



Amsterdam Declarations Partnership

Towards deforestation-free
sustainable commodities

“Enhanced European Cooperation on Soya”

Summary findings of the European National Soya Initiatives (ENSI) on 29th January 2020

The aim of the AD Partnership is deforestation-free, sustainable commodities. The ENSI meetings are organised to facilitate cooperation between national initiatives. The current document provides a very concise overview of the meeting with views shared by participants. The document does not provide a comprehensive overview of the discussions.

1. Cooperation on monitoring and reporting

1.1 Key terminology

Participants noted that regarding soya production the focus is on becoming conversion-free rather than deforestation-free.

Each European Soya Initiative has a different starting point and country context and may define its commitment differently. Coherence in terminology is important to enhance mutual understanding, work towards a level playing field and avoid misinterpretation. In 2019, ENSI participants agreed to the terminology provided by the Accountability Framework Initiative¹, which is similar to key terminology used by the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Food & Agriculture Organisation. The national initiatives could work together to operationalize the AFI further.

1.2 Collaboration on monitoring and reporting

The main purpose of enhanced collaboration is to show our progress towards sustainable and conversion-free soya on a European level in addition to the national level.

The general information need could include:

1. Volume extra-European important soya bean + meal (source EUROSTAT)
2. Volume extra-European import of embedded soya (source?)
3. Volume embedded soya exported per country, use per sector (source?)
4. Volume imported soya FEFAC SSG compliant, legal is minimum (source FEFAC)
5. Volume imported conversion-free, sustainable soya (which standards? see for example IUCN report 2018)
6. Volume imported soya with deforestation-risk exposure (definition?, source FEFAC, FEDIOL)

Lessons learnt were shared by IDH (Nienke Sleurink) on the European Soy Monitoring Report:

- Definitions need to be clear = Accountability Framework Initiative

¹ <https://accountability-framework.org/>



- Data is not readily available or incomplete and there is a reluctance to share data
- The methodology and underlying assumptions need improvement
- There needs to be an engagement process (buy-in) with stakeholders to provide information

Currently, a new monitoring report is being prepared and participants expressed a keen interest to be involved and consulted. The report is expected end March 2020 and it does include a stakeholder consultation. Participants expressed an interest to learn more about the used methodology and assumptions. Introducing a 'reliability scale' was suggested. A distinction between the direct import of soybean & meal versus embedded soya needs to be made. Because Europe imports from many countries with major differences regarding deforestation and conversion, and therefore the country of origin needs to be mentioned.

Participants agreed that enhanced collaboration on data collection and sharing is important to enhance monitoring and reporting. Overall, it is a learning process for all involved and in order to enhance ownership, stakeholders should be involved in the process. There are still quite a few questions regarding the interpretation and explanation of figures and assumptions. If these are better understood there probably also a better common understanding. The conversion figures towards embedded soya differ per country and need careful explanation.

IDH indicated they would be willing to support an annual European level monitoring report the coming years. This would preferably be embedded in a stakeholder process as discussed.

2. Cooperation and synergy to enhance impact

The ADP Support Unit (Peter de Koning) provided a presentation on the linkages between deforestation figures in municipalities in Brazil and export to the ADP countries (see annex for the overview tables). Firstly, the intention is to improve our soy footprint by improving local production, not by moving elsewhere. Nor to move from municipalities that are currently doing well by moving to the ones mentioned and thereby creating a perverse incentive. Secondly, there is an information bias because more information is available for BRA than for ARG and PAR (the Gran Chaco).

The municipalities with the highest deforestation in 2018 have often limited soy areas and deforestation is likely associated with other drivers. 15 municipalities can be identified that are responsible for 80% of the total soy-related deforestation and export to ADP countries. Nine of these municipalities are also the focus of the Soft Commodities Forum (ADM, Bunge, Cargill, COFCO, Glencore, LDC) reporting. The overlap suggests that enhanced cooperation and focus to facilitate sustainability commitments in those municipalities might enhance the impact of our work.

