ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE FÉDÉRALE DE LAUSANNE

RSB Stakeholder Mapping

Content

1. Background 2
2. The Mapping Process 3
2.1 RSB Kick-off (Nov 2006) 3
2.2 RSB First phase (April 2007-January 2009) 3
2.3 RSB Second Phase (January 2009 – today) 4
3. Current RSB Governance Structure and Stakeholder Engagement 5
3.1 RSB Chambers 6
3.2 RSB Steering Board 12
3.3 Expert/Working Groups 12
3.4 Public Consultation 12
3.5 Pilot Projects 13
4. Decision-making process 13
5. Recruiting new members and communication 14
5.1 Recruiting new members 14
5.2 Communication 15
6. Conclusion 16

1. Background

The Roundtable on Sustainable Biofuels (RSB) is a global initiative of the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (EPFL) to develop sustainability standards for biofuels. Promoted as an important alternative to fossil fuels, it has become clear that biofuels also have the potential to cause negative impacts on people and the environment. By developing sustainability standards for biofuels, the RSB proposes a science-based tool to objectively promote good practices, such that biofuels demonstrate a credible benefit over fossil fuels without additional social or environmental burdens.

The RSB was convened in April 2007 by a founding Steering Board comprised of a diverse mix of individuals representing the private, public and NGO sectors. Using expert working groups divided into different thematic topics, in addition to a permanently open public consultation platform called the Bioenergy Wiki, the RSB developed 12 principles and criteria, intended to represent the key relevant aspects of social and environmental sustainability. On August 13, 2008 **Version Zero** of the RSB Standard was agreed upon by the RSB governing body and released for a comprehensive public review process, during which the RSB received over 900 comments and suggestions on the RSB Standard from stakeholders throughout the world. In 2009 the RSB consolidated its stakeholder-based governance through the creation of 11 Chambers, each of them gathering a specific category of actor, from feedstock producers to the transport industry, from human rights NGOs to oil companies, from research institutions to conservation organizations. The participation in the RSB remained open to any organization with some activities related to biofuels. In November 2009, RSB members (about 100 organizations from all sectors) approved **Version 1** of the RSB Standard and Certification System, which comprises various normative documents and guidelines. This set of documents was tested in the field in 2010 (pilot projects). In between, RSB members decided to collapse several chambers together to simplify the consultation process and enhance cross-sector interactions. The balance between the private sector and the civil society remained untouched (Private sector stakeholders participate directly in the RSB as members of chambers 1-3, and stakeholders from civil society participate directly in the RSB as members of chambers 4-6.) and a quorum for decision making was approved to ensure that any decision taken by chambers or the Steering Board would carry enough representation and credibility. In November 2010 **Version 2** of the RSB Standard was approved by the Steering Board after 2 rounds of member consultation and a 30-day public consultation period (September 2010).

As the RSB has global coverage, important stakeholders invariably exist in all regions of the world. With only a small Secretariat staff and governing board, the RSB does not currently have the capacity to interact sufficiently with all key stakeholders in all of the regions of the world in which it aims to operate. For this reason, it is critical that the RSB develop a strong methodology for how to identify key stakeholders and that it convey the correct messaging to these stakeholders in as clear and concise a manner as possible to efficiently involve those interested parties in the discussions and decision making process, and ultimately create a strong sense of ownership among these actors.

2. The Mapping Process

2.1 RSB Kick-off (Nov 2006)

In the notes of the meeting report of the RSB Founding Members (28 November 2006), one can read that, "*To have legitimacy, any effort must ensure that the key stakeholder categories are well represented",* which illustrates the RSB's early commitment to create a multi-stakeholder dialog for the development of sustainable production and use of biofuels. Participants in this meeting included:

- 8 Non-Governmental Organizations
- 2 Governmental agencies and 1 UN Agency
- 7 Companies
- 3 Academic Institutions

Almost all participants agreed to take an active part in the establishment and development of the RSB after this participatory meeting, either as Steering Board members or as Working Group members. In spite of this broad representation, it was recognized that more efforts were needed to reach out to more stakeholders around the world and from various other organizations. Participants jointly committed to actively spread the word about the RSB and recruit members.

