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

(PRJ-0256-2020)

SA National Committee of the International Dairy Federation (SANCIDF)

Quarter 3 2020 (July 2020 till September 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 was paid in March and this Goal is therefore not applicable to this quarter

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

Ms. Louise Göttsche was added as a member of the SC Standards of Identity and labelling (SCSIL) as well as the AT Coordination of Codex Nutrition matters.

Mr. Stephan Steyn was added as member of the SC Dairy Science and Tecnology (SCDST)

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

The following questionaires were received during the previous quarter but were replied to in this quarter:
Quest 0720/SCSA - Determination of fat content — Gravimetric method
IDF Questionnaire 0620/SCAMC - Determination of fat content — Gravimetric method

The following questionaire was received and replied to in this quarter:
Quest 0820/SCAMDM - Identification probiotics.

The following questionaires were received during this quarter but needs only to be replied to in the next quarter:
Quest 0920/SCSIL - Revision of IDF Bulletin 397 — The Codex general standard for the use of dairy terms : its nature, intent and implications.
Quest 1020/SCAMC: Sodium Chloride Determination in cheese

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

No physical IDF board meetings took place during this quarter.

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

Due to the cancelation of WDS 2020 there were no promotional material that could be circulated.

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 has been 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

Not applicable to this 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

Q1

Liaison with IDF re sustainability and environment: First Quarter Report 2020 – 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.
WDS 2020: No further developments because of Covid – 19 and no final decision has been made.
Documents attended to sent through by the IDF and associates:

Request from Laurence Rycken: Provide comments on the IDF's position to the FAO/WHO document: "Sustainable Healthy Diets: Guiding Principles." My response was:

Dear Laurence,

I think the 'Draft IDF position' is adequate as those who compiled the response obviously concentrated on the issues of concern to the dairy industry. I decided to comment beyond the boundaries of the dairy industry, as there are implications for the total animal industry, environmental sustainability and nutritional and other health issues. You are welcome to add some of the comments if appropriate; alternatively, you can send my comments with the official response to the FAO/WHO offices if you think it is significant, or else inform me what you think is appropriate. The comments are attached. Thank you.

Regards, Heinz.

Laurence's response was:

Dear Heinz,

Many thanks for these extensive comments.

As per your suggestion for next actions; the document is currently not open for public consultation, nevertheless it will be included in UN resolutions. Which is the reason IDF has developed a principles position on it to defend the position of dairy in a healthy sustainable diet.

You might want to consider developing a South African reply based on your comments and have it submitted to your relevant government departments in response to the report. As per your comments the FAO/WHO paper makes significant non science based assumptions.

Kind regards,

Laurence

Since the IDF did not incorporate my comments into their position statements, I sent my comments as a personal position to the FAO/WHO.

My detailed response is attached as Annexure 1.
SCENV activities: Nothing to report.

ANNEXURE

1. 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.

Q2

Liaison with IDF re sustainability and environment: Second Quarter Report 2020 – 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.
Documents attended to, sent through by the IDF and associates:

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. His answers to the questions are in red, which were not well articulated:

From: Heinz Meissner [mailto:heinzmeissner@vodamail.co.za]
Sent: 06 May 2020 04:17 PM
To: 'Alexi Ernstoff'
Subject: RE: Reminder: Expert session for Carbon Sequestration, tomorrow April 28th - see ZOOM link

Dear Alexi,

My apology for the late response, even more so because I have three questions which do not provide direct input into the guidelines but may relate to the methodology:

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.

Thank you and regards,

Heinz.

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".

IDF Standing Committee on the Environment (SCENV):

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.

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

Q3

Liaison with IDF re sustainability and environment: Third Quarter Report 2020 – Heinz Meissner.
Comments to Maria Sánchez Mainar:

From: María Sánchez Mainar [mailto:msanchezmainar@fil-idf.org]
Sent: 08 September 2020 08:54 AM
Subject: IDF: white paper - methane, dairy sector, California - FYI

Dear SCENV, AT members on LCA, GWP* members,

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.

Best,

María

From: Heinz Meissner [mailto:heinzmeissner@vodamail.co.za]
Sent: 08 September 2020 12:35 PM
To: 'María Sánchez Mainar'
Cc: 'Alwyn Kraamwinkel'; 'Chris van Dijk'; 'Colin Ohlhoff'; 'Edu Roux'
Subject: RE: white paper - methane, dairy sector, California - FYI

Thank you Maria!

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.

Keep well and healthy!

Heinz.

Documents attended to, sent through by the IDF and associates:
Consultation on the contributions of the Dairy sector to ecosystem services

(Document sent by Maria for completion shortened)

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"[1].

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

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.

The ecosystem services provided by the dairy sector:

The FAO defined 4 types of services[2]:
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 approach and model described under item 1 aim towards that in an integrated fashion.

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

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.

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[3]:

- 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?

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!

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?**

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. **You are welcome! Heinz Meissner, SCENV-SA.**
EAT G20 Report.

Some of the information by the author in his article on the importance of livestock in the socio-economics of the world, sustainable systems, human health etc was taken up by the DairyCep group in their report on behalf of South Africa into the EAT G20 Report

---

[1] FAO, *The contribution of livestock species and breeds to ecosystem services,*

[2] More information : http://www.fao.org/ecosystem-services-biodiversity/en/

[3] FAO, *The contribution of livestock species and breeds to ecosystem services,*

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, the Executive Committee meeting held on 21 August was held with Zoom and the only expense paid was a daily allowance of R300

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

Not applicable to this quarter

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 this quarter

Standards

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".

Newsbriefs

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

No Non-achievements / underperformance has been reported

Income and expenditure statement

Income and expenditure statement	finstate MSA Q3 20200930.pdf
Unnecessary spending during period	No

Popular Report

popular report Q3 2020 SANCIDF.pdf

Additional documentation

No file has been uploaded

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