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

Year 2018/2018 (January 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 year

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

The SANCIDF received six questionnaires during 2018. All were forwarded to the Technical Secretary who in turn, sent them to the appropriate SC member. Two questionnaires were completed and returned to IDF while no replies were needed on four documents.

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

Five e-mails promoting WDS 2018 and two emails regarding posters at this Summit, were received in 2018. All these communications were forwarded to industry leaders, SC members and associate members of SANCIDF.

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 attent 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

DOCUMENTS ATTENDED TO:

I supported the proposal to the IDF for the new work item: “Nutrition and Sustainability Information Hub”, which endeavours to gather relevant information on the topics and add further information as it becomes available.

I commented on a paper entitled: “Losses, inefficiencies and waste in the global food system”, which was requested by the President of the IDF.

I have also commented on the antimicrobial resistance (AMR) perspectives of the IDF as summarised in the four documents:
IDF TF AMR Communication strategy for the IDF Task Force on antimicrobial resistance
IDF TF AMR External reference document
IDF TF AMR Draft internal reference document
IDF TF AMR Questions and Answers

Comments and suggestions were requested on the so-called 10YFP Programme which is a logo for the “Global Action for Sustainable Consumption and Production”. A request was also for countries to affiliate associated projects with the programme, but the SA Dairy Industry currently does not have suitable projects to be aligned. This is expected to change during the course of 2018.

The IDF-DSF requested feedback from countries on country surveys and monitoring on what they refer to as “Status Assessment of High Level Indicator Reporting Metrics”. These are on-farm metrics relating to sustainability such as soil nutrients, soil quality & retention, biodiversity, water availability & quality, and working conditions. In some countries these variables are regularly monitored on their dairy farms. We currently do not have such a programme and therefore I in collaboration with the US and other institutions have proposed an R & D programme to initiate such a monitoring initiative. To align with these goals we have design our R & D programme under the heading: “Sustainable Dairy Production in South Africa”, where the individual projects will contribute to this ideal.

We supported the request by Dr Caroline Emond, Director General of the IDF for the IDF to work on carbon sequestration which will be led by Brian Lindsay, but indicated to them that the recent development of standardised guidelines to measure carbon stocks by the FAO-LEAP Programme should be followed, as countries (Including SA) have decided to endorse those guidelines. Earlier in the year we have provided our input to the LEAP when they drafted the guidelines. Their document, titeld: ‘FAO – Measuring and modelling stock carbon stocks and stock changes in livestock production systems- Guidelines for assessment’ is now open for public comment. Similarly, the LEAP document on water use which we have made input to, is also open for public comment. We have forwarded this document, titeld: ‘FAO- Water use of livestock production systems and supply chains-Guidelines for assessment’ to Sue Viljoen of WWF-SA who works in close collaboration with the MPO’s water initiative. This should be valuable for that initiative.

We responded to the call by the IDF to make contributions to the ‘IDF Dairy Sustainability Outlook’ in the category ‘Measuring carbon in dairy farming’ by submitting the PhD work of Craig Galloway at Woodlands, and in the category ‘Global Dairy Sustainability’ by submitting Milk SA’s intended R & D programme: ‘Climate and Eco-resilience of Dairy Production.

Comments on the document: GHG Emissions Indicator – Baseline Establishment, October 2017. [Comments addressed to Jess Lindsay, wife of Brian Lindsay].

The suggested global figure of 2.9 kg CO2 eq/kg FPCM appears appropriate. However, I wish to point out that South Africa (SA) again appears to be included in the category ‘Sub-Saharan Africa’, as the FAO always does despite repeated requests that SA should be considered on its own. Tier 2 estimates indicate that the national average of SA is about 2.3 (2.1 to 2.5) kg CO2/kg FPCM, whereas the 20% top large herd farmers have GHG emissions as low as 1.3 to 1.6 kg CO2/kg FPCM. Also, preliminary measured CH4 emissions from pasture-based systems (to enable calculation on a Tier 3 basis) indicate that CH4 emissions from enteric fermentation could be 5-10% lower than calculated from Tier 2 estimates.

I also wish to make a general comment, which I also made to Laurence Rycken as a comment on the Protein White Paper draft: In international organizations (white papers/policy documents/Guidelines) we continue with estimates which only consider carbon emissions, whereas there is now substantial literature which also takes into account carbon sequestration. If one takes sequestration into account there are dairy farms which may be almost ‘carbon neutral’. I think we should consider moving towards calculations based on the net effect (C emissions – C sequestration), which will provide a more comprehensive picture of where we need to concentrate in research/education/management.

