

Forest Positive Coalition of Action

Stakeholder Engagement Meeting

4th September 2020



1. Content

1. Agenda.....	2
2. Participants.....	3
3. Actions.....	4
4. Welcome and introduction.....	4
5. Overview of the Coalition and Coalition-Wide Actions.....	5
6. Discussion: Engagement & Collaboration Moving Forward.....	8
6.1. Q&A Discussion:	8
6.1.1. General	8
6.1.2. Commodities/Roadmaps:	9
6.1.3. Human Rights:	11
6.1.4. Supplier/Trader Engagement	13
6.1.5. Production Landscapes.....	14
6.1.6. Transparency and Accountability:	15
6.1.7. Government and Stakeholder Engagement:.....	16
6.1.8. Other.....	20
6.2. NGO Transparency Platform.....	21
7. Wrap up and next steps.....	22

2. Agenda

- 1. Welcome**
 - Objectives and agenda for the meeting
- 2. Coalition-wide actions**
 - Introduction to Coalition-Wide Actions & Links to the CGF Human Rights Coalition
 - Q&A and Discussion
- 3. Discussion: Engagement & Collaboration Moving Forward**
- 4. Wrap-Up**

3. Participants

AFI/Rainforest Alliance - Jeff Milder
 Bank Information Center - Anna Kennedy
 Carrefour - Bertrand Swiderski
 Carrefour - Scarlett Elizée
 CDP - Morgan Gillespy
 CGIAR - Leimona Beria
 CGIAR - Sonia Dewi
 Colgate Palmolive Company - Ann Tracy
 Colgate Palmolive Company - Marie Johansson
 Colgate Palmolive Company - Marina Cabrera
 Colgate Palmolive Company - Ronald Jacoby
 Conservation International - John Buchanan
 Earth Innovation Institute - Dan Nepstad
 Earthworm Foundation - Lucie Blancpain
 Earthworm Foundation - Rob McWilliam
 EIA - Alexander von Bismarck
 Essity - Sofia Kriggsman
 Fern - Indra van Gisbergen
 Forest Peoples Programme - Tom Griffiths
 Forest Trends - Stephen Donofrio
 Global Canopy Programme - Emma Gollub
 Global Witness - Shona Hawkes
 GOLIN - Lucy Wright
 Greenpeace - Diana Ruiz
 Grupo Bimbo - Josselyn Rizo
 Grupo Bimbo - Juan Andrade
 Grupo Bimbo - Mariana Contreras Muñoz
 IDH - Willem Klaasens
 ISEAL - David D'Hollander
 Jerónimo Martins - Ana Rovisco
 Kellogg - Sarah Smith
 Mars, Incorporated - Kevin Rabinovitch
 Meridian Institute - John Erhmann
 METRO AG- Veronika Pountcheva
 Mighty Earth- Sarah Lake
 Mighty Earth - Glenn Hurowitz
 Mondelēz International - Christine McGrath
 Mondelēz International - Tom Armitage
 Mondelēz International - Virginie Mahin
 Nestlé - Barbara Wettstein
 Orang Utan Republik Foundation - Charlotte Bouaziz
 Oxfam America - Aditi Sen
 Pepsico - Andrew Slight
 Pepsico - Brian Kramer
 Proforest - Ruth Nussbaum
 Proforest - Silvia Castro Torres
 Rainforest Action Network - Brihannala Morgan
 Rainforest Action Network - Maggie Martin
 Rainforest Action Network - Robin Averbeck
 Rights and Resources Initiative - Bryson Ogden
 RSPO - Inke Van Der Sluijs
 Sainsbury's - Judith Batchelar
 Sainsbury's - Laura Falk
 Tesco - Anna Turrell
 TFA - Carolina Brandão
 TFA - Jennifer Ferguson-Mitchell
 TFA - Justin Adams
 TFA - Petra Tanos
 The Nature Conservancy - David Cleary
 Unilever - Martin Huxtable
 Unilever - Petra Meekers
 UNDP - Charles O 'Malley
 Verité - Daryll Delgado
 Verité - Melizel Asuncion
 Wageningen University & Research - Marieke Sassen
 Walmart - Mikel Hancock
 World Animal Protection - Rafel Servent
 World Resources Intitute - Rodney Taylor
 WWF - Frederico Soares Machado
 WWF - Jean-François Timmers
 Zoological Society of London - Oliver Cupit
 CGF - Aliya Kumekbayeva
 CGF - Debora Dias
 CGF - Didier Bergeret
 CGF - Ignacio Gavilan
 CGF - Lee Green
 CGF - Madelaine VanDerHeyden
 CGF - Nadia Bunce
 CGF - Noriko Shindo
 CGF - Thomas van Haaren
 CGF - Yanping Gu

4. Actions

Action	Who	Deadline
Meeting minutes and participant list to be sent to all attendees	CGF Staff	Before 22 nd September
Written responses will be provided for all questions asked in the Q&A	CGF Staff	Before 22 nd September
A proposed way forward for engagement will be developed and shared based on input received	CGF Staff	By Q4 2020

5. Welcome and introduction

The anti-trust caution which everyone on the call acknowledged.

The meeting was co-hosted and moderated by The Consumer Goods Forum (CGF) and The Tropical Forest Alliance (TFA).

About the TFA:

TFA was originally set up to help and support CGF members on implementation. TFA serves as a bridge between the private sector and other stakeholders to catalyse collective action, and to find and provide solutions on commodity driven deforestation. The organisation also provides a structured space for dialogue with governments and civil society. This stakeholder meeting is a concrete example of TFA's bridge building role.

Today's meeting:

The meeting is about engaging with NGOs in a structured manner, and to meet everyone's expectations. The meeting will:

- Provide an overview of the CGF Forest Positive Coalition (FP CoA),
- Demonstrate how the FP CoA addressing or intending to address the concerns of the NGO community, and
- Ensure that we are aligned when building the FP CoA.

Part of the meeting will also be spent on discussing future engagement and learn from NGO's insights to structure engagement in the coming meetings.

6. Overview of the Coalition and Coalition-Wide Actions

Introduction:

