



June Newsletter Dairy LCA Project

Dear all,

Find below the June newsletter. Many thanks to all who contributed to this newsletter. Please let me know if you have anything for future newsletters.

Best regards,

Brian

Meeting with BSI – Review of PAS2050

I recently met with a representative of the British Standards Institute regarding the review of the PAS2050. In terms of process there will be a Steering Group of experts that are selected by a Project Manager. As the process progresses the document will be sent to a wider Review Panel. When the draft is ready for public comment, it will be added to the BSI draft commenting site within their website. Though it is anticipated that the actual review will start in the next month or so, anyone can provide feedback on the PAS2050 now and the feedback will be considered in the revision process. There is a link in a box on the right side of the webpage '*comment on PAS2050*'.

I will be submitting a response from the 'dairy sector' based on our experiences over the past couple of years. Should you want me to consider any point in particular to highlight to the BSI Group, then please feel free to forward these to me with some background so that I can effectively formulate the document in the right context.

The web address is <http://shop.bsigroup.com/en/browse-by-sector/Energy--Utilities/PAS-2050/> or <http://feedback.bsigroup.com/>

Other relevant initiatives from British Standards include:

- PAS2060 – a guide to carbon neutrality
- BS8903 – Sustainable Procurement
- Recently started 14046 – A guide to Water Foot Printing

Carbon and Farming Conference

Approximately 100 people from across the UK Dairy Supply Chain (and one or two others from outside the UK shores) attended this conference which saw a range of speakers from farmers, researchers, retailers and government officials deliver presentations from their respective positions in the value chain. The morning session provided the background looking at context, policy and drivers. The afternoon session focused on measurement and monitoring for the UK situation. Measurement and monitoring is an area where the UK has much work to do, be it directly related to the National Inventories or the measurement of performance against the GHG reduction targets for agriculture established by the Government as reported in an earlier issue of this newsletter.

This conference clearly demonstrates to me how far the industry has come in its understanding of the situation and how it had clearly developed a knowledge base which it was applying positively in order to reduce emissions from the sector. One demonstrable point that was made several times during the day was the direct correlation between the economic/efficiency performance of the dairy farm and green house gas emissions. The better performing farms predominantly have a lower carbon footprint, a win win situation!



Andie Stephens of the Carbon Trust mentioned the UK sector specific guidelines that have been developed with Dairy UK and DairyCo. Though still under development, they are soon to be released. It is interesting how the UK marketplace seems to demand the Carbon Trust Certification of their carbon foot prints, hence the funding of this development by the sector.

As the Carbon Trust have been involved in the development of the IDF guidelines for the carbon foot printing of milk and dairy products, we are aware of some differences in the respective approaches. Having said that, the differences are becoming smaller and smaller as new knowledge becomes available through scientific developments. This is a rapidly developing area and I am sure that the IDF will continue to monitor the outcomes of science in this area and update their guidelines as necessary – the Standing Committee on Environment has certainly had discussions along these lines.

More on this once the UK guidelines are released.

PDV Project Netherlands – Towards a Tool for assessing Carbon Foot Prints of Animal Feedstuffs *Thanks to Machiel Blok and Theun Vellinga for their help with this piece.*

I mentioned in the May Newsletter that I would have further details regarding this initiative which is a project designed to develop the necessary models and information associated with estimating the carbon foot print of animal feedstuffs.

The Dutch Feed Industry who is guiding this initiative wanted a three phase approach:

1. An inventory of available knowledge.
2. Development, testing and distribution of an appropriate tool.
3. Maintenance and further development of the tool.

