



Minutes 127 - EB Physical Meeting

Date: May 31st, 2016.

Place: Royal Tulip Alvorada, Brasilia, Brazil.

Attendees:

Producers: Alejandro O´Donnell (Aapresid); Gisela Regina Introvini (FAPCEN); John Landers (APDC); Juliana Lopes (Grupo André Maggi).

Industry, Trade & Finance: Belinda Howell (Retailers´ Soy Group); Christophe Callu Mérite (Feed Alliance); Olaf Brugman (Rabobank); Terence Baines (Unilever).

Civil Society: Alex Ehrenhaus (Solidaridad); Ashis Mondal (ASA); Jean Timmers (WWF); Oswaldo Carvalho (Earth Innovation Institute); Ulises Martínez (Fundación Vida Silvestre Argentina).

Secretariat: Marcelo Visconti; Lieven Callewaert; Enrique Molas; Laura Villegas; Daniel Kazimierski; Catalina Ale Monserrat; Fernando Olivieri, Jimena Frojan (online).

Observers: Daniel Escobar (Grupo André Maggi); Fabio Amadigi (Consultant); James Allen (Consultant); Nienke Sleurink (IDH).

1. Opening and expectations of the meeting. 2 pm.

Olaf Brugman welcomes. Round of presentations.

2. RT11.

Updates on program, agenda and methodology.

James presents the organization of RT11.

He explains the agenda and the content.

Content: next generation of soy production, particularly on environmental and social issues and dialogue, to create spaces of dialogue. He emphasises to encourage this content during the next two days.

He explains that there will be three plenary and parallel sessions, to dig deeper and roundtables discussions.

The parallel sessions will consist of:

- Landscape planning and intelligence.
- Responsible supply chain sourcing.
- Technology and innovation in the field.

In the second day, more social issues will be discussed.

James stresses to create spaces of dialogue. It is important to be active participants, to bring own experience and listen as well.



Terence mentions that the fish bowl format is very good, it makes people more comfortable to talk.

Belinda is concerned about how to engage other people that come to the conference.

James explains that there will be graphic facilitators that will illustrate what have been discussed. They will be very useful to facilitate the communication.

Also he mentions that 92 Organisations are expected to participate. This will be informed in the beginning of the RT11. He will do a quick dynamic to present where people are from.

He explains that the RTRS team together with Jaqueline and Anomi (Alfapress) will help to lead people to their places and make sure the conference runs smoothly.

Olaf says that Katia Abreu has stepped down and won't be able to come. Blairo Maggi won't be able to join the event as well.

James presents the agenda. The role of the moderator is to guide.

James revises the agenda and the people who will be in charge of each parallel session. Furthermore he explains the dynamic of the event.

Gisela has kindly volunteer to moderate a session.

Each room will be set up as a fishbowl. There will be 9 central seats, where speakers will be seating and introducing themselves. The people will be around these central seats and can join the discussion within this central space. People will move from their seats.

Afterwards, roundtable discussions in the plenary room and share the discussions on parallel sessions will take place

The first day finishes at 5 pm, with a cocktail afterwards.

There is a question about the meaning of social inclusion.

James answers that this issue refers to the low income of the people and inequity, among other things.

James explains that new economic motor, development, brings social benefits.

It is important the economic development and the generation of local employment.

Some changes in the standard now are included.

Ulises explains the definition of Jurisdictional approaches.

Nienke adds that IDH defined Mato Grosso as their landscape and they are working with different crops.



James explains the second day, which focuses on the social inclusion.

There will be panel sessions and Question and Answer session.

Closing roundtables discussions: what is RTRS future? Vision for the next generation of the RTRS, how to contribute to a sustainable soy production.

For the closing, four EB members will do a closing.

3. Minutes approval

Minutes 125: Already approved minutes are checked because there were some comments included afterwards.

MINUTES 125 APPROVED.

Minutes 126: Belinda has sent comments by email. The minutes will be rectified and approved in the next meeting.

2. RT11

Messages Alignment

Laura presents how the standard's changes will be communicated.

She explains that the key messages are not only for the RT11, they will be also for the revision of the standard.

-Time to read the p&c communication piece-

Laura explains the Key messages Communication proposal:

Positioning:

- Be balanced.
- Be wider/comprehensive (focus on holistic standard revision based on feedback received).
- Anticipate/Being a step ahead.

Positioning the way RTRS decides the standard revision should be told.