Comments on the document: IDF WHITE PAPER ON DAIRY PROTEÏEN (version 28 OCTOBER 2017) By Jaap Evers

Key recommendations (My comments in [square brackets]

The TF NCF is invited to consider the following recommendations:

Determine the need whether this draft white paper should be developed further. [Yes.] If so, which aspects? Potential issues are listed in Appendix 1. [Suggestions under Appendix 1 below.]

IDF has several initiatives underway relating to dairy protein (e.g. within SCNH, TF NCF, SCAMC). However, it appears that an overarching strategy is lacking. To address this would go

beyond the current mandate of the TFNCF. Hence, the TFNCF should consider recommending to SPCC that an overarching strategy is needed and to suggest to the SPCC how this could be achieved within IDF. [An overarching strategy is required as one cannot consider protein requirements/quality/potential production etc in isolation. It is affected by capacity and economics to produce, environmental constraints, global trade possibilities, consumer variability across the globe etc.]

Appendix 1 Issues that could potentially be (further) addressed in a next iteration of the white paper
In-depth assessment of sustainability claims of dairy and dairy alternatives
Lack of standardised methodology for plant based protein sources. Yes, enormous shortcoming
Milk: IDF methodology Fat & Protein corrected milk basis yes, must be on FPCM basis.
Effect of nutrient density [Yes, arguments about AA composition and requirements are part and parcel of the larger nutrient density argument and if GHG emissions are part of the discussion, then the carbon footprint must be calculated relative to nutrient density (you eat a 'package' of nutrients, not only protein!)]
Gap in international policies - Developed vs developing countries. [Yes, large problem, but not only in terms of policy but also what is possible and what not. One example: in dry (mostly developing countries) water requirements of livestock can be satisfied largely by cheap stored sources of rain water. To change to vegetable and fruit on an equivalent basis will require major infrastructure and irrigation development, plus other investments (energy use, distribution material etc). This is hardly achievable. In terms of culture and habit: People in developing countries use livestock for a number of purposes which cannot be substituted by alternatives.]
Protein content of "whole food" vs isolated protein. [Yes, both are important]. Plants generally contain less protein than in cow milk. How does portion size affect protein quantity? [Yes, portion size becomes important in comparison, but preferably supported/expressed by AA composition and nutrient density.]
Communication strategy for IDF. [Yes, of course]
Identify the science gaps and evaluate them. [Yes, of course]
Analyse consumer trends: e.g. protein supplements becoming more mainstream; used to be for bodybuilders only, but now many gym-goers and non-gym goers consumer it. [Promotion, as we do in South Africa]
Methodology: A key requirement is that agreement on the definition of protein has to obtained, because it will define the fitness-for-purpose of any future method. This definition should take into consideration both the chemical and the nutritional aspects of proteins, and it should be accepted not only by the dairy sector, but by the food community at large. [Yes, crucial]
Methodology: as more protein alternatives will come on the market, hybrid products (part dairy protein, part alternative protein) will likely emerge. This will require method development/validation (e.g. matric effects). [I suppose so]
Methodology: how could different methods be correlated, i.e. what is the best method and how do standards correlate? [Correlation up to now has been rather poor, which suggests that conversions and standards generally are product specific. Shouldn't we accept that even if it is rather inconvenient?]
Methodology: In the protein quality space, the dairy sector is providing funding to validate a new method (DIAAS). What is the possibility that investment in the protein quantity space would speed up development of a reliable and fast method for determining protein content? How much funding would be required (probably much less than for the DIAAS method). [The DIAAS method is comparatively sound and maybe appropriate. If a reliable and fast method is to be developed, it should nevertheless concur with the principles of DIAAS.]
Identify which other organisations are working on (dairy?) protein and map out their initiatives. [?]
Response to the threat that the evidence related to protein intake in early infancy and obesity will be extrapolated. [I do not understand the question.]

[Additional comments below addressed to Laurence Rycken].

In the previous communication I forgot to mention the following: The IDF-DSF, FAO, IPCC and everybody else only consider GHG emissions when they talk about or estimate the carbon footprint of the dairy industry (all livestock industries). What about carbon sequestration?! This becomes even more crucial when comparisons are done with other products (in this case protein). One needs to consider carbon emission minus carbon sequestration, i.e. the net effect. If one does that, many dairy farms have a zero carbon footprint – which should be a powerful argument.

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

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

a) 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 done the calculations.

b) 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.

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

Innovative Practices for Eco-friendly Dairy Processing: A series of IDF fact sheets are published at regular intervals on relevant topics. Dairy Nutrition and Environmental Sustainability: The objective is to strengthen the case supporting the essential role of milk and dairy products as part of a healthy diet, despite a higher environmental cost than many plant-based food commodities. The resource document "Sustainable Dairy Nutrients are Essential for Human Health" is being updated and a Nutrition and Sustainability Central Information Hub has been created.

