

GOOD GROWTH PARTNERSHIP

Supported by:



Led by:



In partnership with:



Accelerating systemic change in sustainable agricultural commodity production

How can we most effectively align donors, international development agencies, NGOs and the private sector?

Roundtable report

Washington DC, October 3rd, 2018



Roundtable findings: accelerating systemic change in sustainable agricultural commodity production


Key challenges

1. Voluntary, market-based approaches have been insufficient to reduce deforestation rates and 'two tier' production systems (see image below) are being created.
2. International action for deforestation-free agricultural production has often not been sufficiently aligned with government priorities in producer countries.
3. Improving smallholder farmer production standards is still being achieved only in pockets and not at scale.
4. Investment in 'business as usual' agricultural expansion far exceeds investment in sustainable intensification and forest protection.
5. The sectoral infrastructure (data, tools, technologies and methodologies) for sustainable land use management and sustainable supply chain management is still underdeveloped.
6. International development programs can be overly rigid in design with insufficient flexibility for major course-corrections and under-resourced for the time it takes to enable successful collaboration between related initiatives.

Recommendations

1. Strengthen collaboration with national governments to align national policy & regulatory frameworks with sustainable production objectives and to level the playing field for all producers.
5. Build financial sector capacity in producer countries and use public, donor and impact investment to leverage greater commercial investment in sustainable intensification and forest conservation.

2. Strengthen collaboration with subnational governments and stakeholders at the jurisdictional and landscape level and develop public private partnerships to deliver change on the ground.



3. Move beyond piecemeal approaches to deliver smallholder capacity building at scale for sector-wide improvements in sustainable production practice.
4. Significantly increase engagement with important buyer markets where demand for sustainable supply is currently limited: China, India, Brazil, Indonesia and other growing markets.

6. Increase investment in common data, tools, technologies and methodologies for sustainable land use management and sustainable supply chain management and financing.

7. Strengthen 'systems thinking' in the design of projects, increasing adaptability and capacity for deeper collaboration between key players (public, private and civil society) and similar projects.

Executive Summary

The [Good Growth Partnership](#) (GGP)¹, a flagship initiative of the [Global Environment Facility](#) (GEF), convened leaders from several major, global agricultural commodity producers and buyers – as well as NGO representatives – to discuss how best to accelerate systemic change in agricultural commodity production.

The roundtable event, held in Washington DC on October 3rd, was an opportunity to share ideas on how future donor funding and private sector action on sustainable sourcing can be best aligned – especially in relation to the on-going work of the GEF funded Good Growth Partnership and the GEF's up-coming Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program.

This report summarises the input from participants on:

- 1 Key challenges for the private sector in achieving zero deforestation in their supply chains, as well as addressing their other key social and environmental sourcing issues;
- 2 Recommendations for how the GEF, the GGP partner organisations and major private sector companies can increase the effectiveness of their work through better collaboration.

This Executive Summary highlights the key challenges and recommendations identified by participants in the roundtable.

Challenges

- 1. Voluntary, market-based approaches have been insufficient to reduce deforestation rates and 'two tier' production systems are being created.**

Voluntary private sector action on reducing deforestation in major commodity supply chains has proven to be insufficient to reduce rates of deforestation due to: limited penetration of certification and lack of pressure from many demand markets. Sector-wide change ultimately requires government action to create and enforce common, minimum standards for all producers.

- 2. International action for deforestation-free agricultural production has often not been sufficiently aligned with government priorities in producer countries.**

International attempts to influence policies on agricultural production standards and forest protection in producer countries are often framed in terms of a series of negatives (e.g. “no deforestation, no peat, no exploitation”) and fail to set out strongly enough the positive vision (e.g. green growth and improved livelihoods) which can mobilise government and wider political support.



Gustavo Fonseca, Director of Programs, GEF

- 3. Improving smallholder farmer production standards is still being achieved only in pockets and not at scale.**

Smallholder farmers lack the capacity, funding and incentives to adopt sustainable production practices. Training in good agricultural practice and sustainable intensification (increasing yields from current agricultural land and reducing pressure for expansion) is currently reaching only a minority of farmers.

- 4. Investment in 'business as usual' agricultural expansion far exceeds investment in sustainable intensification and forest protection.**

Financial incentives for sustainable agricultural production and forest protection are absent or insufficient. International climate finance for forest protection has yet to be unlocked at the amounts required to generate significant change.

- 5. The sectoral infrastructure (data, tools, technologies and methodologies) for sustainable land use management and sustainable supply chain management is still underdeveloped.**

Basic data (e.g. on land ownership, land use change, land use maps, traceability, etc) is still missing and the tools and technologies required for efficient monitoring and management of sustainable land use and sustainability

¹ United Nations Development Programme, International Finance Corporation, Conservation International, World Wildlife Fund and UN Environment.

issues in supply chains are still in relatively early stages of development.


6. **International development programs can be overly rigid in design with insufficient flexibility for major course-corrections and under-resourced for the time it takes to enable successful collaboration between related initiatives.**

While there are numerous initiatives working to address sustainable production, demand and finance, many of them work in isolation, which can help to advance best practice, but does not necessarily create more systemic change. Projects are often too rigid in design and not able to readily adapt to changing circumstances. Nor are they adequately resourced to allow for the time it takes to unlock effective collaboration between initiatives.

Recommendations for the GEF and GGP

1. **Strengthen collaboration with national governments to align national policy & regulatory frameworks with sustainable production objectives and to level the playing field for all producers.**

Collaboration with national governments needs to be strengthened in order to create the enabling conditions for sustainable production – using neutral convenors, building stronger local ownership and emphasising more positive narratives that align better with national political priorities.



2. **Strengthen collaboration with subnational governments and stakeholders at the jurisdictional and landscape level and develop public private partnerships to deliver change on the ground.**

Strengthening work with subnational governments at the jurisdictional and landscape level is critical for translating national policy into change on the ground. In addition, engagement at the jurisdictional and landscape level

provides an avenue for making progress even when the national political context is not favourable for advancing sustainable production standards.

3. **Move beyond piecemeal approaches to deliver smallholder capacity building at scale for sector-wide improvements in sustainable production practice.**

Develop and support national extension services and other support services for smallholders to move beyond piecemeal approaches and build smallholder capacity at scale by mobilising public private partnerships and coalitions across different jurisdictions and landscapes.

4. **Significantly increase engagement with important buyer markets where demand for sustainable supply is currently limited: China, India, Brazil, Indonesia and other growing markets.**

Engagement with buyers and demand markets – as well as consumers – on deforestation-free sourcing issues has been largely focussed on major global brands and European and North American markets. More recently attention is shifting towards engaging with other markets (e.g. India, China, Brazil, Indonesia) which constitute a large proportion of global demand, where awareness and demand for sustainable supply is currently more limited. Engagement with these markets needs to be increased.

