



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

SAFA Practitioners and Partners' Workshop FAO - Rome, Italy, 18-19 March 2013

Summary Report

Introduction

The Sustainability Assessment of Food and Agriculture systems (SAFA) Practitioners and Partners' Workshop was held in FAO, Rome, on 18 and 19 March 2013, in order to take stock of the SAFA pilot studies prior to finalizing the SAFA Guidelines (see Agenda in Appendix 1). The Workshop was attended by 48 experts, including 19 SAFA practitioners and 14 SAFA partners working on sustainability tools in UN organizations, non-governmental organizations and private companies, along with FAO staff (see List of Participants in Appendix 2).

The Workshop was opened by Alexander Mueller, Assistant Director-General, Natural Resources Management and Environment Department (NRD), who welcomed participants in the emerging community of SAFA practitioners. He mentioned that a shared vision of sustainability is lacking and that the development of sustainable development goals will need to be connected with realities on the ground, throughout the food chain. There are hundreds of sustainability tools serving different purposes and the key purpose of SAFA is to provide a framework for a fair playing field for all. SAFA aims to create a common understanding of the constituent elements of sustainability and this Workshop is crucial for gaining clarity on how to best reach this goal.

Lessons from the SAFA pilots

Sally Lee, FAO/NRD, described the FAO benchmarking process, whereby 10 sustainability schemes were compared to the test version of the SAFA Guidelines. Tools benchmarked included: People 4 Earth's SAMS; Forest Stewardship Council Principles and Criteria 1996; FLO-Cert Generic Fairtrade Standards 2011; Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil Principles and Criteria; EU Organic Regulations 889 and 834; IFOAM Basic Standards for Organic Production and Processing 2005; Business and Social Compliance Initiative; Sustainable Agriculture Initiative Platform draft checklist; Response-Inducing Sustainability Evaluation; and Committee on Sustainability Assessment. These tools were chosen because they were used by the pilots, and thus the pilots were able to draw on the benchmarking for the SAFA step related to compliance checking. However, the pilot studies revealed that a SAFA compliance based on benchmarking other tools was not effective, as it eliminates sub-themes and indicators that may be critical hotspots for sustainability, apart from creating a bias toward large operations with multiple certification schemes. Moreover, certification was found not to guarantee sustainability performance, due to differences in rigor of verification processes and non-compliances. However, adherence to sustainability schemes provides a good source of data, as well as sector-specific indicators and best practices.

Lessons from the SAFA pilots

Noémi Nemes, FAO/NRD, summarized the experiences, including opportunities and challenges encountered, from the 23 SAFA pilots undertaken in 19 different countries throughout the world (i.e. Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Nepal, New Zealand, Peru, Sao Tomé et Príncipe, Spain, Switzerland, Tanzania, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States of America) . These pilots included crops, livestock, forestry, fisheries, wild harvests, cotton, bioenergy, tobacco and peat moss commodities and value chains, in small, medium and large-size enterprises (see Description of SAFA pilots in Appendix 3).

Pilot studies concurred to the following strengths of SAFA: the framework was found quite comprehensive in terms of coverage of sustainability aspects, as reflected by the themes and sub-themes; the systemic approach that characterizes the tool was very much appreciated for effectively charting the ecological-social-economic resilience nexus; the tool was indeed useful for self-assessments; the polygon offered simple visualization of performance while enabling identification of hotspots; the width of the themes and sub-themes unveiled the limited coverage of sustainability issues of certified products.

Pilot studies also struggled with a number of SAFA limitations, such as: the added benefit of a SAFA assessment was unclear; the tool was complicated, often lacking adequate guidance for use by non experts; the language and unclear definitions were burdensome; boundary setting and relevance checking were too open to different interpretations; indicators posed major problems for measuring actual performance, in terms of their appropriateness to specific sub-sectors and their ultimate usage (i.e. depending on whether they aimed to internal improvements or external communication); the scoring system was too subjective to allow comparisons; the tool does not support continuous improvements. While most pilots proposed ways to resolve the problems encountered, the lack of a database for benchmarking location-specific practices remained a major gap. Proposals also included IT improvements to the SAFA tool, including more automation, questionnaires-based interfaces, and a “cheese-slice” representation of results at the sub-theme level.

Participants concurred that the SAFA Guidelines’ overarching objectives offered a unique framework for sustainability. However, the challenging indicators of the SAFA Excel tool could be developed and interpreted in different ways and thus, should be kept separate, in order to be customized according to different use purposes. The development of different types of indicators sets was the subject of working groups’ discussions (see below).

General feedback from participants

The Workshop participants expressed their views on many different aspects of SAFA, from suggestions for improvements to the series of sustainability themes, sub-themes and indicators, through requests for supporting information and guidance notes, to governance questions. While the SAFA Secretariat took note of many details to consider in the Guidelines’ revision, the following remained open questions: what is the future of the information that comes out of SAFA in terms of global learning? How is the question of full-cost accounting, which encompasses SAFA, going to be addressed

collectively? Can SAFA explore what policies affect given enterprises? How to achieve a balance between the flexibility required for educational self-assessments and the rigor needed for comparing suppliers' performance? Can SAFA be implemented without expert knowledge to assess and evaluate effective performance?

Participants shared a view put forward by Henrik Moller, New Zealand: in line with its comprehensive ambition, SAFA should be based on the "and" (rather than the "or") option of sustainability approaches in order to accommodate different agendas. As such, SAFA is multi-dimensional and multi-functional tool for a multitude of different users.

Topics discussed by working groups

The SAFA framework: linkages with other sustainability tools. Many tools, metrics and standards exist, covering different components of sustainability, and developed for different purposes and different users. As an umbrella framework, SAFA includes a compliance check that assumes optimal performance for the sub-theme covered. However, differences in approaches, scope and scoring means that coverage of a sub-theme does not necessarily equate to optimal sustainability performance. This working group considered options for integrating the results from existing sustainability tools and certifications schemes into SAFA, while maintaining the integrity of the SAFA assessment. Benchmarking sustainability tools, while not useful for equivalency, is useful in mapping best practices, thresholds and sector-specific indicators. The goal of a SAFA assessment is improved accuracy of analysis of sustainability for all users. The use of existing rules, norms and standards expedite assessment for users, while avoiding duplication by integrating existing data. SAFA is seen as a convener, or harmonizing agent of all sustainability tools. It is a tool that catalyzes improvements for sustainability, in a neutral and participatory mode, through FAO's leadership role in agriculture. There is a strong interest in aligning with a global reference framework, and collaborating to build trust in global supply chains.

