



Minutes -EB Meeting RTRS

London October 28 & 29th

Participants:

Producers: Alex Ehrenhaus (Los Grobo) with proxy vote of AAPRESID; Juliana Lopes (AMaggi) with proxy vote if FAPCEN; John Landers (APDC)

Civil Society: Sandra Mulder (WWF); Ashis Mondal (ASA); Gert Van der Bijl (Solidaridad); Oswaldo Carvalho (EEI)

Industry/Trade/Finance: Belinda Howell (RSG); Olaf Brugman (Rabobank); David Pendlington (Unilever); Cornel Boere (Agrifirm); Patricio Watson (ACSOJA)

Observers: Michelle Morton (Shell); Pablo Casabianca (Syngenta)

Secretariat: Lieven Caellewaert; Agustín Mascotena

Invited (2 day): Carla Kivits, Schuttelaar and Partners.

The agenda is presented, no additional other business to add.

Strategic section starts:

Governance:

President' election: it is re-informed that Alex E. won't continue and there is no replacement from Los Grobo or other producer stepping for candidacy. Rabobank (OB) presents its candidacy for the Presidency, and decision is agreed to be taken at end of first day.

Steering Committee: proposal is presented (President + VPs + Treasurer (on financial related decisions), filtering and deciding on operational aspect to speed up, reduce EB time allocation for non-strategic aspects and support President's role).

It is remarked that if Rabobank is elected as President (currently VP) a new VP is needed. Agrifirm (CB) stands for VP.

It is decided to be an informal organ. EB maintains statutory power.

It is suggested (Sec) as rule that if any component considers that a decision shouldn't be decided by the SC but by the EB, this decision goes to that level.

The proposal is **Approved**.

Strategy evaluation (2014):

Introduction guide is presented, showing the structure of report: analyse the 5 discussed strategic models that EB discussed in 2013 and its evolution in 2014.

Current model:

Objectives, Sub-Objectives, Activities status are presented.

Figures on current and forecast to complete 2014 are presented (has., tons., sales)

Remarks on Credits and forecasts:

WWF: there is a need to trace "indirect" credits sold – e.g. a chicken supplier that purchase credits for a retailer.

In general concerning the government lobby and need of higher engagement with them for 2015



Conclusion EB: Continuous improvement of practical aspects of this model is welcomed ("Just do it").

Multi-crop:

The subject is introduced using ppt from Feb 2014 as input and motion from APDC to re-consider and put in practice asap.

Remarks about corn certification:

Question on what is the overlap between crops? Corn/Soy is the main rotation.

Amaggi: For the producer it would not be a problem to certify; but this will not represent a large sales; most trading of corn is with the government in Brazil. it would not be a high problem for producers. It would be useful to combine audits/certificates (eg 2BS, ISCC); it could also be useful to generate a switch ISCC/RTRS (but costs are much lower for ISCC...)

ASA: Be careful by mixing with the moving curve of RTRS – but it could be a separate plan.

RSG: is more in favour on focussing on Soy

Unilever: Most of the RTRS certification is not crop specific. It would be very pragmatic if other crops grown by an enterprise could be recognised (e.g. sunflower) – we need to consider it seriously; DP suggests to ask the Brazilian Task Force; **Action: check is there an interest from producers? A1**

WWF: Shouldn't we include other stakeholders? Also discuss it with the EU Task Force.

Conclusion:

EB requests the Secretary to deliver a plan and budget and compare it to other approaches **(A2)**

3FI-project

Subject, which has now taken a jurisdictional approach focus, is introduced, referring to RTRS participation at 3Fi project and a draft on communication.

EI (OC) leader of the project makes a presentation.

Remarks (Secretariat):

- The project started with another approach (RT/REDD+) and developed to Jurisdictional
- There is a risk for RTRS in participating in this initiative; about its coherence with our reference (cut-off date 2009 versus other approach)?

3FI see deforestation as a dynamic process – reforestation/deforestation

WWF: Confusion on the definition of "Zero Net deforestation" – look at the Q&A annex; This definition is not aligned with the WWF definition, and it also is not in line with our RTRS standard (cut-off 2009).

Solidaridad: Is there a role for certification in the system?

The group certification of RTRS could be adapted to this system. Furthermore, the territorial approach could bring in new producers for RTRS; both systems could co-exist together.