2.2 RSB First phase (April 2007-January 2009)

The Exploratory Meeting was quickly followed by the establishment of a Founding Steering Board for the RSB. New members joined the Board during the first phase, and at the end of this period, it was composed of:

- WWF International (Claude Martin - Former Director General)
- UNCTAD (Lucas Assunçao)
- Shell (Paloma Berenguer)
- National Wildlife Federation (Barbara Bramble)
- WWF International (Jean-Philippe Denruyter)
- UC Berkeley (Alex Farrel)
- World Economic Forum (Christoph Frei)
- Swiss Energy Ministry (Lukas Gutzwiller)
- Fed. of Swiss Oil Companies (Rolf Hartl)
- Toyota Motor Europe (Stephan Herbst)
- Keio University (Hisashi Ishitani)
- UNICA (Marcos Jank)
- UN Foundation (Melinda Kimble)
- Forest Stewardship Council (Heiko Liedeker – Former Director General)
- Petrobras (Julio Cesar Pinho)
- Energy Center, EPFL (Teddy Püttgen)
- TERI India (Ibrahim Rehman)
- BP (Cameron Rennie)
- Bunge (Henri Rieux)
- Amigo da Terra (Roberto Smeraldi)
- UN Environment Programme (Achim Steiner)

- Mali Folkecenter (Ibrahim Togola)
- Dutch Ministry of Housing and the Environment (Steven Wonink)

In the initial RSB governance structure, the Steering Board was the only decision-making body. It was supported by a secretariat staff and 4 working groups dedicated to the topics to be included in the standards. The four working groups were: Environment, Social Aspects, Greenhouse Gases and Implementation.

Each of these working groups was open to any interested party, coordinated by staff from the Secretariat and chaired by one or two experts as follows:

- Environment (ENV): Jeff McNeely (IUCN).
- Social (SOC): Khamarunga Banda (National African Farmers Union) and Jürgen Maier (German NGO Forum).
- Greenhouse Gases (GHG): Bruce Dale (Michigan State Univ.) and Stephen Krinke (Volkswagen).
- Implementation (IMP): Alan Knight (Virgin) and Richard Sykes (IPIECA)

In July 2008, the Working Groups (WGs) included 408 members (some participants registered in several WGs) from 45 countries! Working Groups were exclusively consulted by emails, through the bioenergy wiki and during teleconferences.

Working Groups were in charge of suggesting the wording of the draft Principles and Criteria, based on consensus and supported by *Ad hoc* Expert Groups, which provided technical expertise whenever needed. Suggestions from the Working Group were discussed by the Steering Board before final decisions.

The main achievement of RSB during the First Phase of its development was the release of Version Zero of the RSB Standard in August 2008.

2.3 RSB Second Phase (January 2009 – today)

With the RSB gaining momentum and recognition, the Founding Steering Board recognized the necessity to consolidate the governance of the RSB. A small group of Steering Board members worked on the development of a formal membership system, after reviewing the governance systems used in other multi-stakeholder standard organizations (IFOAM, IOAS, FSC, ASI, PEFC, MSC and Sustainable Food Lab). The Steering Board decided to replace the Working Groups (except the IMP WG) with 11 Chambers, each one intended to represent a different type of biofuel stakeholder as follows:

1. Farmers and growers of biofuel feedstocks
2. Industrial biofuel producers
3. Retailers/blenders & the transportation industry
4. Banks/investors
5. Rights-based NGOs (including land, water, human, and labor rights)
6. Rural development and food security organizations
7. Environment and conservation organizations
8. Climate change and policy organizations
9. Trade unions
10. Smallholder farmer organizations and indigenous peoples' organizations/ community-based civil society organizations

11. Intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), governments, standard-setters, specialist advisory agencies, certification agencies, and consultant experts.

Each Chamber elected 2 representatives to sit on the new Steering Board., The private sector was represented by 4 chambers, the environmental and related NGOs by 3 chambers and civil society groups by 3 chambers. The final chamber, Chamber 11, was set up as a non-voting chamber. Decisions were taken primarily by consensus, voting being used only as a last resort. Membership was open to any stakeholder that could demonstrate some activities related to biofuels; while membership dues were requested, such fees were not intended to be a barrier to participation, and membership fee waivers may be requested by any organization seeking to participate in the RSB.