Data collection: from subjectivity to accuracy of performance. The test version of the SAFA Tool gave flexibility for users to define their sources for data collection, recognizing the existing sustainability programmes and efforts as key resources. A few SAFA pilot studies used data generated from environmental and social Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) studies, while others used data collected in GRI reporting, the Field to Market analysis, and the results of many diverse certification inspections, including organic, FairTrade, RSPO and FSC. Pilots supplemented this existing data with site visits, interviews, and reviews of their internal documents and programmes. In addition, pilots noted that the CoolFarm Tool and the Exact Tool would be good options for data collection for indicators regarding GHG emissions in the future. Relying on best practices or estimations/proxies created variances and subjectivity of performance. The different approaches yielded different results, thus highlighting the need for establishing guidance for data collection. This working group identified the trade-offs in data quality and subjectivity and options for improving the accuracy of the performance assessment. SAFA implementation will need data collection guidelines and protocols to ensure accuracy of assessments. Also, the use of existing data requires coordination with existing meta-initiatives and tools (27 were identified), as well as the establishment of a common taxonomy.

Users' friendliness: applicability to smallholders. SAFA aims to be applicable to both large and small-scale enterprises. The pilot projects involving smallholders have identified many challenges that they uniquely face, including limited existing data, appropriateness of proposed indicators, lack of capacity to complete the assessment independently and difficulties working with the Excel sheet. This working group discussed these challenges and practical solutions in order to ensure SAFA's applicability to smallholders, among other stakeholders. Creating a fair playing field for all users means, among other things, ensuring an equal burden in time and investment for all users. The current SAFA version does not cover the rights and issues of smallholders and the scope of the indicators proposed does not apply to smallholders, besides requiring data that is difficult and costly to track. It was proposed that one sub-theme be added on "producers' rights" to reflect fair contracts and negotiation and that certain performance indicators be replaced with best practices indicators. Smallholders are not, *per se*, users of SAFA, but rather organizations of producers and governments. One incentive for smallholders' use of SAFA could be the compensation (e.g. through a PES scheme) of growers who adopt sustainable practices. Other uses of SAFA to create change include the implementation of regional planning, local procurement, or the development of legislation, based on SAFA. Because of concerns with SAFA reporting beyond internal use (e.g. fraud, subjectivity, non-comparability between results), it was recommended that a risk assessment be conducted on the potential positive and negative usage of SAFA.

Type of indicators: performance-based and best practice-based indicators. SAFA is a tool designed to assess the performance of enterprises. However, many of the proposed performance-based indicators focus on measurements and data that the pilot projects found too difficult to obtain (such as regional and sectoral targets). This working group discussed the pros and cons of using other creative solutions to make the indicator data easier to collect, while maintaining SAFA's performance-based approach. Indicators types considered include: performance-based; practice-based; improvement-based; policy and management-based. While performance was often difficult to determine (for instance measurable impact on an ecosystem), practice-based indicators require sector-specific expertise with unclear evidence on improvements, while policy documentation is easy to collect but may not represent accurately the impact of the entity. These different indicator types, however, weight differently on a sustainability scale and thus, SAFA. It was agreed that performance indicators, based on primary data, remain on the top of the indicators pyramid. Performance requires a baseline; therefore, continuous monitoring is needed in order to connect the perceived situation with indicators that capture impacts. Practice-based indicators vary from scientific to industry knowledge and there is no science agreement behind benchmarks; therefore, benchmarking best practices is a risky and challenging undertaking.

Tricky indicators: measurement and threshold challenges. For some indicators, data collection proved especially difficult, as well as measurements in relation to the "best achievable targets". In several cases, exact thresholds are region-specific and require expert knowledge. Especially in the environmental dimension (e.g. air, water, biodiversity), degradation drivers are often independent of the enterprise' management, extending to larger ecosystems and wider timelines. This working group analyzed the tricky SAFA sub-themes and recommended changes for indicators that are measurable for all users. It was proposed that: SAFA starts with mapping operations in order to identify hotspots; core/fundamental indicators be identified; best practice indicators be used when performance data was lacking; improvement indicators be added to encourage continuing progress; assessment kits be developed for quantifying environmental indicators, including reference to existing resources (e.g. SAI

Platform's guidelines for tool developers called Sustainability Performance Assessment (SPA) and tools such as the Fieldprint Calculator and Coolfarm); efficiency data be crossed with location (e.g. water use/water scarcity in a given location) and linked to the product (e.g. quantity of water per unit of produce); and guidance be given on boundary setting. For certain indicators, and environmental ones in particular, a tiered approach was recommended, as follows: minimum criteria (e.g. tree coverage); pledge to maintain (e.g. not cutting trees for a period of time); and finally, continuous improvement (e.g. increasing percentage of tree coverage).

Setting boundaries: spatial and temporal scope of value chains' assessments. Although SAFA includes a first step where the boundaries of the operation are to be defined, it lacks guidance notes for setting minimum requirements for these boundaries. Thus, capturing the negative externalities (e.g. feed, minerals and water sourcing) of an operation is not currently ensured. Also, assessing impacts on ecological processes cannot be punctual, as responses extends to periods well beyond the 1 or 5 years proposed for certain indicators. Bringing together data is further challenged in delimiting, describing and analyzing value chains, especially when large, diverse and changing numbers of suppliers are involved. This working group provided suggestions to the requirements on such boundary setting. Whether at the spatial, temporal or food chain level, mapping was recommended in order to understand what was being measured, where would the sphere of influence and direct control of the enterprise stop, what where the organizational and operational boundaries, and what interactions took place in the production network. It was suggested to find inspiration in efforts developing social and environmental Life Cycle Assessments. FAO was requested to provide information on typologies of value chains. It was suggested that improvement indicators, such as land use change, be linked to a timeline related to pristine ecological status (e.g. forests, grasslands, wetlands), thus extending back 20 years. Where a boundary is narrowed, the SAFA reporting needs to be transparent on what has been left-out from the assessment and why.

Indicators' selection: core indicators and customized additions. While the scope of the SAFA themes and sub-themes is comprehensive, pilot studies indicated that the proposed indicators failed to capture the full picture of sustainability. With a view to ensure a good level of sustainability while maintaining flexibility, many pilots have suggested establishing a core list of required indicators, along with customized additional indicators at different value chain/sector/scale level. This working group discussed the pros and cons of this idea and identified potential alternatives that would not overburden SAFA users. It was suggested that although an indicators' set will not be sufficient for each and every case, a single core/fundamental/baseline indicators' set is needed for a general level of reporting, as SAFA users do not necessarily have the knowledge to develop indicators themselves, without the risk of lowering the bar of the assessment. In addition, customized/adapted indicators could be developed, provided that precise guidelines are given to determine the "customization" limits.