Rabobank: Although the jurisdictional approach is not yet implementable rightaway, this approach may add value in reaching our strategic goals, and deserves further exploration and participation by RTRS.; externalcommunication on RTRS's involvement in the project should be managed with care; The jurisdictional approach may also offer solutions regarding good land governance, which is likely to be one of the big next



issues of responsible/sustainable certification schemes. In the financial world there is a large discussion on-going on this issue.

Unilever: Could be very helpful to link data of it to RTRS – eg certain regions being more easy to certify; Link with municipalities; RTRS should engage more with Brazilian authorities.

AMaggi: This project can help to increase government approach.

If you go to RTRS certified regions – you'll see a reduction

If we are going together with other initiatives for deforestation – it can improve collaboration because we start from the regions instead of only units.

We have to keep in mind that deforestation is a dynamic process; also soy has a dynamic activity with cattle . We need to learn about it – but we will not use it in RTRS; it will help us to have a bigger picture (it is not different to other round tables).

Solidaridad: Risk is maybe larger in not being in!

We can say that it helps to move towards sustainability

Conclusion EB:

- The jurisdictional approach and the 3FI-project seem to offer potential for creating synergy with other schemes and stakeholder groups. Therefore, it is worthwhile to be at the table and participate. The EB will position itself further as the project progresses. The EB requests that the Secretariat carefully manages external communications on RTRS's participation in the project. At this point in time, **RTRS does not approve specific 3FI-project documents.**
- The approach will help to link with governments
- RTRS will carefully observe the impacts on deforestation implied by the 3FI-project, in view of RTRS's P&C's on deforestation definition
- Action: discuss next steps and communication agreement in the steering committee (call) **A3**

Multi-level/multi-platform

Discussion is open with a guide focusing mainly on RTRS-ProTerra MoU and Working Plan.

Open questions w.r.t. the memorandum of understanding:

- Is remarked that RTRS has stricter procedures but there is no differential market or civil society recognition
- Question on the ProTerra approach for sampling control approach. Opportunity with the WP to know more about it and compare with RTRS group approach.

WWF: We do not see it as equivalent, e.g. we still have doubts on the sampling principles of ProTerra; but there is somehow a control as it is segregated; Actions plan: are there funds? The idea is to have less as possible need for extra funds;

Agrifirm: Doesn't see advantage on the buying side for RTRS vs. PT

Solidaridad: There was no real demand; who ask risks sources model? No one....



We should stop stressing what the differences are and stress what we have in common! In the end they aim for the same thing
Now help to understand how they are doing it; let's work with them

APDC: The non-GM market is going down; ProTerra would like to move to GM.. – The argument is challenged by EB members, ProTerra as such won't move to GMs, maybe CertId will do if there are not good results in the cooperation with RTRS

AMaggi: The mixed sources doesn't achieve what we want
We should work with ProTerra : make 1 audit process and have a bigger volume!
The payment: in ProTerra the payment is on the certification;
This is an opportunity to develop RTRS (volume)
We should understand the process of the sampling! If this sampling process is good, we could bring it later-on to RTRS;
It's a different product – the cost of segregation is the largest cost;
W.r.t. the pilot: This year was not a good year for producers to add a extra criteria/we need at least 2 months to get producers on board;
RSG: RSG is pushing hard for this MoU;
It's about the communication – the biggest risks
They are not after the RTRS market –
Looking at that sampling process – how can we get the costs down?
RTRS has to do everything they can to achieve
We should have a proposal by RT10? If credible;

Unilever: Do they have a better efficiency?

Conclusion EB:

Note: The EB does not see at this moment the opportunity to create a mixed sources certification that exclusively combines RTRS and ProTerra certified produce. This does not preclude the development of mixed sources models for the future in case of signals of market demand.

RTRS will proceed with the project together with ProTerra to see if this can lower costs for producers who work with both schemes. At the same time we can learn from their way of auditing and sampling and later decide if this is something we want as RTRS or not.

PES (Payments for Environmental Services)

Subject is introduced with the guide that remarks two main issues: BVRio MoU and PES group output.

BVRio MoU: EB received the MoU (about cooperation in between RTRS-BVRio to trade extra-legal reserves of certified producers) and needs to decide on signing

Remarks and observations from EB and observers:

Shell: We should collaborate with Bonsucro

AMaggi: Task Force Brazil – no interest from companies to invest in this PES.