Under this governance structure, the RSB achieved the development of Version One of the RSB Standard (November 2009). In addition to the Principles & Criteria and Guidance, Version One was the first version to include compliance indicators, guidelines and a full set of normative documents for the implementation of the RSB Standard through certification. Version One was based on a combination of discussions among RSB members, as well as global public outreach and consultations in 2008 and 2009 to gather feedback about the preceding Version Zero.

At the beginning of 2010, the Steering Board revised the governance structure as stipulated in the Terms of Reference of the RSB. (This document foresees annual revisions of the governance structure in the first three years of the RSB, followed by a need driven approach.) The next regular review of the governance structure will take place in spring 2011. In June 2010, a new governance structure based on only seven chambers was approved. The new Steering Board established under the revised governance structure later approved revisions to the RSB Principles & Criteria, and the subsequent release of Version 2 in November 2010.

3. Current RSB Governance Structure and Stakeholder Engagement

The current governance structure was approved in June 2010 and builds upon the experience and lessons learned during its initial years, and information gained from the experience of other standards initiatives. Since 2007, discussions within the RSB constituencies and regional outreaches worldwide has allowed for the mapping of stakeholders to a more accurate degree. The current chamber structure represents all the actors with some activities related to biofuels production with a common interest in the development and implementation of the RSB standards[1]. In addition, some of the stakeholders in RSB chamber constituencies may be users of the RSB Standard, and are expected to seek certification or accreditation to deliver certificates.

[1] In some cases, an organization may qualify for more than one chamber. The decision is to participate in one chamber over another is left to the organization, and must be approved by the Steering Board.

3.1 RSB Chambers

Chamber 1: Farmers and Growers of Biofuel Feedstocks

Feedstock producers are the first link in the biofuel value chain. Biomass is the raw material for biofuel production and the first step in the RSB certification scheme. With regard to the 1st generation of biofuels, feedstock producers are most commonly farmers growing agricultural crops. Bioethanol is made out of sugar/starch-rich crops, whereas biodiesel is made out of oilseed crops. Some examples include:

- Sugarcane, which is used to produce bioethanol, either from sugar or molasses (by-product).
- Corn, wheat and other cereals, which are used to produce bioethanol.
- Sweet sorghum, cassava and other starch-rich crops, which are used to produce bioethanol.
- Rapeseed (also called canola in North America), which is used to produce biodiesel.
- Palm oil, which is used to produce biodiesel.
- Jatropha, camelina, moringa & other alternative oilseed crops, which are used to produce biodiesel.

Chamber 1 also includes feedstock processors (e.g. crushers and millers), which represent the second important link in the biofuel value chain. Processors convert raw material (cane, palm fruit, jatropha seeds, etc.) into a more concentrated product that can be used directly in the biofuel production plant (sugar, crude & degummed oil, etc.).

Most people believe that first generation biofuels will represent the majority of biofuel production over the next decade, indicating that farmers and agricultural producers will continue to play an essential role as feedstock producers. In addition, second generation biofuels are increasingly close to commercialization, and are produced through a more complex process which allows for the use of a larger variety of biomass material (e.g. ligno-cellulose). In particular, grasses, wood and any residues or by-product from agriculture and forestry, will likely become new feedstock sources for biofuel production. Moreover, second generation technologies allow for the easier use of waste materials, such as municipal solid waste. Although second generation biofuels currently represent a minor share of the overall production due to their high production costs, such producers are equally invited to join Chamber 1 and bring in sustainability issues related to advanced technologies.

Algae biodiesel is sometimes classified as a “third generation biofuel,” due to the perceived time to commercialization, though the production process is based on oil extraction, similar to first generation technologies. While algae are considered to be a promising technology, penetration in the market is still limited due to technical barriers. Despite the challenges facing algae producers, algae for biofuel production is an exciting and growing sector, and a number of the leading companies in the field have joined the RSB in Chamber 1 as well.

The geographic range of potential feedstock production is unlimited, since all regions of the world can produce feedstock for biofuel production. In 2010, the major regions for feedstock production include Brazil, Argentina, USA, Europe, South-East Asia (esp.,

Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines), China and a few African countries (Mozambique, Tanzania, Kenya and Ethiopia) as listed in the following table[2].

