



Minutes n°113 - EB Physical Meeting

Date: March 2 and 3, 2015

Place: Royal Tulip Alvorada Hotel, Brasilia, Brasil.

Attendees:

Producers: Juliana Lopes (AMaggi); John Landers (APDC)

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

Civil Society: Gert Van Der Bijl (Solidaridad); Katrin Oswald (WWF); Oswaldo Carvalho (Earth Innovation Institute)

Proxys: Gisela Introvini (Fapcen) is given to Juliana Lopes (Amaggi); Ashis Mondal (ASA) is given to Gert Van Der Bijl (Solidaridad)

Observer: Ulises Martinez (Fundación Vida Silvestre Argentina), Cynthia Moleta Cominesi (March 3 only, WWF Brazil)

Secretariat: Agustín Mascotena; Daniel Meyer; Verónica Chorkulak; Lieven Callewaert.

Day 1: March 2nd, 2015

The agenda is presented. Quorum is checked. Olaf Brugman opens the meeting.

1. January 29th Minutes: Page by page review.

- Two changes are introduced:
 - USSEC was invited to the RT10 and not confirmed at that time.
 - Olaf was responsible to integrate the feedback in order to create a working plan for multi-crop.

DECISION: APPROVED

2. Action List Status

- It is reviewed with no additional comments.

3. Round on feedback/conclusions from Field trip + CGF + TFE/TFB meeting in previous week

It is concluded that the field trip was a success with about 70 people attending. It was a good sign from the companies and it also provided them with the possibility of understanding the impact of RTRS in the field as well as the complexity of the soy production, understanding the dimension of the country, the size of the farms and the difficulties for achieving legal compliance.

It is concluded that it was beneficial for both organisations to work in coordination with the CGF. It is highlighted the importance of the call to action made by Hugo Byrnes, Chairman of the CGF.



It is mentioned that it is important to follow up and work with companies that showed interest on RTRS.

It is said that RTRS should be about working with producers, NGOs, and companies in changing the ways of production. Continue working on the communication of benefits of RTRS Certification on the field. It is important to frame that an important part of the work and benefit of RTRS is achieving legal compliance, and communications on this issue should be carefully presented.

It is said that scientific studies are a good mechanism for showing RTRS impact to European retailers and other companies. It could strengthen the communication.

Oswaldo Carvalho suggests for next field trip to visit non certified farms and interview its farm workers.

It is asked to send an email to Field Trip participants adding a reflection about lessons learnt and giving a place for them to share feedback. **[1]**

4. Financial Report 2014

The financial situation as of December 31, 2014 is presented, explaining main sources of income and expenses, and the key differences between actual report and budget.

From the income side, it is highlighted an increase in membership fees as a result of having 28 new members, while from the expenses side the difference in comparison with the budget is mainly explained by new investments in communications and market development areas, as well as by the CoC system development in the RTRS Trading Platform. There was also a higher income because of the funds received for the Mapping Project in Argentina, which will be allocated to the project in 2015.

It is commented that bank account balances are healthy. It is suggested to have a discussion in the Steering Committee about setting minimum security cash levels to define investments capacity. **[2]**

The report will be audited and GA is to approve it in May.

5. Budget 2015

Agustín Mascotena presents the budget based on the following objectives for the year:

- **Business engagement**
- **Other stakeholders engagement**
- **Continue building RTRS reputation**
- **Collaborate and forge coalitions**



It is highlighted the importance of finding the way of keeping smallholders involved in RTRS Certification, commenting that some Indian producers and Gebana did not re-certify in 2014.

Agustín explains that after the end of SFTF project it is expected that most producers continue in the certification process as they now also perceive other benefits.