The legal frame to trade reserves is still not definitive and clear, it should start to be defined on the second semester of 2015 – this would be the time when BVRIO has more info available and when RTRS could sign with clearer rules.



Rabobank: Could the partnership be the same as with ProTerra? (mutual learning process), and include BonSucro. We do not see a concrete proposal so far, could be worked and then sign.

WWF: This is Brazil – couldn't we set up something similar for other countries (e.g. Paraguay)

Conclusion EB:

In view of the legal framework that impacts the reserve trade not being clear and waiting for further legislation in the second semester of 2015, consequences and the benefits of the MoU for (potential) RTRS members are not clear. Therefore, it is decided to postpone signing the MoU. The EB welcomes further exchange and collaboration with BVRio to arrive at joint solutions that add value to our members. The other part of PES discussion is postponed, Secretariat will inform first to Steering Committee **A4**

FUTURE STRATEGY discussion

The subject is introduced with a guide and presenting two documents: 1) 2020 forecasts (simulation of different variables to check reasonability of number's forecast. 2) Document on trend from demand side on going towards physical flows and how RTRS should develop according.

Remark on 2020 doc:

It's an exercise from the Secretariat to check what goals in terms of numbers are reasonable to forecast for RTRS future.

A 2020 market share of 8% means over 20 million tons of certified volume (RSPO holds 16% of oil market today).

Remarks on MB doc:

- We should take into account how to buy Mass Balance in the future; companies are more and more likely to buy Mass Balance;
- Example for the Dairy sector – from 2016, increase the amounts of MB with 20% every year
- Pork/Poultry: are also integrating in their sourcing requirements for Mass Balance;
- Consider to apply the system of Area Mass Balance (Cefetra);
- 80% is direct trade on certificates;

Strategy brainstorming:

Opportunities detected by EB (2014):

- Mc Donald's 100% responsible sourced soy by 2020
- Companies having soy in their agenda
- WWF Soy Report Card
- Retailers commitment and push (RSG)
- RTRS better positioned with international agents (GEF, 3Fi, FSP, UNGC)
- Market Development communications should emphasise "push for decision"
- CGF guidelines

Long term (+25 years) view/goals:

- Aim for mainstream, 50% adoption of RTRS or similar



- Going beyond certification: new models, enable environment protection more actively

Round of remarks:

Market Demand still stays a key! Balance Demand/Supply! (Chicken and egg game)

EU Market:

- Improve the story telling of RTRS meanings
- Linking parts (e.g.: EU producers with actual cooperatives)
- EU commission getting involved in Feed and Food (As it was with fuels)
- Good information how to react at hand (simple guides, Q&A, etc.)
- Work with the Traders engagement
- We are in a shrinking market – every has to cut costs
- This would mean – refocus on 2or 3 main points (Next EXERCISE of EB)
- Show public awareness – with the NGO’s (can’t they make public aware what we do)
- Bring the dialogue together between demand/supply
- Start regional issues – if you want to make it global, think beyond geography

GOAL: 10 million tons of certified responsible soy asap!

Main points – for 2015

It is proposed to EB members to mention 2/3 main points on where to focus efforts for 2015

<p>ASA Market Development strategy, work more on it Communication focus Realistic target: 10 Mio tonnes, ambitious but achievable Public awareness and Gov. engage Volumes, Transparency Working with the UN organisations; Asian Bank, etc</p>	<p>EU rep: Brand focus (food/retail) Shared credits Platform EU T. Force coordination</p>	<p>ACSOJA Focus on increase market development Facilitate the incorporate producers to the certification system/ make it easier Recognize producers services</p>
<p>RSG: Identify 10 MM Tonnes demand Identify 10 MM Tonnes supply Pre contract brand and a producer development</p>	<p>Unilever Where are we sourcing Soy – every meeting I go I will ask (also CGF), look for partnership opportunities & the efficiencies through scale this brings for all in the value chain Support to the Brazilian Task Force, keep exploring landscape approaches e.g. Jurisdictional</p>	<p>Syngenta I will tell a story of RTRS in my next meeting The story of Farmers until producers</p>
<p>Solidaridad Connect feed/retailers/brands and be sure they have the same</p>	<p>Los Grobo Exploit joint communication strategy with the NGO sector</p>	<p>Cornel Focus on Brand owners – also in Asia Don’t forget China</p>