Region/Continent	Country	Region/Continent	Country	Region/Continent	Country
Africa	Ghana	**Asia**	India	**North America**	Guatemala
Africa	Kenya	**Asia**	Malaysia	**North America**	Mexico
Africa	Mali	**Asia**	Philippines	**North America**	United States
Africa	Mozambique	**Asia**	Thailand	**Oceania**	Australia
Africa	Nigeria	**Asia**	Indonesia	**South America**	Argentina
Africa	South Africa	**Europe**	EU Countries	**South America**	Brazil
Africa	Tanzania	**North America**	Canada	**South America**	Colombia
Asia	China	**North America**	Dominican Republic	**South America**	Peru

The size of operations of feedstock producers ranges greatly, from large multi-national corporations, to small-scale producers operating on less than a hectare of land. The RSB makes a strong effort to involve feedstock producers of all sizes, from small farmers to large-scale farmers *(Note that small farmers associations can also join Chamber 5)*.

Feedstock producers and processors are examples of users of the RSB Standard. They will ultimately seek compliance with the RSB Principles & Criteria and other RSB standards in order to receive a certificate of compliance by an accredited auditor. Feedstock producers and processors will respectively carry the first and second certificates in the RSB chain of custody.

Chamber 2: Industrial Biofuel Producers

Chamber 2 (Industrial Biofuel Producers) is mostly made up of companies producing a usable product (biofuel) at an industrial scale. Biofuel producers may buy raw material (e.g. sugar or corn), process it and transform it into biofuel, i.e. bioethanol or biodiesel. Alternatively, biofuel producers may buy processed material (e.g. rapeseed oil or palm oil) and produce biofuel out of it.

Like agricultural producers, industrial biofuel producers vary greatly in size, from very large-scale facilities similar in size to petroleum refineries, to small-scale facilities that may operate in a warehouse or small chemical production plant setting. In most cases, the geographic regions of production are the same as those mentioned in 3.1, though like Chamber 1, Chamber 2 aims to include industrial biofuel producers from all regions.

Biofuel producers can also be considered to be users of the RSB Standard. They may seek to achieve compliance with the RSB Principles & Criteria and other RSB standards in order to receive a certificate of compliance by an accredited auditor. In the RSB chain of custody, certified biofuel producers must buy raw material that carries a certificate of compliance with the RSB standards or any certificate recognized by the RSB from an RSB-certified feedstock producer or processor. If the raw material does not carry such a certificate, the chain of custody is considered broken and no claim of RSB compliance is allowed.

[2] Countries to which RSB members belong are in **green** whereas countries with no RSB member are in **red**.

Chamber 3: Retailers/blenders, the transportation industry, banks/investors

Retailers/Blenders

Previously separated into two distinct chambers, chamber three was collapsed to include financiers of the biofuel industry, along with the transportation and retailer sector. A unique aspect of Chamber 3 is that participation on the RSB Steering Board rotates between the two co-chairs and the chamber alternate on an annual basis, in recognition of the at times different perspectives of these groups within this chamber.

The final link in the biofuel supply chain is the biofuel blender/retailer, also an important RSB stakeholder. Biofuel blenders mostly comprise oil companies that buy biofuel from biofuel producers and blend it with a varying volume of gasoline or diesel, or in some cases distribute unblended biofuel (E100 or B100) through their distribution infrastructure. Oil companies (blenders and retailers) also are considered to be users of the RSB Standard, and will seek RSB certification of their distribution operations in order to receive a certificate of compliance by an accredited auditor.

In the RSB chain of custody, certified biofuel blenders/retailers must buy material that carries a certificate of compliance with the RSB standards or any certificate recognized by the RSB. If such a certificate does not accompany the biofuel purchased, the chain of custody is considered broken and no claim of RSB compliance is allowed. If the biofuel does carry such a certificate, blenders/retailers are able to supply a certified end product to the end-users, for example at the pump in a gas station. Additionally, blenders/retailers are the only economic actors in the RSB supply chain required to calculate the total greenhouse gas emissions over the lifecycle of a certified biofuel. As described in Principle 3, blenders are required to make sure that the blended biofuel they distribute demonstrates at least a 50% GHG benefit, compared to the fossil fuel baseline.

Major retailers/blenders are important actors for the promotion and use of the RSB Standard. Since they are the last link in the chain of custody, they sell an end-product carrying a claim of compliance with the RSB Standard to the final consumers of the biofuel. As such, the retailers/blenders have an important role in marketing RSB certification of their biofuel to the general public, and proper messaging and communication strategies are critical. Because of the growing demand for sustainably produced biofuels, the amount of certified biofuels sold by petroleum distributors is expected to increase significantly over the coming years, helping these companies to improve their public image through RSB certification and other CSR efforts.