Scoring system: minimizing subjectivity while maintaining flexibility. SAFA seeks to offer a fair playing field to assessing all types of enterprises across regions and sectors. While flexibility is required to account for the diversity of settings, subjectivity needs to be minimized in order to secure fairness of the SAFA outcomes. The SAFA scoring system is crucial to this end. However, the present system was generally criticized by most pilots. This working group considered improvements for the scoring method, including binary questions and those requiring quantitative ranking, weighting of indicators,

selection of thresholds and aggregation of scores. It was agreed that SAFA will result in 5 rather than 4 rating thresholds (i.e. color bands). SAFA will also introduce a more sensitive indicator weighting and clearer guidance on the scoring system.

Reflections on the way ahead for SAFA

While participants' views were divided on whether SAFA would provide the reference framework (i.e. the SAFA Guidelines) with or without an implementation tool (i.e. the SAFA Exel Tool), all participants agreed that the Guidelines and Tool are two products serving different purposes. The Guidelines offer guidance for monitoring outcomes and impacts at a general goal level of sustainability; they could also guide the post-2015 Sustainable Development Goal on food and agriculture. The SAFA Tool could be developed separately with and through practitioners in order to generate the exponential knowledge on challenges and supporting practices; to this end, an on-going development process would be required, with annual feedback from practitioners.

The SAFA Guidelines will be revised to reflect the following: a clearer rationale and definition of themes and sub-themes; provision for mapping of scope, boundaries and value-chain relationships; contextualization and hotspots analysis; explanation of hierarchy of indicators and rating rules; guidance notes (including graphs and decision-trees) on value chain typologies, validation of existing methodologies, sampling principles, best-practices benchmarking, thresholds and assessment; and provisions for feedback for constructive use of results in the SAFA report. The systemic coherence between the four sustainability pillars will continue to be the guiding thread. Each of the SAFA sub-themes will feature fundamental indicators relevant for all sectors with regards primary production, processing and marketing; the indicator hierarchy will be pyramidal, with, by decreasing importance: performance indicators; best practices indicators; and policy, planning or target indicators indicators.

Customized sector-specific additions (i.e. crops, livestock, forestry, and fisheries indicators) will be developed as part of the SAFA Tool, and improved as information is collected. ICT experts will be contacted to improve the Tool. The visualization of the sustainability reporting (e.g. polygon) will be improved with indication of data source accuracy. Ultimately, a family of SAFA tools could be envisaged, adapted to sub-sectors and regions.

Performance analysis like SAFA was found to play a role in building trust along the supply chain and strengthening relationships; thus, the use of SAFA for self-assessment and capacity-building were viewed as very important. Requests from pilot studies and the Workshop for future FAO services included the development of a best-practice global knowledge database providing threshold information, as well as users' guidance through e-learning.

SAFA governance

Nadia El-Hage Scialabba, FAO/NRD, informed the Workshop that the SAFA Secretariat intends to present SAFA to FAO member countries for endorsement. This process may be started with a side event to the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) in October 2013, or other governing body meetings. At this point in time, the SAFA Secretariat cannot express views on how this process would develop and for how long. Also, SAFA will be presented to the Sustainable Consumption and Production AgriFood Task Force in June 2013. In the meantime, SAFA will be taken forward under the umbrella of the United Nations Forum on Sustainability Standards (UNFSS), to which FAO participates.

Ulrich Hoffmann, UNCTAD, briefed the Workshop by video conference on the UNFSS. This joint International Trade Centre, FAO, UNCTAD, UNIDO and UNEP forum was to be launched on 21-22 March 2013. The value of the UNFSS is that it is the first Forum which systematically conducts analytical, empirical and capacity-building activities in this field and deals with generic and strategic problems of Voluntary Sustainability Standards (VSS) in a consistent way, without endorsing or legitimizing any specific VSS. The UNFSS is about addressing the sustainable development value of VSS by pooling resources; synchronizing efforts; and assuring policy coherence, coordination and collaboration among UN agencies. The UNFSS has an Advisory Panel of 25 stakeholders from government, NGOs and private sector. The priority issues for the next two years include the provision of: guidance for public and private decision-makers on contextualizing standards; information on costs of VSS; impact assessment; harmonization and equivalency among standards; and capacity-building assistance to Least Developed Countries. With regards impact assessment, SAFA's potential is prominent. A flagship UNFSS report on Internet lists all initiatives analyzing or supporting sustainability standards (see www.unfss.org).

The successful development of SAFA will depend on its community of practitioners and take-up by partners and users. Several partners in the room pointed to something in their own experience/resources that they could share: COSA has experience in expanding and contracting the number of its performance indicators before it found a balance applicable to most crops and countries (i.e. indicators numbers: 60 expanded to 300 then contracted to 135); People4Earth, SAI Platform and GSCP have practice-based indicators; the Sustainability Dashboard maintains a hub for learning trade-offs between indicators; ITC Standards Map openly features 750 sustainability criteria; TSC has done a comparative analysis of 100 assessment tools; ISEAL is working on credibility principles; FiBL has developed the SMART assessment tool that is compatible with SAFA, and many others.

Most partners have identified the use, or reference, of SAFA's framework as a means to harmonize language in their own tools, or with their partners; pilots and partners together were in agreement that this is a major added value of SAFA. Many additional opportunities for collaboration with SAFA have been identified by the partners, including: the use of information gathered by the FiBL tool in feedback to revise the SAFA guidelines and Excel tool; promotion of SAFA as a universal language through publishing SAFA in the ITC database and other databases; GSCP agreed to share their resources to work with SAFA to find overlaps and linkages in best practices and definitions of the SAFA framework; SAI Platform's offered to share its SPA guidelines on compiling and using farm and background data for sustainability assessment; and PROMACER committed to integrate the SAFA framework into their own system to cover gaps left by certification or existing programmes.

Concluding remarks

Nadia El-Hage Scialabba informed that the SAFA Guidelines will be revised by June 2013 and the Tool and its customized additions by end of 2013. During this period, drafts will be shared with the Workshop participants prior to their finalization. During the Guidelines revision process, the SAFA Secretariat will consider ways to capitalize on existing tools and resources; to this end, participants agreed to send to the Secretariat information related to their respective sustainability tool, for FAO to compile and circulate to all participants. Participants agreed to remain in contact as SAFA Partners, not only to feed into the SAFA process, but also in order to network and share resources.

Through a final “tour de table”, all participants expressed their satisfaction with the Workshop and with the direction taken by SAFA, though lots a work is still required to fine-tune numerous aspects. One participant comment summarizes the dominating feeling in the room: “if not SAFA, what else?” Another participant added that SAFA means “purity”, “cleanness” or “integrity” in Nepalese. Generally, all participants felt that they could benefit from SAFA setting overall guidelines, language and framework: what is measured, who, where in supply chain and how, need to have consistency and commonality. FAO mandate is to harmonize sustainability taxonomy and to create a best practices reference point.

