Membership of and interaction with the International Dairy Federation by the SANCIDF

(PRJ-0256-2020)

SA National Committee of the International Dairy Federation (SANCIDF)

Year 2020 (January 2020 till December 2020)

Project goals

Goal 1 - To maintain membership of IDF by paying the membership fees of IDF and IMP before 31 March 2020 at the best possible exchange rates

Achievements

The membership fee of €40 900 was paid in March but instead of a budgeted exchange rate of R17.216, the rate at date of payment was R18.794. This resulted in a budget overspent of R122 458.

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 2 - Review SA representatives on IDF bodies (SC'S, AT'S etc.) so that the best-qualified persons can represent SA on these bodies

Achievements

The following changes were made to SA representatives on IDF bodies:
SC Marketing: Removed Mr. Bertus de Jongh who passed away
SC Standards of Identity and labelling: Added Ms. Louise Göttsche
SC Dairy Science and Technology: Added Mr. Stephan Steyn
SC Farm Management: Dr. Chris van Dijk replaced Dr. Koos Coetzee who retired

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 3 - Ensure appropriate and timely (before set deadlines) inputs by SANCIDF and SA representatives on IDF bodies to IDF

Achievements

New Work Items

20/01 Management practices of calves from birth to weaning

20/02 Standard for the determination of drug residues in milk products

20/03 Standard for the determination of Lactoferrin in milk and milk products

20/04 Standard method for the enumeration of butyric-acid forming (cheese spoiling) clostridia in raw milk samples.

20/05 IDF guidelines on safe use and reuse of water in food production, including input to CCFH

20/06 4th Update of the Inventory of Microbial Food Cultures

20/07 Practical Guidelines for sampling of raw materials, intermediary and finished product for analytical testing

20/08 Input to CCNFSDU on Probiotics (Identification, Safety Demonstration, Mechanism of Action, …)

20/09 Dairy Declaration- contribution of dairy to SDG 2 & SDG 3

Questionnaires

The following questionnaires were processed during the year:

Questionnaire 0120/SCNH SCM - School Milk Programmes Survey - Approval for IDF publication

Questionnaire 0220/SCAMAC - Milk and milk powder — Determination of aflatoxin M1 content — Clean-up by immunoaffinity chromatography and determination by high-performance liquid chromatography (editorial revision) - Approval for Joint ISO-IDF publication of international standards

Questionnaire 0320/SCAMC - Infant formula and adult nutritionals — Determination of fructans — High performance anion exchange chromatography with pulsed amperometric detection (HPAEC-PAD) after enzymatic treatment - Approval for Joint ISO-IDF publication of international standards

Questionnaire 0420/SCSA - Milk and milk products — Guidelines for the application of near infrared spectrometry - Approval for Joint ISO-IDF publication of international standards

Questionnaire 0520/SCAMAC - Milk, milk products and infant formulae — Determination of melamine and cyanuric acid by liquid chromatography and tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) - Approval for Joint ISO-IDF publication of international standards

Questionnaire 0620/SCAMC - Determination of fat content — Gravimetric method

Questionnaire 0720/SCSA - Determination of fat content — Gravimetric method

Questionnaire 0820/SCAMDM - Identification probiotics.

Questionnaire 0920/SCSIL - Revision of IDF Bulletin 397 — The Codex general standard for the use of dairy terms : its nature, intent and implications.

Questionnaire 1020/SCAMC: Sodium Chloride Determination in cheese

Questionnaire 1120/SCSA Guidance on the application of conversion equations for determination of microbiological quality of raw milk

Questionnaire 1220 Lactose, an important nutrient: Advocating a revised policy approach for dairy and its intrinsic sugar probiotics

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 4 - Enable two SA representatives on the IDF board of directors and SPCC to attend meetings that do not coincide with the annual World Dairy Summit

Achievements

Mr. Alwyn Kraamwinkel attended an IDF board meeting in February and his expenses of R29 673 was paid out of the budget of R50 000 for this item. No other meetings were attended

during the rest of the year due to Covid-19.

