



Participation of the SA dairy industry and its projects, via SANCIDF, in the activities of the IDF

(PRJ-0186-2018)

South African National Committee of IDF

Quarter 4 2018 (October 2018 till December 2018)

Project goals

Goal 1 - Review SA representatives on IDF bodies (SC'S, AT'S ETC) so that the best qualified persons can represent SA on these bodies

Achievements

No new representatives were appointed during this quarter

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 2 - Ensure appropriate and timely (before set deadlines) inputs by SANCIDF and SA representatives on IDF bodies to IDF

Achievements

Questionnaire 0218/ MH SCDST was completed and returned to IDF. On the question "Does your National Committee approve the publication of the attached papers as a bulletin of the IDF" the SANCIDF replied that it wishes to abstain from voting. The SA member of the SCMh gave the following comment: "Identification of new subspecies and/or (re)-classification takes place continuously. When the information is published in a Bulletin, it is already outdated. I agree that the information is made available but is a Bulletin the appropriate place? Should it not rather be published under Scientific documents/references on the IDF website? If the information is published in a Bulletin it should be updated at least every two years".

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 3 - Promote the forthcoming World Dairy Summit (Daejeon, South Korea) amongst dairy industry role-players by forwarding all promotional e-mails to MPO/Sampro/DAFF representatives and South African SC members as well as articles about WDS 2018 in industry magazines

Achievements

Since WDS 2018 was held in this quarter, it was too late to promote the event amongst dairy industry role players. We did, however, receive 8 general News Mails and 3 Daily Newsletters on the Summit which were all circulated to industry representatives. The first announcement of WDS 2019 was received in December and it was also sent to all industry representatives, Standing Committee members and Associate members

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 4 - Send a delegation of SANCIDF officials to attend the World Dairy Summit

Achievements

Out of Milk SA budget, two delegates, Messrs Loubser and Kraamwinkel attended WDS 2018. The budget provided for three delegates, the third being Dr. Van Dijk. Dr. Van Dijk indicated earlier in the year that he would prefer to attend the Anti Microbial Resistance (AMR) conference in Morocco in October but due to pressure of work, he was unable to attend.

Out of surplus funds from WDS 2012, three persons were delegated to attend WDS 2018. They were Prof. Elna Buys from the University of Pretoria, Dr. Colin Ohlhoff from Fair Cape Dairies and Mrs Gill Slaughter from Turners Conferences. The first two of these delegates attended some of the business meetings allocated to them as well as the conference and Mrs Slaughter manned the promotional booth for WDS 2020.

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 5 - Delegates to the WDS to give meaningful feed-back to the local dairy industry within one month after their return in a format prescribed in a contractual agreement with SANCIDF

Achievements

All delegates mentioned under Goal 5 did submit reports as was required from them in the contractual agreement. These reports are attached to this report

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 6 - Liaise with IDF re sustainability and environment by providing timeous input from SA and communicating information from IDF to the SA industry

Achievements

Fourth Quarter Report 2018 – Heinz Meissner

Goal: To liaise with the IDF regarding sustainability and environment by providing input from South Africa and communicating information from the IDF to the local industry.

Report:

Documents attended to:

Comments on the document: LEAP3 PROJECT PROPOSAL: ACTIVITIES AND DELIVERABLES [Comments addressed to Caroline Emond and Maria Sánchez-Mainar].

Dear colleagues,

In general, I support the comments made by you on the LEAP3 Draft, but would like to submit the following:

Under the General Objective: Although I understand the reason to do so, I am concerned if we try to distinguish between countries with high and low environmental footprint. We have industrialized (high) and non industrialized (low) countries, but industrialized countries in terms of agricultural (and therefore livestock) environmental footprint may be low per unit product produced because of particular measures such as improved efficiency and production system employed. Overall though the agricultural (livestock) environmental footprint may still be higher because of total scale of activity and numbers compared to non industrialized countries. Also, production system is a function of investment and resources, which sometimes are not available in poorer countries. Another factor, which I have emphasized before, is environmental footprint must be calculated as the net between GHG emissions and carbon storage/sequestration. It is of little use if one increases efficiency by intensifying (lower GHG emissions) but one's carbon stocks and sequestration are low because of conventional tilling practices and high inorganic fertilizer use to produce the corn and soybeans which one uses in the rations of the animals. I can add further examples. This shows that it will be extremely difficult to effectively distinguish between countries with low and high environmental footprint. Some, as yet, haven't even do the calculations.

