

## **Bonsucro Technical Advisory Board**

### **Meeting Minutes**

#### **Public Version**

**28 May 2019 – 13:00-15:00 London Time, Online**

Attendance, TAB:

- **Jean-Claude Autrey, Chair**
- **Derric Pennington**
- **Armando Ortega**
- **Peter Allsopp**
- **Aurea Nardelli**

Excused, TAB:

- **Damien Sanfilippo**
- **Manoel Regis Lima Verde Leal**
- **Raoul Lionnet**
- **Roshan Lal Tamak**

Attendance, Bonsucro:

- **Nicolas Viart**
- **Celine Orthlieb**
- **Chen-Wei Chang**
- **Nahuel Tunon**

1. **General Update on Bonsucro & approval of minutes of meeting held in Bonsucro Global Week**

Minutes approved.

2. **Exemption request on the Certification Protocol regarding Indicator 1.1.7 of the Chain of Custody**

No conflict of interest was declared by the TAB members. The TAB discussed if the applicant had sufficient control measures in place to manage the subcontractors and the need to provide flexibility to operators in applying the Chain of Custody.

- **TAB approved the exemption request**

### **3. Conversion rates for Credit trading platform**

The TAB discussed the industry data and the Bonsucro data presented for the conversion rate. There was a comment on the need to be conservative in the conversion rates. The TAB commented that the Bonsucro and industry data are not completely different, except sugar to molasses.

- **The TAB has asked the Secretariat to review the conversion rates for:**
  - **Bagasse to electricity**
  - **Molasses to ethanol**
  - **Yield to Cane**

### **4. Certification suspension update / exemption procedure**

The TAB did not have comments regarding the suspension update.

The TAB discussed the exemption procedure and were supportive. TAB members confirmed that peer standards have the same system and it works to give flexibility and credibility to the process. There was a question on what happens when the exemption request is related to not applying a particular indicator. The Secretariat confirmed that if it is a core indicator it would automatically be categorised as a High-risk exemption and be sent to the TAB for decision. If it is a non-core it would be treated on a case by case basis.

- **TAB approved the exemption procedure.**

### **5. Applications to join the Technical Advisory Board**

Candidates and missing gaps in the board were discussed. The decision was centred on unique viewpoints or skills are needed in the TAB and how the candidates would add to these.

- **TAB decision to appoint Marianne Lips and Catharina Wesseling**
- **TAB asked the secretariat to remind the approved candidates of the Code of Conduct and Confidentiality procedures**

### **6. Standard revision pre-consultation**

The TAB discussed the Standard Revision consultation survey results and gave the following feedback as guidance to the working group.

**Social Indicators: The TAB instructed the WG to look more specifically at the top 3 choices for social priorities, particularly forced labour and living wage.**

On Forced Labour they provided additional instructions.

- It is already treated in the standard very clearly, difficult to add more specific indicators
- Improvements can be made in the guidance documents or be applied outside of the area of certification
- Importance of evaluating sources of forced labour (migration, fee payment, advance payments, specific country laws). These could be treated more rigorously



The TAB also discussed the phased implementation of indicators. The approach made them feel concerned regarding the credibility of the Bonsucro certification mark. TAB members commented that peer standards do use this approach for smallholders and for non-core indicators.

TAB decision:

- **No phased implementation to Core indicators**
- **If phased implementation is employed for non-core indicators, it must be time bound and clarity over which indicators are currently being met.**

The TAB discussed applying critical indicators to the whole supply area. It was suggested that some peer standards are doing this (FSC association policies for members) but they do it outside of the standard. It is a different set of requirements which needs specific skills. There were questions if the Bonsucro system was mature enough to handle these additional requirements.

**The TAB instructed the WG to investigate the application of the Bonsucro Standard outside of the unit of certification**

The TAB discussed incorporating improvement requirements into the Standard. There were discussions on the limit of these and if this was pragmatic to include in the standard or if it were better supported by a programme.

**No decision was reached.**

The TAB discussed risk-based implementation of the Standard. There were questions on how would risks be evaluated and who would ensure the risk assessments are done correctly.

TAB decision:

- **The WG should explore feasible ways to implement a risk-based system into the Standard**

The TAB discussed alignment with international standards. They **instruct the working group to look into alignment with the UNGP**

## **7. Selection of the Standard Revision Working Group**

The TAB agreed with Bonsucro's recommendations. It was found that it ensured a balance of interest between the sugar producing geographies and expertise related to the Standard Revision. The TAB also selected 3 additional candidates due to the additional experience and expertise they will bring to the WG.

- **The TAB recommended the Board of Directors approves the selection of the standard revision working group members.**

**END**