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 5 - Promote the forthcoming World Dairy Summit (Cape Town, South Africa) 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 2020 in industry publications

Achievements

With the spreading of Covid-19, the future of WDS 2020 was under investigation since early February. Ultimately, due more to restrictive traveling policies, the effect of Covid-19 on global economies and emotions than the disease itself, it was decided by the SANCIDF to ask IDF for absolvement of all South Africa's responsibilities regarding WDS 2020. IDF agreed and cancelled the event.

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 6 - To send a delegation of five SANCIDF officials to attend the World Dairy Summit in Cape Town from 28 September till 1 October 2020

Achievements

As mentioned under Goal 6, the Summit was cancelled.

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 7 - Delegates to the WDS to give meaningful feed-back to the local dairy industry within one month after the Summit in a format prescribed in a contractual agreement with SANCIDF

Achievements

See Goals 5 and 6 above.

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 8 - Print and distribute to levy payers a collection of all delegates' reports

Achievements

The collection of WDS 2019 reports by delegates were submitted for lay-out and printing just before lock down was announced and since this kind of printing was not an essential process, the printers had to close. The booklets with reports by all SA delegates to WDS 2019 were distributed to all levy payers of Milk SA and other stakeholders in the dairy industry in the second

quarter.

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 9 - To liaise with IDF re sustainability and environment by providing timeous input from SA and communicating information from IDF to the SA industry

Achievements

(First to 3rd Quarter Report 2020 by Dr Heinz Meissner.)

1. Responded to request from Laurence Rycken to provide comments on the IDF's position to the FAO/WHO document: "Sustainable Healthy Diets: Guiding Principles." Detailed response as follows:

COMMENTS ON: SUSTAINABLE HEALTHY DIETS: GUIDING PRINCIPLES - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION Rome, 2019. (*Author of comments: Heinz H. Meissner, PhD – South Africa, February 2020.)*

Comments:

On the page before 'Contents', the statement is made: 'The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO or WHO'. Question: How is it possible that officials of the FAO and WHO do not take responsibility for the contents of an official document they present to the public and make available in the scientific literature?!

Page 6, first paragraph, the definition of 'Sustainable Healthy Diets'. I am concerned if 'food safety' is not specifically included in the definition, since it also does not appear to be included in SDG Goals 1 to 13 in the next paragraph.

Page 8, third paragraph, the statement: 'Currently, food systems are responsible for a significant share (20-33 percent) of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions' The statement needs to be referenced as it depends on which methodology one uses; if it is the methodology of the IPCC which distinguishes between the energy, transport, manufacturing, mining, agriculture etc sectors, this figure is much smaller. [This also refers to page 21]

The principles provided between pages 9 and 13 are supported in general. I will rather concentrate on specifics in the summary papers from the international consultation.

Page 17, WHO recommendations, the following bullets:

'Keep total fat intake to less than 30% of total energy intake, with a shift in fat consumption away from saturated fats to unsaturated fats, and towards the elimination of industrial trans fats'. **Comment:** Accepted, but the statement does not take into account that recent evidence based on meta-analysis of many results found very little if any relationship between saturated fats and NCD's. This should be commented on and taken into account in future guidelines. 'Eat at least 400g of fruits and vegetables a day'. **Comment:** Not possible in dry countries where soils and inadequate water do not allow production of large quantities of vegetables and fruits. Furthermore, in many instances these products cannot be imported either because of high costs related to processing, packaging, storage and transport, being perishable foods.

Page 18, statement: 'Studies of food and health relationships have consistently highlighted associations between low intakes of plant-based foods as well as high intakes of animal products and ultra-processed foods, and poor health outcomes'. **Comments:** The contrast between low intakes and high intakes is not surprising as plant-based foods are generally low in *utilisable* energy since they contain indigestible fibrous material, whereas animal products are generally high in *utilisable* energy which implies that consumers concentrating on plant-based diets will generally eat less than requirement whereas those concentrating on animal products will generally eat more than requirement. Thus, the problem is quantity rather than the product per se, which is often implicated. I agree with the concern about ultra-processed foods, since ultra-processing may destroy essential nutrients, but processing is necessary for shelf life and food safety, the latter which sometimes is not adequately controlled/addressed.