A new work item was proposed for the yearly report IDF Dairy Sustainability, and members were requested to indicate whether they approve that the work should be initiated and whether they want to contribute with an article on the described sections. I supported the initiative as I think it will be valuable to have an umbrella initiative to inform and supplement work in individual countries. I also indicated that at some stage when we have information I would like to contribute to the 'Research Report'.

Dairy Sector goals to safeguard environmental resources - initiatives & targets: Assistance was requested to review an information document on how dairy safeguards the environment (from an IDF perspective). A survey of examples was also requested. I commented and also completed the 'monkey survey'.

Objectives

While reporting to the global dairy sector on developments concerning the environment (e.g. effects of environment on milk and milk products, effects of dairying on the environment), the Standing Committee on Environment is considering:
Energy efficiency and GHG emissions quantification and mitigation, including renewable energy generation;
Water quality, efficiency and reuse
Biodiversity
Waste management and reduction
Review and adoption/promotion of best available technologies and practice;
Contribute to work addressing the intersection of nutrition and environmental sustainability;
Contribute to work addressing the intersection of animal health and welfare, animal nutrition and environmental impact;

And provides leadership on environmental sustainability issues in close liaison with other IDF Standing Committees and relevant international and third-party organizations.

Recent outcomes

These focussed to a large extent on Life Cycle Analysis (LCA) methodology, with the following contributions accepted:
Handling multi-functionality problems in LCA by Miguel BRANDÃO, KTH, Stockholm
Examples of different approaches for allocation By Kurt BUXMANN, International Aluminium Institute (consultant)
Findings in evaluation of recycling and allocation methods By Pernilla CEDERSTRAND or Ellen RIISE, Essity Hygiene and Health AB, Göteborg
Exploring weighting in LCA By Anne-Marie BOULAY, LIRIDE (Sherbrooke University) and CIRAIG (Polytechnique Montreal)

LIME Methods for weighting By Atsushi INABA, Faculty of Engineering, Kogakuin University
Should weighting result in reduced damage or reduced distance? By Bo WEIDEMA, 2.-0 LCA consultants
Examples of guidance on how to use weighting: by Bengt STEEN, Chalmers University of Technology
Integrating MultiCriteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) in LCA By Philippe OSSET, SCORELCA
Normalization, weighting and aggregation of LCA results to support decision-making processes By Peter SALING, BASF SE

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

Altogether R16 318 was spent on travelling costs for two Executive Committee members and one Standing Committee member to attend meetings

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

Reports were submitted on the work of 11 Standing Committees and one task force. All these separate reports were combined in one document and is attached with this report.

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

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

Achievements

IDF provides a permanent source of authoritative scientific and other information on a whole range of topics relevant to the dairy sector. Covering a wide range of dairy-related issues, IDF Bulletins are the go-to references for the dairy professionals. The IDF Catalogue lists 190 bulletins of which the oldest is Bulletin 026/1965 and the latest is Bulletin 488/2017. To view the Catalogue, go to:

https://store.fil-idf.org/publications/?swoof=1&paged=1&product_cat=bulletin

Standards and Bulletins are available to all stakeholders and other interested parties in the dairy

industry. The prices of Standards vary from €15,00 to €200 and for Bulletins from free to €600,00 each. The weakness of the Rand puts most of these valuable publications out of reach of most individuals and organisations in South Africa. For this reason the SA National Committee of IDF (SANCIDF) will pass the 25% discount it gets from IDF, on to a buyer of any Standard or Bulletin ordered from the SANCIDF office"

The following Bulletins were received during the year:

N° 493/ 2018, "Proceedings of the 6th Paratuberculosis Forum"

N° 494/ 2018, "IDF World Dairy Situation 2018 report"

Industry leaders were informed of these new publications of IDF.

The following two standards were received during the year:
Joint Standard ISO 19660 I IDF 237: 2018 - Cream — Determination of fat content — Acido-butyrometric method
Joint Standard ISO 19662 I IDF 238: 2018 - Milk — Determination of fat content — Acido-butyrometric (Gerber method),

Industry leaders were also informed of these new publications of IDF

The following article with the title "Information produced by IDF available to the SA dairy industry" was published in the June 2018 issue of The Dairy Mail:

"Standards

IDF proactively contributes to the development of science-based globally harmonised standards, guidelines, codes of practice and related methodologies across all working areas, to continually improve regulatory environments for the dairy sector. It does this through proactively engaging with key international organisations and influencers such as the international food standards setting body Codex Alimentarius and the International Organisation for Standardisation (ISO). IDF also identifies knowledge gaps, prioritising its activities, proposing solutions and seeking a consensus on these. International Standards for methods of analysis and sampling of milk and milk products are used as references at a national and global level.