Juliana Lopes comments that this is a crucial year for Amaggi producers as they have to comply with 100% of indicators and therefore the market is important to keep them in the process. This certified production was expected to be sold through physical chain but they have decided to advance with credits sales in order to keep them on board. Juliana also comments that there are some producers looking for them to be certified. This is a possibility to increase the number of producers (about 20 more producers)

The planned activities and objectives by area are showed:

- **Administration and governance activities:** main issues highlighted are relation with other initiatives, development of long term contract, more involvement of producers in the EB composition, mapping use and communications.
- **Communications:**
 - It is highlighted RTRS will work in developing indicators as requested by IDH.
 - It was concluded that RTRS needs and wants to improve its external communications on its longer term and strategic ambitions, and on specific messages to stakeholders in Latin-America and Europe.
 - is also commented that a communication agency for Brazil will be hired.
- **Market development unit**

MD Brazil: Task Force Brazil updates are presented. 30 people are part of it and more have shown interest to join after the field trip. It is explained that the implementation of TFB Strategic Plan 2015 has started. Strategic communication and marketing plan for Brazil will be ready by April. Daniel Meyer explains that TF Brazil is developing an RTRS Committee of Publi-Private engagement (RTRS-CEPP) in Brazil. Target groups are: Ministry of agriculture, Ministry of environment, embrapa, CNA, ABAG, SICREDI, Santander, Rabobank, Banco do Brasil, Caixa economica federal, BNDES, Banco Nordeste.

Discussion: It is asked what the approach and division of roles in the RTRS Committee of Publi-Private engagement will be. Conclusion: Key messages and positions of this committee need to be aligned with the EB, since the proposal suggests that EB is formally responsible for this, and with overall communication strategy and plan (also to be approved by EB). Olaf suggests that statements that commit RTRS towards



government bodies and officials should only be made by those entrusted by the Statutes and Bylaws to represent RTRS (Note included after the meeting). [3]

DECISION: COMMITTEE IS APPROVED

Juliana Lopes is the coordinator of the UN Global Compact Workshop (4.03.15) and she says that if you are RTRS Certified then it reduces to three items what is required by global compact.

MD Europe: The goals for the unit are to increase volumes of Responsible Soy in Europe, increase awareness and understanding of RTRS in Europe, and understand the challenges for producers. Field trip to Brazil was a very important activity to establish the Brand positioning of RTRS in Europe in terms of added value and content.

Lieven Callewaert explains that he is working with the following companies: Mars, Danone, DMK, Auchan, Lactalis and Colruyt.

Lieven confirms Danube soy will be speaker at RT10 and that he will be speaker at Danube Conference. Katrin Oswald asks to approach Nestlé, as they are now looking at direct soy use and start looking at feed for dairy in 2016/2017.

Belinda Howell comments that Lieven has developed a great presentation on how to buy credits and impacts. Belinda suggests completing the presentation, moving towards physical. It is asked to organize a conference call with the catalyst group to discuss with them on this presentation. [4]

MD Argentina/Uruguay/Paraguay/China/India/Canada/US: Verónica Chorkulak explains that some actions planned for the unit are workshops with producers, participation at main events, improve communication to producers, links with producers associations, mapping exercise in Argentina will include other stakeholder's invitations and visit to India including government representation.

The budget includes hiring Enrique Molas to work as RTRS representative for Paraguay, south of Brazil and Bolivia.

US: trying to have a constructive dialogue with USB, USSEC, ASA; thus invited to speak at RT10.

China: still a weak area that has to be developed. Solidaridad, TNC and WWF will launch a project to engage Chinese companies on March 19 in Beijing, funded by Moore Foundation.

Conclusions of the Budget 2015

RTRS is financing its growth with donations but could adjust expenses to be self-sustained if needed or in emergency cases.



There is a positive environment for RTRS development in terms of demand and supply motivation. But it is still difficult to forecast on demand or supply volumes as the market is still defining its action plans and not all of them are public.

Cash flow does not present deficits for 2015

John Landers asks for a follow up on commitments made in the past. Katrin Oswald supports this call and refers to supplychange.org as a tool as well as to the Soy Report Card WWF issued in 2014, which was highly appreciated by all participants. WWF is planning to issue a next Soy Report Card, most probably in 2016.

There is a discussion about rephrasing the long term goal in the budget budget towards transforming the soy sector to responsibility and integrating the 10 Mio. t goal until 2017 as a milestone to get there. It is decided to keep 1,9 million as target for 2015 credits sales.