5. **Build financial sector capacity in producer countries and use public, donor and impact investment to leverage greater commercial investment in sustainable intensification and forest conservation.**

Public financial incentives, donor finance and impact investment should be used for catalysing financial innovation with the objective of unlocking the far greater levels of commercial investment for scaling up sustainable intensification and forest conservation.

6. **Increase investment in common data, tools, technologies and methodologies for sustainable land use management and sustainable supply chain management and financing.**

To create a well-functioning market for the supply of sustainable commodities, further investment is needed to develop and scale the datasets, tools, technologies and common methodologies that can reduce complexity and transaction costs – for example, technology for forest mapping and monitoring; technology for transparency and traceability of products; common data sources, definitions and methodologies for investment decision making.

7. Strengthen 'systems thinking' in the design of projects, increasing adaptability and capacity for deeper collaboration between key players (public, private and civil society) and similar projects.

Change strategies and practices should be more informed by systems thinking – involving more co-design, collaborative innovation, more agility and adaptability, both within and across initiatives. Facilitating and brokering multi-stakeholder partnerships to scale action on the ground is a priority.



Specific recommendations for work on sustainable palm oil in Indonesia

Key recommendations for palm oil in Indonesia included:

- “ Use more positive framings around the economic benefits of a sustainable palm oil sector, both nationally and in relation to specific landscapes and jurisdictions.
- “ Strengthen international support for ISPO “which represents the government’s definition of sustainability in the sector and is the avenue for how to enact change in Indonesia”.
- “ Create stronger connections between the National Action Plan on Sustainable Palm Oil (NAP) and other activities – e.g. jurisdictional and landscape and other initiatives like One Map.
- “ Strengthen focus on communities, landscapes and jurisdictions, rather than individual smallholders – and get beyond “project by project”.
- “ Support work to increase transparency in the sector, particularly in hot spots and around high risk mills.
- “ Support the capacity for legal enforcement, particularly working with jurisdictions at forest frontiers.
- “ Continue work to influence domestic awareness of sustainability issues and increase demand for sustainable production.

- “ Scale up efforts to work with major international markets that are not considering sustainability criteria.
- “ Increasing inter-agency alignment within GGP and collaboration with other major programmes.


Specific recommendations for work on soy and beef in the Cerrado (Brazil) and Chaco (Paraguay)

From the session that jointly covered soy and beef in the Cerrado and the Chaco, key recommendations included:

- “ Support efforts to create an agreed map of land ownership and land use – including indigenous and traditional community rights.
- “ Influence government to set high priority zones / no-go zones, combined with compensation.
- “ Strengthen state and local government capacity for CAR (Cadastro Ambiental Rural – Rural Environmental Registry) compliance.
- “ Encourage land swaps for farmers to develop cleared land owned by the government instead of forest.
- “ Producers are part of the solution. Farmers are the largest investors in native vegetation – we need to make it in their interest to use that capital in an effective way so it is sustainable.
- “ Build closer relationships with farmer organisations.
- “ Invest in tools / technology for effective farmer training at scale.
- “ Invest in bringing slaughter houses up to international standards.
- “ Significantly scale up efforts on engagement with demand markets in beef, where penetration on sustainable sourcing criteria is very low.
- “ Continue to build on **TRASE** to improve traceability.
- “ Develop and disseminate among producers a clear business case for sustainable intensification.
- “ Support the development of innovative financial products that support no conversion.
- “ Support aggregation of farmers into larger groups to make financing possible.
- “ Create a fund to compensate farmers for not developing forest they are otherwise legally entitled to.

Conclusion

This report has been provided to the GEF for input into the FOLUR funding process. The report has also been reviewed by the partners in the Good Growth Partnership and new insights and recommendations are being integrated into workplans. Overall the workshop reinforced the need and value of the approach of the Good Growth Partnership – as well as GEF’s current plans for FOLUR.



Participants in the roundtable recognised the need to accelerate and scale the work of GGP. The private sector representatives clearly recognised that better alignment with national and subnational government priorities in producer countries is key and that GGP can play a crucial role connecting to governments. Equally, international development organisations need strong partnerships with the private sector – and with funders and investors – to demonstrate that sustainable production practices attract meaningful inward investment, drive sector and market development and can deliver significant economic and social benefits for producer countries.

A key gap is that important demand markets – such as China, India, Brazil and Indonesia – are not currently strongly engaged with these international efforts to drive sustainable production standards. GGP and the GEF need to strengthen engagement with these markets, which are critical for shifting the global sustainable food and agriculture system.

There is also a critical need to move beyond “project by project” approaches towards the design and delivery of more systemic solutions – both in terms of the legal & regulatory frameworks and legal enforcement in producer countries and also in terms of sector-wide capacity building (training and finance) that can reach millions of farmers, rather than just thousands.

To deliver more systemic solutions going forward, GEF and GGP should deepen their partnerships with key private sector organisations such as the Consumer Goods Forum and convene the private sector and other key actors (funders, development organisations and governments) for “deep dive” working sessions to make progress on specific challenges. Such processes can also offer a mechanism for private sector input into the development and implementation of FOLUR. This deeper cross-sectoral collaboration will benefit sustainable commodity buyers by creating sector-wide change, rather than just pockets of best practice.

1. Purpose of the Roundtable

The [Good Growth Partnership](#) (GGP)², a flagship initiative of the [Global Environment Facility](#) (GEF), convened leaders from several major, global agricultural commodity producers and buyers – as well as NGO representatives – to discuss how best to accelerate sector transformation in agricultural commodity production, particularly in countries with ecologically important forests. (A list of participants is included in the appendix.)

The roundtable event, held in Washington DC on October 3rd, was an opportunity to share ideas on how to best align private sector approaches to sustainable sourcing and current & future donor funding – especially in relation to the on-going work of the GEF funded Good Growth Partnership and the GEF’s up-coming Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program.

The event addressed the following questions:

- How can GEF funding priorities in the Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program be best aligned with private sector priorities for responsible sourcing?
- Indonesian palm oil: how can donors, international agencies and the private sector best collaborate to accelerate sector-wide transformation?
- Latin American beef & soy: how can companies implement their sustainable sourcing commitments and also meet global demand while conserving native vegetation in the Chaco (Paraguay) and Cerrado (Brazil)?

2. Scope of this report

During the course of the day, participants were asked to write down on cards:

- 1 **Key challenges** for the private sector in achieving zero deforestation in their supply chains, as well as addressing their other key social and environmental sourcing issues;

- 2 **Recommendations** for how the GEF, the GGP partner organisations and major private sector companies can increase the effectiveness of their work through better collaboration.

Participants provided more than 400 suggestions of challenges and recommendations. In this report we have attempted to cluster those ideas into key themes. We have included direct quotes from participants cards and also, in places, summarised the important key messages. As such, this report is not intended to be a comprehensive analysis of the issues or reflect the views of any one of the organisations present. It simply reflects the various perspectives of the participants at the event.