Page 19, statement: ‘The implied shifts toward plant foods and away from animal foods (excepting fish and seafood) and for changes in food production systems have direct relevance to the sustainability agenda’. **Comment:** This is a dangerous statement as it ignores the many bio-available nutrients which animal foods bring to the table which plant based foods do not contain. It is even more unacceptable for dry countries where plant based foods will always be limiting and consumers have to depend on animal foods.

Page 21, statement: ‘As populations become more affluent and urbanized, they demand more food, particularly more meat, fish, dairy, eggs, sugar, fats, and oils. This dietary transition is associated with increased risk of diet-related diseases, while the animal source foods have higher environmental impacts per calorie or grams of food produced than do most plant-based foods’. **Comment:** The first sentence implies animal foods increase the risk of diet-related diseases, which has no scientific foundation when energy intake is standardized as publications based on meta-analyses show. The second sentence has also no significance as it is wrong to compare per calorie (because the calories are not standardized to utilisable) or per gram. The comparison needs to be done in relation to bio-available nutrients supplied, with animal foods being much more nutrient dense than plant based foods.

Page 21, statement: ‘It is in high income countries where the greatest dietary changes are needed to reduce the environmental pressure’. **Comment:** This statement is a bit generalized. It is more related to resource availability than high income; Saudi-Arabia has high income, but has little agricultural production resources.

Page 21, statement: ‘Foremost among these is a transition to diets that contain a smaller proportion of calories from animal source foods, and particularly ruminant meat (e.g. cows, goats, and sheep)’. **Comment:** As implied above this statement has no justification.

Page 21, statement: ‘Many studies have shown that reducing meat consumption can reduce GHGs while remaining nutritionally adequate (e.g. refs [9, 10, 12]). For example, global adoption of a low-meat diet that meets nutritional recommendations for fruits, vegetables, and caloric requirements is estimated to reduce diet-related GHGs by nearly 50 percent, and premature mortality by nearly 20 percent’. **Comment:** The statement is correct if one does not take into account carbon sequestration. The benefit of ruminants in this regard is that methane with a short live span in the atmosphere compared to carbon dioxide is ‘returned’ through photosynthesis to the pastures/rangeland if well-managed in quantities twice and more than emitted. Environmentalists have concentrated only on the emissions instead of the net between emissions and sequestration. The picture changes dramatically if one calculates by means of the net effect.

Page 22, statement: ‘In Kenya, cows and other ruminants are an integral source of nutrition, food, and economic security especially in rural communities, but are also a major driver of environmental damage’. **Comment:** Cows and other ruminants per se cannot be a major driver of environmental damage; it is the wrong management associated with animal farming as was also implicated above with the carbon sequestration argument.

Page 26, statement:’ Food expenditure data can be used to estimate the projected cost of more nutritionally adequate or more diverse diets, adjusted to 2000 kcal, for comparisons across diverse groups’. **Comment:** Although the principle to adjust to a standardised energy intake is correct, the question is which level of intake and how. To explain: 2000 kcal is about sufficient for a 65 kg (?) male. The requirements differ vastly between weight classes (which you to some degree can adjust by using metabolic weight [W0.75]), infants and young children, and lactating women (also in terms of amino acids and other nutrients). Thus, the adjustment needs to be made taking into consideration which group one wants to highlight and most often the young and the lactating women are the most vulnerable, and not the 65 kg male example. A further problem with adjusting to 2000 kcal is that it does not take into account that the digestibility, utilisability and bio-availability of food groups and their nutrients are not the same, and therefore the conclusions drawn from the adjustment may be skewed if not outright wrong. [The models discussed in further sentences are more acceptable].

Page 30, statement: ’Diets are, however, more than the sum of foods consumed or the dietary patterns associated with them. They are a way of life that shapes and is shaped by local social, cultural and economic contexts. Such aspects are important pillars of the concept of sustainability’. **Comment:** I agree. The MD and NDD are discussed as plant-based diets which seem to be more healthy and environmental friendly. However, one can highlight examples across the globe where animal/fish based diets have similar outcomes (Eskimos, Kenyan/Tanzanian Masai). There are many other reasons (geographical, cultural, genetic isolation, availability of food, tensions, way of life etc, etc) which one needs to accept and which makes it highly unlikely (as the EAT_LANCET report proposes) that one can establish a more

globally acceptable menu. Also, in terms of environmental impact as I have referred to above, in most instances it is a question of management inadequacies which are responsible for the impact rather than plant or animal farming per se.