DECISION: BUDGET IS APPROVED (on day 2 after suggested wording changes)

Wording changes were:

- P. 3: From "Business engagement: to increase demand and balance with supply. RTRS needs for the first time increase efforts to have more available certified production; for this purpose, to simplify certification methods and reduce costs, are a key elements on the strategy."
→ Changed to: Business engagement: RTRS needs to further engage businesses and producers to increase demand and supply. For both goals, it is important to reduce costs of certification without compromising standards.
- P. 4: If RTRS do not make major changes at the standard verification the growth is important but still limited
→ Changed to: sentence deleted

6. RT10 and GA9

Update on RT10 status of: Content, Speakers, Sponsors, and Communications

EB feedback in general: It is suggested to invest in inviting producers (including Brazil and Argentina) and include a German speaker. There should be time for some discussion and have the possibility of replying if someone is saying something against RTRS. It is also important to invite consumer companies as Nestlé and Danone. Belinda Howell will contact a company to speak at RT10 in representation of CGF [5]. It is said that it is needed to work on the benefits of being sponsor. Agustin will circulate the last sponsorship document with the EB, in order to improve it. [6] Lieven, the EB and the Secretariat will use this updated document to target the Belgium market and other companies. It is that it would cause traction and attention, if a "high impact event" could be presented around RT10 (i.e. a major commitment, consider commitment of Koen De Heus and if it will be public by then). It is noted the necessity to prepare a risk communication concept for RT10.



EB feedback by Session:

- **Session Travel Guide:** Olaf/Secretariat will contact FEFAC and Deheus to invite them to be speaker at this session. [7].
- **Session about Green Miles for our Trip:** It is suggested to include Laurent Micol (ICV) in another session and cover the social part of this session. Possibility of including Suresh. [8]
- **Session Travel Insurance for your brand:** It is asked to include here an explanation on how to calculate the direct or indirect soy use. Agustín explains that for each session short videos will be prepared. [9]
- **Session Choosing Regions:** It is suggested to include Daniel Nepstad in this session. It is asked to check his availability. It is suggested to be clear with the coordinator about what is the outcome of this session, since regional approaches like Danube Soy is not the same and not to be confused with landscape approaches. [10]
- **What's Next:** Juliana will contact Alejandro Litovsky. Important for this session [11]. It is suggested to include government representation and/or a European policy maker.

GA9 preparation: EB definition

It is informed that there are four position vacancies in the producer member constituency, four in the industry member constituency and four in the civil society member constituency.

Ulises Martinez from Fundación Vida Silvestre Argentina confirms that he will be candidate for the EB (civil society constituency). Juliana confirms Amaggi will continue. Cornel explains that Agrifirm will not candidate for the Board but FEFAC is discussing and selecting another candidate for the EB. Agustín explains that ACSOJA will discontinue membership of EB and RTRS. Olaf Brugman confirms that Rabobank intends to renew its candidacy for the EB membership and Belinda Howell states that it is pending final confirmation but the Retailers' Soy Group would also continue. Gert comments that Solidaridad needs to decide it formally and could be represented by someone else within the organisation. Katrin Oswald says WWF would re-candidate itself through Sandra Mulder. It is pending to confirm continuity of ASA, Fapcen and Aapresid. [9].

It is decided not to include a world café session about the P&C review in the RT10. It is decided to include in the GA a communication about the P&C review, ask for participation and present process to when and how this will be possible for interested stakeholders and to show the tool where the RTRS maps will be integrated and what the further process is to finalize them and make them usable.



Within two weeks the EB will send any motion if any to be treated at the GA [10].

The secretariat will send immediately a communication to present EB position vacancies. [12].

It is discussed the possibility of including a discussion about 4.4 in the Session III (Green miles for our trip) and to present RTRS as to find solutions for the potential end of the soy moratorium. Daniel Zarin (CLUA) is suggested as coordinator [13].

It is decided to move the European Task force meeting for the morning of May 18th to enable a meeting of the European and Brazilian Task Forces.

7. P&C Review

Cecilia Gabutti, former RTRS technical Unit manager, is accepted as technical coordinator of the P&C Review. It is suggested to look for a facilitator for some of the meetings. Juliana Lopes will suggest one. It is highlighted the importance of the communication in this process. It is suggested to be clear in the process, ensuring a communication link between the technical manager of the P&C Review, the facilitator, RTRS Secretariat and relevant stakeholders.

Three facilitator proposals will be presented. [14]

DECISION: P&C REVIEW COORDINATOR IS APPROVED

8. Exercise about criteria 4.4:

It is explained that other schemes did not move the cut-off date for deforestation but they put some flexibility. Belinda proposes to develop a product for frontier areas and one for consolidated areas. In this way RTRS could be able to contribute to sustainable solutions in frontier areas without losing the strength of RTRS.