Many of the challenges (section 4) and recommendations (section 5) apply across commodities and geographies. However, in section 6 we highlight some of the key specific recommendations from the session on Indonesian palm oil, and in section 7 we highlight key recommendations from the session on beef and soy in the Cerrado (Brazil) and Chaco (Paraguay).

3. Are we winning?

An informal straw poll (by show of hands) of the 55 participants was taken on the question “are winning or losing in our efforts to halt deforestation?” This was the result:



This clearly indicates the scale of the challenge we face and the need, collectively, to “raise our game”. We hope that this report will stimulate thinking on how to do that.

² United Nations Development Programme, International Finance Corporation, Conservation International, World Wildlife Fund and UN Environment.

4. Challenges

The challenges identified by participants are clustered into the following key themes:


1. Voluntary, market-based approaches have been insufficient to reduce deforestation rates and ‘two tier’ production systems are being created.
2. International action for deforestation-free agricultural production has often not been sufficiently aligned with government priorities in producer countries.
3. Improving smallholder farmer production standards is still being achieved only in pockets and not at scale.
4. Investment in ‘business as usual’ agricultural expansion far exceeds investment in sustainable intensification and forest protection.
5. The sectoral infrastructure (data, tools, technologies and methodologies) for sustainable land use management and sustainable supply chain management is still underdeveloped.
6. International development programs can be overly rigid in design with insufficient flexibility for major course-corrections and under-resourced for the time it takes to enable successful collaboration between related initiatives.

4.1 Voluntary, market-based approaches have been insufficient to reduce deforestation rates and ‘two tier’ production systems are being created

Voluntary private sector action on reducing deforestation in major commodity supply chains has proven to be insufficient to reduce rates of deforestation due to: limited penetration of certification and lack of pressure from many demand markets. Sector-wide change ultimately requires government action to create and enforce common, minimum standards for all producers.

- Over the past 15-20 years there has been a strong emphasis on market-based approaches to sustainable sourcing, particularly through the adoption of voluntary sustainability standards (VSS). While these have been hugely important in developing best practice, the market penetration of VSS and certification is still low. There are still multiple destinations for unsustainably produced products, which has led to the creation of a ‘two tier’ production system. Major brands (who are most exposed to international NGO pressure) have made significant progress in shifting to sustainable supply chains, but since there are still large markets for unsustainably

produced commodities, the underlying environmental and social challenges remain.



- “ Agricultural commodity markets do not easily lend themselves to premiums and without premiums the business case for VSS and certification may be weak or non-existent.
- “ Companies that are adopting sustainability best practice are bearing costs (or are under pressure to bear costs) that competitors are not bearing, which puts them at a commercial disadvantage.
- “ The market does not reward sustainable production – cheaters who fly under the radar compete unfairly.
- “ Even if we manage to make our supply chain deforestation free, expanding demand for that commodity can drive conversion and create a motivation for leakage.
- There is uneven pressure on buyers to meet sustainability standards, where some markets have a lot of pressure (Europe and North America) and others have very little (China, India, South East Asia, South America). Similarly, there has been a lot of pressure on timber and palm oil, increasing pressure on soy, and much less pressure on beef – even though beef is currently driving deforestation at a rate 10x higher than the other commodities.
- “ Pressure on the big brands from activist NGOs creates an incentive for more responsible companies to pull back from high risk locations, meaning that forest frontiers are left to less responsible producers and buyers.
- “ Supply chain approaches focus on managing existing agricultural land. Preserving forests and other important biomes also requires that protected areas are created and maintained. While the private sector can support this, the work needs to be led by governments and requires effective land use planning.

- “ The bottom line is that it is not possible for the private sector to do everything and for systemic change to be created without action from producer governments to create and enforce a legal and regulatory framework that requires sustainable production by all producers.
- “ The private sector is reliant on actions outside their control, even in their own supply chains. Barriers include lack of transparency, traceability, corruption, lack of enforcement.
- “ Where companies act, they should do so in coalitions, which can influence government agendas and shift markets and policy in both production and demand markets – whereas unilateral action by companies has limited ability to impact the wider system.



Chris McGrath, Chief Sustainability, Well-being, Public & Government Affairs Officer, Mondelēz

4.2 International action for deforestation-free agricultural production has often not been sufficiently aligned with government priorities in producer countries

International attempts to influence policies on agricultural production standards and forest protection in producer countries are often framed in negative terms and fail to set out a positive vision which can mobilise government and wider political support.

- Effective national and subnational government action is required in order to create lasting, systemic solutions – particularly in creating the right enabling environment, addressing issues such as:
 - Land rights, land registration and agreed maps of land ownership.
 - Land use planning – including zoning, issue of plantation licenses, creation and enforcement of set asides and protected areas.
 - Land use monitoring – real time monitoring of land use change.

- Sectoral capacity building – e.g. extension services and development of service sector for farmer supplies and support.
- Labour rights.
- Monitoring and enforcement of legal compliance.
- “ There has been insufficient attention on how to build the ‘business case’ for national and local governments. Agricultural expansion has helped drive economic growth, increased prosperity and reduced poverty – these social benefits have often been ignored by environmental activists – and the case for environmental protection is not always sufficiently compelling at the national or local level.
- “ International action for deforestation-free commodity production has often been advanced in spite of government, rather than in partnership with government. This has contributed to an adversarial atmosphere that has not been helpful.
- “ We need to stop the blame and shame, West vs East, developed vs developing.
- “ Government priorities are self-sufficiency and economic growth – misalignment with that means little government support.

4.3 Improving smallholder farmer production standards is still being achieved only in pockets and not at scale

Smallholder farmers have limited access to training and capacity building services. Improving smallholder farmer production standards is still being achieved only in pockets and not at scale.

- “ Adherence to voluntary sustainability standards and certification schemes can be too complex and costly for smallholders. They typically lack the capacity to take on the additional requirements that sustainability standards impose on them and often any premium is insufficient to offset costs.
- “ Smallholders often do not have access to the finance they need for converting to sustainable production practices, including the costs of replanting into higher yielding varieties.
- National extension services can be under-resourced and have limited reach. Similarly, smallholder training and finance schemes run by producers may only reach a relatively small number of farmers. Larger producers are better resourced for providing services to smallholders they source from, but small and medium

sized producers often have limited capacity to provide support to smallholders.

- “ Most smallholder capacity building is not done at scale.
- “ The vast, complicated smallholder environment is difficult for buyers to identify and influence.

4.4 Investment in ‘business as usual’ agricultural expansion far exceeds investment in sustainable intensification and forest protection

Financial incentives for sustainable agriculture and forest protection are absent or insufficient. International climate finance for forest protection has yet to be unlocked at the levels required to generate significant change.