Page 33 and 34: I agree with everything said on food safety. In many regions food safety is the number one challenge and not what one eats or the amount that one eats. One further concern is that the philosophy of emphasising 'naturally or organically produced' foods, while having benefits, may increase the risk of contamination, poor shelf life and even food borne disease. Maybe this should be mentioned.

General comment: The summary papers from the international consultation are informative as they discuss the influencing issues from different angles, and are therefore valuable. However, one can also sense that the different angles lead to different conclusions and even contradictions. This is not surprising as the many influencing factors actually prohibit one globally acceptable diet proposal, but it does not imply that within country with its own socio-economic, cultural and resource challenges more healthy and environmental friendly possibilities should not be pursued.

2. Request from Alexi Ernstoff: Provide comments on the document Carbon Sequestration Guidelines and the accompanying slides by Quantis (his company), to which the author responded with the questions below.

1) Do you acknowledge the 'Cattle Carbon Cycle' in the guidelines as it is depicted in the first slide above (not attached). If not, why not? [This is not meant to be a criticism; it is simply to understand what is the point of departure in addressing calculations in the guidelines]

AE: Since we are only looking at sequestration this "cycle" is not directly being assessed. The methane emissions of cattle would be included in the LCA in any case.

2) It appears that you use GWP (100) from the IPCC, instead of the more recent GWP* from the paper of Allen et al (2018). See second slide for reference. Again why?

AE: GWP* is about short lived pollutants, not about temporary carbon sequestration.

3) To calculate carbon stocks (SOC) in regenerative agriculture (RA) by using cover crops, residual straw, manure compost etc, one wonders what are the amounts (say in tons/ha) which you accept of each as being sufficient to add to SOC. SOC % is a cumulative value as it is measured, which I presume to change will require substantial amounts of the materials mentioned. Whereas the amounts of cover crops, residual straw etc should not be a problem, it is not that easy with manure. One normally does not stack manure for such a purpose, which implies that it will originate from cattle grazing the cover crops etc. Do you regard the normal grazing as providing sufficient to provide SOC, and after mineralization N, P and K, and if so, why doesn't that then apply to cattle grazing rangeland? I see your argument is that it is not land change and I suppose you regard rangeland as having a saturated level? Nevertheless, manure and plant material do enter the soil through action of dung beetles, other fauna, water etc, and that is mostly in the form of ligno-cellulosic material (containing C). This implies that it is a similar process than with RA where the manure needs to enter the soil from above since you do not use tillage to get it into the soil. Is here an anomaly?

AE: Models can help answer those questions like CENTURY, ROTHC, DayCent etc.

Notwithstanding Alexi's indifferent response the author is pleased to report that his plea for a sequestration approach and recognition that the warming potential of methane is lower than generally accepted, following the publication of the Oxford group (Allen et al, 2018), have been recognized in the response of IDF Communications to the IATP's 'Milking the Planet'. To quote from the response:

"Significant differences between biogenic carbon and fossil fuel carbon in terms of warming potential

Global warming is due to increases in the levels of greenhouse gases (GHG). The extraction and burning of fossil fuels is the major culprit, as this releases CO2 which remains in the atmosphere (for 1000+ y). Any future use of oil, coal, and gas will add extra CO2 and, thus, more warming. Livestock is said to cause global warming because ruminants produce methane, which is a potent GHG. This picture is overly simplistic because - in contrast to CO2 - methane from ruminants does not accumulate in the atmosphere and produces no new warming.
Methane from livestock is part of the carbon cycle. Plant growth is based on photosynthesis, which consumes CO2. Ruminant animals will up-cycle human-inedible plant material into high-quality animal food, thereby releasing methane. The latter will be rapidly destroyed in the atmosphere (10 y) and converted into CO2, which then goes once more to plant growth. Well-

managed ruminants are even able to sequester carbon in the soil, thereby also improving soil health.
The reason why atmospheric methane has been increasing during the last years despite stable emissions from cattle is because part of it originates from fossil fuel production and use, agriculture and waste, biomass burning, wetlands and other natural emissions.
The Oxford University GWP* metric provides a better comparison, more accurately reflecting warming and combining short- and long-term effects".