Juliana Lopes comments that RTRS has the obligation to make the difference and to work on how to develop sustainable rural development. In terms of the economic situation for example Maranhão has developed a lot from having soy production. The main idea of 4.4 is to preserve biodiversity, but it is deemed difficult or may be impossible to achieve zero deforestation in frontier areas.

Juliana explains that there will be a lot of restoration in Brazil, and RTRS could cooperate with that resulting in a social positive impact and protection of biodiversity. If RTRS decides not to be in this movement there will be other certification schemes that will and RTRS will be confined to certification in already consolidated regions. Juliana comments that the issue is to define after 2009 how we can work to protect biodiversity and social values.

Gert states that in a macro level it is possible expanding into grass, but at farm level, if a producer can expand in a legal way, certification is not going to stop deforestation at a farm level. Premium will not be enough to stop it.



Olaf Brugman comments that certification could be a way to stop negative impact but also to create positive social or environmental impacts.

Katrin Oswald states to keep separate the simplification of criterion 4.4 from changing the cut-off date and not to change cut-off date. According to a calculation of WWF 73% of soy production can still be done in compliance with RTRS. RTRS needs to be very careful in trade-off between credibility and possible integration of frontier areas.

Ulises Martinez states that a certification scheme only can assure consumers about the responsible origin of their consumption, but it is not a right tool to prevent deforestation. Then, changing the cut-off to achieve biodiversity improvements would be a mistake. In return he encourages RTRS to find alternative mechanisms as PES schemes to comply with this aim.

Juliana suggests talking in the GA about what are the specific issues that we want to achieve with the 4.4 (e.g. Improve rural development, achieve zero net deforestation, etc) and then define the 4.4.

It is decided to have a list of options prepared for the GA with pros and cons. Olaf will organize a call with Juliana, Oswaldo, Belinda, Sandra and Ulises. **[15]**

9. PES PROJECT

Daniel Meyer explains the objective of the project: To identify possibilities of different Payment for Environmental Services (PES) mechanisms for RTRS mapping category 1 and 2 in Brazil (additional forest areas).

Considerations:

A first project was launched to analyze potential alternatives and develop a potential pilot test linked to the RTRS Map. Four PES Mechanisms were analysed & discussed by working groups and consultants during the project.

A 5 PES-model, also called RTRS Conservation Index, is presented as a proposal of balancing the different PES-models discussed. RTRS Conservation Index should to be used for setting the value of the compensation to be received by a producer for conserving additional forest areas (mapping category areas 1 & 2)

How it will work

Monetary value (USD) per Conservation Index Unit is regulated by RTRS and defined by cash flows that goes into RTRS Biodiversity/HCV Fund

A smaller part of all transactions flows from RTRS conventional credit system automatically goes into RTRS Biodiversity/HCV Fund

RTRS members as well as external companies and organisations (non RTRS members) could voluntary support RTRS Biodiversity/HCV Fund



RTRS producers with additional forest areas are compensated on a yearly basis after approved audit by certification organisms.

Next steps to be approved by the EB

-Viability assessment of RTRS biodiversity/HCV Fund (March-July 2015)

-Pilot of RTRS PES System in a delimited area considered as a high priority area for biodiversity conservation and for strategic interest for RTRS (September 2015)

Discussion

It is asked who would pay for it and how much would be enough to compensate the areas. It is suggested not to focus on soy chain in terms of market, but rather on government and institutional funding.

It is approved to continue with a viability study and a pilot of RTRS PES System in a delimited area considered as a high priority area for biodiversity conservation. Budget: 30,000 Euros, available from IUCN.

DECISION: CONTINUITY OF PES PROJECT IS APPROVED

- 18:20 –

-----FIRST DAY OF THE MEETING CLOSED -----

Day 2: May 3rd, 2015

10. Communications

Observations: RTRS received a first proposal over budget possibilities and after a feedback call a second proposal from S&P was sent. Agustin says that IDH gave feedback to refine specific KPIs on media impact and other related aspects managed by S&P.

EB Feedback: it is asked how the communication plan supports RTRS work plan. Agustín explains that S&P is a service provider that helps with the communication related to Lieven's activities and all the Secretariat activities.