<p>agenda The Consumer Goods Forum – they have to make clear their commitments Target the Traders;</p>	<p>China is growing /Kofko – exploit those mergers; Increase market development – balance and representative in EU and Brazil</p>	<p>Focus on all producing companies (more than Brazil – US, India, Argentina) Vision and communication – the 10 Billion people in 2050 – help build sustainable food (bring a message for the longer run)</p>
<p>WWF Propose a strategy EU regulations; market strategy, reductions, certification Market Developments – Italy/Spain, more French retailers; CGF Brazil & Argentina – link supply/demand Work more on CGF and RSG</p>	<p>APDC Brazilian Pork exporters – make them aware of the RTRS Public awareness with consumers/retailers – pay a better premium Commitment on the premium for farmers – Pre-Contract (Belinda</p>	<p>AMaggi Link supply & demand – 500 KT for Amaggi and RTRS Awareness creating at the governments How can this be commercial tool Go to retailers – we have now a company in the “Consumers Goods Forum” that would like to buy responsible soy - Bridge non-cert and certified Retailers and Co’s need a strong message Opportunity for smaller traders</p>
<p>Shell Set-up meetings Argentina (BioDiesel suppliers- - non are RTRS members Brazil – BonSucro certified producers – make them also RTRS (they work closely with RTRS)</p>	<p>EEI We focus to much on Amazon and not enough to the rest of the - promote in the entire country Create a “show” case to promote RTRS</p>	<p>Rabobank Engage with Banks (20 target) and financial institutions – link to RTRS and CGF Research on international trade volumes – push for making it available “Green bonds” – a Rabo product – company get it if they generate positive impact/ than they can use it for other “responsible” initiatives</p>

Other remarks:

Climate Bonds – there is a new NGO is setting this up for Bio Energy

Juliana: a producer filled in the Rabobank client assessment questionnaire and got a reduction on the loan rate for having lower environmental and social risks, in which being RTRS-certified was seen one of the components that are a proxy for lower risks.!

Conclusions EB:

Actions A5:



- Make a summary plan
- Discuss in a physical meeting in February
- Preferably Brazil and to be combined with the field trips Brazil

Mapping Argentina

Secretariat reports that Moore Foundation will finance the project and it should start in 2015 and take one year, starting in February 2015 and ending at March 2016. First meeting of stakeholders will be also tested as platform for a Working Group. The project will also integrate the maps of the other countries (so far Brazil and Paraguay) in an IT platform and potentially linked to WRI

Mapping Paraguay

The project is presented (Secretariat), and questions and doubts are answered about the main outputs.

One of the points of discussion in Paraguay is about Oriental situation, where there is a high percentage of production over area deforested after 2004 (against law).

Conclusions EB:

The EB thanks the Secretary for the progress and results of the mapping project. The EB approves the current maps in the light of them having been accepted by all stakeholders involved in the Paraguay mapping project. The approval is conditional on the map that shows deforestation after 2009 in the oriental part will be added to the maps (action A7). The EB requests the development of corresponding guidelines for the use and implementation of these maps.(A6) :

Voting for the new president

Olaf – president

Vice president - Cornel

Action needed, communication (REPEATED on A6)

Steering committee

- NGO – Sandra
- Producers – Juliana
- Industry - Cornel

Conclusion EB:

The EB thanks its members for having stepped forward to assume their new roles. And request that efforts are made to attract one producer and one NGO representative to complete the EB in next GA (Action A8).

Day 2: October 29th

Mapping Brazil

Subject is introduced with a guide and a presentation done by AMaggi as Task Force Brazil representative.

Remarks after presentation:

- Suggestion to explore another communication of the maps;



- It is suggested to use the map only as guide for Certification Bodies– tool for expansion (The maps preferable should be used by the grower and the Certification Bodies to decide about potential expansion.
- It is suggested to take out from the criteria the map mentioning

To order discussion three steps/questions are suggested:

Step 1: does the map reflect the standard?