3. Maria Sánchez Mainar requested comments on UC Davis professors Frank Mitloehner, Ph.D., and Ermias Kebreab, Ph.D. have released a very graphic white paper focused on methane and showing how climate neutrality is within reach for the California dairy sector. I recommend you the publication "Methane, Cows, and Climate Change: California's Dairy's Pathway to Climate Neutrality," which examines recent literature from leading climate scientists and its implications for the California dairy sector.

The author replied:

Yes, the picture changes dramatically if you calculate on GWP* instead of GWP100. I am glad to see that the European Commission is now considering 'A new policy on methane' which will take GWP* into account. I am sure you are familiar with that? This will have far reaching implications for the perceived GHG emissions of the Dairy Industry and in fact the whole livestock sector; actual GHG emissions are clearly much lower than currently accepted.

4. Consultation on the contributions of the Dairy sector to ecosystem services.

4.1 The understanding of the Ecosystem Services approach in the Dairy sector. The FAO definition of ES: "Ecosystems and biodiversity regulate our environment and sustain future production. While landscapes – the visible manifestations of ecosystems – inspire our cultures and provide a home for wildlife and people alike, building blocks such as genes and chemical compounds provide us with tools for innovation and science. These benefits are known as ecosystem services. Directly or indirectly, they underpin every aspect of our societies.

Some ecosystem services are more evident than others. Those that we consume directly, such as food and raw materials, are valued in markets. On the other hand, services, such as pollination and nutrient cycling, are less easily quantifiable though they play vital life-supporting roles".

How does it apply to your country? Is it an unknown/growing/well-known approach regarding the environmental issues?

Reply by the author

In South Africa the Department of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries is responsible for GHG reporting, verification and monitoring, but they also recognise the principles and importance of ecological services. Thus, they have been working on a green paper some time ago to define principles and methodology, but payment for ecological services and how it should be implemented is difficult which also is the case in other parts of the world. The recent more emphasis on carbon sequestration and the benefits of improvement in soil health and regenerative agriculture to farmers, depending communities, sustainability and society at large (eg consumers will benefit because of nutrient dense foods from improved soil health) are gaining momentum. If production is more sustainable the whole value chain benefits and investors will be more willing to invest (and therefore support) in farming activities which could then be seen as 'payment for ecological services'. Of course, improvement in the natural resource base also benefits to biodiversity improvement. I am involved with an initiative termed 'Integrity in food production' with a slogan 'Heal the Land, heal the People' which aims to promote regenerative agriculture and get buy in from everybody in the value chain. Improvement in soil health and carbon should increase the monetary value of soil (and therefore farm) to the benefit of both farmer and investor (where applicable). Specifically in dairy we have embarked on a project involving a system dynamics model which will integrate production criteria, GHG, carbon sequestration, soil health, animal welfare and socio-economic issues into a 'integrity' modified profit model which could assist farmers.

4.2 The ecosystem services provided by the dairy sector: The FAO defined 4 types of services:
Provisioning Services (food, fibres, fuels…)
Regulating Services (air, soil and water quality, control of floods, crop pollination, carbon

sequestration…)
Supporting Services (biodiversity, habitat for species, maintenance of genetic diversity, nutrient management…)
Cultural Services (non-material benefits)

In your country, how these services are considered or utilized by the dairy sector, the stakeholders or the consumers?

The author replied

The approach and model described under item 1 aim towards that in an integrated fashion.

4.3 What services would you highlight regarding this classification for your dairy sector?

The author replied

All of them, but we are in the initial phases, apart from provisioning of course. Comment: I do not agree with the term 'Supporting Services'. The services listed there are very much an integral part of sustainable production.