APPENDIX 1: Agenda

DAY 1

9:00 - 9:30h

Opening

- Welcoming and introductory remarks (Nadia El-Hage Scialabba, FAO)
- Introduction of participants

9:30 - 10:30

Lessons from the SAFA pilots

- Sharing experience on benchmarking standards against SAFA (Sally Lee, FAO)
- Summary of feedback from SAFA pilots studies (Noemi Nemes, FAO)
- Discussion

11:00 - 12:00

Brainstorming

- SAFA potential and areas of improvement
- Choice of Working Group topics: priority issues, implications and potential solutions of main topics to be worked-out in working group mode

13:30 - 15:00

Working Groups (A)

- WG1: Queen Juliana Room (B324), Aimee Russillo (facilitator)
- WG2: Gabon Room (A Ground floor), Sally Lee (facilitator)
- WG 3: México Room (D211), Nadia El-Hage Scialabba (facilitator)
- WG4: Pakistan Room (A127), Noemi Nemes (facilitator)

16:00 - 17:30

Working Groups (B)

- WG1: Queen Juliana Room (B324), Aimee Russillo (facilitator)
- WG2: Gabon Room (A Ground floor), Sally Lee (facilitator)
- WG 3: México Room (D211), Nadia El-Hage Scialabba (facilitator)
- WG4: Pakistan Room (A127), Noemi Nemes (facilitator)

DAY 2

9:00 - 10:30

Working Groups' findings

- Facilitators present key issues, constraints and areas requiring attention
- Plenary discussions

11:00 - 12:30

SAFA governance

- FAO perspectives and possible scenarios (Nadia El-Hage Scialabba, FAO)
- United Nations Forum on Sustainability Standards (Ulrich Hoffmann, UNCTAD)
- Discussion on SAFA's governance

14:00 - 15:30

SAFA accessibility, flexibility, rigor and credibility

- Reflections on outcomes (Aimee Russillo)
- Discussion on trade-offs and balancing purpose of different SAFA uses
- Consensus on the way ahead for finalizing the SAFA Guidelines

16:00 - 17:00

Conclusions

- Met and failed expectations
- Next steps

APPENDIX 2: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

| Name | Institution/entity being assessed in the SAFA pilot study (institutional affiliation, if different from pilot) |
|--|--|
| <u>Practitioners</u> | |
| Baumgartner, Nina | Ittica Golfo di Follonica- Aquaculture, Italy (Istituto per la Certificazione Etica ed Ambientale - ICEA) |
| Calero Rodríguez, Juan Ghimire, Maheswar | Café Direct - UK/Ireland/Tanzania Society for Environment Conservation and Agriculture Research and Development, Nepal |
| González Tato, Rogelio | Asociación de Productores de Madera de Cerdido, Spain (Iniciativa en Gestión Forestal - INEVA) |
| Grenz, Jan Horsbrugh, Benedict | Micarna SA, Switzerland (Bern University of Applied Sciences) Expofrut, Argentina (UNIVeG Group) |
| Kirke, James British American Tobacco Kukeawkasem, Yotsawin | Bangladesh Co. Ltd, Brazil/Bangladesh (Leaf Sustainability) GIZ palmoil project, Thailand (consultant) |
| Mordhorst, Anne | ProNatur, Peru (Soil & More Foundation) |
| Moller, Henrik | Sustainable Winegrowing New Zealand (University of Otago) |
| Moreau, Tara | Sole Food Farms, Canada (consultant) |
| Pinell Prado, Pablo | CINMA Ltd, Bolivia |
| Reed, Janet | Cotton Incorporated, USA |
| Reid, John | Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, New Zealand |
| Revéret, Jean-Pierre | The Quebec Pork Producers Association, Canada (AGECO) |
| Saunders, Caroline | Organic Dairy, New Zealand (Lincoln University) |
| Scaraggi, Chiara | CECAB Cooperative Organic Cocoa, São Tomé and Príncipe (Istituto Certificazione Etica ed Ambientale - ICEA) |
| Schader, Christian | Allos, Germany (Research Institute of Organic Agriculture) |
| Short, Paul Francis | Canadian Sphagnum Peat Moss Association, Canada |
| Sligh, James Michael | Cotton smallholders, USA (Rural Advancement Foundation International - RAFI) |
| <u>Partners</u> | |
| Apetrei, Cristina | People 4 Earth (SAMS), The Netherlands |
| Beaudoin, Marie-Bénédicte | Global Social Compliance Programme (GSCP), France |
| Boone, Jacobus | The Sustainability Consortium (TSC), Netherlands |
| Fagan, John | Global ID Group, The Netherlands |
| Fellus, Emeline | Sustainable Agriculture Initiative (SAI) Platform, Netherlands |
| Giovannucci, Daniele | Committee on Sustainability Assessment (COSA), USA |
| Grandi, Cristina | International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements |
| Grunder, Julien | Permanent Representation to FAO, Switzerland |
| Komives, Kristin | The International Social and Environmental Accreditation and Labelling Alliance (ISEAL), Belgium |
| Lamolle, Mathieu | ITC/Trade for Sustainable Development Programme (T4SD) |
| Maccari, Michele | International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Italy |
| Pythoud, Francois | Federal Office of Agriculture, Switzerland |
| Ronchi, Cesare | Barilla Group, Italy |
| Van Leeuwem, Annelot | Solidaridad, The Netherlands |
| <u>FAO staff</u> | |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Hoffman, Irene | Animal Production and Health Division |
| Hoogeveen, Jippe | Land and Water Division |
| Poisot, Anne Sophie | Plant Production and Protection Division |
| Ottaviani, Daniela | Fisheries and Aquaculture Economics and Policy Division |
| Santacoloma Pilar | Rural Infrastructure and Agro-Industries Division |
| Tubiello, Francesco | Climate, Energy and Tenure Division |

SAFA Secretariat

Nadia El-Hage Scialabba (project leader) and Noemi Nemes (project coordinator)
Mathilde Iweins and Stephane Jost (staff)
Sally Lee and Aimee Russillo (consultants)