With Phase 1 now complete the conclusions and recommendations were developed to inform the development of Phase 2. These conclusions and recommendations are as follows:

1. Methodologically there are no great obstacles to develop a carbon footprint assessment tool for animal feed. However, four issues need to be discussed internationally to gain wider support. These four issues are the different approaches to land use and land use change, economic allocation, system boundaries and improvement options. Phase 2 needs to focus on resolving these issues.
2. Further study on the carbon footprint effects of feed additives is required. Data need to be collected on the production of enzymes, mineral additives and synthetic amino acids.
3. A lot of background data needs to come from crop growers and suppliers of feed materials; so, a great effort is needed to develop a robust and publicly available database. It should be developed in cooperation with suppliers of feed materials.
4. Calculation models and background data are needed to describe the conversion of feed into animal products, methane emissions from enteric fermentation, faeces and urine and nitrous oxide emissions in different animal housing systems. Descriptive models will be sufficient for the first version of the carbon footprint assessment tool. In later versions, more mechanistic model can be included.



5. Development of the tool in Phase 2 should involve several coordinated parallel activities on methodology and database development and the development of the carbon footprint assessment tool.

6. Methodology and database development should be done preferably by a consortium of international organizations to engender broad support for the approach.

I have attached a copy of this comprehensive report should you wish to delve deeper?

IDF Common methodology for LCA

Well, I think we are getting there now! At last I hear you say??

The last conference call of the Action Team working on this document made some key decisions regarding the technical approach of the Guidelines and now we are working on getting the structure and flow of these to a suitable state for wider review by our dairy stakeholders. It now looks like a very different document (positively) to the one we were working on a month ago!

It is intended to get these guidelines to the IDF in early July for wider review after the Action Team and Standing Committee on Environment has had one last chance to look for any major issues. Importantly at this stage we need our stakeholders to be comfortable with the technical aspects of the guidelines and provide any feedback on areas that are not clear or they are not happy with.

We have started developing the communications strategy to run alongside this document and this will encompass a variety of approaches to ensure we access and stimulate the required reaction across the spectrum of interested parties.

So be prepared, the document is coming soon for review!

Bonn Climate talks – ‘Important progress’! - *Thanks to Hayden Montgomery for assistance with this piece*

Meetings took place in Bonn between May 31 and June 9 and according to Yvo de Boer, UNFCCC Executive Secretary, a big step forward is now possible in Cancun (COP16) later this year. The Bonn meeting focused on the ‘fleshing out’ of the specifics of how a climate change regime can effectively work in practice. This meeting progressed work that was not finalized in Copenhagen 2009.

To access the full UNFCCC press release go to - http://unfccc.int/files/press/news_room/press_releases_and_advisories/application/pdf/20101106_pr_closing_june.pdf

In terms of agricultural implications of the Bonn meeting, no further advances were made on the current draft of the ‘agricultural’ wording in the AWG LCA negotiating text (and the associated launch of a work programme on agriculture). It is still hoped that agreement of this wording (see attached) will happen in Cancun at COP16. However, the SBSTA (Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice) met and debated the how best to advance the development of the scope and content of the agricultural work programme



ahead of COP16. It was agreed that it was not appropriate to advance this programme before the COP16 meeting when the decision on agriculture would be made.

Nutrient Density and Sustainability

The June conference call of this working group provided updates on recent meetings of both the IDF Standing Committee on Nutrition and Health and the Utrecht Group as mentioned in my last newsletter.

The Group agreed a two pronged approach whereby the science would be encouraged to continue, though in the interim, we would review our current state of knowledge and utilize this as a basis for individual organizations to develop their own communications campaigns/initiatives.

Cindy Schweitzer and I will firstly develop a project proposal for the group to consider before moving to identify suitably qualified organizations / individuals (funding permitting) to undertake this review which I anticipate will be made available to the global dairy sector as a resource when developing any domestic programmes.

RTRS – The open letter – lessons? *Thanks to Emeline Fellus for bringing this to our attention*

The attached letter is rejecting the intended launch of a 'label' by the Round Table of Responsible Soy. I know some of you who will be reading this newsletter will be aware of the letter with its numerous signatories, through your membership of this Group.