4.4 The challenges regarding the Ecosystem Services Approach. As this approach is not widespread so far, the FAO identified the main challenges to improve the understanding, the valuing, and the incentivizing of these services:
- **There is still a lack of data and information to increase the recognition of the livestock contribution**
- The economic value of some values is still difficult to quantify
- These services (like carbon sequestration) are not enough taken into account in the developing carbon markets
- **The financial mechanisms and policies that could support incentives for these services are not enough developed**
- Production effects of implementation of practices

Based on these examples or your experience, what are the main challenges for the Dairy Sector in your country?

The author replied

I can echo the challenges as indicated by the FAO. We talk about these and we do work on implementation plans (the model being an example), but I do not see much progress because of the financial challenges and other concerns (Covid-19 eg) in the immediate future. The challenges certainly are not priorities in the country at the moment!

4.5 National current initiatives on the contribution of the Dairy sector. There are some initiatives that try to find ways of meeting the challenges identified regarding ES. They are not necessarily explicitly covered by the ES concept, like the studies on biodiversity, carbon sequestration or nutrient management for example. Therefore, do you have any initiatives to share with the SCENV?

The author replied

Dairy structure initiatives: Our R & D programme and interaction with farmers emphasize sustainable approaches (ex: national commitment to improve some services)

Research studies on the ES approach: Not directly, but the Integra approach does have components (ex: studies on the link between dairy and biodiversity)

Financing mechanisms: Nothing at the moment, although we have delayed carbon taxing of the agricultural sector by arguing the point of food security and other biological, ecological and socio-economic services provided by agriculture (ex: Carbon sequestration financial incentives, Carbon markets)

Consumer information initiative: We have a highly successful consumer education programme which has received an award from the IDF (ex. Communication on dairy contribution to ES)

Regulatory programs / Government policies on ES: There have been initiatives by government such as the green paper mentioned under item 1, but priorities are currently at the bread and butter level (ex. Policies that favour Ecosystems linked to dairy)

Other kind of initiatives: ……

Regarding the SCENV orientations in November, and with your agreement, we will consider developing further case studies based on these initiatives.

IDF STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT (SCENV):

1. The SCENV met on the 4th of June through teleconference. The draft Minutes will be available after 14 July after comments have been received. Tasks and actions which are attended to in 2019/2020 include:

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 will consider:
GHG emissions quantification and mitigation, including energy efficiency and 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;

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

2. Priority items for 2019-2020

Progress on ongoing work items:
'Life Cycle Assessment Development Monitoring Group': monitor and test guidance documents and tools, including carbon footprint and carbon sequestration
'Innovative Practices for Eco-Friendly Dairy Processing'; with a focus on reducing and valorising solid waste
Biodiversity and ecosystem services: guidance documents on assessment and good practices (including planet boundaries assessment)
Support communication on sustainability: IDF sustainability outlook

Provide support and inputs to the IDF Sustainability Steering Group (SSG)
Participate actively in the working groups of the multi-stakeholder partnerships: FAO Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance (FAO LEAP) Partnership, and FAO Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock (FAO GASL). Participate in the UNEP conferences and ISO meetings

(From here onward reported by Dr. Colin Ohlhoff)

3. Attended and participated in the SCENV mid-year meeting hosted via Zoom platform (4th June 2020)

4. Attended and participated in the SCENV end-year meeting hosted via Zoom platform (12th November 2020)
Next meeting planned for 4th June 2021

5. Included as member of proposed work group on 'Ecosystem Services and the Dairy Sector'. First meeting held and attended on 4th May 2020 via Zoom.

The initial proposal has been drafted and circulated for the SC to review. Ronan Lasbleiz (FR) as Action Team leader. The aim of the AT is (a) to gather objective elements on how the Ecosystem Services (ES).

Approach is considered in the various dairy countries and then to disseminate it with the IDF community (through a report and selected case studies). (b) To identify the main challenges of the ES approach in the dairy sector (c) Possibly develop methodologies towards the measurement of ES. The SCFM would be the likely other IDF body involved in this work.

6. Indicators for healthy diets in a sustainable food system (possible): new work item on Sustainable Healthy Diets is being prepared between SCNH and SCENV.