APPENDIX 3: DESCRIPTION OF SAFA PILOT STUDIES

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of participant Juan Manuel Calero Rodriguez | Name of institution represented Cafédirect |
| Name of pilot study Cafédirect's coffee supply chain | Location United Kingdom, Ireland, Mexico & Tanzania |
| Value chain Beverage crop - coffee | Main activity Cafédirect - marketing Bewley's - processing/manufacturing/packaging CESMACH – primary coffee production KCU – primary coffee production |
| Number of farms involved CESMACH – 360 farmers KCU – 60,000 farmers | Total area involved CESMACH – 1,203 hectares KCU – 120,000 hectares |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved 1 – Bewley's (Dublin, Ireland) | Number of family farmers or employees involved CESMACH – 360 farmers/KCU – 60,000 farmers |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any Fairtrade (FLO) and Soil Association Organic | Data used for the SAFA assessment Interviews with supply chain partners, internal interviews with key departments within Cafedirect, Cafedirect's mission & Gold Standard (including our KPI's) |
| Description of enterprise At Cafédirect, we know that the best coffee starts with the best growers. So we source exclusively from smallholder growers whose personal care and attention leads to an extra special taste. But small isn't always beautiful. Smallholder growers in remote communities are the least able to realise the benefits of their harvest, and most vulnerable to risks such as climate change. That's why we do things differently. We go direct, working in partnership with smallholder growers, to cut out the middleman, and give growers a greater share of the benefits. It's the perfect blend. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of participant Maheswar Ghimire | Name of institution represented Society for Environment Conservation & Agriculture Research and Development |
| Name of pilot study SAFA | Location NEPAL |
| Value chain Mainly Food Crops | Main activity Primary Production |
| Number of farms involved 40 | Total area involved About 40 ha |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved N/A | Number of family farmers or employees involved 40 farm families |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any implemented | Data used for the SAFA assessment Existing, New test/analysis, Interview, Visit, Survey |
| Description of enterprise Within SAFA pilot study we tried to use the Excel tool and its different aspect within those participating farms. The main objective of this study is to assess the possibility of application at small holder level as well as get an overview of the analysis outcome like GHG emission from the present farming system. | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of participant Rogelio Gonzalez Tato INEVA - Iniciativa en Gestión Forestal | Name of institution represented Asociación de Productores de Madera de Cerdido (PROMACER) |
| Name of pilot study SAFA assessment of forest group of smallholders | Location Spain |
| Value chain Forestry | Main activity Wood production |
| Number of farms involved 68 | Total area involved 550 ha |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved None | Number of family farmers or employees involved 15 |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any FSC | Data used for the SAFA assessment Documentation from FSC system Interviews with workers Field visits Data recorder during FSC implementation (interviews, field visits) |
| Description of enterprise PROMACER is a small forest owners association located in Galicia (NW Spain) created to improve the distribution of its products by an organized way and get a stable price for their products. PROMACER members produce eucalyptus wood (plantations) for pulp and paper industry. PROMACER has recently (August 2012) FSC certification for 68 smallholders covering 550 ha divided in 1.500 discontinued plots, being the first FSC certification of this kind of properties. Each smallholder is responsible for plantation and forest management, while PROMACER coordinates forest operation (like logging) and monitors smallholders' operations. Complementarily to FSC, SAFA helps to assess forest performance. | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of participant Dr. Jan Grenz | Name of institution represented Bern University of Applied Sciences |
| Name of pilot study Micarna SA | Location Switzerland |
| Value chain Livestock, poultry, fisheries, aquaculture | Main activity Processing |
| Number of farms involved Several 10000 (exact figure not known, due to production abroad) | Total area involved Not known. Example figure: 700000 pigs processed in 2011. |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved Eight processing units | Number of family farmers or employees involved 2300 employees |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any <u>Suppliers</u> : IP-Suisse (integrated), Bio-Suisse (organic), MSC, ASC, BSCI (only in risk countries), Proof of Ecological Performance (Switzerland only) <u>Company</u> : ISO 9001, HACCP, FSSC 22000 | Data used for the SAFA assessment Interviews, existing reports and ratings (internal and external) |
| Description of enterprise Micarna SA is a Swiss company that produces fresh meat, poultry, seafood and charcuterie (processed meat products, e.g. sausage), plus regional specialties of Grisons, convenience and organic produce. The company operates since 1958 and is one of 21 companies that form M-Industrie, which in turn is a part of the Migros Group. Micarna has eight production sites, where 2300 people are employed. Headquarters are located in Courtepin in the French- and Bazenheid in the German-speaking part of Switzerland. In the business year 2011, total sales amounted to 143090 tons of produce, and total revenue was 1251 million Swiss Francs. | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of participant Ben Horsbrugh, Director, Quality Management | Name of institution represented UNIVEG Group |
| Name of pilot study Expofrut Argentina | Location Argentina |
| Value chain Food – apples and pears | Main activity Primary production, packaging and marketing |
| Number of farms involved 5 | Total area involved 239 ha |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved | Number of family farmers or employees involved k.A. |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any GlobalGAP, partly organic | Data used for the SAFA assessment GRI Audit performed by third party company |
| Description of enterprise Expofrut Argentina integrates production, packing, and export within the UNIVEG supply chain. The Argentinean company's headquarters are located in General Roca in the province of Río Negro at the northern edge of Patagonia. The population of this desert like area is mainly concentrated around the Río Negro river and highly active in irrigated fruit culture. The area is the production centre of 65% of Argentinean pears and apples. The company produces and sources its apples and pears in two valleys of the Río Negro: Alto Valle and Valle Medio. Thirteen own packing sheds receive, select, pack and ship the fruit to many locations. In the harbour of San Antonio the company manages a cold storage where the freight can be reorganized and exported overseas. | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of participant Yotsawin Kukeawkasem | Name of institution represented Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Internationaler Zusammen Arbeit (GIZ) |
| Name of pilot study Sustainable palm oil production | Location Thailand |
| Value chain Oil palm | Main activity Primary production |
| Number of farms involved 317 farmers (each has ca. 2 plots) | Total area involved 2,124 .08 hectares |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved | Number of family farmers or employees involved 317 farmers |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any RSPO | Data used for the SAFA assessment Existing studies |
| Description of enterprise The 2 oil palm smallholder groups with the membership of 317 farmers (average farm size of 6.7 ha) are located in Krabi Thailand. The groups were supported by GIZ and Office of Agricultural Economics (OAE) from 2010 to mid-2012 in improving their farm practices, linkages to the millers, and farmer group formation. Since October 2012, the groups are certified with RSPO standard and continue trading their certificates under RSPO's Greenpalm. The smallholders are compliance with the commodity specific standard- RSPO which is comprised of 8 principles, 39 criteria, and some 130s indicators. Moreover, the smallholder groups are obliged to comply with group certification standard and install internal control system. | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of participant Anne Mordhorst (Soil & More Foundation) | Name of institution represented ProNatur Peru |