Participation in Chamber 3 is open to all sizes of petroleum companies, including large multinationals, state actors, and small, family owned petroleum distributors.

Transportation Industry

The transportation industry includes companies involved in selling goods or services related to transport. This includes car and plane manufacturers, public transportation companies (i.e. buses and trains), airline companies, port authorities, and member-based organizations promoting sustainable transport.

As stakeholders within the transportation sector are major fuel consumers they will play a key role in promoting sustainable production and use of biofuels by enhancing the demand for certified products. Though most stakeholders from the transportation industry will not seek RSB certification themselves, they have an important role by promoting and supporting biofuel initiatives.

A few companies from the transportation industry do not consume fuel themselves, but nevertheless play an active role in promoting the production and use of sustainable biofuels. Plane manufacturers, for example, are showing interest in this topic by assisting airlines to conduct biofuel test flights. Plane manufacturers may also influence fuel supply and distribution through partnerships and parallel activities.

Bank/Investors

Funding is an important factor in the growths of the biofuel industry in general and the sustainable production of biofuels in particular. As with any emerging technology, production costs for next generation biofuels remain high, which means it is necessary to improve production technologies to optimize the return on investment. Banks and Investors are not actors in the biofuel supply chain and are not considered potential direct users of the RSB Standard. However, financiers may strongly influence the development of biofuels imposing sustainability requirements on their investments in order to manage the social and environmental risk associated with their biofuel investments.

Banks and investors also have a strong influence on other biofuel stakeholders in the developing world who are willing to seek compliance with the RSB Standard, but for whom compliance and certification costs represent an obstacle. Development banks may finance certification support initiatives, as well as large-scale projects in developing countries, oriented towards either commercial exports or local energy needs. Like traditional investors, development banks see certification as another way to conduct due diligence on their investments, and manage risks against investing in a project with negative social or environmental impacts.

Chamber 4: Rights-based NGOs (including land, water, human, and labor rights) & Trade Unions

While Chambers 1, 2 and 3 are made up of stakeholders from the private sector, Chambers 4-6 are intended to represent organizations from non-governmental organizations and civil society groups. While such entities are not typically direct users of the RSB Standard (i.e.

not seeking certification), NGOs and civil society groups are directly and indirectly affected by the conditions in which biofuels are produced and used. The participation of such groups in the RSB is essential to guarantee that social and environmental considerations, which may not be adequately addressed in all cases of biofuel production, are duly integrated into the RSB Standard. The participation of NGOs and civil society groups ensures that the RSB Standard carries strong credibility, and that the RSB name brings clear value to the groups who achieve its certification.

Rights-based NGOs

As with all agricultural and industrial activities, biofuel operations biofuel production requires human labor, and while many countries have established rules regarding labor rights, the potential for worker rights violations and worker exploitation still exists. In addition, the rights of local or indigenous people negatively affected by biofuel operations may be totally ignored, especially in developing world settings. The inclusion of rights-based NGOs in the RSB is intended to address these issues and provide participation of groups that can help develop standards that ensure labor and human rights are respected throughout the biofuel supply chain. Such groups tend to have a close connection to local communities, and provide important insight into how rights-related issues can be addressed in the RSB Standard.

Trade Unions

Composed of workers directly within the work environment, trade unions are entities that seek to protect the rights of employees and workers they represent against potential abuses an unregulated work setting might create. Their knowledge of the work environment and the specificities of the agro-industrial sectors contributes to their relevance in the development of the RSB standards. The role of trade unions is to add another important voice to ensure that labor rights are reasonably protected without unnecessarily impacting the economic viability of companies through unnecessary burdens.

Chamber 5: Rural development or food security organizations & Smallholder farmer organizations or indigenous peoples' organizations or community-based civil society organizations

The impacts of agricultural or industrial projects on indigenous populations may potentially be negative if the rights of such groups are not taken into consideration. In addition to concerns about human rights infringement (in particular land and water rights of indigenous people), biofuel production triggered a new debate about the impact of operations on food security during the commodity price peak in 2008. In addition, biofuel production represents an important opportunity to improve local livelihoods and economies in poverty regions through benefit sharing.