The goal of this work item proposal is to find an acceptable indicator considering both the ecologic effects of food production and the (nutrient) quality of foods.

7. SCENV Meetings Notable Agenda Items:
General update from Maria Sanchez-Mainar: Presentation of new publications and progress around the communication of IDF work.
Update of work done by Standing Committees on AHW, FM and DST.
SPCC update: Four new work items for 2021. Will focus mainly on sustainable food systems (strong link to SCENV and SCNH). There was concern that this topic is complex and would likely require expertise from outside the IDF.
Food system summit (UN meeting in Quarter 3 of 2021). IDF has established a multidisciplinary task team which will focus on demonstrating the important role of dairy in sustainable food

systems.
Feedback from Brian Lindsay: Carbon sequestration projection is currently out for public consultation. Document available on IDF website. GWP* - Literature study was completed by Dr Roger Cady. Next step to look at the implications of applying this methodology to different systems/geographical regions/climates. The document should be released soon.
Action team on LCA monitoring noted as a big benefit to the dairy industry. Demonstrates that Dairy is a leader in this field and that Dairy is a responsible sector. IDF methodology is being incorporated into methods being used by other sectors. Methodology still considered largely 'academic', need to find ways to make it more practically implementable.

8. SCENV Priority items/Program of work for 2020-2021:
Water quality, efficiency, and reuse.
Waste management and reduction.
GHG emissions quantification and mitigation, including energy efficiency and renewable energy generation.
Ecosystem services including biodiversity.
Review and adoption/promotion of best available technologies and practice.
Contribute to work addressing the intersection of nutrition and environmental sustainability.
Progress on ongoing work items:
'Life Cycle Assessment Development Monitoring Group': Identify differences between existing standards (ISO, FAO, IDF PEF).
Biodiversity and ecosystem services: gather information about the uniqueness of dairy production regarding Ecosystem Services. Prepare a document highlighting its contributions (current initiatives, case studies).
Support communication on sustainability: IDF sustainability outlook.
Provide support and inputs to the IDF Sustainability Steering Group (SSG)
Participate actively in the working groups of the multi-stakeholder partnerships: FAO Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance (FAO LEAP) Partnership, and FAO Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock (FAO GASL). Participate to the UNEP conferences and ISO meetings

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 10 - Fund travel and accommodation expenses to SANCIDF officials and SC members who need to travel to attend EC and AGM

Achievements

Due to Covid-19 and the lock down at various levels, caused the Executive Committee and AGM meetings to be held held with Zoom and no travel was therefore necessary.

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 11 - Obtain annual reports from South African representatives on IDF bodies (Standing Committees, Action Teams, etc.)

Achievements

Reports were obtained from all representatives on Standing Committees, Action Teams, etc. and are attached to this report.

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Goal 12 - Make information about documents produced by the IDF (Bulletins, Standards, Fact Sheets 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 documents were received during the year

1. Bulletins

Bulletin N° 503/2020: Global Marketing Trends

Bulletin N° 504/2020, "New applications of MIR spectrometry: Quality assurance practices with new parameters in raw milk analysis".

Bulletin N° 506/2020, "The World Dairy Situation 2020"

Bulletin N° 507/2020, "The Codex General Standard for the use of Dairy Terms" 7

2. Standards

Joint ISO 23291 I IDF 247 (2020) Standard "Milk-based infant formula powders — Quantification of whey protein content by sodium dodecyl sulfate-capillary gel electrophoresis (SDS-CGE)"

Joint ISO 22579 I IDF 241 (2020) Standard, "Infant formula and adult nutritionals — Determination of fructans — High performance anion exchange chromatography with pulsed amperometric detection (HPAEC-PAD) after enzymatic treatment ",

Joint ISO ISO 22186 I IDF 245 (2020) Standard, "Milk and milk products — Determination of nitrofurazone".

3. News Items

Early bird registration now open for the IDF symposium on goat sheep and other non-cow milks

IDF Communications - Starbucks. Announcement by coffee chain Starbucks that they aim to lessen the organization’s carbon emissions by reducing dairy and promoting the consumption of plant-based beverages as an alternative. While this has (quite rightly) been met with a certain level of incredulity – see some examples below – we encourage you more than ever to get onto social media and share the true facts about dairy.