- Communication tone: inform, not announce.

Motivation

- The standard revision is part of RTRS continuous improvement. It is fully aware and committed to represent the different opinions and needs of its members, a multi stakeholder group.
- Amendments are based on the implementation and certification experience.

Key/Core Messages

Standard review, focus on:



- New standard is more accurate and clearer to implement.
- Zero Deforestation.
- Improvements in community relations and labour conditions principles.

Laura explains that for each message, it should show facts.

Fist Message: NEW STANDARD IS MORE ACCURATE AND CLEARER TO IMPLEMENT.

She says that in order to demonstrate that the new standard is more accurate and clearer to implement, it can be said that HCV assessments are no longer required.

Belinda and Christophe consider that the tense "less costly" is too vague. He suggests putting some figure to show that the cost of the certification decreases, such as percentages.

Ulises comments that is very risky to put that HCV assessments are no longer required. He recommends expressing that now the new standard is more accurate and clearer to implement.

Laura explains that the new standard is more accurate and clearer because is no longer required to do a HCV assessment.

Belinda suggests saying that the new standard is economically viable.

Moreover, John recommends having a business case to demonstrate the decrease of the cost.

Second Message: NEW STANDARD ENABLES RTRS TO CERTIFY ZERO DEFORESTATION.

Facts:

- From June 3rd 2016, no conversion of any natural land, steep slopes and areas designated by law to serve the purpose of native conservation and/or cultural and social protection is allowed.
- The areas of Category 1 (red area) on the maps, as well as all areas with native forests, wetlands and riparian zones in places where no map is available, remain protected from 2009 under the new criteria in the standard.
- Producers who converted Category 2 areas (yellow area) on the maps between 2009 and 3rd June 2016, that couldn't enter certification without an HCV assessment, are now eligible to certify.

Replace the word "from" in the first fact, to "after".

Christophe wants to know if RTRS is the only standard to be zero deforestation. He clarifies that RTRS is the only multi stakeholder's certification for soy to be zero deforestation.



Jean says that RTRS is the only one who is claiming the zero conversion of native vegetation. All the others standards are almost zero deforestation.

Jean offers to check if RTRS is the only zero deforestation standard.

Third Message: IMPROVEMENT ON PRINCIPLES AND CRITERIA THAT IMPACTS IN SOCIAL AND LABOR CONDITIONS, AND CONSIDERS SMALLHOLDERS CERTIFICATION VIABILITY.

Ulises clarifies that there are no improvements about these issues to communicate in the standard. He explains that there are more details, regarding small holders in the new standard.

Laura answers that RTRS will say that it has updated some indicators regarding these issues.

Moreover, Ulises mentions that child labour is acceptable in some countries. He adds that in the former standard it wasn't acceptable, but in the new it is. He suggests removing that fact and replacing with another on.

Ashis stresses that the messages have to be shorter and clear. We have to convert them smarter and neutral. RTRS don't have to refer every time to he, because they are women participating in the production of soy.

4. Break: 3:28- 3:44

5. General Assembly.

Marcelo presents the agenda of the GA.

The financial report will be presented by Olaf, as RTRS doesn't have a treasurer.

Ashis is interested to know what the item "member's performance" refers to.

Olafs explains that during the GA, the members of RTRS will vote for the performance of the people who used to be EB members.

Olafs explains briefly the voting procedure.

In the GA the complete standard will be voted. If there is approval, the whole standard is accepted. In the case the whole standard is not immediately approved, it will be voted principle per principle. If some principle is not approved, it will be voted criteria per criteria.

He also adds, that the bylaws explain how to vote. However, there are some issues missing.

Christophe comments that in the last GA, the members of RTRS voted the place for the next RT.

Olaf explains to him that that votation was used to test the devices.



6. Transformation Navigation Hub update.

Lieven Callewaert presents the project (TNH). The highlights from the reports given by Malik Institute (syntegration) were taken into account, focusing on what will be done to achieve sustainable production by 2020.

At the level of implementation, Lieven suggest thinking out of the box.

The aim of the paper is to prepare the necessary steps to develop and establish a Sustainable Soy TNH. RTRS will be the initiator, with the Mission is to start-up a Sustainable Soy TNH, to make it up and running as an operational day-to-day monitoring platform aiming to become the reference for measuring the sustainable soy movement and improvements

There is a concern about RTRS already being a sustainable platform.