- A quarter of global emissions are attributable to forests, agriculture and other land uses (IPCC figures) – and food and land use interventions can contribute at least a third of the solution to climate change through reducing emissions and increasing carbon capture (Project Drawdown figures). Yet, sustainable agriculture and land use receive only about 10% of climate related development finance (OECD figures). Meanwhile the value of mainstream investment into ‘business as usual’ expansion of agriculture far exceeds this.
- “ Current PES (payment for environmental services) schemes and compensation mechanisms for not developing forest that is legally zoned for agriculture are often either non-existent, insufficient or ineffective as an incentive for conservation.
- “ Current commercial funding that is seeking investments in deforestation-free production can be slow to obtain, burdensome in its due diligence and reporting requirements, and can be more costly than alternative commercial sources of finance and therefore can fail to act as an incentive. On the positive side, deforestation-free finance sources can offer longer- term finance options than are available than from other commercial sources.
- “ Rural finance is always hard. Agri finance even harder. The ESG [environmental, social, governance] overlay on agri and rural finance brings along more complexity. The private financial sector has little incentive to approach this on a commercial basis in comparison to other more lucrative immediate opportunities.

- “ Lack of brokerage service at the local level to identify sources of sustainable finance and disperse it to companies including SMEs.
- “ The M&E [monitoring & evaluation] for donor funding on sustainability issues can be onerous.
- “ Restoration is an under-financed area because there is little awareness of the role of finance sector in promoting the financing of sustainable landscapes.
- “ A key challenge is delivering the right incentives to the right person or group at the right time to incentivize good practice.



4.5 The sectoral infrastructure (data, tools, technologies and methodologies) for sustainable land use management and sustainable supply chain management is still underdeveloped

Basic data (e.g. on land ownership, land use change, land use maps, traceability, etc) is still missing and the tools and technologies required for efficient monitoring and management of sustainability issues in supply chains are still in relatively early stages of development.

- A fully developed market for sustainable production and demand requires new infrastructure, including:
 - Real time forest monitoring – satellite tracking.
 - Data on the location and ownership of farms – land registration.
 - Land use planning maps.
 - Transparency of supply chains.
 - Traceability through the supply chain – chain of custody technology (e.g. mobile apps, blockchain).
 - Standard metrics for measuring and reporting performance on sustainable sourcing commitments.
 - ESG metrics for different types of financing (e.g. fixed income, equity, project financing, corporate loans, project finance, etc.).

- Methodologies for measuring human and social capital value.
- Currently some of these are still unavailable or immature, data is lacking, there are competing systems and duplication of effort. This makes sustainable supply chain management difficult and costly. It also makes investment decision making slow and costly.
- “ We are prioritizing and investing in land use satellite mapping in cocoa and palm, but we need help scaling and bringing technology to better use the information at scale. Why the hesitancy?
- “ We need traceability...for palm oil to ensure supply from deforested land can be rejected.
- “ Key challenge: traceability to plantation. Key priority: supply chain maps & traceability.
- “ Need to strengthen robust, public monitoring capabilities on priority landscapes.
- “ Focus on finding solutions for implementation of deforestation and conversion free commitments that include not only monitoring tools but also market incentives and technical knowledge components for producers.
- “ Push for greater alignment around metrics, monitoring and reporting amongst all stakeholders.
- “ Fix the 'broken chain' between producers and millers towards systemic transparency.

4.6 International development programs can be overly rigid in design with insufficient flexibility for major course-corrections and under-resourced for the time it takes to enable successful collaboration between related initiatives

While there are numerous initiatives working to address sustainable production, demand and finance, many of them work in isolation, which can help to advance best practice, but does not necessarily create more systemic change. Projects are often too rigid in design and not able to readily adapt to changing circumstances. Nor are they adequately resourced to allow for the time it takes to unlock effective collaboration between initiatives.

- There are a multitude of initiatives addressing sustainable agriculture and supply chain development, which means that progress is being made on many fronts. However this presents a number of challenges as the activity comes at the risk of duplication, dilution of effort and confusion.

- “ Key players can be confused by the sheer volume of activity and overwhelmed by requests to participate in multiple initiatives. There is a risk of duplication of effort between different initiatives.
- “ Effective collaboration takes time, but international development project resources are often focused on internal project objectives, with limited resources available for enabling collaboration with other projects – meaning that collaboration can often be limited and the results unsatisfactory.
- “ Many development projects are operating at pilot scale – or they are stand-alone initiatives not nested within national development strategies (such as REDD+). There is less activity addressing systemic change and working at scale at the national level.
- “ The context can change significantly during project execution and new learning can point to the need for different strategies. However, projects funded by international donors can be relatively rigid in program design, which makes major course corrections difficult.



Naoko Ishii, Chief Executive Officer, GEF

5. Recommendations for GEF and GGP

We cluster the recommendations identified by participants into the following key themes:

1. Strengthen collaboration with national governments to align national policy & regulatory frameworks with sustainable production objectives and to level the playing field for all producers.
2. Strengthen collaboration with subnational governments and stakeholders at the jurisdictional and landscape level.
3. Move beyond piecemeal approaches to deliver smallholder capacity building at scale for sector-wide improvements in sustainable production practice.

4. Significantly increase engagement with important buyer markets where demand for sustainable supply is currently limited: China, India, Brazil, Indonesia and other growing markets.
5. Build national financial sector capacity and use public, donor and impact investment to leverage greater commercial investment in sustainable intensification and forest conservation.
6. Increase investment in common data, tools, technologies and methodologies for sustainable land use management and sustainable supply chain management and financing.
7. Strengthen 'systems thinking' in the design of development projects, increasing adaptability and capacity for deeper collaboration between key players (public, private and civil society) and similar projects.


5.1 Strengthen collaboration with national governments to align national policy & regulatory frameworks with sustainable production objectives and to level the playing field for all producers

Collaboration with national governments needs to be strengthened in order to create the enabling conditions for sustainable production – using neutral convenors, building stronger local ownership and emphasising more positive narratives that align better with national political priorities.

- “ GEF should prioritize the enabling conditions that the private sector is not able to address.
- “ Effective action on deforestation requires a supportive policy environment, including the right legal and regulatory frameworks and the capacity, will and associated budgets to monitor and enforce compliance. The role of national and subnational governments is therefore central for ensuring that land is used sustainably – particularly in relation to:
 - Land rights, registration and mapping
 - Land use planning
 - Protected areas
 - Land use change monitoring
 - Legal enforcement
- “ True sustainable transformation of the food system and commodity supply chains to achieve SDGs will not happen without active buy-in from government and industry and investors.
- “ Allocate resources to develop and implement plausible pathways toward achieving adequate public

policies, even if these are neither linear nor short term.

- “ Ideally action is required at both the national level – where overarching legal frameworks and policy priorities are set – and at the subnational level, where the responsibility for implementation often lies (depending on the particular country and the degree to which authority is centralized or decentralized). The work of GGP in Indonesia, working at the national, provincial and district level provides a good model for this.



