



Minutes n°114 - EB Conference Call

Date: April 14, 2015

Attendees:

Producers: Gisela Introvini (FAPCEN)

Industry, Trade & Finance: Belinda Howell (Retailers' Soy Group); Cornel Boere (Agrifirm, FEFAC); David Pendlington (Unilever); Olaf Brugman (Rabobank)

Civil Society: Ashis Mondal (ASA); Gert Van Der Bijl (Solidaridad); Oswaldo Carvalho (Earth Innovation Institute); Sandra Mulder (WWF)

Secretariat: Agustín Mascotena; Daniel Kazimierski; Daniel Meyer; Jimena Couto; Jimena Froján; Verónica Chorkulak; Lieven Callewaert.

The agenda is presented and checked for further subjects to be included. No changes. The meeting begins.

1. Minutes Meeting 113: no comments or changes. **[A1]**

APPROVED

2. RT10: Secretariat provides an update (good basis of speakers and more than 100 registered participants) and requests for help and suggestions regarding speakers.

RT10 is lacking a policy maker. Lieven reached for the Flemish Agriculture Minister, S&P for the deputies listed in an e-mail on the topic, and WWF was talking to a Dutch Minister, all with negative responses. The task is hard as there is a European Commission meeting at the same time as RT10. Ashis asks about the chances to have a policy maker from India as he would be willing to be a speaker and it would make the difference in taking RTRS forward in India. The invitation has to come from an organisation recognized by the governor or known by him (eg: WWF). Olaf asks Secretariat to work with Ashis on this **[A2]**. Agustín mentions the need of a European policy maker and to take into account the conference budget. Sandra says she had suggested some Parliament representatives.

A representative to talk about non-GM is needed, as Denofa declined the invitation. Waitrose was reached but did not provide a response. Belinda offers to follow up on Waitrose and check Swiss retailers **[A3]**.

Still waiting for a reply from FEFAC. A coordinator for Green Miles session is needed as Daniel Zarin declined and Daniel Nepstad cannot ensure his presence **[A4]**.

David needs to confirm the joint presentation between Unilever and Hugo Byrnes representing CGF in the opening session **[A5]**

Mr. Liu will speak as a Chinese representative at What's Next Session.

A Finance representative is needed for session II. Olaf comments that BEI's Secretariat prefers members to make the presentation on behalf of BEI. Only 2 of them are also members of RTRS (Rabobank, already has a speaker, and Santander, Chris Wells won't be able to make it to RT10). Olaf asks if inviting a non-member bank could be



a possibility, keeping in mind they are not working with RTRS. Gert suggests that inviting them could stimulate them to join.

If we achieve all of these tasks we would only need to adjust the programme and agenda, and we should be fine tuning on announcements and check finance balance.

We still have a negative balance, as we are expecting more sponsors. The deficit won't be a damage to RTRS but is higher than expected (-40K Euros), considering the invitation of speakers from India and China. The target of participants to reduce the deficit as much as possible is 250. However, finding more sponsors would be useful as we were waiting more sponsorship this year **[A6]**.

3. Communications: introduction to context of new strategy document and previous discussions with S&P. The previous strategy was presented in Brasília and the EB asked to redefine.

A new document describing the plan was sent late the night before the call, feedback on it is needed within five working days and sent to Agustín and Olaf **[A7]**.

Sandra comments she did not have time to discuss it with Carrie, yet. Gert says that, overall, he supports what is written there, although at first he was not that convinced. He had a call with Ronald Hiel, who made things more specific and with that background he supports what is there. Belinda had a really good conversation with Ronald, too, and it seemed that he got the message that a number of EB members was expressing, that there was disappointment that the message was not punchy enough with S&P and probably there is a need to change the way RTRS is working in partnership.

Sandra is surprised that Ronald is involved as there was agreement on a division of roles. Agustín explains on the last EB Meeting complaints pointed that in Iguazu Ronald explained the strategic plan with no follow up afterwards and now the EB wanted it to be reviewed by the top management of S&P, independently of the conflict of interests.

Olaf adds that the whole communication, supply chain and planning is there, so now having the docs on the table, the messages, stakeholder groups defined, we need to be smarter to work with this and squeeze everything we have to have the maximum effect, keeping in mind the messages and responses to usual myths and criticism with simple language. Olaf also suggests including communication as a regular topic in EB meetings.

Oswaldo recommends being careful with the "no involvement in deforestation" statement as now we are starting to review P&C, not to give a message and then change it later, which would lead to criticism. For Oswaldo it is a bit hard to say NO deforestation, maybe change to legal deforestation. Olaf mentions RTRS is far from the stage where that could change.

Ashis adds that strategic messages are too technical and should be broken into easier messages; and that we should be talking about economic impact, as well as environmental and social, and include small farmers in messages as it is an



emerging discussion. Olaf points out to review in detail stakeholder groups that are being distinguished and simple messages are written.

4. EB candidates: Cornel says Feed Alliance would be willing to become EB member and represent FEFAC as well. The chance is high and now has to go through FEFAC members.