IDF Communications - Responding to study 'Dairy, soy and risk of breast cancer: Those confounded milks' A new study was released yesterday which associates intake of dairy milk with greater risk of breast cancer. The study ‘Dairy, soy, and risk of breast cancer: those confounded milks’ was published in the International Journal of Epidemiology and funded by the National Cancer Institute at the National Institutes of Health and the World Cancer Research Fund (UK).

Early bird registration till 15 March for the 8th IDF International symposium on sheep, goat and other non-cow milk

IDF World | August 2020

IDF Team Update - September 2020

IDF Webinar Invitation | US Dietary Guidelines: scientific committee report

IDF symposium on goat, sheep and other non-cow milks goes digital

Special World School Milk Day webinar: The contribution of school milk to child nutrition

IDF Webinar | Future Markets for Dairy Products

Watch the IDF Webinars again | Economic impacts of COVID - 19 and the dairy sector

IDF Webinar Invitation | Food Cultures, the Gut Microbiome and Health

IDF Communication Alert: New report - Global Trends Affecting Dairy

IDF Webinar on Management of calves from birth to weaning

Webinar: Front of pack Nutrition labelling implemented in the Nordic countries - Key Hole Scheme

Day 1 agenda: IDF symposium on goat, sheep and other non-cow milks

IDF Webinar Invitation: IDF Dairy Farmers Roundtable
IDF Webinar Invitation: Launch of the IDF World Dairy Situation Report
Invitation to the IDF Forum 2020
DSF Newsletter #34 October 2020
Day 3 agenda of 8th IDF International Symposium on goat, sheep and other non-cow milk
IDF Webinar Invitation: Launch of the IDF World Dairy Situation Report
Watch the IDF Webinars again: US Dietary Guidelines and Food Cultures, the Gut Microbiome and Health
IDF Webinar Invitation update: Case studies on how the dairy industry is adapting to the challenges presented by Covid-19 from a food safety perspective
Watch the IDF Webinars again: Front of Pack Nutrition Labelling (FOPNL) Series
IDF Webinar Invitation: SCDPE Economic Series on the evolution of dairy market signals
IDF World: Special Edition Message from our Director General
IDF Communication Alert: New IDF Bulletin for the Use of Dairy Terms
IDF Team Update - November 2020
IDF and ICAR Webinar Invitation: Development and Application of a Certified Reference Material for Somatic Cell Counting in Milk
New Research Review: A Literature of Global Warming Potential* (GWP*)
IDF Webinar Invitation: IDF Dairy Farmers Roundtable III

4. Press releases

IDF 'raises a virtual glass' on World Milk Day 2020
IDF launches 3rd Edition of Dairy Sustainability Outlook
Participate in the launch of the IDF World Dairy Situation Report 2020
New President for International Dairy Federation

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Income and expenditure statement

Income and expenditure statement	finstate MSA Q4 20201231.pdf
Unnecessary spending during period	No

Popular Report

popular report year 2020 SANCIDF.pdf

Additional documentation

agm Presidents Report IDF 2019 Melt Loubser.pdf
agm report 2020 IDF WDS Istanbul Report - Dr Colin Ohlhoff.pdf
agm report 2020 SCDPE Alwyn Kraamwinkel.pdf
agm report 2020 SCDST etc Jan Floor.pdf
agm report 2020 SCENV Colin Ohlhoff.pdf
agm report 2020 SCENV Heinz meissner.pdf
agm report 2020 SCFM n SPCC Koos Coetzee.pdf
agm report 2020 SCM Christine Leighton.pdf
agm report 2020 SCNH M Vermaak.pdf
agm report 2020 SCSIL J Burger.pdf
agm report 2020 TFAMR Martin vd Leek.pdf
agm report 2020 The Role of Ruminants in Sustainable Diets Colin Ohlhoff.pdf

agm report Colin Ohlhoff SCENV Feedback 2019-2020.pdf
agm report national secretary 2019 SANCIDF.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