- “ Promote better coordination between the supply chain approach and influencing public policies.
- “ Engage local governments to align with implementation plans.
- “ Need to convene stakeholder dialogue around a specific problem to be solved that includes and involves government and aligns government interest with other stakeholders
- “ Government buy-in is critical to success and the private the sector needs a more neutral broker in order to effectively engage with government.
- “ Opportunity for GEF to serve as a key liaison with governments.
- “ The New York Declaration of Forests (NYDF) Global Platform should increase awareness of the inter-connections and inter-dependencies between private sector and government commitments.
- “ Government administrations include diverse internal stakeholders, so it is important to bridge across different agendas.
- “ Processes should be able to withstand changes of government – e.g. processes that have cross-party support.

- “ Strategies for government engagement also need to be agile and adaptable to changing political environments.
- “ To increase the effectiveness of government engagement it is important to use positive framings that are aligned with political priorities and present a strong business case, especially around economic development – landscape approaches can assist this.
- “ Position farmers in the public eye as part of the solution to both feeding the world AND providing environmental services.
- “ Low levels of institutional capacity at a national and local level mean that capacity for the enforcement of laws is often weak. Institutional capacity building within government is therefore essential.

5.2 Strengthen collaboration with subnational governments and stakeholders at the jurisdictional and landscape level and develop public private partnerships to deliver change on the ground

Strengthening work with subnational governments at the jurisdictional and landscape level is critical for translating national policy into change on the ground. In addition, engagement at the jurisdictional and landscape level provides an avenue for making progress even when the national political context is not favourable for advancing sustainable production standards.

- “ Going forward, the agenda should be broadened out beyond reducing deforestation from commodity expansion to include other critical issues relating to food and land use, as reflected in the FOLUR program – especially the carbon capture opportunities from forest protection, forest restoration, regenerative agriculture, silvopasture, farmland restoration. Landscape level programs are particularly well suited to this.
- “ Jurisdictional and landscape approaches provide an opportunity to identify and emphasize potential value to local stakeholders from better forest management (such as reduce risks of flood and landslide) and move beyond global rhetoric towards a place-based collaboration to achieve common objectives.
- “ Jurisdictional and landscape approaches provide an attractive avenue for on-the-ground investment by international companies who want to develop their supply chains through more collaborative and systemic approaches, as evidenced by the successful engagement of companies in the Coalition for

Sustainable Livelihoods in North Sumatra and Aceh. This approach takes significant time investments to manage stakeholders. NGOs have an important role to play in coordinating government and private sector actors in landscape efforts.

- “ We need stronger connections between landscape programmes and corporate value chains.
- “ Create a pre-competitive space to collaborate and align investments in key landscapes.
- “ Share learning and collaborate with others – e.g. TNC work on Healthy Agricultural Systems.
- “ GEF and GGP should focus on creating the ‘connective tissues’, ‘bridges’ that need to be crossed between national + sub national governments, supply chains actors and NGOs/CSOs operating at different scales.
- “ Effective engagement and partnering with subnational jurisdictions is essential for cascading national policy priorities downwards (e.g. in the case of GGP’s work implementing the Indonesian National Action Plan at the provincial and district level) and/or for working in situations where national policy may not be supportive to the agenda, but where there is opportunity for effective collaboration with subnational governments.
- “ Pick a shortlist of 30 jurisdictions globally in different continents to pilot landscape solutions and a global platform to share learnings of what works and doesn’t.

5.3 Move beyond piecemeal approaches to deliver smallholder capacity building at scale for sector-wide improvements in sustainable production practice

Develop and support national extension services and other support services for smallholder capacity building at scale.

- “ Donors, foundations, NGOs and the private sector all have roles to play in supporting capacity building for national extension services and also scaling up private sector training of farmers.
- “ Grant funders can provide co-funding of farmer training. This could be done through the creation of technical assistance grant funds for smallholder development.
- “ Buyers can provide funding for training farmers within their supply chain and/or landscapes and jurisdictions they are sourcing from.

“ NGOs can facilitate and support the organisation of smallholders into farmer associations to enable more effective delivery of capacity building and access to finance.



Kevin Rabinovitch, VP Sustainability, Mars

5.4 Significantly increase engagement with important buyer markets where demand for sustainable supply is currently limited: China, India, Brazil, Indonesia and other growing markets

Engagement with buyers and demand markets and consumers on deforestation-free sourcing issues has been largely focussed on major global brands and European and North American markets. Attention more recently has been focussed on in other markets (e.g. India, China, Brazil, Indonesia) which constitute an enormous proportion of global demand, where awareness and demand for sustainable supply is currently more limited. Engagement with these markets needs to be increased.

- The lack of global market demand for sustainable commodity products is a critical issue. Although the major international brands (under the spotlight of international NGOs) are actively working on sustainable sourcing, many of their competitors are flying under the radar. Meanwhile the issues of sustainable production are only just coming on to the agenda in major markets like India and China and key domestic consumption markets in Indonesia and Brazil.
- “ Work through GGP to engage and influence these other demand markets should be significantly scaled up.
- “ Much more work is required to engage and influence major demand markets, such as India and China.
- “ Implementing agencies should engage with demand side government initiatives working on sustainable sourcing criteria in demand countries, both in public sector procurement policies and their work with buyer

companies (e.g. UK Roundtable on Sustainable Soya and UK Roundtable on Sourcing Sustainable Palm Oil).

5.5 Build financial sector capacity in producer countries and use public, donor and impact investment to leverage greater commercial investment in sustainable intensification and forest conservation

Public financial incentives, donor finance and impact investment should be used for catalysing financial innovation with the objective of unlocking the far greater levels of commercial investment for scaling up sustainable intensification and forest conservation.

- “ Build capacity within national/domestic financial institutions to promote environmental and socially screened investments and the capacity to monitor them. Also build capacity with central banks to advocated and monitor ESG compliance.
- “ Public financial incentives are key to incentivize producers, through tax breaks and other fiscal or public procurement related incentives.
- “ GEF should allocate funding to de-risk investment in sustainable intensification in order to increase investor support of sustainable producers, including smallholder farmers.
- “ Blended capital will be essential to scale up the flow of finance into the sector in order to provide a genuine incentive for the adoption of more sustainable production practices.
- “ Use donor funding for developing and testing innovative financing mechanisms for sustainable intensification and forest conservation.
- “ GEF can also incentivise the sector by funding the development of investment support tools, such as satellite monitoring of farms to enable effective risk analysis, due diligence and investment monitoring.
- “ Support projects to become ‘bankable’ through interventions such as technical assistance, de-risking, provision of guarantees, etc.
- “ GEF could consider investing in community-level lending to provide favourable lending terms to smallholders and SMEs. Fintech solutions (especially open source) could facilitate smallholder access to payments – mobile banking.
- “ Fintech and other technologies have a large role in a solution to reduce costs and provide necessary tools for risk identification and management, and portfolio monitoring.