It is remarked that the TNH is not a replacement or an alternative in any way of organizations currently working towards more sustainable soy supply chains

Lieven explains the suggested action plan.

- 1- Launch of the preparation. (Phase 1)
- 2- Preparation phase. (Phase 1)
- 3- Launch steering in January 2017. (Phase 2)
- 4- start

Jean says that WWF supports strongly the movement and that is important to rely on the experiences of other schemes, such as bonsucro.

For this stage, the initiative will be for RTRS.

Ashis states that there is nothing in the presentation that explains how these changes will happen. The problems are very fundamental and this project is not going to change that.

It is stressed that this is a project management system.

It is discussed that RTRS is not inclusive; it has less than 3% of the market.

We have to show others that we are moving forwards.

Within this project, the standard is maintained and kept as it is now.

Alex asks how to make sure it works this way.

John says that he does not believe that it will work, unless we have a project manager. Lieven can be the project manager.

There is a question about funding.



Ashis says that the bigger challenge is that 99% of the soy is out of the sustainability market.

Ulises says that the people who participated in the syntegration were RTRS members, and from other schemes and adds that we need to strengthen our own structure and that with this project we will be creating a new one instead.

Ashis says that nobody knows how to implement.

John explains that is very complicated for a farmer to certify RTRS, it is difficult to achieve. It is slow.

Marcelo adds that there are members of RTRS that have their own schemes.

The platform will be a space where they can discuss, but it not going to be a multistakeholder initiative.

The platform will help everyone to go up.

John thinks it is best to invest in RTRS, instead of this platform. To help RTRS be the first organization.

Christophe adds that the position in France is about no gm

Ashis suggests trying to influence the market to become sustainable.

There is a suggestion to work together with influencers from the government and the civil society and to persuade NGOs to put pressure on the industries.

Belinda is concerned that it is RTRS's initiative to start this platform and supports Jhon's idea.

Idh does not support RTRS being the leading organization of this initiative.

Belinda adds that this is something that IDH could do, as part of the market transformation.

Olaf asks if there are oppositions to the Project proposal.

Ulises replies that the text could be improved in order to avoid overlapping te text para que no sea un overlapping.

John suggests involving an international organization and the government.

Christophe suggests doing marketing activities.

Olaf summarizes the discusión and provides feedback: dice unas palabras de feedback:

-To design a neutral logo, not related with RTRS

-Rewrite the proposal to make sure RTRS is not competing with other standards



- To work on marketing and communication
- To have other schemes on board, to learn from them
- Looking for funding and diversity of funding
- To have a steering committee, involving international agency and government.
- Written comments are welcome

Break: 5.31- 5.37

7. Paraquat: Group set up.

Jimena Frojan presents a proposal of the Terms of Reference for the Paraquat Working Group.

The objectives and expected outcomes are presented. These are:

- To review and discuss the evidence received during the public consultation in order to come up with the expected outcome.
- Analyse the evidence received during the Public Consultation.
- Provide information for the revision of the note on Paraquat deadline.
- Overview and come up with recommendations on the use of Paraquat.
- Suggest how RTRS can approach this subject publicly.

The Paraquat Review WG will deliver a draft on the corresponding indicator (5.6.2 for RTRS Soy Production Standard v2.0) be approved by the Executive Board and endorsed by the General Assembly in 2017.

The basis for electing the participants is presented. The group will be comprised by 3 participants per constituency, which will be elected by the RTRS Executive Board based on: **[A2]**

- Expert knowledge and/or experience in the topics addressed by this WG,
- Representation of the views of the correspondent constituency,
- Ability to review and comment the documents in the working language
- When possible, RTRS will seek balance on the geographical representation of the WG participants.

A timeline summary is presented. It is proposed to send out a call for participants during the first week of June, to have the participants selected by late July and to start with the working group by August/September with a physical meeting. A final draft should be submitted to the EB before March 2017.

It is suggested to leave it up to the WG participants to have a physical meeting or not since it is not always possible to travel to distant locations.



There is a question on the evidence received and if that would be the only source of information for the group: It is agreed to add that the evidence received is the basis on which the WG will work and if needed further information should be researched by the WG members

The ToR is approved with the above-mentioned amendments.

The meeting continues only for the EB members.

----- MEETING CLOSED -----

Activity	Responsible Party	Deadline
[A1] Input from the EB members	Laura Villegas	-
[A2] Send call for participants to form the Paraquat Review WG	RTRS Secretariat	June 10 th