. (Yes, I did use the word coveted.)

Lastly, don't forget, "Sam Skeptik" and "P.D. Trainer," that education teaches a person how to spell experience.

Russ McHugh
C.P.P., CPPO

Re: In my opinion's "Show me the money"

Asner's [column] calls this innovative thinking and, in the same breath, a scheme. This is exactly what Asner calls it in his second last paragraph – a scheme. [To me] the definition of scheme [that applies here] is in secret or underhand way. This type of procedure will make our profession look bad, not only ethically but, again, painted with a brush of only looking at dollars instead of the lowest acquisition cost. There will be a perception that this process is unethical, and the transparency [of the process] will not be open. Instead of this method, ask the bidders in a last and final scenario to discount the price instead of offering or sending cash.

I am very surprised you allowed Asner's [column] the way it was printed. He is correct; it is nothing but a scheme, and not what our profession should be promoting. Asner's . . . background in our profession is as a writer and [giver of] seminars, and his viewpoint is not based on on-the-job experience.

Darryl Mathe
Manager of Supplies & Services
City of Greater Sudbury

Editor's Note: Columns in *Summit*, as elsewhere, generally reflect the columnist's personal viewpoint.