In order to build a coherent set of requirements to address the numerous social issues related to biofuel production, the organizations represented in Chamber 5 bring the voice of the most vulnerable stakeholders at the table: small farmers, vulnerable communities,

indigenous people and all those who may be negatively impacted from business as usual, in absence of a sustainability standard ensuring such projects bring local benefits as well. The role of Chamber 5 organizations is to relay the progress in developing and implementing the RSB Standard to their constituencies, and create buy-in and trust among local communities so that they will also promote certification as a credible solution to address social issues.

Chamber 6: Environment or conservation organizations & Climate change or policy organizations

As one of the three pillars of sustainability, respect for the environment is a critical issue for a standard seeking to define sustainable biofuel production. As with social criteria, environmental issues are not specific to biofuel production, and environmental organizations with experience in agricultural and industrial operations know well the key aspects which need to be carefully addressed in a sustainability standard: conservation (incl. biodiversity, ecosystem services and other nature management aspects), soil, water and air protection. Topics such as biodiversity management are extremely complex and require technical knowledge from environmental and conservation organizations. For many of these groups, collaborative discussions with industry groups on how best to minimize the impacts of their operations on biodiversity and other natural resources are common and many have experience working with commercial interests to propose recommendations for good practices and technologies.

Recently, some environmental organizations have started to focus on the field of climate change, some of whom have specialized in this area only. Since among the main reasons behind rapid biofuel growth is the argument that biofuels can serve as an important tool to mitigate climate change it is essential to verify that this promise is achieved. A number of organizations now specialize in the specific issues of climate change as they relate to biofuels, including the calculation of greenhouse gases emissions, which is a core element of the RSB Standard.

The participation of environmental/conservation and climate change organizations in the development and implementation of the RSB Standard is therefore essential to:

- Ensure that environmental issues are accurately and comprehensively addressed;
- Provide technical resources about good practices for environmental protection in line with economic reality;
- Promote the use of the RSB Standard to create a broader support; and
- Provide credibility to the users of the RSB Standard

Chamber 7: Intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), governments, standard-setters, specialist advisory agencies, certification agencies, and consultant experts

When the governance system was finalized (*See 2.3*), it was decided that a specific consultative and non-voting chamber would be open to organizations besides 1) the private sector involved in the biofuel value chain; 2) NGOs that have particular interests across the spectrum of biofuels; and 3) civil society organizations (CSOs) whose members are directly impacted by biofuels projects.

Chamber 7 allows inter-governmental organizations (IGOs), governments, research institutes, consultants, and other types of groups that do not fall into chambers 1-6 to participate in the RSB process and share their expertise and opinions. Furthermore, highly visible and recognized organizations such as UN agencies or academic institutions provide valuable support and credibility for the RSB Standard through their own networks, and governments may use the work of the RSB to develop their own policies for sustainable biofuel production and use.

The list of RSB members is available in Annex I.

3.2 RSB Steering Board

The Steering Board is the highest decision-making body of the RSB and is responsible for overseeing the content development of the RSB Standard. The two Co-Chairs of all Chambers are the members of the RSB Steering Board. The Chamber's Alternate is invited to participate in Steering Board Meetings.

The participants in the Steering Board do not defend their personal or organizational opinions, but are committed to representing the recommendations and/or decisions reached in their respective Chambers and to upholding the overall RSB objectives.

A more complete description of the Steering Board's decision process is included in section 4.

3.3 Expert/Working Groups

Non-RSB members are invited to participate in discussions on complex issues requiring some specific expertise, such as greenhouse gas calculation methodology, indirect impacts of bioenergy or liabilities related to the use of GMOs. This open participation beyond the sole membership gives an opportunity for the RSB to benefit from state-of-the-art knowledge and expertise while preserving some balance in opinion and extend stakeholder involvement.

Expert/Working Groups address recommendations to the RSB Chambers and/or the Steering Board and inform their discussions and decisions on a given topic. An Expert/Working Group is active as long as required to complete its agreed-upon task and is dissolved upon its completion. Participation in an Expert/Working Group does not involve any financial compensation.

The list of participants in the Expert Groups on GHG and Indirect Impacts is available in Annex II.

3.4 Public Consultation

While decisions regarding the development and implementation of the RSB Standard pertain to the RSB members, non-members are welcome to submit their comments and suggestions anytime. Those are regarded by the Secretariat and eventually considered during revision periods. Revision periods usually include public consultation, which is actively promoted on the RSB websites. Public feedback is used to inform discussions and decisions by RSB members.