- The FP CoA is composed of 17 member companies, with a collective market value of US\$1.8 trillion, working together to accelerate systemic efforts to remove deforestation and/or conversion from key commodity supply chains.
- We want to be part of the solutions and multi-stakeholder partnerships are key to create transformational change.
- We are committed to engaging key supply chain actors and reporting progress transparently to drive change.
- Members agree to engage suppliers/traders and drive progress towards mainstreaming deforestation-free/conversion-free businesses
- Companies commit to reporting regularly on progress against specific time bound objectives; spatial data on supply chains and target jurisdictions; and progress towards supplier compliance
- Starting in 2018, we led a process to define the Forest Positive Coalitions Theory of Change, and understand how we can make more progress and what it would take to ultimately end deforestation. This led to the development of 7 levers for change and the Theory of Change, of which there are 3 levers where we as companies can really drive change:
 - **Supply chain management:** in the past we typically focused on our own supply chains as companies, working with suppliers and using certification to track individual supply chains to ensure they are deforestation free. The challenge with this approach is that deforestation would continue to happen in other parts of the suppliers' network. Therefore, this is about moving suppliers to embracing deforestation-free practices across their whole production base and supply, ensuring deforestation-free business. Importantly, this is not just about commodity use but looking at how the land is used.
 - **Forest Positive Policies:** for producer countries, narratives about standing forests as a resource, not an obstacle to economic development that catalyses political will, electability, policy making, governance and illegality. For developed countries, trade policies supportive of protection and restoration.
 - **Jurisdictional wins:** intense focus on the supply side levers (1,2 and 3) in a specific geography to create success stories to protect key places and catalyse further action.
- We are focusing on 3 main commodities: palm; soy; paper, pulp and fibre-based packaging, each with its respective working group. We have also established a working group on communication and engagement.
- The commodity specific roadmaps set out action in each area. These roadmaps are not static, but are open for challenge and further evolution, and we notably welcome NGO and expert feedback.
 - The draft Palm Oil Roadmap has already been shared externally via a stakeholder consultation.
 - The Soy Roadmap is currently under stakeholder consultation.
 - The Paper, Pulp and Fibre-Based Packaging Roadmap is under development.
- There are 4 coalition-wide actions:
 - Supplier and Trader Engagement
 - Transparency and Accountability
 - Production Landscapes – collaborating in key landscapes
 - Governments and stakeholder engagement
- The strategy and roadmap of the FP CoA has been shared to CEOs and CPOs- this is not just a coalition of sustainability and public affairs specialists - there is alignment with and adherence from CEOs and the buying/commercial functions.

Supplier / Trader engagement:

Vision of Success: Members reduce consumption of high-risk commodities and buy from and work with suppliers & traders that are progressing to deliver forest positive across their business.

- We as a coalition have aligned on our expectations and established a list of common asks to suppliers/traders.
- We also know that the buying and many key business decisions are taking place at Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) level so have included them in our dialogue.
- We are aligning our data, using pre-competitive datasets to shape individual and collective actions. We feel this is an effective way to contribute to the transformational change we need.

Production landscapes

Vision of Success: The members of the Coalition work collectively and in collaboration with governments, producers, local communities and civil society to support sustainable, forest positive development in key commodity producing landscapes.

- Many companies have taken on investments in capacity building at a landscape level on individual scale. What we intend to do here is work together with TFA and all relevant stakeholders to:
 - identify and engage in priority production landscapes to address deforestation and to support forest conservation and restoration efforts, with a positive outcome for communities
 - support development of independent credible approaches to designing, implementing and monitoring landscape initiatives
- This work is still at an early stage, even if some companies have begun at an individual level. We would welcome comments and input on how we can work on this, and where our priorities should be.

Connecting with the Human Rights Coalition

- We are ensuring that the Forest Positive agenda remains linked to another key agenda of CGF: the Human Rights Coalition - Working to End Forced Labour.
- Forced labour remains the key focus point of the Human Rights Coalition, initially. Whilst we know that the human rights agenda is much broader than forced labour, we are collectively focusing our efforts at CGF level on our most salient issue which is forced labour. This is an area where collective action can make the greatest impact. Forced labour also broaches a number of labour exploitation issues and serves as an entry door into a wider spectrum of challenges.
- Currently 24.9 million people are estimated to be in forced labour worldwide. Abuse of recruitment practices and workers' treatment is prevalent in the industry e.g. charging of fees to workers, wage withholding, lack of contractual agreements, restricted worker's freedom of movement etc.
- Following the launch of our 2016 CGF Social Resolution on Forced Labour, we adopted 3 Priority Industry Principles on forced labour, looking at addressing the core drivers of the issue, and to guide our work:
 - Every worker should have freedom of movement
 - No worker should pay for a job
 - No worker should be indebted or coerced to work.
- Why do we believe it is necessary to link the HRC agenda with the FP CoA agenda?
 - Many studies show that unsustainable practices generating deforestation can also be linked to working conditions that could be associated with forced labour.
 - We cannot operate as responsible businesses sourcing deforestation-free products, if we cannot ensure that they are not being produced under forced labour.
- We are also ensuring links to the agenda of our Sustainable Supply Chain Initiative, which is a benchmarking tool which we hope will drive us towards faster progress.

Forest Positive CoA | Stakeholder Engagement Meeting | 4th September 2020

- Our key bridge between the FP CoA and HRC is on the commodity of palm oil, where each coalition has dedicated efforts to addressing issues in the sector. For the HRC Palm Oil Roadmap, central to our efforts in addressing forced labour is the deployment of forced labour focused Human Rights Due Diligence Systems (HRDD). Our goal is for every player to deploy HRDD across the palm oil value chain.
- Our HRDD approach is modelled after the version developed for members own operations, covering 6 steps, aligned with the UNGPs. We start by defining a policy through to tracking its effectiveness. We believe that not every company is on the same level, and understand that its implementation will be a journey to move from launched to leadership level.
- We aim to cooperate on the ground with selected suppliers initially, and also to develop effective remediation and preventative measures on key areas of focus, such as responsible recruitment. In parallel, and in alignment with the Forest Positive Coalition's Palm Oil Working Group, we will engage relevant stakeholders to enable the adoption and enforcement of measures with governments to eliminate forced labour within the palm oil sector.
- We hope to have the NGO communities' constructive feedback and insights, notably when this draft palm oil roadmap is shared for stakeholder consultation in the next few weeks.
- CGF plans to officially launch the Human Rights Coalition- Working to End Forced Labour in Q4 of this year.

Government and Stakeholder Engagement

Vision of success: An enabling environment to deliver on our collective commitments as laid out in the Charter and the Commodity Roadmaps, created through engagement with governments and key stakeholders.

- Achieving deforestation-free supply chains will require multi stakeholder collaboration. When it comes to stakeholder engagement, the first stage was with the stakeholder consultation for the definition of the 7 levers of change.
- We now want stakeholder engagement to become a regular dialogue and pave the way for greater collaboration.
- Governmental engagement: we believe that the industry has a key role to play in producer and demand-side countries.
- Progress to Date:
 - Identification of company's key corporate affairs / government affairs stakeholders at EU and Brazil levels.
 - EU: Coalition members participated in the TFA EU Roundtables and contributed to the resulting discussion paper.

Transparency and Accountability

Vision of success: Reporting should bring actionable insights and support collective transparency

- There are a number of objectives around reporting. External trust and confidence in our industry will be earned through our industry meeting the timelines and objectives that we have set: both on an individual and collective level, and how we engage the broader system, otherwise we will fail in creating change in a timely way.
- We propose measuring at a very granular level as well as more looking at more qualitative KPIs e.g. how we are behaving, how we engage stakeholders, and how we bring the system on board with us to build a forest positive future.
- Reporting should always bring actionable insights. We are very conscious that, in different geographies and commodities, progress is moving at different speeds and is often driven by legislation which is not evenly distributed.
- One of the advantages of this coalition is that, whilst members are moving at different paces, we can try to move collectively together.
- There are 2 levels of reporting

- CoA members reporting at company level against the metrics set out in the commodity roadmaps
- Aggregated reporting at collective level.
- Our objective is not to create another reporting standard and framework but to use recognised frameworks such as CDP. We need to agree on what those recognised frameworks are for reporting individual company progress.
- For reporting as a collective, we need to discuss with you as stakeholders:
 - Our effectiveness and challenges around Supplier/Trader Engagement
 - Engagement in Key Production Landscapes
 - Intensity of the Governmental Engagement Efforts (tracking of relevant actions)
 - Responsiveness to Stakeholders (Engagement Platform, Survey on trust levels...)

