

TAB meeting

30 November 12pm to 2pm UK Time, Online

Attendance, TAB:

**Jean-Claude Autrey
Amy Jackson
Damien Sanfilippo
Manoel Regis Lima Verde Leal
Raoul Lionnet
Roshan Lal Tamak
Peter Allsopp**

Attendance, Bonsucro:

**Nicolas Viart
Anne Nistad
Rafael Seixas
Sonia Slavinski
Nahuel Tunon**

Not present:

Armando Ortega

1.1 Welcome and Brief Update

The quorum was reached, the TAB Chair opened the meeting. The TAB meeting minutes from the previous session, 18-19 September, were approved unanimously by those present. Updates were given on the agreed action points, summarised below

- 1.** It was requested that more data on the theory of change be presented to the TAB (but not published). Overall a yield comparison – historical ‘before’ and ‘after’ would be good to have.
 - a.** Will be included in the upcoming yearly Outcome Report
- 2.** In choosing partners for change, mills and farmers should be given priority. Request for participation in the consultation.
 - a.** Approval and partners will be sought for approval
- 3.** It was requested that Bonsucro should identify where the growers are more likely to be certified with the mill as collecting data on smallholders will be difficult.

4. It was recommended that Bonsucro carry out a pilot on smallholders which would highlight any difficulties to meet objectives: 1 in Latin America, 1 in India etc.
 - a. Tested the assumptions of the new Smallholder standard in India.
5. It was agreed that for the smallholder context Bonsucro should consider which core criteria could become non-core criteria, but that criteria should not be removed.
 - a. The question has been included in the standard development work
6. It was suggested to look at how other ISEAL members assess smallholders.
 - a. Will be raised during the development of the Smallholder standard
 - b. UTZ BCI, Fairtrade, SAN have all been assessed on how they classify smallholders.
7. It was suggested to make a theory of change on what the impact is with regards to traders which might result in a Mass Balance Chain of Custody standard revision.
 - a. Will put forward from April 2018 a proposition to review the ChoC Standard. (Evaluation and research will be conducted).
8. It was agreed that Bonsucro assess assurance risk parameters, the history of conformity and how well mills and operators have acted on corrective action plans in order to create risk assessment tools on audit frequency.
 - a. Will be covered by Anne.
9. It was suggested to review consistently repeated mill and operator non-conformities.
 - a. Anne is collecting the data when each audit report are received
10. Bonsucro to consult the membership on GM cane to be able to make informed statements. No further action at present.
 - a. No action required
11. Bonsucro should check where the 5kg Agrochemical comes from and look into more sophisticated approaches
 - a. The question has been postponed to FY2018/19 when background work will be carried out to start the review of the Bonsucro Production Standard
12. Supplementary irrigation should be removed from the calculator.
 - a. Acted
13. It was suggested to collect data on trash, mulch, compost applications and consider eventually removing planting rate related to yields from the Standard.
 - a. Will be looked at the 2019 review of the standard.

1.2 Standards Development Update

Bonsucro presented the changes to the standard revision procedure that were approved by the Board of Directors on the 3rd of November. The revision was carried out following changes in Bonsucro Governance and to maintain compliance with ISEAL Standard Setting Code. No questions were raised.

Following on, Bonsucro presented the developments on the Smallholder Bonsucro Standards and consultation was sought on the proposed indicators for each of the 7 principles. Below is the summary of the 7 principles and the questions raised.

Smallholder Definition: Proposed consultation question on smallholder definition that included ownership criteria as the defining principle. TAB members asked for more details about what constituted ownership of sugarcane farming activities, and raised that when it comes to ownership of land, it's a complex issue as it often happens that farmers do not own the land, yet they have "decision making" authority on the land, which is key. The question on land leasing – when farmers have relinquished all decision making power, but still technically own the land, raised the question on whether they should be eligible to apply the Smallholder standard. The Smallholder Steering Committee will be further consulted on this.

Further comments were given on the land lease model, specifically around who will be the "certified entity", the owner of the land or the manager of the land. The Standard seems to allude that the owner of the "certification" is the land owner, however SS clarified that this is not the intention of the definition, the owner should be the owner of the "cane" – i.e. the person with decision making authority on the land. However, this definition is also contentious as the ownership of cane can be split between farmer, mill and land owner. It was agreed to go back to the steering committee on this

Consultation question: Should land where the smallholder farmer is not the decision maker (i.e. leased to the mill) be eligible to receive Smallholder Standard certification?
Recommendation: If the farmer has no say at all, the smallholder standard will not be applicable. The farmer must have some control of the activities (even if less than 100%). TAB seems to agree with this possibility. But restate that farmer must own or lease the farm. The TAB recommended focusing on the decision makers as they are the one we target.