It is assumed that closer linkages between supply chain initiatives in European countries as implemented by ENSI and support to jurisdictional sustainability in the above-mentioned municipalities would reduce soy-related and overall deforestation in those jurisdictions. Potential actions could include:

1. Diplomatic dialogue with jurisdictional governments to facilitate deforestation-free commitments;
2. Buy conversion-free soy / credits from target jurisdictions;
3. Support the "Funding for Soy Farmers Initiative";



4. Direct additional support to committed jurisdictions and initiatives;
5. Report from top-15 jurisdictions to assess 'impact' and show how sustainable demand reduces deforestation (sources: Trase.earth, GTC, SCF, ...)

Participants found the overview very interesting and would like to take this forward. Trader representatives of the SCF will come back to ADP Support Unit with a response after internal consultation and with WBCSD.

In addition to the current overview more information might be needed on other drivers of deforestation to put soy-related deforestation into perspective.

Daniel Nepstad from Earth Innovation Institute presented the Tropical Forest Champions initiative (www.forestchampions.org). The initiative is designed to foster and support partnerships between aspiring tropical forest jurisdictions (their governments, farm sectors, communities) and governments, companies, donors, investors to slow the loss and speed the recovery of tropical forests. Born in the Governors' Climate and Forests Task Force, it is designed to make these critical partnerships safe and easy for both governments and private sector actors, ultimately supporting jurisdictions to become successful in their pursuit of forest-friendly development as they become better places to do business. The aim is to: (1) tell the world what we are doing; (2) facilitate carbon finance and technical assistance; (3) create a safe haven for companies from campaigns. Currently, there are 10 states involved. They have to sign a commitment and subsequently have 2 years to develop a plan and MRV-framework. The carbon-neutrality and offsetting raised many questions. The systems are rooted in the UNFCCC which has already determined reference levels, developed standards and LCAs to determine the carbon footprint. It should be noted there is a politically sensitive discussion on whether carbon credits from the current UNFCCC framework can still be sold post 2021 when the Paris Agreement comes into force (new legal framework).

The Governors' Climate and Forests (GCF) Taskforce also developed a webpage related to impact, which includes soy and forest protection information.²

3. Structure and process to enhance cooperation

Ariane Louwage presented the Collaborative Soya Initiative, which aims to facilitate the transition towards 100% conversion-free sustainable soy and market uptake by enhancing collaboration between soy initiatives globally. CSI has been established as an independent, credible, transparent and inclusive collaborative framework with a 1p manager. Working groups have been formed and will organise webinars (19 Feb, WP Engage; 3 March, WP Make it Practical).

Further Information: ariane@thegreenconnection.be

EFECA (UK) presented the ENSI conveners' statement to align key principles and approaches, enhance collaboration and provide a common market signal. The statement will be presented on the ADP website soon.

² <http://gcfimpact.org/products?product=41>



Lessons can be learned from the European Sustainable Palm Oil initiatives (ESPO). This initiative was launched end 2015 together with the ADP and also rooted in national initiatives whereby each country had its own ambitions, KPIs and implementation challenges. A lean (1p) secretariat was formed and positioned at Dutch MVO Alliance Oils & Fats to support implementation. Financial support was provided by IDH. The secretariat also helped to do outreach and inform other interested countries. National initiatives are mainly financed by membership fees.

In general, participants felt it was important to enhance their own performance and improve exchange between on-going European national initiatives. Any structure should be supportive to national implementation. Both the structure as well as the process need to be independent and neutral. Participants agreed that IDH together with EFECA will draft a Terms of Reference for a lean European level structure and process.

Deforestation per biome in Brazil

Source: Trase.earth

Year		2015		2016		2017		
Biome		Deforestation (ha/yr)	Soy-related	Deforestation (ha/yr)	Soy-related	Deforestation (ha/yr)	Soy-related	%
1	Cerrado	711.031	125.955	853.584	126.851	523.674	100.675	19%
2	Amazonia	183.756	7.269	256.435	9.951	287.405	8.250	3%
3	Pantanal	25.609	-	72.087	-	24.840	-	0%
4	Mata Atlantica	3.774	125	4.478	187	4.651	193	4%
	<i>Total</i>	<i>924.170</i>	<i>133.349</i>	<i>1.186.584</i>	<i>136.989</i>	<i>840.570</i>	<i>109.118</i>	<i>13%</i>

Municipalities with the HIGHEST deforestation rates

Source: Trase.earth

Row 1,2, 8 en 9: In the Amazonia biome. Deforestation is not soy-related.