Step 2: the HCV guide and communication

Step 3: discussion the 4.4 (deforestation allowed after 2009 and wording)

New round of remarks:

Unilever: What did we learn about this process? Recognition that RTRS has really made a major public contribution – RTRS can really help with clarifying the halting deforestation challenge in Brasil. We need to communicate this effectively. If we define a better 4.4 – will more producers come?

APDC: Maps are good for the “macro-scale”, need to be worked at the “micro-scale” level.

Brazilian government (MMA) is working on a new mapping of the Cerrado Daniel is sending our maps to the governments. Government engagement.

I can't see how RTRS can take a different position compared to the status of the government

We need to understand that the 4.4 is a moving discussion (dynamic)

The map is the tool – it will not stop expansion

Let's respect what the governments create – collaboration WWF with the governments

AMaggi: Until we don't have it – we work with the 4.4; if the state has it – then we use it

Rabobank: By going through this process, we need to show we care about the practical constraints on the flour. On the macro level we need to make the things as clear as possible; it's a good point in having the maps

AMaggi: The map should very simple for the producers; If you deforest before 2009 – then it's OK; if it's after 2009 – check decision tree (based on the map) and to build a simple guide

- APDC: the maps should be redefined once the government comes up;
- If maps of the government become the law – then they become part of the legal criteria of RTRS (Secretariat)
- APDC: we should sell it as a guide for growers expansion program and selling

Conclusions EB:

The EB thanks the Secretariat and the Task Force Brazil for their efforts in developing the maps and creating stakeholder agreements from all constituencies involved. The EB approves the Brazilian maps, and requests that the Secretariat develops an implementation and communication plan including specific guidance on what the objectives of the maps are, what information they are based on, and on the valid interpretation and use. (Action **A6 bis**)



- **HCVA Assessment**

Question to the board: Do we approve the usage of the full guide of HCVA (see annex 10.3)

WWF:

- In RSPO the assessment result needs to be on the web-site for comments (30 days) – some procedure is needed for RTRS as well. is this defined in the full guide? If not a procedure should be developed **A9**
- The simple guide could be done by the producers
- APDC: for small holder – be released of it ? This is part of the implementation

Rabobank:

- Suggest to accept the guide
- And then analyse the consequences/impact/costs for the different stakeholders of HCVA assessments

Conclusion EB:

The EB approves the HCV Guide, thanking the Secretariat and Task Force Brazil for their efforts in creating it. It requests the Executive Director to develop an implementation proposal that addresses impacts and costs for different stakeholders and impact on new planting procedures. It also agrees on a ('new plantings') procedure to publish assessments on the website for comments (Action A9, A10)

New 4.4. Approach (responsible expansion)

Discussion introduced with a guide and presentation.

Inform and decide on recommendation to change the map use and wording on P&C;
Question is: can the secretary work on a change of the 4.4 to be ready for the next GA?

Remarks

Solidaridad: Treat it together with the total review of the P&C

It should be one of the core elements for the next GA

Is a good moment to discuss with the members and learn about it

WWF: I don't think that it is easy

We have to go into a large process – if we separate it from the P&C it will be an extra cost;

Rabobank: How would a good progress look like?

RSG: What do people expect – can we find a process that makes us going from now until may?

Be careful with the management of the expectations on this review!

We need to mandate a group from Brazil

We will not been able to review the whole P&C before may next year

I would strongly recommend to review!

AMaggi: If we change it can be a step to bring other organizations to RTRS discussion again.

We can get more partners in RTRS in the future

People expect this for the GA



If we don't do it, they will start grow without certifications
We need at least a signal on the 4.4 (wording) at the GA !!

ACSOJA: Could be possible an Exceptions article?

Rabobank: Can we disconnect the review process from the review of the P&C ?
Then, we can at least explain – and it can be an input for the P&C -
The proposal is to create the clarity!

RSG: The aim should be : Have a resolution for the GA in May 2015 !
That we can we use than as input to the kick-off of the P&C review –
Process for the whole P&C review – and we make a resolution for the 4.4 for the GA

WWF: to simplify the wording of 4.4. is a good thing, but it cannot be that the content changes (such as changing cut-off date or lowering the bar on 'no deforestation').
This was agreed by other board members.