It is commented that a communication strategy is missing. It was expected to have a long term strategy and cohesive approach presented, and reach more media and press.

It is decided to ask S&P to work on metrics, on a strategic cohesive approach and key messages overall and by country. It is decided to be clear that we expect a delivery on those outputs.



It is decided to have a call with S&P in March, including Roland, to explain that it is lacking the continuation of the strategy and it is needed to be more concrete. **[16]**

11. Monitoring impact. Impact assessment

Agustin explains that RTRS has included some indicators in the IT Platform that should be completed by CBs and will be used to monitor RTRS impact. He comments that ISEAL recognition requires having an impact assessment scheme in place.

Katrin Oswald asks for fact based information about RTRS that is needed for communication and lobbying, mentioning business cases and scientifically more rigorous impact assessment.

Olaf Brugman will have a call with WWF to understand their knowledge on business case and impact assessment mechanisms. **[17]**

12. Effort Recognition

Agustín presents a proposal to help smallholders that are leaving certification because cost is over benefit. He explains some producers have very low yields and need double of the prices to cover costs.

The proposal is based on secure volumes: this could also be an opportunity to secure supply volume in case of an unexpected production fall (weather, diseases, insects...)

Discussion and feedback from EB: It is said that this proposal would be providing with benefits to those that did not do things correctly. John Landers comments that there should not be a disconnection between tonnes and certificates as proposed and that the focus should be on yields and once they get better returns they would certify. It is suggested to try to market the "smallholders' credits". Belinda Howell explains that RSPO has a jurisdictional approach for smallholders.

It is asked to develop further projects for smallholders. Gert says he does not think certification is the right tool to tackle the issues for smallholders, that is, we should not be looking for funds for smallholder to achieve certification, but be looking for funds to work with small producers on improving social, ecological and economic sustainability. Agustín will contact Dr Puvan J. Selvanathan (UN Global Compact) to look for funds to help smallholders to achieve certification. **[18]**

DECISION: THE PROPOSAL IS NOT APPROVED

13. Membership and credits



Agustín asks for approval confirmation of the new policy developed for credits buyers that states that non-member can buy credits by signing license agreement and paying an annual fee. Better reporting on credit buyers will be developed (include purchased, resold and “transferred”/“allocated” credits), to prevent double selling, unsubstantiated claims, etc. [19]

It is noted to work on added value proposition to become respectively stay a member of RTRS. At the moment, RTRS contacts non-member buyers buying more than 1'500 credits per year, explaining RTRS and membership to them.

DECISION: THE PROPOSAL IS APPROVED

14.Mapping Project

Agustín talks about HCVA assessors limited capacity and HCVA next course in order to have more licensed trainers to perform HCVA assessments and therefore reduce its cost. Agustín talks about the maps being a guide for farmers and auditors, not a definite tool because of errors in scale and limited applicability on management unit level.

Ulises presents the tool ArcGIS from ESRI where the maps will be integrated.

It is suggested to show the tool at the GA, and also to be used as a reference during the 4.4 discussion and to complete the standard review. Afterwards, it will be decided how to use it a manual and communication about it will be developed, to explain use, potentials, limits and risks of maps.

It is asked to show progress on the Mapping tool (technical issues) in following calls.

[20]

15.Multi-crop certification

Agustín Mascotena explains that the proposal has support from WWF. He also explains that it is needed to define how to approach: development of new modules, setting up a working group, business plan, IT platform developments, communications, etc.

Terence Baines, through Skype, states he will come back on a specific proposal to develop a pilot to evaluate RTRS multi-crop certification, and will involve Katrin (WWF) in the development. [21]

Katrin Oswald explains that the reason of WWF's interest is that commodities leaders of WWF observe sustainable feed growing, therefore increasing demand of other certified crops. The Aquaculture Feed Dialogue is discussing integration of sustainable feed in the ASC feed criteria, so there will be potential from this side (mainly corn).



Gert will investigate about the potential. It is decided not to make any communication about this at the GA.

16.RTRS Reporting from members

Agustín explains that templates reports have been updated. , feedback of WWF is included.

DECISION: REPORT TEMPLATES ARE APPROVED

It is decided to be flexible, and extend the deadline to complete the report as they are being sent in March instead of January. Deadline will be extended up to June. It is suggested to make a comment that confidential information can be optional to complete.