| Name of pilot study Sustainability Flower Quick Assessment | Location Peru |
| Value chain Food crop | Main activity Primary production of mangos, bananas and passion fruits |
| Number of farms involved 6 | Total area involved 620 ha |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved 1 | Number of family farmers or employees involved 380 |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any EU organic, Bio Suisse, Naturland, Fairtrade, Global Gap | Data used for the SAFA assessment Sustainability Flower Quick Assessment |
| Description of enterprise ProNatur is an association of individual landowners who have organized themselves to pool their resources in order to afford technical assistance and gain access to the export market. The association was founded in 1996 in the tropical highlands of the Peruvian rainforest around the town of Moyobamba. Today more than 1,000 families participate in the organization and actively cultivate just over 3,300 ha of coffee, mango and limes together with other crops such as beans peas, bananas, asparagus and more. In the pilot study the focus was only on a part of the whole association. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of participant Henrik Moller | Name of institution represented ^a Agribusiness Group (Andrew Barber) ^b Aarhus University, Department of Engineering / Otago University, Centre for Sustainability (Vicent Gasso) |
| Name of pilot study SWNZ Vineyards | Location New Zealand |
| Value chain Food crop | Main activity Primary production |
| Number of farms involved 1100 | Total area involved 31,750 ha |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved N/A | Number of family farmers or employees involved Unsure |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any Sustainable Winegrowing New Zealand (SWNZ) | Data used for the SAFA assessment Existing data |
| Description of enterprise The 1,100 vineyards average 29 ha, ranging from 0.12 to 800 ha. All vineyards are members of the Sustainable Wine NZ programme. The vineyards are from throughout New Zealand which extends from sub-tropical Northland (36° S) to the world's most southerly grape growing region Central Otago (46° S). Vineyards benefit from the moderating effect of the maritime climate (no vineyard is more than 120km from the ocean) with long sunshine hours and nights cooled by sea breezes. | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of participant Henrik Moller | Name of institution represented ^a Agribusiness Group ^b Aarhus University, Department of Engineering / Otago University, Centre for Sustainability (Andrew Barber ^a -Vicent Gasso ^b) |
| Name of pilot study SWNZ Winery | Location New Zealand |
| Value chain Food crop | Main activity Processing (winery) |
| Number of farms involved N/A | Total area involved N/A |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved 138 | Number of family farmers or employees involved Unsure |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any Sustainable Winegrowing New Zealand (SWNZ) | Data used for the SAFA assessment Existing data |
| Description of enterprise The 138 wineries range in size from 1200 litres to 45,000,000 litres. The wineries are from throughout NZ. There is a mix of wineries from those based on traditional concept of a small family owned winery surrounded by a vineyard through to large multinational companies that supplement their own grapes with that supplied by contract growers. | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of participant Pablo Pinell | Name of institution represented Consultant |
| Name of pilot study CINMA. Forestry and sawmilling operations | Location Bolivia |
| Value chain Forestry | Main activity Primary production |
| Number of farms involved One concession and one sawmilling operation | Total area involved 120,000 hectares |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved none | Number of family farmers or employees involved |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any FSC | Data used for the SAFA assessment Interview and secondary information review |
| Description of enterprise CINMA is forestry and sawmilling company, operating a concession of 120,000 hectares in the northern Amazon forests of Bolivia (Bajo Paragua). Cinma belongs to a group of companies owned by Dekker Hout from Holland. All its operations are certified by FSC standards and although most of the wood the process come from their own forest concession, they are looking forward to buy logs from other sources that eventually will become FSC certified. Actually CINMA provides timber to Dekma the secondary manufacturing company located in La Paz. They are starting to sell remaining volumes to the local Bolivian market. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of participant Dr. John Reid | Name of institution represented Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu |
| Name of pilot study Ahikā Kai | Location New Zealand |
| Value chain Harvesting, processing, and distributing wild harvested eels and titi via a virtual sales and marketing platform. | Main activity This initiative covers a tribally owned marketing and sales platform for indigenous producers. The platform is integrated with the operations of tribal members operating at a cottage-scale to wild harvest and process mahinga kai (traditional foods). The value-chain is integrated with whānau harvesting, processing, then delivering product ordered through the sales platform. |
| Number of farms involved NA | Total area involved NA |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved Two cottage industry scale processing units. | Number of family farmers or employees involved Two extended families – approximately 15 to 20 individuals. |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any Suppliers to Ahikā Kai are licensed to the sales platform and must adhere to a set of indigenous sustainability principles established by the tribe Ngāi Tahu. | Data used for the SAFA assessment Direct operational knowledge and documentations associated with the enterprise. |
| Description of enterprise Ahikā Kai (food from the home fires) is an online marketing and sales platform for indigenous foods. This platform is a social enterprise designed to assist in the economic and social development of whanau (extended family) food production initiatives. Whānau wild harvest and process products for sale via the sales-platform. The ‘back-end’ of the platform assists whānau in managing their commercial operations. The system is being developed by the Ngāi Tahu tribal council. | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of participant Christian Schader | Name of institution represented Research Institute of Organic Agriculture (FiBL) |
| Name of pilot study Allos | Location Germany |
| Value chain | Main activity |
| Number of farms involved 0 | Total area involved n.a. |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved 1 | Number of family farmers or employees involved 0 |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any Organic (EU-Regulation), IFS, ISO9001, ISO14001 UTZ, RSPO (in some supply chains) | Data used for the SAFA assessment Existing |
| Description of enterprise Allos belongs to the pioneers of Natural Food. During the past thirty-five years, a quality culture has developed at Allos with regard to how food is handled, which reliably provides directions for everyday tasks. Biological foods must be natural and should be based on sensible recipes. Allos has actively developed the natural food sector as a result of successful product innovations. As a manufacturer’s brand, Allos is characterized by reliability, diversity and high quality requirements. | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of participant Caroline Sanders | Name of institution represented (in full) The AgriBusiness Group, The Agricultural Research Group on Sustainability (Jon Manhire, ARGOS) |
| Name of pilot study Organic Dairy | Location (country) New Zealand |
| Value chain Dairy Farming | Main activity Primary production |