7. Discussion: Engagement & Collaboration Moving Forward

7.1. Q&A Discussion:

7.1.1. *General*

- **What is the deadline for the Coalition to achieve zero-net deforestation? Will it be achieved by the end of the year as originally stated in 2010?**
- **What is the deadline that the Coalition will achieve zero net deforestation?**
 - The Forest Positive Coalition has not set a deadline to achieve zero-net deforestation. The CGF's previous approach to eliminating deforestation from its members' supply chains was based around the 2010 commitment to achieve zero-net deforestation. While our companies made progress towards that goal, we have learned that acting on individual supply chains will not alone drive the transformation needed to achieve a forest positive future. That is why the Coalition was formed this year based on the new Theory of Change which encourages a more transparent, multi-stakeholder and transformative approach.
- **Would it be possible to add "deforestation AND CONVERSION" (in cap) in the Coalition's narrative?**
 - Yes, we will make sure to amend the language to reflect this.
- **Really glad to hear that you brought together both CEOs AND Chief Procurement Officers. Can you or have you also brought together Chief People Officers/heads of HR to share ideas and innovations on how to incentivize sustainability within individual performance/evaluation and compensation programs?**
 - This is an interesting question - we have not yet connected with Chief People Officers/heads of HR but will definitely explore this as they are a key stakeholder within companies.
- **How does the CGF plan to engage with the hundreds of members that are not part of the coalition? Is there an expectation that all members should join this coalition?**
 - At CGF we regularly reach out to members to recruit more members for the Coalition. All retailer and manufacturer members can join the Coalition and we encourage their active participation.
- **What role do you see for research to support the Coalition's agenda setting and actions in relation to achieving zero-deforestation and integrated land-use approach? If so, could the platform**

support making research needs more visible? E.g. might it support consolidating similar questions from different partners? Or needs for research products? (data, knowledge, tools etc).

- One goal of the Coalition's Transparency & Engagement Platform is to help identify and prioritise issues that require our attention and action. Research is certainly one area in which the Platform could offer valuable insight, especially given that users will be able to see questions and resources posted by others as a method of triangulation.
 - Other technologies are also available to support the Coalition's work. Many actors are working on enhanced traceability. We are excited to learn more about how we can leverage technological tools to better manage our supply chains. We are also engaging with our peers involved in the CGF's End-to-End Value Chain initiative and Product Data Coalition of Action, who are working on supply chains, mapping, traceability and product data. All of these tools can provide valuable data that can aid important research
- **Are less known or emerging conversion fronts in the Coalition's radar, like the Great Plains (700kha converted/y), African savannahs and Asian steppes? Using AFI definitions of Ecosystems and no conversion as reference. Thank you!**
 - We are using AFI as a central guide, but focus is more on existing conversion fronts where commercial leverage is more effective rather than emerging ones
 - **Some products are not worth the resources they deplete - eg junk food. Will the CGF grapple with the dire need to reduce consumption overall?**
 - We recommend following up on this question with individual companies. At industry-wide level CGF leads a Coalition on [Collaboration for Healthier Lives](#) that addresses related issues.

7.1.2. *Commodities/Roadmaps:*

- **Hi all, thanks for sharing these exciting efforts. While new technologies and remote sensing would allow for accurate conservation monitoring, it would need to link up with actions and investments on the ground to shape the agency of producers. To what degree can the roadmaps provide concrete guidelines on how to do the latter in an effective and coordinated manner? And how would this relate to industry wide standards or sourcing codes?**
 - We agree technology alone is not enough. The Roadmaps are trying to build that combination, working with suppliers and in production landscapes. To better determine how we can approach this, we are planning to reach out to leading organisations such as AFI, IDH, ISEAL, etc
- **How do you see the future of commodity certifications? When working on the traceability withing a certain jurisdiction, what type of supports do you expect from the public sectors?**
 - Certification is a really important tool but often not enough on its own. We will however continue to work with certification and schemes (including through our [Sustainable Supply Chain Initiative](#)).
 - On the public sector - we have a coalition-wide action on government engagement where we are exploring these types of questions.
- **Will the non forest natural ecosystems targeted by commodity driven conversion be considered?**
 - Yes, non-forest natural ecosystems are being considered (for example peatlands, the Cerrado, etc)
- **CGF has defined its commodity foci on Soy, Palm and Paper, Pulp and Fibre-based Packaging, what is the plan for engaging on beef?**
- **Why cattle is not included considering the role it has in deforestation in Latin America?**
 - We are focusing on the commodities where we believe we can have the greatest impact collectively. As we learn more, and share our learnings, we may explore applying our

- strategies to other commodities, or work with partners who are more active in these other commodities.
- Beef is a complicated topic since it also broaches issues around water and animal welfare, as well as deforestation.
 - We are reflecting on whether to also integrate a working group focused on beef.
- **Beyond exploring creating a beef working group, can the CGF commit to addressing beef sustainability? Given the CGF's elite role, it is essential you are seen to be working on beef even if a broad number of members are not yet interested**
 - **We have seen CGF companies enforce policies against deforestation and human rights abuse in the palm oil sector especially, and have supported concrete industry-wide action in cocoa. While there is much more to do, this has produced results, in particular a sustained 3/4 decline in deforestation for palm oil, and initial reductions in deforestation for cocoa. But when it comes to meat, the world's largest driver of deforestation and human rights abuse, CGF companies have for the most part been unwilling so far to actually enforce policies against deforestation, climate pollution and egregious human rights abuse, even as Amazon deforestation reaches the highest level in a dozen years, and big meat companies continue to pollute water and climate and drive displacement or health impacts to local communities across the Americas. What is the timeline for CGF companies to actually bring the proven effective approach from other commodities to meat?**
 - **Cattle was part of the original pledge from CGF of four priority commodities - as it should be - the single largest driver of deforestation in the world!**
 - **It is not just beef: leather is relevant also.**
 - Beef (and leather) needs a more hollistic approach as it encompasses many other issues e.g. water, animal welfare, alternative proteins as beef replacement and lab grown meat. There is a limited number of CGF member companies with a large enough market share to make an adequate impact and with matters like meat alternatives, this subject is often competitive.
 - Some individual CGF members are in exploratory discussions about what approaches and actions can be taken on beef in collaboration with existing efforts.
 - **There are enormous tools like (but not only) Visipec to drive action in the cattle sector. The gap is appetite of JBS and others to actually take meaningful steps because they don't feel like they face consequences from customers if they continue deforestation and displacment. Similar dynamics in soy with Cargill & Bunge.**
 - Thank you for the information on Visipec.
 - As part of our supplier/trader engagement, we are working with Chief Procurement Officers (CPOs) asking them to address their commercial teams, with CEOs, and to technical and functional levels to ensure we are getting the Forest Positive commitments on their agendas and priorities.
 - There is great value in cooperating with suppliers and working together on sector wide barriers could be one way forward. We are also developing consequential responses (including through CPO engagement with suppliers) when we see that progress is not moving in the right direction e.g. non respect of deforestation commitments.
 - **Congrats for this initiative, dialogue and collaboration is critical for achieving deforestation/conversion free commodities. For the soy sector, since 2006, the approaches to tackling deforestation/conversion that have been demonstrating efficiency, effectiveness and transparency are based on a voluntary private sector cut-off date + implementation of MRV system; with support from civil society organizations.**
 - Thank you for the suggestion, we will follow up with your organisation to discuss further.
 - **This is the case, for instance, of the Amazon Soy Moratorium: the process started with a market's cut-off date – at the time (2006), and the implementation of a common MRV system by traders; audited annually by third parties. The same is happening now for the Cerrado landscape, with**

some traders, so these traders are starting the process with a present cut-off date (July/2020) – following the Accountability Framework’s principles and criteria; and are planning to design their MRV system with support from NGOs. Is the Coalition considering to adopt this successfully implemented approaches: a 2020 cut-off date + MRV systems?