It is suggested to make a reminder during GA for those that have not sent it. It is asked to inform members about how the information will be published. Gert suggests including in the communication that RTRS has done its best to fit each organisation and also to give place for suggestions for improvements. **[22]**

17.Alliances

Status of RTRS-Proterra Mou

Agustín Mascotena updates on the status of the MoU:

- Check list for stacked audits prepared
- Check list under revision
- Amaggi is determining farms that will be stack audited under both schemes and making arrangements (in-kind contribution by Amaggi)

Next steps

- Short project to be prepared to be sent to IDH-aim at financing expenses for audits and analyses of results and communications
- After initial approval checklist will be sent to RTRS
- After RTRS approval check list will be ready to be used
- Audits on farms
- Analysis of results
- Recommendations to Proterra Foundation and to the RTRS
- Joint decision on how to move forward

BM TRADA Responsible Soy

The background of BM Trada Responsible Soy Scheme is presented. It is explained that answers a specific demand from Retailers, to purchase from a range of certified sources without needing multiple certifications.



It is for Non-GM soy and covers the supply of food products via one of the followings:
 1-The BM TRADA Responsibly Sourced Soy CoC
 2-The Roundtable for Responsible Soy (non-GM)
 3-The Proterra Protocol.

The Scheme will allow controlled mixing of soy inputs from all schemes and/or with other BM TRADA non-GM verified inputs.

Decision: It is decided to request BM Trada to be accredited by RTRS in Chain of Custody in order to advance in cooperation. It is decided not to make a public approval. **[23]**

Global Compact

Agustín explains the UN Global Compact scheme. Dr Puvan J. Selvanathan will be presenting it at the RT10.

Juliana Lopes explains that the UN Global Compact members are requested to complete a report and additional reporting is required for those companies that are part of the Food and agriculture chain. She explains that being certified according to one of the Round Tables’ Schemes will confirm compliance with some of these additional reporting requirements.

Gert asks if it is possible to have a strategy between Round Tables. To be explored **[24]**

Olaf comments that it is a chance for RTRS to be recognized there. He supports if it does not involve time and money for RTRS (APPROVED).

ISEAL

Agustín updates on RTRS progress towards ISEAL recognition. Agustín explains Jimena Froján will travel to ISEAL’s office to work with them and finish the recognition **[25]**

- 12:40 –

-----**SECOND DAY OF THE MEETING CLOSED** -----

Activity	Responsible Party	Deadline
1 Field trip participants mailing	Secretariat	March 6
2 Setting minimum cash levels discussion	Steering Committee	May 18
3 Align position and messages to Public sector with EB	Task Force Br + EB	Next TFB mtng
4 Conference call on ppt of Mkt tools	Catalyst Group	Not specified
5 Contact CGF speaker	Belinda	Done by 2 nd day
6 Sponsoring doc circulate among EB	Agustín	Done by 2 nd day
7 Contact FEFAC & Deheus RT10 CEOs	Olaf/Secretariat	March 13th
8 RT10 Change ICV include Solidaridad India – at Green Miles session	Secretariat	March 13th
9 Prepare short videos for RT10 including	Secretariat	April



Soy Print		
10 Invite D.Nepstad and instruct session coordinator for Choosing regions session	Secretariat	March 13- April
11 Support to contact Alejandro Litovsky	Juliana	March 13
12 Call for EB candidates	Secretariat	March 6
13 Invite Daniel Zarim (CLUA)	Secretariat	March 13
14 Facilitators search for P&C	Secretariat/EB	March 20
15 Preparation of 4.4 guides	Some EB + Ulises M.	Not defined
16 Organize Strategy call (Comms) w/S&P	Agustin	March 5
17 Call on impact assessment	Olaf/WWF	Not defined
18 Explore funding for SH with UN	Agustin	Not defined
19 reporting on credit buyers development and adjustment according to input from WWF.	Secretariat	Not defined
20 Show advance on Mapping tools	Secretariat	Next call
21 Proposal on Multicrop	Terence	Next call
22 Give space for feedback on reports	Secretariat	Before sending
23 Give feedback to BM Trada	Secretariat	March 13
24 Explore joint action with RTs about UNGC FABPs and ISAP	Secretariat	March 26
25 ISEAL application in situ (UK)	Technical Manager	April