Conclusion EB:

The EB requests the Executive Director to discuss the review and update of criteria 4.4 with the Task Force Brazil, the outcome of which aims to result in a proposal on how to approach the review and update of criteria 4.4 by the multi-stakeholder process, as an specific input to the overall P&C review process to be started in 2015. **A11**

The SC will come with a proposal to see if something can be pre-discussed/presented/similar at GA (as informative/constructive but not decisive).

Task Force Argentina

Subject introduced with a guide, remark that a first Argentina meeting is planned for Nov 13th

Remarks: should start rather as a workgroup and not directly as a Task Force
Discussion in Argentina: a lot more awareness of "sustainability discussion" – this is really an on-going mentality change

Rabobank: Would be useful to invite Rabobank

WWF: Not use the acronym TFA (Tropical Forest Alliance)

Conclusion EB: The EB has heard the progress report on Task Force Argentina, and welcomes the Secretariat to further develop the Task Force.

Task Force Brazil

Subject is introduced with a presentation done by AMaggi representing the TFB

Strategic plan lines designed by TFB:

How can we guarantee demand?

How can we have producers coming on board?

Brazil can deliver a bigger volume – in a fast way with big properties – but do not want to do only this –

We have to manage the balance between demand/supply

Works close with EU Task Force and balance – to not have the problem that RTRS is for big farmers;

We want to work with all the areas in Brazil (South Brazil so far out of the picture)



Field trips – on objective could be to show difference in the certification process (1st year – after 3 years) / what are the difficulties from region to region;
We feel we have a strong commitment to make RTRS really successful – we have to make ourselves more exposed;
Role of the representatives of Brazil – there should be somebody understanding the growers
We need to have a positive message working in collaboration

WWF: What resources needed? Answer: is still under discussion – now it's more like a discussion about the roles;
More Non-GM discussed? Not discussed at TF Brazil (difficult to increase RTRS after ProTerra MoU)

APDC: Ask for funding to the Brazilian government

Task Force India

Subject introduced with a short guide and reference to the Soy Platform newsletter.

Remarks: RTRS needs to engage with the Platform **A12**
Secretariat will be travelling to India to explore new potential action fields
Coordinate TFI with other TF, mainly EU

Conclusion EB: The EB has heard the progress report on Task Force India, and welcomes the activities and further progress of the TF.

Task Force Europe

Subject introduced with short guide and Agenda ppt.
The next day activities are explained (see TFE minutes and ppts)

Conclusion EB: the EB has heard the progress report of the Task Force Europe, and welcomes further development of the activities. The EB requests the Executive Director to clearly mention the successes of the TF Europe (new members, new credit purchases) in RTRS external communications, especially to the Brazilian market.

RT10

Subject is introduced
3 proposals for logistics and communications support have been received
Decision to be taken:
What is the aim?
Do we follow the classical model or different strategy?
Remarks
Rabo Bank: Working in a steering committee **A13**
Working groups to involve all Stakeholders
Content needs to attract people
What do we want to learn from it?
What would the EU want to learn?
What producers want to learn?
The content part is the main issue!
What do we want to present to the members

**Suggestions:**

Training sessions on the P&C?
Sessions on sales and certifications;
Mini-courses...(education)
Organize the dinners
What we have worked on?
What have we achieved, etc. – messaging
Bringing in policy makers
RTRS solution for the Soy Moratorium (not covered any more for Brand Risks)
Soy Moratorium – continuity? RTRS as new solution?
Consult the regional tasks forces
Identify a range of stakeholders
Draft for next call!

Volunteers: Gert, Sandra, Lieven

Conclusion EB:

The EB decides to install a working group to further develop content ideas for RT10. The steering committee members of the EB and the TF leaders are part of the working group. The Executive Director is requested to align the working group with working groups on communications and logistics.

Action step (part of **A13**);

P&C standard revision

The EB needs to decide about the procedure presented (accepted by ISEAL)

Conclusion EB:

The EB approves the procedure. Secretariat will work to implement asap **A14**

Communication Agency presentation

Carla Kivits from S&P makes a presentation about their work so far and future steps

Remarks:

Suggested to send the newsflashes also out of Europe **A15**

We ask members to write blogs on RTRS – action **A16** (The Secretariat will start the first one AM)

Questions to S&P

How do you manage the conflict of interest?

Do you have a “code of conduct”?