- We agree having a cut-off date is crucial and we are building on AFi guidance
- **In addition to beef is there also a reflection ongoing to include rubber as it is also a key FRC and some rubber companies are engaged in zero deforestation production.**
 - We are focusing on the commodities where we believe we can have the greatest impact collectively. As we learn more, and share our learnings, we may explore applying our strategies to other commodities, or work with partners who are more active in these other commodities.
- **Were RTRS and Proterra consulted for the soy WG?**
 - RTRS and Proterra have not been reached directly about the soy work but we are undergoing a stakeholder consultation now and will make sure to loop them in.
- **PO plan still has no KPI on traceability to production areas only goes to mills. With such low ambition this action plan will fail like the 2020 commitments. When will you address the production level where deforestation is happening?**
 - The Coalition is currently working on is having a palm oil monitoring platform, building on existing work. Different companies have spent time and money to invest in different platforms and are working to align on what we have on putting these together and openly on having visibility on these.
 - Traceability is a key approach and in the palm roadmap we are including a KPI on Fresh Fruit Bunches and production areas and discussing it in the other roadmaps.
 - Traceability is however quite complicated for embedded products. Soy is often used in feed for animals which is then used for meat and eggs etc.
 - We would welcome inputs from stakeholders on this to help accelerate individual efforts.

7.1.3. Human Rights:

- **CGF did not mention anything about land rights in the human rights approach, and this is considered as essential for any successful HRDD approach and FPIC. How is CGF intending on approaching this topic?**
 - CGF has had lengthy discussions on the topic, which are still ongoing and we hope that when we move to stakeholder consultation on the HRC Palm Oil Roadmap that we will received detailed feedback on this topic, and others which have been previously highlighted such as Human Rights Defenders, in terms of constructive ways CGF can contribute to the addressing the issues.
- **Why is CGF focusing upon Forced Labour?**
 - Freedom from forced labour is an enabler for other human rights. As an industry we are collectively trying to focus our efforts on the most salient human rights risk in line with the UNGP approach and avoid trying to address too many issues in a diluted way. In trying to address and eradicate forced labour, we inevitably link to other endemic forces which are connected to structural issues such as governmental policies and systemic issues such as debt bondage. Together with other stakeholder initiatives focusing on human rights, we intend to collaborate and leverage existing work to be effective and efficient in our industry efforts to tackle human rights issues notably in the palm oil sector, whilst our key focus will be on addressing forced labour.

- With regards to Human Rights Defenders, we will need to have a focused discussion with stakeholders working on this topic to understand what could be a coordinated response from business and stakeholders.
- We recognise this is a serious issue and we are also concerned about recent developments. This would be a good subject to discuss and we believe it is necessary to explore with stakeholders in a dedicated meeting ASAP.
- **Communities' land is stolen and migrant workers subject to forced labor are brought in. Ending landgrabbing and upholding land rights prevents forced labor from happening in the first place. Ending forced labor is critical but not more salient than upholding land rights. Both should be tackled simultaneously.**
 - Land rights and forced labour are both critical issues that go hand-in-hand. Upholding the human rights of communities who live in and/or make their living in forest ecosystems is essential to creating a forest positive future. That is why the Coalition's approach is also closely aligned with the CGF's Human Rights Coalition and its Priority Industry Principles.
- **I pose the question again - It is understood that labour rights are core right to be protected - and rightly so - at the same time, however, the UNGPs emphasise the connectedness of human rights. Human rights defenders face major threats right now and the situation is worsening- so it is essential CGF address the spectrum of human rights in its roadmaps *especially* in relation to HRD as these rights holders face repression (not only trade union leaders, but community leaders defending lands and forests) - will CGF answer messages from the Zero Tolerance Initiative?**

<https://www.zerotoleranceinitiative.org/zti-message-to-consumer-goods-forum>

 - We recognise this is a serious issue and we are also concerned about recent developments. This would be a good subject to discuss and we believe it is necessary to explore with stakeholders in a dedicated meeting ASAP.
- **Hi. Corruption is one of the key drivers of unethical recruitment and labor (and environmental) issues. How is the coalition planning to address this, esp. when engaging governments?**
 - This is a good point and we'll bring the subject to the attention of the Coalition to discuss.
- **In developing its action plans, how will the GCF Coalition of Action on Human Rights listen *directly* to rights holders, including land and environmental defenders in producer countries and long affected by their supply chains?**
 - Part of our engagement plan and why we will trial engagement in Malaysia as part of our work on palm oil and human rights
- **I hope CGF can - in addition to taking real action to prevent future deforestation and abuse - also support large scale finance for forests and Indigenous communities to mitigate past damage; this seems like a fundamental obligation given the record of harm to Indigenous communities, Black and brown people, and other local people... as well as wildlife. Thank you.**
 - The Human Rights Coalition is focused on collaborative actions to address the most salient issues (for which industry collaboration are key). However, this issue may be worth following up with individual companies.
- **In many geographies, rights holders do not want to engage with multinational corporations at all due to long histories of land grabbing and marginalization. How will the CGF grapple with communities who simply want their land returned to community ownership and management and want companies to abandon their territories?**
 - We would recommend addressing this question to individual companies.

