

RLA IWG Land Use Change Task Group Meeting #2

Thursday, July 26, 2018

Agenda:

1. Introductions
2. Upcoming Meetings
3. RLRT Charter
4. Goals review
5. Land Use Change:
 - What aspects to we address?
 - Which impacts to focus on?
 - Which definitions and frameworks do we use?
 - Which groups to work with?
 - Which traceability systems will work?

Reviewing Goals from the Terms of Reference

LUC – What do we need to determine?

Do we address all aspects of LUC?

- Conversion of natural ecosystems
- Deforestation only
- Zero conversion, zero deforestation or zero “illegal” deforestation? – discuss at a later time.

GRSB: Globally, the GRSB does have a focus on forests (there is a task force), but don't want to brush over other land conversion issues. The USRSB focuses on conversion of grasslands (not forests). Going through this thinking process right now; retail sector has had a difficult time with this because of global sourcing. If only thinking about geography of the US, deforestation is not an issue. Considering putting in a metric for land conversion and then further drilling down on where deforestation is an issue, as well as grasslands. Dive into the issues, but keep the metrics at a slightly higher level that can hopefully cover all of those topics and be applicable in the sourcing country. Crossover with the GTPS for deforestation issues.

Brands: focus on deforestation is preferred; no need for additional scopes.

Proposed scope: Deforestation as core focus, recognize or recommend broader scopes.

- Need to get further input from other stakeholders

What impacts do we focus on?

- Deforestation prevention?
- Biodiversity impacts?
- Social Impacts?

Proposed scope(s):

- **Biome preservation** (biodiversity, climate impacts)
- **Social** – forced labour, land tenure, indigenous rights, etc.
 - Look at how this is being addressed by AFI (eg: Ministry of Labour in Brazil blacklist on forced labour).
 - Look at broader set of issues, but setting hard requirements on critical issues (such as forced labour and indigenous rights).

Brands: good to recognize social, depending on the geographic location of the deforestation issue and what social issues stand. It's an important consideration; would be a blind spot if we didn't recognize it.

Which definitions?

Definitions rely on baseline dates/maps; a larger percentage of players are automatically excluded. Opt-out system – controversial because it means that basically you forgive everything that happened before. Other lines of thought include pushing back the date based on some agreements from that time. Very complex overall.

- Need to think about how are we going to bring back those who have “opted-out”; there needs to be a backdoor where they can come back. Makes it very difficult to design this system.

Which frameworks to use? Targets, definitions, etc.

Anything companies are looking to report back on: SDGs, etc.? Anything we want to reference?

Drive Sustainability just published a report on top areas of risk; not taking direct action on leather yet, but are looking at it.

EMBRAPA

Research Institute from Brazil – a lot of research and exchange of ideas across Latin America, Australia, and US (with USDA). Carbon neutral cattle ranching in Brazil; going to be at GRSB conference.

Some leather stakeholders are exposed to the issues soy has (one step reserved) because the soy is used to feed the cattle that produce leather. RTRS in Brazil is already working with a zero-deforestation policy. (Francisco knows RTRS in Brazil)

Agree to use the AFI definitions, targets, and goals.

One of the complaints about the CFA are the lack of mechanisms for M&E.

Yes, leather is a by-product, but we have an opportunity to leverage the good work that is being done at the farm level. One of the major drivers for this work is the animal welfare issues. It's a matter of framing the work; although leather is not the primary driver, leather stakeholders are willing to collaborate on the issues surrounding the beef industry.

Comment: the question is that leather is certainly not the driver of cattle ranching issues or deforestation. Of course, everyone is concerned about the AW or deforestation issues; need to see the tanner as a recycling operation. Tanners have absolutely no say in the factors.

NWF – tanners play the same role as the soy crushers, but when the message/demands come down the line from the end users, the tanneries will be involved. Although they don't have a say in the meatpackers industry, but they will be involved.