There is still an industry representative needed. The deadline was April 15th but it can be extended not further than April 24th as we need to communicate Members for the GA.

Sandra says there was a second round of candidates in the Bylaws in article 18.2. Olaf suggests connecting offline with Belinda, Cornel and David to look for the remaining industry candidate. **[A8]**

5. GA subjects: the usual subjects and election of EB candidates is in the agenda. The EB is asked for inputs. Olaf is in doubt if we should carry on with 4.4 discussions, asking for a proposal from the GA or just raise awareness that this is happening.

Gert says we have been going around this for 3 years and we need to face it, even though it is sensitive.

Belinda agrees and remembers that TFB has been clear that we won't get the support of other producers unless we tell them we are being responsive to their requests. It seems to her that GA would be a good opportunity to pass it through membership and check if it is acceptable for them.

Oswaldo adds that last week during TFB meeting the subject was on the table and TFB is expecting a final decision about this point. Producers are ready to apply but are waiting for this decision.

Sandra is not sure about what decision the stakeholder group is expecting. Gisela asks for EB to go to Maranhão, to see what is going on with RTRS Certification there.

Sandra says that EB should come up with an agreed text.

David adds that if this something that would not be commonly discussed with all members we should not do it.

Olaf says that we should avoid some people coursing the decision to one direction in a non transparent way, when we have a transparent procedure.

David says the best way to fix that is in the P&C discussion. Sandra agrees. Belinda comments on RSPO P&C review, which had negative results for RSPO, and asks not to discuss it only within the P&C process.

David adds that there could be an awareness point, so that every member realizes that this is the trickiest one of all decisions and we get that decision in the GA.

Olaf says this comments are being made very soon and we'll then be able to say where we stand, we should at least explain the GA all the steps in the process and make sure that in the first comment rounds there are specific proposals. Olaf proposes to work on specific statements for 4.4 made by people already involved in the P&C process, share them and check who would be submitting comments to P&C process. To have a vibrant session on RT10 and in the meantime the P&C is already running. Ask for specific alternatives to address our concerns and make sure they are not forgotten and then submit to P&C process. Belinda supports, and adds this may satisfy TFB needs to have something on the table. **[A9]**



6. Status: P&C and Mapping (HCV): technology and tools are in place for Paraguay and Brazil.

Main concerns: HCV assessors, no success in having training workshop with HCVN network; and the issue of launching maps and then having the P&C review changing the rules immediately.

Sandra says we should not keep waiting to launch the Maps as it is not good for credibility, and adds that the lack of assessors is not a big thing now but we need to make efforts to get this for the future.

Oswaldo says that Brazilian maps had consensus on TFB but to launch them we need to change rules to use the maps. Olaf will follow up with Agustín and get back with a proposal on this for the EB. **[10]**

7. TF update:

- **Europe:** there has been no meetings, as the last webex was cancelled and re-scheduled in the TFE Physical Meeting (May 18).

Belinda presents a proposal of alliance with ProTerra and Danube Soya to collaborate in market development and communications in Europe. Belinda will share a presentation with all EB members for their feedback and see what the roadmap looks before the end of this week. **[11]**

- **Brazil:** TFB decided not to have a communication agency for Brazil but would rather have a contact with a journalist to build stories and dissemination of RTRS. **[12]**

8. Other comments: Sandra says that she is surprised to see the P&C has started. Agustín explains that the timing for comments is ISEAL compliant and the first meeting will be about setting the agenda, using the input of the GA. It is not that this input will be about the tiny detail of requirements. Agustín suggests selecting working group members and being sure those candidates will be able to collect input before June. Sandra says this is too short for members to give input. Agustín explains the second round will be appropriate, about 2 months or more long. David agrees with Sandra, and he wants the special team in Unilever to provide the best input, and therefore asks for help to facilitate that for them. Agustín explains the timeline and documents needed are at the website, as well as in the invitation sent, but offers to send this to him individually. Sandra says this should also be clear for other stakeholders.

- 16:51 CET -

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

Activity	Responsible Party	Deadline
1 Upload Minutes to website	Secretariat	April 14
2 Invite policy maker from India	Secretariat & Ashis & WWF?	April 17
3 Follow up on Waitrose’s invitation & invite Swiss Retailer	Belinda	April 17
4 Suggest coordinator for Green Miles	EB	April 17
5 Confirmation of CGF ppt in opening session	David	April 17
6 Call for more Sponsors	EB	April 17
7 Send feedback on S&P’s key messages	EB	April 21



8 Contact I,T&F reps to become EB Members	Olaf, David, Belinda & Gert	April 24
9 Gather statement on P&C process to share at RT10 (how?)	Olaf	TBD
10 Send the EB TFB's proposal on the maps	Secretariat & Olaf	TBD
11 Send presentation on collaboration with ProTerra and Danube Soya to EB	Belinda	April 17
12 Start working with journalist within TFB	TFB	TBD
13 Send P&C documents to David	Secretariat	TBD