7.1.4. Supplier/Trader Engagement

- **Whilst acknowledging the challenges of complying with anti-trust legislation, how can CGF take more action on non-compliances?**
 - Due to anti-trust legislation, we cannot collectively say that we will all stop working with a supplier. However, we can work with Chief Procurement Officers (CPOs) asking them to address their commercial teams, with CEOs, and to technical and functional levels to ensure we are getting the Forest Positive commitments on their agendas and priorities.
 - There is great value in cooperating with suppliers and working together on sector wide barriers could be one way forward. We also need to discuss when progress is not moving in the right direction e.g. non respect of deforestation commitments.
 - CGF has been working with an anti-trust lawyer to explore what is possible, and having public, shared commitments and asks to suppliers, where progress is assessed via shared data on a public platform is one way to address non compliances, providing that each company makes their own individual sourcing and business decisions with regards to supplier relationships.
- **Would feedback engagement with suppliers needs major improvement and it starts with pinpointing human rights abuses and environmental damage. How is it identified? Who decides it is salient and requires action? How does a case enter a company grievance tracker? It appears arbitrary at present in many cases including with major CGF members grievance logs... In short, engagement in part flows from salient issues and *grievances* identified by CGF members....**
 - As part of our work on the Palm Oil Roadmap, there's a subgroup looking at monitoring and response. There's a recognition more thought is needed on building effective and aligned responses to these issues.
 - There is still a lot for us to learn, but under the Human Rights Coalition due diligence work will look at how you engage on human rights issues, in particular on remediation.
- **Understanding there are clear concerns over anti-trust, how can the CGF do more to support members taking commercial action against non-compliant suppliers?**
 - Through our current work we are providing coherent and consistent information to members on supply chain actors as well as guidance on appropriate responses. However, antitrust does not allow us to dictate to members what actions to take in relation to a specific supplier.
- **Who decides a case is 'closed' - and a specific grievance is 'resolved' and right to effective remedy is realised by affected communities and/or workers? How are the views of rights holders and aggrieved parties respected?**
 - This is a question companies are grappling with and would welcome further input and discussion.
- **Thank you all for the informative presentations. On the Supplier/Trader Engagement section. What kind of levers do supporting companies have to influence behavioral change on the part of suppliers? Are new strategies being considered? Consider human rights violations/deforestation/environmental impacts at the community level, where links can be made through supply chain to CGF member companies. From the local community perspective, a brand walking away from a particular supplier or is not ideal.**
 - This one of the major challenges the companies are dealing with. We welcome more collaboration and input from organisations that have practical ideas and solutions. This will be key to addressing this, particularly through jurisdictional/landscape engagement, initiatives and programmes.
- **The current approach of engagement to 'mainstream' NDPE expectations without consistent commercial consequences for a failure of compliance throughout supply chains has not halted**

deforestation, peat destruction or human rights abuses in forest commodity supply chains. Will CGF commit to a systemic approach to non-compliance which includes including thresholds to determine the status of sourcing and suspension or termination of non-compliant suppliers, as well as formal grievance redress processes for human rights, land conflict, and labor violations?

- Under our Palm Oil work, we have a subgroup developing a response framework which we hope will begin to address issues you're raising. This needs to be general guidance in order to be antitrust compliant. We hope this work will also provide insights on how to approach this for other commodities.
- **The proposed shift from D/C-free supply chains to D/C-free businesses at the supplier/trader level is essential but has been challenging to date, with resistance from some traders. Can you say more about what the Coalition's aligned "asks" to traders will include and your ideas on how to make traders more receptive to the transformational shift in business practices that is desired?**
 - We have a framework to address this and are developing details for each commodity. These frameworks will outline how to work with traders and make non-compliance consequential. This is an essential point for trader/supplier engagement and why we are working with CPOs. Their inherent business leverage makes them uniquely positioned to drive transformation in this space.
- **There is still a lack of "carrots"—positive incentives—for farmers and producer regions to choose the forest-positive pathway. Does the Coalition have a "carrot" strategy?**
 - The "carrot" strategy focuses on proactive engagement in key production landscapes, which would allow us to work in collaboration with key stakeholders on the ground - including farmers - to identify incentives that support a forest-positive pathway.

7.1.5. Production Landscapes

- **I cannot agree more with the integrated land-use approach. This really brings the four worlds closer: business, government, local communities and CSO. I would like to know further how the Coalition plans to do it at the landscape and jurisdictional levels?**
 - Our roadmaps are and will continue to take into consideration existing projects and initiatives and partner where it makes most sense. Our intention is not to duplicate or replace existing work and we are exploring opportunities to work with partners and platforms to drive our work, including and with the help of TFA.
- **Scaling landscape and jurisdictional approaches presents some significant challenges, as they tend to be quite resource intensive for companies to engage with. So how do we go beyond a few good practice pilot cases and take this approach to scale? So will the Coalition look at the question of how landscape and jurisdictional approaches could be scaled? This will probably require additional intermediation / financial innovation - so that companies can engage in portfolios of landscapes/jurisdictions in a resource effective manner. This seems like a challenge to think about now, rather than in 2-3 years time.**
 - Thank you for the suggestion. The Coalition envisions engaging with key stakeholders to help explore this challenging question in the near term.
- **We would like to draw your attention to a project the "Sustainable Biomarkets Platform" which is under development by the Belgian Alliance for Sustainable Palm Oil, in collaboration with UNDP, the Benelux Union and the Government of Indonesia - it is intended to be a platform for facilitating collaboration and brokering relationships and partnerships with buyers and manufacturers, connecting them to producers and landscape/jurisdictional work and projects on the ground in Indonesia (and potentially Malaysia in the future). UNDP can connect you into this project.**
 - Thank you for the suggestion, we will follow up with your organisation.

7.1.6. **Transparency and Accountability:**

- **What is the level of transparency that we are intending to work on? And how do we define this?**
 - We are receiving stakeholder feedback on what the relevant level of transparency would be and building this together. In terms of regulation, there are some which focus on information disclosure, and others which verify that disclosure. We are interested in exploring how technology could help and looking for bigger assurances which go beyond disclosure.
- **Will all companies in the CGF Forest Positive Coalition commit to transparency in grievances, including suspensions of non-complaint suppliers?**
- **Could you speak to how levels of transparency apply to supply chains themselves: where are discussions surrounding tracing and publishing the actual origin of deforestation commodities?**
 - We are committed to transparency and we have a coalition-wide action on transparency and accountability. This work is currently underway.
- **Will there be evaluation of stakeholders' satisfaction with engagement to ensure we aren't being used to rubber stamp this process without sufficient opportunities to interact?**
 - Feedback from stakeholders about their relationship with the Coalition is always welcome. Additionally, the variety of features that will be offered on the Transparency & Engagement Platform will also allow stakeholders to offer their input on the engagement process itself.
- **On Transparency and Accountability. Local communities represent an on-the-ground and real-time source of information on human rights and environmental impacts. There are a number of examples where communities are utilizing simple technology to monitor and report on the status of forests and supply chain impacts (among a whole host of other issues). This perspective represents the viewpoint of the stakeholder group who must live with the outcomes of whether or not this initiative (and others of course) are successful. How are the CGF and member companies considering integrating community-based and sourced data on impacts into transparency, accountability, and reporting structures?**
 - This is a really good point and timely to raise at this point as we look at multiple ways to monitor impacts on the ground more effectively. We will add this to the considerations. If you have any specific examples that would help, do not hesitate to share with the Forest Positive Coalition.
- **It is wonderful to see a dedicated action that focuses on enhancing transparency and accountability, and that there is consensus around using standardised frameworks such as CDP and AFI. CDP's 2020 forests questionnaire is fully aligned with AFI, i.e. if companies are reporting via CDP we can easily assess progress in line with the AFI principles and guidelines. It also includes modules on supplier engagement and will be updated in the coming years to align with new guidance on Jurisdictional Approaches. We would welcome the opportunity to join a small group of companies to discuss in more detail how CDP can support corporate reporting and transparency.**
 - Thank you for this feedback it is a good point and is reassuring to know there is consistency and alignment we will pick this up separately with you as we need to work up what the most relevant of the existing reporting frameworks are.
- **In addition to traceability to the point of production which is essential there needs to be transparency and public accountability (reports) on company "responses" and preventative and mitigation actions. When violations are detected in the supply chain (BOTH past violations and present ones). This is so often missing today - where grievance logs simply reports the company has engaged the supplier. It is vital more detail is given on remedial actions and responses**

- This is recognised by Coalition members. Under our Palm Oil work, we have a subgroup developing a response framework which we hope will begin to address issues you're raising. This needs to be general guidance in order to be antitrust compliant. We hope this work will also provide insights on how to approach this for other commodities.
- **A further major question: how will CGF verify compliance in the supply chain as presently it relies heavily on self reporting of Tier 1 suppliers or commercial auditors: how will independent verifiers be used beyond certification audits? (which are anyhow flawed)?**
 - We will be trying to answer this question and develop practical approaches and guidance through the trader/supplier engagement and transparency and accountability coalition-wide actions.
 - We are also trying to ensure certifications and schemes continuously improve notably on the question of auditor selection/qualification through the criteria used for our industry benchmarking via the SSCI | [Sustainable Supply Chain Initiative](#).