Point of clarification: The TAB asked whether 25ha considers the whole farm or only the sugarcane planted area. The answer is Sugarcane planted area. **Recommendation:** include this clarification in the proposed standard.

Summary of Changes Presented:

Principle 2:

Point of clarification: Difference between family labour and hired labour – local legislation, if existing, will have to be followed.

TAB asked if there is a difference between children and farm labour. Small family farm labour allows children over the age ratified in ILO C138 to work. In most cases, the requirement would be at least 14 years old to work on family farm. The type will be non-hazardous work (no chemical application, no harvesting, and no machinery). TAB asked to check if hazardous work is defined at country level by local legislation.

Principle 3 – removed indicator on GHG emissions.

Principle 4 –

Indicator 4.1.2 on no conversion of high conservation value area; the proposal is to move to the land of conversion was not within 5 years and no more 2008.

Environmental Impact Management Plan – streamline the number of topics covered. IPM, cane burning, soil, use of artificial agrochemicals and water. The EIMP should be done at group level. The TAB asked to include disease and weed management. It was asked whether the push for biocontrol by the task force was the right approach, as in some cases biocontrol doesn't work; biocontrol doesn't work for example for diseases or weeds and in rat control. The TAB also mentioned that the use of artificial fertilizers is also a problem and the standard should encourage its reduction.

Land conversion: the TAB mentioned that the risk of land conversion is real and smallholders don't have perception of the risk.

Ratio of extension officers – TAB asked whether the ratio should look at the area covered per smallholder. There is inclination to maintain a ratio per farmers as the focus is farmer access/knowledge transfer and improved decision making, not on total cane production.

Updated draft to be sent to TAB members as well as the survey questions and support to answer them as part of launching the pilot.

1.3 Integrating Farms in the Bonsucro Protocol

The different options around the Bonsucro Recognised Farm certification and how it should be integrated in the current certification system were presented: publish as a separate standard, add as an annex to the Certification Protocol or revise it completely. Bonsucro presented the preferred option of revising it and integrating auditing requirements in the Protocol.

There was also a question and debate around whether mills should be allowed to be certified on their own, as farms are. Some members were concerned by mills being able to be certified on their own, others identified it as an opportunity as farmers sell cane to several mills. The reasons for allowing this option were challenged. A member mentioned that by allowing farmers to be certified on their own this raised the potential necessity to also allow mills to be certified on their own. It was suggested to further study the mill alone option. A TAB member asked whether the scheme would allow a mill to be certified for 50% of its production. A TAB member asked if we should set a minimum volume of certified cane to be received / certified. Currently there is no minimum.

1.4 Monitoring and Evaluation Update

Bonsucro informed progress around Bonsucro's Theory of Change and Monitoring Framework, and invited the TAB to participate in consultations in December 2018.

A TAB member asked where the quantitative outcome data fit? We don't mean to dive into each story we could, but to use the quantitative data from our tools like connect to identify the stories to further investigate.

Another member asked what drives the whole process and who is asking for M&E. The first request is from ourselves to ensure our decisions and actions are delivering the expected outcomes and impact and that we learn and adapt from the data we collect. There is also a

demand from our stakeholders to understand our impact to ensure that their time and money invested in Bonsucro are being used effectively. Finally, Bonsucro complies with the ISEAL Impacts Code, which required the existence of a M&E system and explicit measures of success.

Members also raised question regarding the interest of stakeholders and more technical topics like M&E. Since the launch of the consultation there have already been 2 answers from interested parties and several members of the Members' Council have volunteered to participate in the upcoming focus group discussion on 12 December. It's a complex topic but we do get interest, particularly when the discussions turn to measurements of Bonsucro's success.

The TAB agreed with the suggested objectives for the upcoming focus group discussion on 12 December. The Secretariat then requested for volunteers from the TAB to participate in the focus group and to commit to reading and giving feedback around the Theory of Change and generic stories that explain Bonsucro's contribution to change in the industry.

The following members have volunteered: Jean Claude Autrey, Regis Leal, and Roshan Lal Tamak. The Secretariat will share further information with these members.

1.5 Action points

- The comments raised by the TAB, particularly around ownership of cane and control of farm activities, are to be included in the consultation notes of the Smallholder Standard process.
- The Secretariat is to gather further information and debate (in view to forming a recommendation) with regards to the possibility of offering mill-only certification (i.e. certifying only the mill, not including supplying farms) as well as to the possibility of requiring a minimum amount of cane/sugar production to be certified.
- The Secretariat is to share background material and logistic details around the MEAL consultation focus group planned for 12 December 2017 with those members of the TAB who have volunteered to take part.

1.6 Next meeting

The Secretariat will suggest dates for the next (teleconference) meeting of the TAB, likely to take place between March and April 2018, depending on the approval process for the Smallholder Standard and the dates of the Board and Members' Council meetings (to be defined).