- “ Can you facilitate aggregating all the different tiny needs at a small scale and bundle these into larger pools that can be securitised and brought to market for investors?
- “ Matching grants at larger scale to private sector partnerships that support farming communities to design landscape plans and support farmers with regeneration of agroforestry trees.
- “ Investment into a fund or mechanism to compensate farmers not to plant in conservation areas when they have a legal right to, or to compensate them to move off conservation areas.
- “ Need to engage with high priority areas...Invest in prioritization of the green zones throughout risky areas and implement a preferential flow from monitored green farmers.

5.6 Increase investment in common data, tools, technologies and methodologies for sustainable land use management and sustainable supply chain management and financing

To create a well-functioning market for the financing and production of sustainable commodities, further investment is needed to develop and scale the datasets, tools, technologies and common methodologies that can reduce complexity and transaction costs.

- “ Developing a sustainable food and land use system requires the development of new data sources, tools, technologies and methodologies. GEF should focus funding on the development of these.
- “ The Accountability Framework can provide a common basis for metrics, definitions and reporting across the board.
- “ CDP can support with establishing common reporting frameworks.
- “ Leading companies are moving towards science-based targets for sustainability. GEF funding could support data provision to make the establishment of these targets easier, thereby encouraging the up-take of science-based targets by more companies. Ideally this should also be aligned with national targets – e.g. NDCs and REDD+ national action plans.
- “ Support the private sector to be more effective in influencing public policies, by providing better scientific information related to their expansion needs.

- “ Stronger data is needed to demonstrate the local climate, water and other environmental impacts of reduced forest cover and other land use changes.
- “ TRASE is helping companies understand their supply chain risks by mapping companies’ commodity purchases back to the jurisdiction of origin and assigning deforestation risk proportional to the volumes they source from that area.
- “ Use scientific research outcomes on micro climate impacts of vegetation conversion as reasons to invite farmers as supporters of establishing appropriate ecological zoning.
- “ Clearer business cases and pathways for action need to be developed for companies at different stages of the value chain.
- “ Land use satellite mapping – we’re prioritising and investing in this in cocoa and palm. But we need help scaling and bringing technology to better use the information at scale.
- “ Need to strengthen robust, public landscape monitoring capabilities for priority landscapes.



Kevin Rabinovith, John Buchanan, Andrew Bovarnick (from L to R)

5.7 Strengthen ‘systems thinking’ in the design of projects, increasing adaptability and capacity for deeper collaboration between key players (public, private and civil society) and similar projects

Change strategies and practices should be more informed by systems thinking – involving more co-design, collaborative innovation, more agility and adaptability, both within and across initiatives. Facilitating and brokering multi-stakeholder partnerships to scale action on the ground is a priority.

- “ Organisational dynamics mean that it is difficult to avoid multiple actors following their own agendas. However, more could be done to generate greater alignment, enabling more coherence between different initiatives and unlocking synergies.

- “ Collaboration takes time – so key players need to be encouraged to allocate sufficient resources (people and time) to be able to unlock the benefits of collaboration, and funders need to consider this in how programmes are funded.
- “ GEF 7 should build on its major investment developing collaboration in the GGP partnership.
- “ There is still a lot to be done. More coordination is needed to make sure all the efforts are directed towards 'systemic' change.
- “ There is power in aligned approaches. But only if they are aligned not just at headlines but at a more detailed level.
- “ Need a Theory of Change based on systems thinking.
- “ Must move forward on a systems-based approach - the premise of the whole conversation today. Supply chain focussed activities, no matter how well executed will fall short if these levers are acted upon alone.
- “ Increase investment in 'marketplaces' for the brokering and facilitation of partnerships, particularly those that attempt to tackle systemic issues, rather than small scale partnerships at the level of projects. The National Commodity Platforms convened by UNDP are designed to do this.
- “ Strengthen collaboration between all the GGP partner organisations, the Consumer Goods Forum and other key organisations such as TFA2020 and other leading NGOs working on these issues.
- “ Have GEF & GGP partners communicate more broadly projects that companies can engage in.
- “ Businesses don't know what the options are, how to get involved with sustainable initiatives. More outreach is needed to bring them to the table, and they may be quite willing.
- “ GGP should convene stakeholders around specific problems to be solved for more “deep dive” collaborative sessions that can both generate solutions and create / support partnerships for delivery – this can be done both globally and at the national and sub-national level.
- “ Design projects to be more agile, adopting practices from design thinking / collaborative innovation communities which are more aligned to systems thinking approaches, rather than traditional project design which can be more linear in approach.
- “ Private sector engagement is more effective through coalitions.

- “ GEF and GGP should identify other pilots and projects that are working and well and look to scale them.
- “ We need more than just 2-3 case studies – more like 30 case studies around the world to understand what the solutions are – we need to put some money into understanding the underlying technical processes.
- “ Need to convene stakeholder dialogue around a specific problem to be solved that includes and involves government and aligns government interest with other stakeholders.
- “ We need to spend time together on creating new solutions beyond what exists today.
- “ GEF can continue to fund multi-stakeholder platforms that promote alignment of incentives.
- “ Need adaptive management (don't wait 8 years to adjust theory of change). Need theory of change based on 'systems thinking.'
- “ The GGP has brought together different agencies with different strengths to work in various landscapes, with the hope of achieving greater impact than any single agency would have.

6. Specific recommendations for palm oil in Indonesia

Many of the challenges and recommendations above are relevant to multiple commodities and geographies. In this section we draw out a few of the points that were made specifically in relation to palm oil in Indonesia.



6.1 Government engagement

- “ Only way to have real solutions is if Indonesia buys into it. The Indonesian government is particularly sensitive to international voices.
- “ Inter-ministerial cooperation is key (especially between trade, agriculture, environment, finance ministries)

- “ Governance is the greatest issue – need to engage all the way down to the district level.
- “ Continue to devote resources and effort to ‘on-the ground’ national and provincial and district activities.
- “ Improve connectivity between national, provincial and district government.
- “ Localize the narrative of impact.
- “ Use more positive framings around the role of farmers in protecting the environment.
- “ Government priorities are self-sufficiency and growth – so any agenda for change needs to align around these goals.
- “ Our need: Government engagement aligned with NDPE [No Deforestation, No Peat, No Exploitation] objectives.
- “ Support greater legal enforcement – supporting transparency, capacity building.
- “ GEF can work with the World Bank to influence the agenda on palm oil.
- “ Engage international private sector in National Action Plan implementation.
- “ Greater support for ISPO, which represents the government’s definition of sustainability in the sector and is the avenue for how to enact change in Indonesia.
- “ Create stronger connections between the National Action Plan on Sustainable Palm Oil (NAP) and other activities – e.g. jurisdictional and landscape – and also other initiatives like One Map.