Agriculture (and therefore the livestock sector) has a huge obligation to assist in limiting CO2 accumulation, by yes emissions reduction, but even more so by the carbon sink (sequestration) method. To stimulate participation by global farmers, incentive schemes, and to provide suitable carbon offset avenues for companies with high footprints, need to be developed in a standardized way (meaning through guidelines that are suitable to everyone). I therefore support the intended LEAP3 intention of work towards Ecosystem Services, Eco-Toxicity, Biomass carbon stocks and stock changes, etc.

Comments on the document: Agro-ecological approaches and other innovations for sustainable agriculture and food systems that enhance food security and nutrition [Comments addressed to Laurence Rycken]. I have no comments with particular reference to Q1 through 10, but the following may be relevant:

The document is thorough and deals effectively with a comprehensive subject. However agro-ecology, although this conceptually and needs wise is the way to go forward, we will always have a number of systems, the success of implementation which will depend on natural resources, economy, trade and local circumstances. This should be recognised.

The document sometimes reads difficult, one reason being that all sorts of definitions for particular topics are provided which I don't think is necessary; after consultation within the Project Team who are highly knowledgeable, decide on the most appropriate and work with that. The reader gets lost with all the detail.

The comparison between small scale and larger operations lacks the important distinction that in many countries small scale operators do not own the land and may therefore not be able to access loans. Therefore they are largely bound to household supply with little opportunity to expand and access markets. They in addition cannot compete because of not affordable and stringent quality control, food safety and traceability measures imposed by retailers.

Economic principles should be addressed: (1) Farm products are properly paid for if there is a demand for them and not if there are not a demand. This will always skew the distribution of food and not always meet the ideal of FSN. (2) World trade offers the opportunity to distribute the oversupply of food from countries which have, to countries which do not have, provided they can pay or the investment in the poor country by the distributing company makes economic sense which often is not the case. (3) Wasted food can be a source of such distribution, but the cost to re-process, re-pack, cold storage and transport often makes this not viable.

The recommendations are mostly applicable but they do not naturally follow or are even divorced from the text. The way the text is constructed should be addressed, so the recommendations follow more 'naturally' from the discussion. This will help the reader.

Work items of the SCENV:

Reports at WDS 2018:

Innovative Practices for Eco-Friendly Dairy Processing – P Brazzale (IT)

The leader mentioned the new IDF Bulletin "[Total Cost of Ownership \(TCO\): An approach to support sustainable investments in the dairy processing and packaging industry](#)". The TCO structure is based on the concept of Life Cycle Assessment. TCO could also be used as the basis for calculating environmental key performance indicators. TCO can be a very powerful tool to support sustainable investment from economic and environmental perspectives.

Energy use and savings – ([draft document](#)) R Bertsch (DE)

IDF's goal in developing this document is to assist sustainability managers and leaders in improving the management of energy across the dairy supply chain. Dairy processing has a minimal part of global energy use, but it is a part and therefore we are also responsible for the energy consumption in our sector. Therefore, to support the dairy processing sector on its challenge of increasing energy efficiency while minimizing negative impacts on the environment, the IDF is releasing this document to showcase eco-friendly and energy saving technologies used by dairy processors.

Water waste management – P Barrucand (FR)

IDF's goal in developing this document is to provide an overview of wastewater (WW) and WW treatment in Dairy Processing, showcasing innovative solutions that can be applied and are already implemented at plant scale (lab scale process are excluded). Wastewater is mainly from processing and cleaning operations (CIP). The technologies showcased result from a survey carried out by IDF in 2016 on existing technologies in dairy plants around the world

Solid waste management – P Brazzale (IT)

This scoping document for the dairy sector is to review technologies to reduce and optimize and technologies to recover, reuse and valorise the solid waste along the whole dairy chain in order to boost circular economy. The group is looking for dairy scientists, engineers, researchers, technologists to work on this.

Dairy nutrition and environmental sustainability (Jointly with SCNH)

The goal of this work is to provide the international dairy sector with relevant information to join the conversation. Yet, this Information Hub has barely received two valuable inputs since January 2018. The SWOT analysis of this work has led the leader to propose a discontinuation of this hub.