Standards are essential for consumer protection and trade. IDF aims at shaping global regulatory frameworks through the development of policies, laws, regulations, protocols/codes of practice, specifications, guidelines and fact sheets. IDF is currently involved in four very different types of standard setting activities

- Food standards for international trade with Codex
- Animal health and welfare standards for international trade with OIE
- Standards for Methods of analysis and sampling with IDF/ISO, AOAC, USP
- Standards for milking machines, dairy safety and quality management systems, environmental standards etc. with ISO and other organizations

There are 180 Standards in the IDF catalogue of which the oldest is IDF 020-4:2001 and the latest is IDF/ RM 233-2: 2017. To view summaries of all the standards in the Catalogue, go to:

https://store.fil-idf.org/publications/?swoof=1&product_cat=standards&paged=1

Bulletins

IDF provides a permanent source of authoritative scientific and other information on a whole range of topics relevant to the dairy sector. Covering a wide range of dairy-related issues, IDF Bulletins are the go-to references for the dairy professionals. The IDF Catalogue lists 190 bulletins of which the oldest is Bulletin 026/1965 and the latest is Bulletin 488/2017. To view the Catalogue, go to: https://store.fil-idf.org/publications/?swoof=1&paged=1&product_cat=bulletin

The Standards and Bulletins are available to all stakeholders and other interested parties in the dairy industry. The prices of Standards vary from €15,00 to €200 and for Bulletins from free to €600,00 each. The weakness of the Rand puts most of these valuable publications out of reach of most individuals and organisations in South Africa. For this reason the SA National Committee of IDF (SANCIDF) will pass the 25% discount it gets from IDF, on to a buyer of any Standard or Bulletin ordered from the SANCIDF office"

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

The following publications were received from IDF during this quarter:

STANDARDS
Joint Standard ISO 19660 I IDF 237: 2018 - Cream — Determination of fat content — Acido-butyrometric method
Joint Standard ISO 19662 I IDF 238: 2018 - Milk — Determination of fat content — Acido-butyrometric (Gerber method)
Standard IDF 140-1 ISO 9233-1 2007 Cheese, cheese rind and processed cheese determination of natamycin content

BULLETINS
Bulletin N° 491/ 2018,"Teat-cup and cluster removal strategies for cattle and small ruminants, Review and recommendations".
Bulletin N°493/ 2018, "Proceedings of the 6th Paratuberculosis Forum"

FACT SHEETS
Fact sheet 005/2017: Phthalates in Dairy Equipment
Fact Sheet 001/2018: Heat Treatment – overview
Fact sheet 003/2018 - Trans fatty acids to be differentiated into industrially produced TFAs and naturally present TFAs.

OTHER
The International Dairy Federation I Animal Health Report which addresses key issues affecting the dairy sector. The report is a worldwide journey through the field of animal health and welfare within dairy and provides insights on topics including animal welfare, mastitis, antimicrobial resistance and biosecurity.

NEWS ITEMS
News Brief 119
IDF World - Issue 1 - June 2018. The International Dairy Federation is pleased to present our new newsletter, IDF World, which aims to share the latest science on dairy, as well as the work of our dairy community of experts in a clear and simple manner. As the global leader in dairy expertise, IDF intends to share knowledge and expertise with its members and stakeholders.
https://www.fil-idf.org/newsletter/idf-world-issue-1-june-2018
IDF Team Update - September 2018
IDF: Team insights 2018 – The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World
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"

An article on Phthalates appeared in the March 2018 issue of the Dairy Mail and an article on Heat treatment will appear in the May issue of the Dairy Mail. All titles were also posted on the Milk SA website.

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Income and expenditure statement

Income and expenditure statement	finstate MSA Yr 20181231.pdf
Unnecessary spending during period	No

Popular Report

Yr 2018 POPULAR REPORT.pdf

Additional documentation

agm report for SCDPE and GDP 2018 Alwyn Kraamwinkel.pdf
agm report NS 2018 Edu Roux.pdf
agm report SCAHW 2018 M vd Leek.pdf
agm report SCAMC SCAMDM SCAMAC SCDST 2018.pdf
agm report SCENV 2018 H Meissner.pdf
agm report SCFM and SPCC 2018 Koos Coetzee.pdf
agm report SCM, IMP 2018 C Leighton.pdf
agm report SCNH 2018 Report M Vermaak.pdf
agm report SCSIL 2018 Jompie Burger.pdf
agm report TFAMR 2018 M vd Leek.pdf
WDS 2018 AND GDP Report Alwyn Kraamwinkel.pdf
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

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