| Number of farms involved 12 organic farms (but representing 120 organic farms) | Total area involved 1,400 Ha, 2686 cows |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved None-all milk was sent to the same company but not covered in this SAFA. | Number of family farmers or employees involved Total – 21.4 full time equivalents including unpaid family members (9 FTE) |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any Organic certification | Data used for the SAFA assessment Based on the results of a 9 year study which involved intensive monitoring of the environmental, social, economic and productivity values for each farm. This involved a high level of interaction between the farmers and the researchers (approx. 20) -see http://www.argos.org.nz/transdisciplinary_analysis_dairy.html for more details. |
| Description of enterprise The farms used for this SAFA were all converting to organic dairy production in 2004. They are located in traditional dairy farming regions of the North Island of New Zealand. They are all family owned farms, are un-irrigated and have been dairy farming for more than 1 generation. Cows are either Fresian or crossbreed with peak numbers varying between 138-600 cows with between 1.7 to 3.2 cows per Ha. Farm size varied between 407 Ha and 73 Ha with annual total milk solids per farm varying between 216,985 to 39,746 kg per year. | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of participant Michael Sligh | Name of institution represented Rural Advancement Foundational International |
| Name of pilot study SAFA | Location (country) NC USA |
| Value chain Food Crop/ livestock | Main activity Production |
| Number of farms involved 2 | Total area involved 120 H, 20,000 chickens |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved 0 | Number of family farmers or employees involved 4 |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any Organic/ seed and livestock contracts | Data used for the SAFA assessment SAFA, interviews and visits |
| Description of enterprise Two family-size farming operations were chosen in the coastal plain of eastern NC to compare and contrast. And, to evaluate more informal family scale operations applicability to the SAFA metrics. Operations annually rent most of their acreage, both are about the same size or 60 hectares each and both primarily grow small grains and livestock. While one farms using organic methods with certification and sells into organic markets. The other uses seed and production contracts and sells into the conventional market. One contracts chickens for a major poultry company and the other raises livestock mostly for home consumption and local direct sales. | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Name of participant Chiara Scaraggi | Name of institution represented ICEA Istituto Certificazione Etica ed Ambientale |
| Name of pilot study CECAB Cooperative Organic Cocoa | Location Sao Tome and Principe |
| Value chain Food crop: cocoa (<i>Theobroma cacao</i>) | Main activity Primary cocoa production |
| Number of farms involved 1800 smallholders | Total area involved Approximately 2.160 hectares |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved CECAB cooperative only has post-harvest facilities for the primary cocoa processing (cocoa fermentation and drying of the beans) | Number of family farmers or employees involved 1800 cooperative shareholders + 16 employees at cooperative headquarter |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any Organic Reg (EC) 834/2007 | Data used for the SAFA assessment For this SAFA assessment were visited CECAB fields and infrastructures (more precisely: 1 smallholder farm, 1 rural community, 1 farmer association, the main cocoa warehouse and the cooperative head office) and were interviewed 9 farmers, 1 rural community leader, 1 association leader, 3 technical assistants, 1 warehouse manager, 1 secretary, 1 manager for certification service, 1 manager of the grievance procedures, 1 quality manager, 1 president, 1 Ministry of Agriculture (former CECAB president) |
| Description of enterprise Cooperativa Exportação de Cacao Biologico (CECAB) cooperative is an organic cocoa producer –certified by Ecocert- in Sao Tome and Principe. CECAB was born in 2003 under the PAPAFA project, funded and designed by IFAD. CECAB cooperative is composed of 34 farmer level association representing 45 rural communities for a total number of 1800 smallholder farms. CECAB has always had a stable buyer, the French chocolate manufacturer KAOKA: they signed 5 years trade contract in 2005, further extended in a PPP (Public-Private-Partnership); the sales are based on agreed price, including organic and quality premiums (all invested in social services). | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of participant Sally Lee | Name of institution represented Food and Agriculture Organization |
| Name of pilot study Core Sound Seafood | Location Harker’s Island, North Carolina |
| Value chain Capture fishery, Community supported fishery operation, Mr. Big’s Seafood retail locally at Harker’s Island, some processing (cleaning) | Main activity Main activity is fishing |
| Number of farms involved 1 fishery operation (Mr. Big’s, has 2 boats.) Buy from other fishers in the area as well. | Total area involved n/a |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved CSF network, 1 retail store, and 1 space for processing | Number of family farmers or employees involved 3 co-owners and 2 employees |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any none | Data used for the SAFA assessment 2 days of interviews/site visit + follow-up survey |
| Description of enterprise Core sound Seafood is an LLC run out of the home of the owners. It is an internet based business, in that orders for shares are coordinated over their website. In addition the husband and wife team also run Mr. Big's Seafood, a wholesale fish company, and Mr. Big's Seafood retail, a store on Harker's Island that sells local seafood. Fishing takes place in the sound and ocean, as well as the river. The business value is estimated at \$150,000. Mr. Big's purchases from 7 fishers in their area regularly, and Mr Big's sells seafood to CSS. | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Name of participant James Kirke | Name of institution represented Souza Cruz (Carlos Palma / Gustavo Maciel/ Mauricio Cantisani) |
| Name of pilot study SAFA Pilot Study Tobacco Production Souza Cruz | Location Brazil |
| Value chain Tobacco | Main activity Primary production |
| Number of farms involved 30 thousand | Total area involved Around 90 thousand hectares |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved 3 | Number of family farmers or employees involved Around 45 thousand sons and daughters of the integrated farmers |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any Social Responsibility On Tobacco Production - SRTP | Data used for the SAFA assessment Brazilian legislation, internal policies, internal data base, interviews, certifications, surveys w/ farmers |
| Description of enterprise Founded in April 1903 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, the company is involved in the entire production cycle of tobacco, from growing and processing tobacco to the manufacturing and distribution of cigarettes. Employing more than 7 thousand people, the company also had created in 1918 the Integrated System of Tobacco Production, maintaining contracts with more than 30 thousand integrated farmers in the three states of the south of Brazil. Through our Sustainable Farmer Platform we address actions to enhance and increase sustainability in the field, with focus in maximize the integrated farm as a sustainable business, eradication of child labor and increase safety and health of the farmer, contribute positively with the environmental impact of the tobacco production. | |
| Name of participant James Kirke | Name of institution represented British American Tobacco Bangladesh Co. Ltd (Akhter A Khan-Serajul Haque-Minhazul Islam Arup) |
| Name of pilot study SAFA pilot study on Tobacco Growing & buying | Location Kushtia (Bangladesh) |
| Value chain | Main activity (but for pilot study we have considered only primary production i.e. tobacco production through contract farming system & tobacco buying) |
| Number of farms involved 33,996 (for study 25 farms were considered) | Total area involved 21,332 hectare (for study 35 Hectare of 25 farms was considered) |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved 3 (2 Processing Unit & 1 Manufacturing Unit) (Manufacturing & processing were out of pilot study scope) | Number of family farmers or employees involved 36,500 (approx.) |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any Company standards, guidelines, procedures, policies, Social Responsibility in Tobacco Production (SRTP), EHS etc. | Data used for the SAFA assessment Existing data, visit, interviews & survey. Country's legislation & internal Company Policies. |