7.1.7. Government and Stakeholder Engagement:

- **Reporting as a Collective on Coalition-wide Actions - in Indonesia there is already a National Action Plan (NAP) for Sustainable Palm Oil, which includes actions that are relevant to the private sector. We would recommend that when designing your reporting, you consider reporting progress against actions in the NAP. This will help to demonstrate to the Government of Indonesia that CGF companies are mobilising to help deliver a sustainable palm oil sector - which will build trust and relationships and strengthen public private collaboration.**
 - Thank you for this suggestion. It will help inform our Government Engagement plan which has a focus on Indonesia as a producing country.
- **In Southeast Asia, forced labor is a high risk issue in Malaysian palm oil, but I did not see engagement with the Malaysian government in the list. Why is that?**
 - In the Human Rights Coalition- Working to End Forced Labour, there will be a governmental advocacy workstream and our main focus will be upon Malaysia on addressing forced labour issues, notably for the palm oil sector. There is also a dedicated working group in the FP CoA working on governmental advocacy. We have not yet discussed how these two workstreams will come together for a coordinated approach. This is why we have both human rights focused and environmental NGOs involved in the discussions today, to make those links where it makes sense.
- **The need for the an EU due diligence regulation has been at the center of TFA roundtables. will the CGF also explicitly express support for an ambitious due diligence regulation to address deforestation, forest degradation and human rights (especially tenure rights)**
 - The discussions on due diligence are very topical at EU level and one of the main topics of discussion during the TFA led roundtables. The next step is looking at how recommendations from the EU can be taken further and be formulated into official asks. A few CoA members have made calls supporting mandatory due diligence, and there was a communication from companies on this. There is strong support and agreement from the FP CoA.
 - TFA are building on the roundtables they had organised, and the discussion paper, and are looking to capture the discussions of policy expert. For those of you who have feedback, we will ask you to reach out to us as we will be building on this further with stakeholders.
- **The point on Government Engagement includes "leverage collective voice..." and "advocacy for a policy landscape..." - At UNDP we would recommend that you need to think about much deeper and wider Government Engagement across ministries (agriculture, environment, forestry, health, infrastructure, finance, and so on) - not just at the ministerial level, but at the level of Directors,**

etc. This needs to be systemic and on-going - also backed up by collective action that demonstrates that the private sector is a partner in creating and delivering solutions - not just advocating for change, but collaborating and partnering in delivering it.

- Thanks for the suggestion, we will certainly take this into account as we develop our specific government engagement plans. And as you rightly say we aim to link our engagement with proofpoints of what we're doing on the ground, what we have learned and what challenges we face.
- **On Government Engagement slides. It is clear that companies have unique leverage to influence governments to change/implement national level policies that are supportive or achieving forest positive outcomes for supply chains and local peoples. This section of the presentation was interesting but I understand that more is underway to develop it. How are the CGF, TFA, and participating companies currently engaging governments? What might this engagement look like in practice?**
 - The CGF and the Coalition both work with governments to advocate for and support practices and policies that will change behaviours and outcomes at a macro-level.
 - We will work with producer governments to build a constructive dialogue and help them adopt sound policies that reflect the true value of forest ecosystems, including stepping up enforcement against illegal deforestation and incentivising the right behaviours, as well as respect the rights of indigenous peoples and communities.
 - We'll also engage with demand side governments to help shape upcoming regulatory and non regulatory frameworks. Our engagement may take different forms, including participation in consultative processes and sharing of our learnings and challenges.
- **Are these the right countries? For palm oil, we would recommend adding Malaysia. Indonesia represents around 55% of global production. Malaysia represents around 25% of global production. Including Malaysia, the Coalition would therefore be addressing 80% of global production. Most companies are sourcing from both countries and many of the key stakeholders (NGOs / multilaterals etc) are working across both.**
 - Indonesia, Brazil, EU and China are the countries of priorities for engaging on Forest Positive policies. As part of the Human Rights - Working to end forced labor, we are also working on an advocacy strategy and have selected Malaysia as a country of focus.
- **Are these the right countries? In addition to Indonesia and Malaysia, we could also throw into the mix PNG, given that it is in the same region and shares a border with Indonesia. All three countries are part of the GEF-7 FOLUR project launching in 2021 and we (at UNDP) are looking at the possibility of a regional initiative on sustainable palm oil across the three countries - this could be a great opportunity for collaboration / synergies.**
 - Thanks for your suggestion and for pointing this out. We will first focus on the countries mentioned (Indonesia, Brazil, EU and China for Forest Positive policies and Malaysia for Human Rights) as these were identified as those where we can collectively move the needle. But we will reevaluate our strategy on a regular basis.
- **Collaboration with Governments: Considering your purpose to build common workstreams and zero deforestation/conversion targets with the Brazil government, Bolsonaro said a couple of weeks ago that there is no fires and deforestation occurring in the country. How do you plan to have a positive collaboration with negationist and anti-science governments?**
 - Our initial objective is to create space to enable dialogue with the government, and based on this we hope to support a forest positive government agenda. Our hope is that with constructive, solutions oriented dialogue, we can work towards a collective understanding that sustainable landuse and local economic prosperity can go hand in hand. We welcome any suggestions you may have on how we can achieve this in Brazil.