The purpose of highlighting this letter within this newsletter is not to further provide audience to the letter, but more use it as an example to learn from, should the dairy sector look to undertake similar initiatives in the future.

- Should we ever have a 'sustainably produced' label?
- If so, should they cover smaller, more specific areas that we know we can address?
- What areas must be covered in 'label development' to ensure that we do not have this type of challenge?
- Who do we have around the table – could be quite a big table?
- Are there wider issues, than those you are trying to address, in the area in which you are working?

Whether the issues that are raised are genuine, I cannot comment as I am not a member of the RTRS, though as an observation, many of the 'undersigned' are anti-GM Groups so potentially, regardless of what the RTRS does in terms of reducing deforestation linked to soy production, it will never be enough in the eyes of these groups whilst GM is still permitted – wider issues need to be considered.

Regardless of the credibility of the 'undersigned' and their specific interests, the simple matter here is that all the hard work of this group could potentially be undermined by a letter of this nature. We need to think, act and tread strategically when addressing sensitive issues such as these as an industry.



UNEP Report urges meat and dairy free diet.

UN urges global move to meat and dairy-free diet

Lesser consumption of animal products is necessary to save the world from the worst impacts of climate change, UN report says (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/jun/02/un-report-meat-free-diet>)

This was the title in the UK's Guardian newspapers on-line site based on the recently released report by the United Nations Environment Programme titled – **Assessing The Environmental Impacts of Consumption and Production, Priority Products and Materials.**

I will let you make your own conclusions, though the report does highlight our key challenge of feeding the growing world population with safe and nutritious foodstuffs sustainably.

I have attached a copy for your reference.

US Beef Life Cycle Assessment Working Group – June 2/3

This extremely positive meeting facilitated by World Wildlife Fund USA was an initial step towards developing a life cycle assessment of the US beef value chain. Delegates, both physical and virtual came from as far as Australia and Europe, though the vast majority of the 50 or so present were members of the US beef industry, from feed production right through to retail, though also included animal health companies, academia, check – off organizations and NGO's.

The workshop was an excellent combination of presentations, open and panel discussions and breakout groups to try and get a handle on how best to move the task forward. The presentations ranged from LCA activities undertaken in other countries such as Brazil and Australia, and there was even opportunity to share a little dairy experience with Ying Wang of DMI and Greg Thoma of the University of Arkansas. We were able to take the group through the current dairy work on Common methodology and the importance of effective collaboration in achieving the objectives of their project once these have been agreed on.

The discussions took us into the many areas of sustainability. The challenge that the Working Group has now is to try and refine this and possibly prioritise the 'needs' so as to develop a focused project that delivers at a high level as opposed to trying to deliver everything that was raised and either having to wait considerable time for the outputs or being disappointed with the outputs as they were trying to cover too much.

The Working Group now need to try and develop the discussion paper for the US beef LCA that will be presented and further refined at the forthcoming Global conference on Sustainable Beef, November 1-3, 2010 in Denver Colorado.

I have further details of the conference should you be interested in attending.



Green Paper - 1 page explanation for use by dairy organizations

Feedback from a range of stakeholders on the first draft of this material has now been received. The SAI Platform Dairy Working Group requested the development of a simple explanation of the Agenda for Action and Green Paper to share with colleagues within their own organizations to encourage them to provide 'sustainability' examples to the Green Paper website.

We are currently seeking quotations from printers to get final design work done and a small number printed, though the ultimate aim is to have this information on the SAI platform, Green Paper and other websites for use by the dairy sector. We plan to have this completed in July.

Global Research Alliance

The Global Research Alliance on Agricultural Greenhouse Gases has now launched their new website as a portal to communicate the work that they are doing. Though in its early stages, there is already plenty of information on the site to bring people up to speed. I have signed up to become a partner in this process and will provide regular reports to you via these newsletters, though I am sure that should you want to become a partner in your own right, you can do this via the site.

The web address is: <http://www.globalresearchalliance.org/>