Description of enterprise

The company set up its first sales depot at Armanitola in Dhaka 100 years ago. After the partition of India in 1947, Pakistan Tobacco Company was established in 1949. The first factory in Bangladesh (the then East Pakistan) was set up in 1949 at Fauzdarhat in Chittagong. In 1965, the second factory of Pakistan Tobacco Company went into production in Mohakhali, Dhaka. Then it became Bangladesh Tobacco Company Limited in 1972 immediately after Bangladesh's independence. In 1998, the Company changed its name and identity to British American Tobacco Bangladesh aligning the corporate identity with other operating Companies in the British American Tobacco group. BAT Bangladesh makes quality tobacco products for the diverse preferences of consumers, spanning the business from crop to consumer' and employees are committed to embedding the principles of Corporate social responsibility in every steps of its business. We grow our tobacco leaves through our registered farmers by focusing on sustainable agriculture in socially responsible manner. The company is highly committed to responsible behavior which is an integral part of its sustainability agenda. Sustainable business practices are at the heart of its strategy. It believes that the business has a key role to play in helping society to achieve the necessary sustainable balance of economic growth, environmental protection and social progress in ways that will build value for its stakeholders, including shareholders.

| | |
|--|---|
| Name of participant Jean-Pierre Revéret | Name of institution represented The Quebec Pork Producers Association (Fédération des producteurs de porcs du Québec) |
| Name of pilot study The social responsibility report of the pork production of Quebec | Location Quebec (Canada) |
| Value chain Pork production process | Main activity Pig breeding |
| Number of farms involved 3560 pork producers all across the province of Quebec (Canada). The assessment will cover the environmental and socioeconomic performance of a representative sample of 182 pig farmers. | Total area involved Number of pigs in Quebec : 7,4 million (2011) |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved The Quebec Pork Producers Association and a representative sample of 182 pig farmers. | Number of family farmers or employees involved 20 000 employees for the total pork production in Quebec |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any BEA certification : Animal Well-Being Canadian Certification (governmental) AQC certification : Canadian official recognition of food safety programs at the farm | Data used for the SAFA assessment Social life cycle assessment report (2012) Water life cycle assessment report (2012) Carbon footprint report (2010) Sustainable development indicators report (2010) The FPPQ annual report (2011) The pork strategic plan (2010-2014) |
| Description of enterprise The Quebec Pork Producers Association (Fédération des producteurs de porcs du Québec) is an association that brings together 3560 pork producers all across the province of Quebec (Canada). The FPPQ manages the Quebec pork producers' Joint Plan and administers the regulation of pork collective marketing . Missions of the FPPQ are : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ To insure the sustainability of Quebec's pork producers; ✓ To develop pork production in a long term perspective; ✓ To be a leader in Quebec's pork industry; ✓ To offer a high-quality product to our consumers and the rest of the world. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of participant Paul Short | Name of institution represented The Canadian Sphagnum and Peat moss Association |
| Name of pilot study Industrial Social Responsibility (ISR) report of the Canadian peat moss industry | Location Canada |
| Value chain Peat moss production | Main activity Primary production |
| Number of farms involved 7 peat moss producers which account for 70% of the horticultural peat moss production in Canada | Total area involved (hectares)/animal heads In Canada, Peatlands are representing 90% of the wetlands and cover 119 million hectares |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved The Canadian Sphagnum Peat Moss Association is involved in the project | Number of family farmers or employees involved - Total Number of Employees 2,628 - Number of seasonal employees 1,329 |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any (e.g. organic, fair trade, FSC, RSPO) Veriflora Standard | Data used for the SAFA assessment (existing, new tests, interviews, visit, surveys) The assessment relied mostly on existing data generated from previous LCA-based studies, as well as from the Veriflora certification. Most were published within the last five years. However, there were some indicators in the environmental dimension for which we did not have data - especially for those indicators assessing improvements of the environmental performance. We referred to available data generally year-specific (eg. greenhouse gases, air emission, etc.) |
| Description of enterprise The CSPMA is an association of peat moss producers and related enterprises devoted to promoting the sustainable management of Canadian peatlands and the industry. The association provides support and advocacy for its members and leadership in environmental and social stewardship and economic well-being related to the use of Canadian peatland resources. | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Name of participant Tara Moreau | Name of institution represented |
| Name of pilot study Sole Food Farms | Location Vancouver, BC Canada |
| Value chain Urban farm | Main activity Primary Crop Production |
| Number of farms involved 3 | Total area involved 3 acres |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved 4 | Number of family farmers or employees involved 25 |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any None | Data used for the SAFA assessment Google Form Surveys |
| Description of enterprise Sole Food operates a network of urban farms that is transforming underutilized land in Vancouver, Canada into street farms that grow food, people and community. Situated in the Downtown Eastside, a community known for its poverty, violence, drug use, sex trade, and crime, Sole Food provides employment, training and community inclusion to vulnerable populations. Sole Food founders Michael Ableman and Seann Dory, are on a mission to show how urban farm networks can contribute to social change, build local food economies and re-purpose underutilized lands. In 2012, Sole Food grossed over \$150,000 on 3 acres of raised beds that grow 40 different crops and over 300 varieties of fruits and vegetables. | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Name of participant Janet Reed | Name of institution represented Cotton Incorporated |
| Name of pilot study U.S. Cotton | Location United States of America |
| Value chain Fiber crop | Main activity Primary production |
| Number of farms involved Around 18,600 | Total area involved About 4 million hectares |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved Approximately 15 million bales | Number of family farmers or employees involved All farms are family owned |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any None | Data used for the SAFA assessment Surveys, existing |
| Description of enterprise The SAFA approach for this pilot incorporates multiple farms across 4 US regions for three categories of production practices, biotech, irrigated/non-irrigated, mechanized. The average size farm is around 200 hectares and is highly mechanized. Cotton farmers in the US are on average younger than the typical farmer; 5% are women and 40% of cotton farmers work off the farm as well. Climatic conditions of US cotton States span the range of conditions found in other cotton-growing regions around the world. | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of participant Nina Baumgartner | Name of institution represented ICEA – Istituto per la Certificazione Etica e Ambientale |
| Name of pilot study Italian Aquaculture Farms | Location (country) Italy |
| Value chain Aquaculture | Main activity Primary production and processing |
| Number of farms involved 2 | Total area involved (hectares)/animal heads 102ha/ 725t/ 1.505.000 fishes |
| Number of manufacturing/processing units or sale points involved 1 | Number of family farmers or employees involved 30 |
| Scheme (s) or standard(s) adhered to, if any Organic & Friend of the Sea | Data used for the SAFA assessment Interviews, visits and internal documents |
| Description of enterprise. Producer I.G.F. – This company has a concession area at sea of 1000m*1000m in the Gulf of Piombino (LI), at 24-27m depth, for the grow out of seabass and seabream of few grams up to commercial size (around 500gr) . Every day two boats bring high quality feed to the animals, for about 18 months. The company sells the unprocessed fish to wholesalers. Processor P.I.T. – This company eviscerates and processes rainbow and brown trout into fillets and burgers. The fish comes alive to the processing plant the day before being processed. The distribution of the finished product is left to third parties. | |