- S&P explains that policy about integrity is on top of the list of company values (eg Albert Hein and Plus)

Education the consumers? - Is out of scope for the moment

Social media: is it linked with Facebook? - LinkedIn, Youtube, Twitter. Is managed through the secretariat

Do you have KPI's? how can we monitor the progress? - S&P didn't done a baseline analysis;

But is done through the news monitoring;

Have you seen negative news reaction?

This is more in the margin; The main issues are more GM/NonGM; etc. Strategy is “keep telling your own story”

Need for more information – monthly credits updates **A17**



Conclusion EB:

We should discuss the workflow – improve it; A17
Has to be picked-up with the steering committee A17
There should be a link with the communication strategy and communications units of (board) members such as WWF/Solidaridad/Rabobank/Unilever;; A18
Volunteer from the EB – to connect better between S&P and the network A18

Conclusion EB:

1/ Short term: Develop procedures (A17 bis)
2/ Mid-long: Need more involvement of the board/members in the communication strategy; this will need more time. We should make it happen!! (A18 bis)

Chain of Custody facilitation

Subject is introduced with guide and reference to doc (pre-certified status of facilities allowing flows before final audit)

Remarks:

AMaggi: Why not certify central and not the individual location
As there is no physical check, avoid the location audit and use the ERP system of the company;
WWF: Check if in RSPO, there was a related issue
APDC: Shouldn't it be by country?

Conclusion EB: EB approves the modifications.

Abu Dhabi Declaration

The EB needs to decide about signing and joining the initiative (about standardization and recognition of good agricultural practices among standards) or not.

WWF: Not clear, what would be expected?

Conclusion: EB decides not to join now and monitors progress of the Abu Dhabi Declaration initiative.

Pesticides RTRS

The Secretariat informs that the Group is not active now.
Some potential lines of actions are presented: Biological control (FAPCEN) and support to local laws to improve containers recycling by companies (ACSOJA).
WWF: New approaches should fit into the P&C review

Conclusion EB: The Pesticides working group is dissolved as per this decision, thanking those who have contributed to its activities and results.. The executive director is requested to include pesticide issues in the P&C review process (Action 14 bis)

CLOSING OF MEETING

The meeting was closed at 6 pm, thanking the executive director, the Secretariat and the EB members for their inputs and participation, and thanking Unilever for their kind hosting of the meeting.



Activities list

Activity	Description	Responsible
A1	Multicrop: check is there an interest from producers?	Unilever/Secretariat
A2	Multi crop: delivers a plan and budget and compares it to other approaches (alliances?)	Secretariat
A3	3Fi: discuss in the steering committee an approach (call)	Steering Committee
A4	PES WG output: Secretariat will inform first to Steering Committee	Secretariat
A5	Future strategy: Make a summary plan, Discuss in a physical meeting in February, Brazil? – And combine with the field trips Brazil?	Secretariat/ President/ SC
A6	MAPS: work on guidelines for use and interpretation	Secretariat
A7	Paraguay map: deforestation after 2009 map is lacking for the oriental part	Secretariat
A8	Looby to attract one producer & one NGO to complete the EB in next GA A8	EB members/ Sec
A9	HCVA: In RSPO the assessment result needs to be on the web-site for comments (15 days) – is this in the full guide?	Secretariat
A10	Analyse the consequences/impact/costs for the different stakeholders of HCVA assesments	Secretariat
A11	start the clarifications communication on how to use the with the current tools and include 4.4 in the full P&C review	Secretariat
A12	TF India: RTRS needs to engage with the Platform; travelling to India to explore new potential action fields; Coordinate TFI with other TF, mainly EU	Secretariat
A13	RT10: Working in a steering committee content, message, etc.	Steering Committee
A14	P&C review: Secretariat will work to implement asap (including 4.4 and pesticides)	Secretariat
A15	Comms.: Suggested to send the newsflashes also out of Europe	Secr/S&P
A16	Comms: We ask members to write blogs on RTRS	EB members
A17	S&P/Sec coordination: Need for more information – monthly credits updates; discuss the workflow – improve it; picked-up with the steering committee;	Sec/S&P
A18	Comms Strategy: link with the communication strategy and WWF/Solidaridat communications units; Volunteer from the EB – to connect better between S&P and the network; Need more involvement of the board/members in the communication strategy; this will need more time	EB/S&P