The columns 'main destination' and 'main trader' do not suggest these are responsible but are meant to assess relevance.

	Municipalities	State	Surface area	Deforestation 2016 (ha/yr)	Deforestation 2017 (ha/yr)	Total soy area 2017 (ha)	Soy Production (mt)	Main destination	Main trader
1	Altamira	Para	159.533.000	41.437	22.703	2.000	6.000	China (26%) + Europe	Cargill (100%)
2	Porto Velho	Rondonia	34.091.000	30.881	35.043	9.650	30.880	Europe (64%)	Amaggi (60%)
3	Sao Desiderio	Bahia	15.116.000	19.954	12.297	394.041	1.395.693	China (55%)	ADM (31%)
4	Sebastiao Leal	Piauí	3.152.000	15.646	1.916	21.726	72.521	Europe (42%)	Proquicel (52%)
5	Novo Progresso	Para	38.162.000	14.242	6.137	17.000	56.100	Brazil (100%)	domestic
6	Baixa Grande do Ribeiro	Piauí	7.809.000	13.490	4.910	129.343	547.894	China (57%)	Bunge (22%)
7	Balsas	Maranhao	13.142.000	11.187	11.961	187.144	505.289	China (66%)	Amaggi (21%)
8	Candeias do Jamari	Rondonia	6.844.000	9.892	10.655	5.000	13.500	Europe (64%)	Amaggi (60%)
9	Machandinho D'Oeste	Rondonia	8.509.000	9.387	9.963	4.941	17.788	Europe (64%)	Amaggi (60%)
10	Caceres	Mato Grosso	24.577.000	9.321	12.624	6.085	21.906	Brazil (51%) + China	COFCO (49%)

Brazilian municipalities with the highest soy-related deforestation linked to export to ADP countries (plus Sweden).

Source: Trase.earth

Soy-related deforestation is 87,489 ha or 80% of the total deforestation (108,925 ha) in Cerrado and Amazonia biomes.

The columns 'main destination' and 'main trader' do not suggest these are responsible but are meant to assess relevance.

ADP- risk	Municipalities	State	Surface area (ha)	Soy area 2017 (ha)	Deforestation 2017 (ha/yr)	Main destination	Main trader
1	Sao Desiderio	Bahia	15.116.000	394.041	12.297	China (55%)	ADM (31%)
2	Balsas	Maranhão	13.142.000	187.144	11.961	China (66%)	Amaggi (21%)
3	Jaborandi	São Paulo	9.995.000	94.356	9.086	Brazil (94%)	Bunge (6%)
4	Santa Filomena	Piauí	5.285.000	57.860	7.513	China (84%)	Amaggi (73%)
5	Formosa do Rio Preto	Bahia	1.590.200	405.583	7.383	Brazil (38%) + Europe	Bunge (43%)
6	Barreiras	Bahia	7.538.000	184.532	6.072	China (56%)	Cargill (67%)
7	Niquelandia	Goiás	9.843.000	40.000	5.152	Brazil (63%) + Europe	Granol (37%)
8	Baixa Grande do Ribeiro	Bahia	7.809.000	179.343	4.910	China (57%)	Bunge (22%)
9	Campos de Julio	Mato Grosso	6.802.000	195.780	4.906	Brazil (27%) + Europe	Amaggi (42%)
10	Feliz Natal	Mato Grosso	11.463.000	122.000	4.117	Brazil (50%)	Bunge (34%)
11	Peixe	Tocantins	529.100	49.997	3.978	Brazil (62%) + Europe	Granol (24%)
12	Gilbues	Piauí	3.495.000	32.060	2.969	Brazil (51%) + Europe	Gavilon (46%)
13	Riachao das Neves	Bahia	5.979.000	120.201	2.905	Brazil (54%) + Europe	Bunge (46%)
14	Corrente	Piauí	3.028.000	14.908	2.237	China (56%)	ADM (56%)
15	Currais	Piauí	3.157.000	43.291	1.983	Brazil (93%)	Oleoplan (7%)

In blue, municipalities that are also in the list of the Soft Commodities Forum reports.