6.2 Demand market engagement

- “ Influencing domestic market awareness and demand can also impact the political context for sectoral change.
- “ WWF has consumer campaigns in Indonesia for palm oil – to link their consumption to destruction of forests to their well-being (health, water, economic, etc.)
- “ Scale up efforts to work with major markets that are not considering sustainability criteria.

6.3 Jurisdictional and landscape approaches

- “ The way in which the product is aggregated through the supply chain means that a jurisdictional approach is required.

- “ Strengthen focus on communities, landscapes and jurisdictions, rather than individual smallholders.
- “ Local economic development is key so people have alternative livelihoods.
- “ The vast, complicated smallholder environment is difficult for us to identify and influence.
- “ GEF-7 as support for government capacity building as part of jurisdictional efforts like Coalition for Sustainable Livelihoods in North Sumatra/Aceh.

6.4 Data, tools, technologies, methodologies

- “ Support increased transparency in the sector – traceability, examples of corporate malfeasance, increasing legal enforcement.
- “ Need to fix the broken chain between producers and millers to provide transparency.
- “ Collaborate with the Government Open Data transparency initiative.

6.5 Better collaboration

- “ Need to get beyond project by project.
- “ Increase inter-agency alignment – within GGP and with other key actors.
- “ Greater coordination / connection between initiatives.
- “ Increase / improve communication to private sector of existing efforts: NAP, CSL [Coalition for Sustainable Livelihoods], tools, etc.
- “ Increase communications of case studies of best practice and offer as models for others to follow.
- “ Shared understanding of high-risk mills – coordination from supply chain actors necessary to avoid duplication of efforts on verification.
- “ Producers, even the responsible ones, are overwhelmed by advocacy NGOs and government. They have reached a point where anything they do becomes the baseline.
- “ How will private sector express ambition for the next generation of this work after 2020 commitment sunsets? Will GGP play a role in setting targets and tracking against those? Possible role for CDP in tracking reporting.

7. Specific recommendations for beef and soy in Cerrado (Brazil) and Chaco (Paraguay)

The session on Cerrado soy and Chaco beef had a strong emphasis on financial incentives for producers to avoid converting natural lands that have already been designated for production or that could legally be deforested under current policy frameworks. The overarching sentiment was that demand markets—while important—would not be able to save the native vegetation in these important biomes without additional incentives and government support.



John Buchanan, Vice President, Sustainable Production, Conservation International

7.1 Government engagement

- “ Support the development of a sustainability vision both for the Cerrado and for the Chaco.
- “ Influence government to set high priority zones / no-go zones, combined with compensation.
- “ Invest in government monitoring of land use change.
- “ Support efforts to create an agreed map of land ownership and land use – including indigenous and traditional community rights.
- “ Strengthen state and local government capacity for CAR (Cadastro Ambiental Rural – Rural Environmental Registry) compliance.
- “ Support state and local government's administrative capacity to validate Brazil's CAR.
- “ Encourage land swaps for farmers to develop cleared land owned by the government instead of forest.

7.2 Jurisdictions and landscapes

- “ Invest in landscape level initiatives.

- “ Develop best practice models and communicate learnings to encourage replication.

7.3 Producer capacity building

- “ Producers are part of the solution- need to make sure we use this approach when we work with producers. Brazil farmers are the largest investors in native vegetation – how to make it in their interest to use that capital in an effective way so it is sustainable.
- “ Build closer relationships with farmer organisations.
- “ Build capacity for CAR compliance.
- “ Invest in sustainable intensification.
- “ Increase investment in farmer training.
- “ Invest in tools / technology for effective farmer training at scale.
- “ Invest in bringing slaughter houses up to international standards.

7.4 Demand market engagement

- “ Need to significantly scale up efforts on engagement with demand markets in beef, where penetration on sustainable sourcing criteria is very low.
- “ Continue to build on [TRASE](#) and other soy work.

7.5 Finance and incentives

- “ Develop and disseminate among producers clear business case for sustainable intensification.
- “ Support the development of innovative financial products that support no conversion.
- “ Support aggregation of farmers into larger groups to make financing possible.
- “ Increase availability of longer-term finance for investment into sustainable intensification, alongside conservation.
- “ De-risk impact funds so that they can offer attractive finance options for deforestation free production.
- “ Convene and facilitate platforms to support alignment of incentives.
- “ Create a fund to compensate farmers for not developing forest they are legally entitled to.
- “ Funding of conservation and restoration projects.


“ Broker connection to preferential finance for good sustainability performance.

7.6 Data, tools methodologies

“ Push for greater alignment around metrics, monitoring and reporting amongst all stakeholders.

8. Conclusion

This report has been provided to the GEF for input into the FOLUR funding process. The report has also been reviewed by the partners in the Good Growth Partnership and new insights and recommendations are being integrated into workplans. Overall the workshop reinforced the need and value of the approach of the Good Growth Partnership – as well as GEF’s current plans for FOLUR.



Participants in the roundtable recognised the need to accelerate and scale the work of GGP. The private sector representatives clearly recognised that better alignment with national and subnational government priorities in producer countries is key and that GGP can play a crucial role connecting to governments. Equally, international development organisations need strong partnerships with the private sector – and with funders and investors – to demonstrate that sustainable production practices attract meaningful inward investment, drive sector and market development and can deliver significant economic and social benefits for producer countries.

A key gap is that important demand markets – such as China, India, Brazil and Indonesia – are not currently

strongly engaged with these international efforts to drive sustainable production standards. GGP and the GEF need to strengthen engagement with these markets, which are critical for shifting the global sustainable food and agriculture system.

There is also a critical need to move beyond “project by project” approaches towards the design and delivery of more systemic solutions – both in terms of the legal & regulatory frameworks and legal enforcement in producer countries and also in terms of sector-wide capacity building (training and finance) that can reach millions of farmers, rather than just thousands.

To deliver more systemic solutions going forward, GEF and GGP should deepen their partnerships with key private sector organisations such as the Consumer Goods Forum and convene the private sector and other key actors (funders, development organisations and governments) for “deep dive” working sessions to make progress on specific challenges. Such processes can also offer a mechanism for private sector input into the development and implementation of FOLUR. This deeper cross-sectoral collaboration will benefit sustainable commodity buyers by creating sector-wide change, rather than just pockets of best practice.