- **What level of ambition in zeroing deforestation/conversion do you find possible to reach with national and subnational governments that considers that deforestation/conversion is fundamental for economical development; and are highly influenced by farmer' groups that are not even complying with environmental laws?**
 - Our initial objective is to create space to enable dialogue with producer country governments, and our hope is that with constructive, solutions-oriented dialogue, we can work towards a collective understanding that sustainable landuse and local economic prosperity can go hand in hand. We welcome any suggestions you may have on how we can achieve this.
- **Follow up to previous regulatory question: legislation is moving in the U.S., perhaps quite rapidly over the next few weeks. What is the best mechanism for us to encourage/assist the Coalition to tangibly support deforestation supply chain legislation in the U.S. during this critical time, which appears to be your goal?**
 - So far, we haven't prioritized the US for government engagement, but we'd be happy to hear your thoughts on this. The best mechanism is to reach out and inform us of opportunities and potential concrete actions we can consider.
- **UNDP would like to invite the CGF Forest Positive Coalition to actively engage with the implementation of the Indonesian National Action Plan for Sustainable Palm Oil, which includes national level policy change and activities, and is being cascaded down across all provinces and districts.**
 - Thank you for this suggestion - we will follow up with UNDP to explore further collaboration around the NAP.
- **With regard to engagement, it is recommended that CGF talks directly to rights holders and civil society in producer countries. In relation to HRD, CGF should consider engaging members of the Zero Tolerance Initiative (ZTi) directly....**
 - Thanks for the feedback. Engaging with civil society in producing countries is part of our stakeholder engagement's objectives. Based on all the feedback received during this first engagement, we're looking at how best to achieve this.
- **Civil society should be able to give real input on how we would like to be engaged. This will not work for affected people / rightsholders and there is no clarity about how giving any inputs on such a platform will be responded to / accounted for.**
 - The Coalition's Transparency & Engagement Platform is still in development, but should be seen as a dynamic space that can be adapted to meet the needs of stakeholders if and when the situation arises. We hope the variety of features that the platform will offer will allow for stakeholders to provide input in diverse ways that will suit their needs best. Clear guidelines for facilitation and how information will be responded to, recorded and accounted for will also be made available.
 - We are happy to discuss how we can best integrate other stakeholders, particularly those on the ground in producer countries. Input from stakeholders will be especially key here.
- **RRI via the Interlaken Group would be pleased to explore collaboration on these issues, particularly on engaging and influencing government stakeholders and piloting new approaches re transparency and accountability. There is already some overlap among supporting private sector and NGO leaders**
 - Thanks for your interest and for the proposal to collaborate. We'd be interested in hearing more.
- **Agree on determining how local civil society can be engaged in this space.**

- This is something we are very conscious of and are exploring the best way to achieve this. Based on the feedback received during this first engagement we're looking at how best to achieve this.
- **Civil society organizations are still asking the CGF for a response to our letter from Sept 2019 and our full set of actions we call on CGF to take. Will the CGF respond to our letter? [ran.org/cgf](https://www.ran.org/cgf) and [ran.org/cgf-followup](https://www.ran.org/cgf-followup)**
 - The CGF and the Coalition did respond to the letter from RAN and others. Our response can be viewed here: <https://www.theconsumergoodsforum.com/wp-content/uploads/2020-CGF-Forest-Positive-Coalition-Response-to-Stakeholders-Letter-200620.pdf>
- **Process for engagement: the way this meeting has been designed does not facilitate discussion between stakeholders, which should also be an important part of this process. Apart from critiquing what the Coalition is doing, this forum could be a space for enabling and facilitating collaboration between stakeholders as well.**
 - This meeting was intended to be an introductory session for the Coalition to introduce itself in more detail to the NGO community and lay the foundation for future discussion. With limited time and very detailed agenda, unfortunately this last meeting could not allow for the fruitful discussions that the Coalition is prepared and motivated to have with stakeholders. Future meetings will be designed for more in-person discussion, and the digital Transparency & Engagement Platform will also provide opportunity to continue dialogue among all stakeholders outside of time-restricted meetings.
- **For future calls we would recommend more of a workshop style approach (a) use Zoom standard set up so that we can all see each other and have the capability to connect with each other (b) use Zoom chat so that we can see what other people are asking (c) hold breakout group discussions and then capture key points arising from the discussions in chat once participants are back in the plenary.**
 - Thank for these suggestions. Future calls will be structured to allow for more real-time discussion between the Coalition and stakeholders.
- **We agree with the point about the need for a stakeholder engagement process that goes beyond intermittent calls - for example, a stakeholder advisory board, which goes into much more depth in helping to develop, steer, iterate and improve how this initiative develops. UNDP would be happy to participate, particularly bringing our experience in government engagement at depth, which is a critical success factor and one of the hardest things to do.**
 - Thanks for the suggestion. As mentioned during the webinar, this was our stakeholder engagement "version 0". Based on the feedback received, we're looking at how to develop a strong stakeholder engagement process that will pave the way for an ongoing, constructive dialogue and collaboration.
- **This is a great initiative. We welcome this call and look forward to on-going engagement.**
 - Thank you for your support and we look forward to our ongoing engagement.
- **Will the recording be shared with dial-in participants afterwards?**
 - The recording from the call will be used solely for note-taking purposes.
- **In your advocacy with demand-side governments are you also asking for EU financial sector actors to be covered under any future due diligence obligation?**
 - Based on the work that has led to the publication of the Discussion Paper, the Coalition is in the process of developing more specific asks, including exploring how to go more in-depth on due diligence. We will certainly consider this suggestion. The Discussion Paper is available here https://www.tropicalforestalliance.org/assets/Uploads/Summary-of-Findings_TFA-Roundtable-Discussions-on-EU-Action-to-Protect-Forests.pdf

- **How can we ensure that the dialogues will be recorded and structured?**
 - We will share the minutes from this dialogue asap, and will answer all questions asked during the call, which could not be addressed, in the call minutes.
- **Thanks for your reply Didier re: commercial action. Given the central role of CPOs, can the CGF facilitate more communication between NGOs and CPOs to create collective understanding of the procurement challenges they see to certain sustainability actions?**
 - Thank you for the suggestion – we would welcome further discussion on this topic.
- **To be clear, RAN does not see this as a good model of stakeholder engagement. All letter signatories (ran.org/cgf-followup) were not invited. Participants were muted and our comments censored. Groups from the global south were excluded and instead consultants who are paid by companies were invited.**
 - Thanks for the feedback. As mentioned during the webinar, this was our stakeholder engagement "version 0". Based on the feedback received, we're looking at how to develop a strong stakeholder engagement process that will pave the way for an ongoing, constructive dialogue and collaboration.
- **The need for an EU due diligence regulation addressing deforestation, forest degradation has been at the center of discussions of TFA. Is the CGF coalition explicitly supporting a EU DD regulation?**
 - Based on the work that has led to the publication of the Discussion Paper, the Coalition is in the process of developing more specific asks, including exploring how to go more in-depth on due diligence. We will certainly consider this suggestion. The Discussion Paper is available here https://www.tropicalforestalliance.org/assets/Uploads/Summary-of-Findings_TFA-Roundtable-Discussions-on-EU-Action-to-Protect-Forests.pdf
- **How will the cgf ensure they enable direct dialogue with corporate accountability activists and organisations and networks in producer countries and globally? A two way dialogue is essential as in this format not being able to speak is not so effective we challenge when we are silenced?**
 - Thanks for the feedback. As mentioned during the webinar, this was our stakeholder engagement "version 0". Based on the feedback received, we're looking at how to develop a strong stakeholder engagement process that will pave the way for an ongoing, constructive dialogue and collaboration.
- **A specific question is will CGF meet with leader from the Zero Tolerance Initiative?**
 - We're looking to engage all relevant stakeholders on the Forest Positive and Human Rights agenda. Based on the webinar and feedback received, we're looking at the best way to structure this engagement so that it serves as a basis for ongoing dialogue and collaboration.
 - We recognise this is a serious issue and we are also concerned about recent developments. This would be a good subject to discuss and we believe it is necessary to explore with stakeholders in a dedicated meeting ASAP.