IDF Dairy Sustainability Outlook ([progress report](#) & [draft document](#)) – N Jones (CL)

The new IDF Publication "IDF Dairy Sustainability Outlook" was presented. The objective is to use it as a communications instrument for ongoing research initiatives on sustainability as well as a comprehensive update on IDF work on global sustainability initiatives. More information can be found on the [NWI approved](#) by the SPCC in Jan 2018. Two options were presented for the first issue. The first option, a general issue, proposed the following sections: 1) News from member countries (Global & specific sustainability projects), 2) Other Global initiatives, 3) Research Initiatives (Environment, Socio- Economic, Nutrition) and 4) Future and Past IDF Events. The second option, a thematic issue has the following sections: 1) Opinion, 2) Global Initiative, 3) News from member countries (on the topic of the global initiative), 4) Research Initiative (on the topic of the global initiative), 5) Future and Past IDF Events (on the topic of the global initiative). The general issue was preferred.

Further reports at the SCENV Meeting at WDS 2018

Updates were also given on: Life Cycle Assessment Development; Biodiversity and the Dairy Sector; Impact of changes in dietary recommendations; LEAP methodologies for the Dairy Sector, and the work of the Dairy Sustainability Framework.

Some good news!

Dairy Industry Curbing Greenhouse Gas Emissions through Gains in Efficiency:

A new analysis from the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) demonstrates a decrease in dairy emissions intensity. The analysis calculates GHG emissions from the dairy sector over a ten-year period (2005-2015) and reports reductions in all regions of the world. On average, GHG emitted in the production of milk has decreased in 'emissions intensity' (emissions per unit of product) by almost 11% from 2.8 to 2.5kg CO₂ equivalents per kg of product produced. Over the same time period, global dairy production has grown by 30% to meet consumers demand for high-quality nutritious food products. This growth has been achieved through increasing milk yields and numbers of cows. As a result of increased global output, absolute emissions rose by 18% globally. Importantly, the FAO notes that without the efficiency improvements made by the sector, total emissions from dairy would have increased by almost 38%.

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 7 - Fund travel and accommodation expenses to SANCIDF officials and SC members who need to travel to attend Exco and AGM meetings

Achievements

No meetings were held in this quarter that required members to be reimbursed for traveling expenses

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 8 - Obtain annual reports from South African representatives on IDF bodies (Standing Committees, Action Teams, etc)

Achievements

This is not applicable to this quarter as the AGM took place in the second quarter

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 9 - Promote the use of IDF Bulletins and Standards (SANCIDF subsidy of 50% applies)

Achievements

The only Bulletin received this quarter was the IDF World Dairy Situation 2018 report which was launched at the World Dairy Summit in Daejeon, Korea, on 16 October. It was put together by IDF experts from dairy producing countries around the world under the scope of work by the IDF Standing Committee on Dairy Policies and Economics (SCDPE). Industry leaders were informed of this new publication of IDF.

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 10 - Make information about documents produced by the IDF (Bulletins, Standards and Newsletters) available to levy payers and the general public by publishing the titles on the Milk SA website and in The Dairy Mail and Milk Essay

Achievements

Three press releases (apart from those released at WDS 2018) were issued in this quarter announcing:

The World Dairy Situation report

The World Antibiotic Awareness Week from 12-18 November 2018. IDF joins global fight against antimicrobial resistance to preserve efficacy and public health.

The release of a new IDF publication, "IDF Dairy Sustainability Outlook No.1" that can download by National Committees from the IDF Website.

These documents will be available on the Milk SA website

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Income and expenditure statement

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Income and expenditure statement | finstate MSA Q4 20181231.pdf |
| Unnecessary spending during period | No |

Popular Report

[Q4 2018 POPULAR REPORT.pdf](#)

Additional documentation

[WDS 2018 Report - Dr Colin Ohlhoff.pdf](#)

[WDS 2018 report EM Buys.pdf](#)

[WDS 2018 report Melt Loubser.pdf](#)

[WDS 2018 Report Mrs Gill Slaughter.pdf](#)

[WDS 2018 AND GDP Report combined Alwyn Kraamwinkel.pdf](#)

Statement

| | |
|---|-----|
| Levy funds were applied only for the purposes stated in the contract | Yes |
| Levy funds were applied in an appropriate and accountable manner | Yes |
| Sufficient management and internal control systems were in place to adequately control the project and accurately account for the project expenditure | Yes |
| The information provided in the report is correct | Yes |