Appendix

Participant list

Alison Taylor	Chief Sustainability Officer	Archer Daniels Midland
Hervé Duteil	Chief Sustainability Officer, Americas	BNP Paribas
Michel Reis dos Santos	Director, Global Sustainability	Bunge
John Hartmann	Business Operations and Supply Chain Leader	Cargill
Jillian Gladstone	Forests Senior Program Manager	CDP
Ariel Meyerstein	Senior Vice President, Corporate Sustainability	Citi
Peter Graham	Managing Director of Policy and Research	Climate Advisers
Dan Zarin	Director of Programs	CLUA
John Buchanan	Vice President, Sustainable Production	Conservation International
Raina Lang	Director, Sustainable Coffee Markets	Conservation International
Asha Bobb-Semple	Operations Analyst	GEF
Claus Astrup	Advisor to the CEO	GEF
Gustavo Fonseca	Director of Programs	GEF
Hannah Fairbank	Senior Biodiversity Specialist	GEF
Mohamed Bakarr	Lead Environmental Specialist	GEF
Naoko Ishii	Chief Executive Officer	GEF
Pascal Martinez	Senior Climate Change Specialist	GEF
Paul Hartman	Senior Environmental Specialist	GEF
Ernest Bethe	Regional Leader	IFC
Fernanda Lopez	Consultant	IFC
Guillermo Terol	Program Officer	IFC
Jannina Flores Ramirez	Program Assistant	IFC
Lorena Ramirez	Project Manager	IFC
Julio Quintana-Castillo	Senior Manager Sustainability	Kraft Heinz
Kevin Rabinovitch	Global VP Sustainability	Mars
Michael Reading	Manager, Sustainability, Global Issues Management Center of Excellence	McDonald's
Tim Mealey	Senior Partner and Managing Director	Meridien
Chris McGrath	Chief Sustainability, Well-being, Public & Government Affairs Officer	Mondelēz
Jack Scott	VP Sustainability and Responsible Sourcing	Nestle USA and Nestle Purina PetCare
Christopher Stewart	Chief Sustainability Officer	Olam
Tracey Duffey	Head of External Funding	Olam Cocoa
Rob Meyers	Sustainability Director	PepsiCo
Adrienne Stork	Accountability Framework	Rainforest Alliance
Chris Whaley	Secretary	Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP)
Ivo Mulder	Finance & Economics Coordinator - Freshwater, Land and Climate Branch	UN Environment
Jonathan Gheysens	Expert for Ecosystem Services and Sustainable Land Use	UN Environment

Lara Jacob	Good Growth Partnership Program Manager	UN Environment
Andrew Bovarnick	Global Head, Green Commodities Programme	UNDP
Charles O'Malley	Senior Partnerships Advisor, Green Commodities Programme	UNDP
Jamison Ervin	Manager, Global Program on Nature for Development	UNDP
Madeline Craig	Programme Analyst	UNDP
Nicole Desantis	Programme Specialist & Policy Advisor	UNDP
Pascale Bonzom	Global Project Manager, Good Growth Partnership	UNDP
Luiz Fernando do Amaral	Global Executive Manager - GFW Commodities & Finance	WRI
Elizabeth Schueler	Senior Director	WWF
Jordan Swift	Monitoring Evaluation & Reporting Officer	WWF
Karla Canavan	VP Commodity Trade and Finance	WWF
Kavita Prakash-Mani	Practice Leader, Markets	WWF
Kerry Cesareo	VP Forests	WWF
Luis Iseppe	Senior Director, Strategic Corporate Engagement, Food	WWF
Margaret Arbuthnot	Good Growth Partnership, Demand Project Manager	WWF
Owen Hauck	Commodity Supply Chains Economist	WWF

Agenda

- 10:00** **Welcome**
- Welcome to the IFC** – Tania Kaddeche, Regional Head of Industry for Latin America, IFC
- Introduction to the theme** – Andrew Bovarnick, Global Head, Green Commodities Programme, UNDP
- The private sector perspective** – Chris McGrath, Chief Sustainability, Well-being, Public & Government Affairs Officer, Mondelēz
- Agenda overview** – Charles O’Malley, Senior Partnerships Advisor, Green Commodities Programme, UNDP
-
- 10:20** **How can GEF funding priorities in the Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Project be best aligned with private sector priorities for responsible sourcing?**
- Welcome by GEF** – Naoko Ishii, CEO, GEF
- GEF FOLUR funding priorities** – Gustavo Fonseca, Director of Programs, GEF
- Discussion at tables**, followed by **plenary discussion**
- *Challenges*: what are the key challenges for the private sector in effectively achieving their responsible sourcing objectives, across key commodities and sourcing countries?
 - *Recommendations*: how can GEF and the GGP partner organisations best support effective private sector action at the (1) country and (2) global level to accelerate sustainable production?
- Facilitator: Charles O’Malley, UNDP
-
- 11:30** **The case of Indonesian palm oil: how can donors and international agencies best collaborate with the international private sector to accelerate sector-wide transformation?**
- The Good Growth Partnership in Indonesia** – Andrew Bovarnick, UNDP
- The Coalition for Sustainable Livelihoods** – John Buchanan, Vice President Sustainable Production, Conservation International
- Evolving the CGF ‘Theory of Change’** – Kevin Rabinovitch, Global Vice President Sustainability, Mars
- Discussion at tables**, followed by **plenary discussion**
- *Challenges*: what are the key challenges for the private sector in effectively achieving their sourcing objectives for sustainable palm oil from Indonesia?
 - *Recommendations*: how can GEF and the GGP partners best support effective private sector action to accelerate sector-wide change in the Indonesian palm oil sector?
- Facilitator: Kavita Prakash-Mani, Practice Leader, Markets, WWF
-
- 12:45** **Lunch**
-
- 1:45** **Latin American beef & soy: how can companies implement their sourcing commitments and also meet global demand while conserving native vegetation in the Chaco and Cerrado?**
- Panellists**: John Hartmann, Business Operations and Supply Chain Leader, Cargill; Karla Canavan, VP Commodity Trade and Finance, WWF; Guillermo Terol, Program Officer, IFC
- Moderator: John Buchanan, Conservation International
- Discussions at tables**: land use planning; financial incentives; NGO tools; GEF funding priorities.
- Plenary discussion**
-
- 3:00** **Summary of key insights, recommendations and next steps**
- Discussion at tables**, followed by **plenary discussion**
- GEF**: key takeaways and next steps
-
- 3:30** **Close**
-

About the Good Growth Partnership

The Good Growth Partnership is a partnership funded by the Global Environment Facility, led by the United Nations Development Programme and implemented in collaboration with Conservation International, the International Finance Corporation, UN Environment and World Wildlife Fund. In partnership with the governments

of Brazil, Indonesia, Liberia and Paraguay, as well as civil society and major private sector players, we aim to reduce deforestation and enable sustainable development three global commodity supply chains: soy, beef and palm oil – working across sustainable production, responsible demand and finance.

GEF Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program

The Food Systems, Land Use, and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program will address the underlying drivers of unsustainable food systems and land use change by supporting countries to take a more holistic and system-wide approach that is in line with their specific needs for generating global environmental benefits. A coordinated rational and more environmentally sustainable land-use framework at a national or jurisdictional level is key to ensure efficient food production and commodity supply

chains, protect the environment, and support human prosperity. The Impact Program will focus on achieving three objectives: (1) Promoting sustainable food systems to meet growing global demand, (2) Promoting deforestation-free agricultural commodity supply chains to slow loss of tropical forests, and (3) Promoting restoration of degraded landscapes for sustainable production and to maintain ecosystem services.