7.1.8. Other

- **I assume AFI is the Accountability Framework Initiative.**
 - Indeed, AFI refers to the Accountability Framework Initiative

7.2. NGO Transparency Platform

- CGF would like to propose another means of engagement with the stakeholder community on the Forest Positive agenda, to maintain ongoing communication and maintain momentum between calls.
- We would like to propose a digital platform which will allow participants (NGOs and CGF FP CoA members) to participate in a dynamic, participatory way. The platform would provide exclusive space for online discussion, accessible 24/7, and also features an automatic translation feature.
- This platform will allow CGF to post meeting agendas ahead of time to allow for input on the most important issues to focus on. It will also allow participants to share important issues on the platform and to ask questions. The objective is to keep the floor open for discussion and keep the dialogue collaborative.
- Once live, CGF will facilitate the platform- but it can only be successful if it is used by the NGO community.
- During the call, CGF carried out a survey to gauge for NGO interest in this Engagement Platform, asking **“Do you think such an Engagement Platform will be useful for our collaborations?”**
 - **57% indicated Yes**
 - **35% Probably**
 - **8% No**

Discussion:

- **Is this platform open to everyone?**
 - This is an open, non-exclusionary platform, and we wish it to be as transparent as possible.
 - There will be no specific rules, but we will define together the modalities of engagement, and tone of voice to ensure that this is a platform of constructive exchange with a respectful tone.
- **How will CGF engage with those who do not have access to such technology and being affected by these issues (deforestation/human rights)?**
 - This is an area where NGOs and Civil Society Organisations can help CGF in making those connections, as additional eyes and ears to input these voices.
 - The objective behind the landscape engagement approaches will be for CGF to work with local communities and it is key to provide a voice to smallholders and other stakeholders on the ground.
 - Stakeholders can write in their native language on the platform. Their input will be translated.
- **If CGF is working 4 themes and then below them are separate commodity action groups, there are a lot of potential contact points and literally dozens of areas to potentially engage around. While the engagement platform may be useful for eg gathering feedback on a policy document, it doesn't seem a good space for advice on strategic direction and framing, which requires conversation and dialogue, even if virtual. So besides the engagement platform are there other modes of engagement you are thinking about, moving forwards?**
 - The platform will not be the only method we will use to engage stakeholders, it is one tool among others. Beyond an online platform we are committed to ongoing dialogue through other means and understanding what works and doesn't work to make continued dialogue more engaging.
 - We are also aware most of our communication is in English and mostly convenient timezone for US and Europe and are therefore not always able to include more local organisations in the discussion (though note the platform has integrated automatic translation for multiple languages).

- More targeted engagement will be necessary to reach out to those on the ground and in local communities, and this can potentially be done through existing platforms. All and more suggestions are welcome to make this engagement constructive and collaborative.
- **Stakeholder engagement will be more effective if the stakeholders - workers, local communities including smallholders - are empowered to claim their rights. Does CGF have plans to get involved in empowerment/ rights awareness of key stakeholders?**
 - We understand there is a lot of work to be done, raising awareness for workers rights is important, in addition to informing our own people. We believe that through stakeholder engagement we are getting very valuable insights and ideas to integrate in future progress.
 - This is a key objective from our work in conjunction with the Human Rights Coalition – Working to end forced labour. We have designed our Priority Industry Principles against forced labour with that in mind. Expressing in very simple terms what should be the norm. We will give special considerations to awareness raising around these to ensure workers understand their rights.

8. Wrap up and next steps

General insights

- We recognise that we have not fully achieved our 2020 goal but have learned a lot and are committed to working together as a collective and with stakeholders to accelerate action where we can really make a difference.
- A number of stakeholders have called on the Coalition to consider creating a cattle/beef specific working group. However, it must be recognised that very few companies CGF member buy beef in significant quantities and therefore supply-chain impact is minimal.
- Stakeholders believe that connecting with CEOs and CPOs is good, but believe it is also important to connect with heads of HR to incentivise staff across whole organisations.
- The Coalition is grateful for the input and questions from those who attended the meeting and look forward to continued dialogue and collaboration.

Supplier/Trader Engagement

- Stakeholders find supplier/trader engagement critical for the success of the Coalition. It is important that individual members to implement procurement systems and decisions that deliver benefits to suppliers for progress towards forest positive, as well as follow through with clear consequences for inaction

Production Landscapes

- Integrated land use approach will be a key contributor to the Coalition's success.
- Scaling projects beyond pilot phase presents a significant challenge, and there is a need for the Coalition to provide support in this area. This will require collaboration with a wider set of stakeholders, as well as intermediation and financial innovation.

Connecting with the Human Rights Coalition

- CGF should pay particular attention to critical human rights issues linked to deforestation and land conversion. In particular, land rights, FPIC, and protecting human rights defenders are areas CGF should pay closer attention to.
- Forced labour is currently the area of focus for CGF given the opportunity for CGF companies to make significant impact in this area. However, other human rights issues can be explored and discussed with stakeholders to understand how businesses can best tackle these issues.

Government & Stakeholder Engagement

- Coalition companies are in a unique position to engage governments and drive action. However, the Coalition should consider connecting with governments not only at ministerial level but also take a more systemic approach.
- Recommend including Malaysia in government engagement. It is noted that on human rights there will be a component focusing on Malaysia specifically
- The Coalition supports taking on board recommendations from the EU and encourage due diligence regulation addressing deforestation.
- Some stakeholders believe the format for this meeting did not allow for adequate engagement and more stakeholders should have been invited. The current meeting was organised as an introductory session and future meetings will allow for more interaction and dialogue. All signatories will be invited to next call and CGF will also accommodate different timezones in future calls.
- We aim to have regular scheduled and ad-hoc meetings to ensure greater communication and collaboration with the stakeholder community.
- An engagement platform is being developed by CGF to allow stakeholders to connect with us on a more regular basis. More information will be provided in the coming weeks ahead of the platform's launch.

Enhancing Transparency & Accountability

- Reporting should bring actionable insights and support collective transparency across all Coalition members.
- The act of finalising the reporting models should not delay our on-the-ground actions.

Annex 1 - Antitrust Caution

Introduction

Set out below is a proposed caution. The aim of this is to serve as a reminder to all participants of the antitrust law requirements.

Anti-trust caution

As representatives of Association members, it is our shared responsibility to ensure that this meeting is conducted in accordance with the Statutes of the Association which state:

"The association shall not enter into any discussion, activity or conduct that may infringe, on its part or on the part of its members, any applicable competition law. By way of example, members shall not discuss, communicate or exchange, any commercially sensitive information, including information relating to prices, marketing and advertising strategy, costs and revenues, trading terms and conditions with third parties, including purchasing strategy, terms of supply, trade programs, or distribution strategy"

Even though you will all have had antitrust training in your respective companies and been in situations like this many times before, we would nonetheless remind you that aside from the obvious violations, you should at all times refrain from discussing any company-specific information which is confidential and that you should not agree anything that limits the ability of companies to compete independently in the market place. You are best placed to judge what is and what is not commercially sensitive or confidential, and what are the relevant parameters of competing. Remember that these parameters may include the Sustainability strategy of your company, and you should not disclose confidential information relating to it.

Please also remember that failure to comply with antitrust laws may lead to serious consequences for you as an individual, for your companies and for TCGF itself. Such consequences include severe fines, private actions for damages and the imposition of criminal penalties, including imprisonment, under national laws.

With this brief antitrust admonition, we look forward to a successful meeting.

Annex 2 – Call Slides (see separate PPT)