3.5 Pilot Projects

Pilot projects are used to refine the RSB standards based on field testing. They are useful in bringing in the expertise of certification bodies and auditors, and the reality of operators on the ground. They provide a practical view about how to document the verification of the requirements in the RSB Standard. Because of the decision to use 3rd party auditors to deliver certificates of compliance, certification bodies and auditors cannot become RSB members. An involvement in the decision-making process on the standard would compromise the independence of certification bodies and the credibility of the system.

4. Decision-making process

From the beginning, the Roundtable on Sustainable Biofuels has been committed to develop its standard in compliance with the Standard-Setting Code developed by the ISEAL Alliance. Among many other rules, this commitment involves:

- Offering stakeholders the opportunity to actively participate in the development and implementation of the RSB Standard;
- Facilitating the participation of such groups through outreach, electronic means, teleconferences, etc;
- Establishing a clear decision-process with a balance between all the sectors involved; and;
- Making the development and implementation of the RSB Standard public and transparent.

As per the Terms of Reference, the decision-making process is as follows:

RSB Chambers

- Decisions are taken by **consensus** within each Chamber, with consensus being defined as the lack of sustained opposition.
- If consensus is not reached after several tries, a decision may be reached by a vote of 3/4 of all members of the Chamber.
- Members who believe that their opinions have been not been sufficiently heard or heeded may use the *Direct Consultation process*, during which their concerns are taken directly to the Secretariat or the RSB Steering Board.

RSB Steering Board

- The Steering Board is made up of the 2 representatives from each Chamber and the Executive Secretary of the RSB (*ex officio)*.
- Chambers 1-6 are decision-making Chambers in the Steering Board, may block consensus and have formal voting rights. The representatives of Chamber 7 to the RSB Steering Board are not granted these rights.
- Representatives are in charge of representing the decisions obtained in their chamber.
- Decisions are taken by consensus within the Steering Board, with consensus being defined as the lack of sustained opposition.

- If consensus cannot be reached after several tries, a decision may be reached by a vote of 3/4 of the voting members of the Steering Board.
- A Chamber which believes that its opinions have been not been sufficiently heard or heeded may use the *Direct Consultation process*.

5. Recruiting new members and communication

5.1 Recruiting new members

Recruiting new members is an ongoing activity, with no limitation in time. Potential new members may be approached by Secretariat staff, RSB members or may decide to join the RSB on their own initiative. Applicants are requested to submit a set of documents described in the RSB Terms of Reference; each application is evaluated by the Secretariat before submission to the Steering Board for final decision. Because reaching out to potential new members is time consuming, some sectors are targeted as a priority, based on regular scanning of RSB membership. Chambers with fewer participants benefit from a more active outreach effort.

As the value proposition of the RSB will vary greatly by stakeholder type, it is critical to use proper messaging during communications with organizations that might be interested in joining the RSB.

Private Sector

In the case of private sector groups, it is important to describe the value of the RSB to help them meet their business objectives, for instance by increasing access to markets. One good way to demonstrate the value of the RSB is to approach such groups with specific markets in mind that might be opened to them through participation in the RSB (e.g. regulatory markets such as the EU, or specific downstream supply chain actors that have agreed to purchase RSB certified products.). In the case of the fuel users (e.g. the transportation sector), it will be critical for these groups to find intrinsic value in the credibility of RSB certification, for instance by benefiting from promotion or support by the NGO sector.

Civil Society

In the case of the civil society, it is very important to demonstrate that the RSB Standard addresses the issues of importance to that particular group. Convincing civil society groups that the RSB is an appropriate and reliable instrument to mitigate negative impacts of biofuel production will enhance the broad support for the RSB Standard among social and environmental NGOs. Participation of other groups working in the same field, especially those with whom the organization has collaborated with in the past, or those with a positive reputation of commitment and expertise can be helpful. A convincing argument among civil society organizations is that the RSB governance structure is balanced, such that equal weight is given to both the private sector and civil society in the RSB decision-making process (3 chambers each). This balance ensures that civil society organizations have access to learn about the views of major economic actors, and benefit from the balanced governance structure that protects them.

Public Sector/Governments

As public sector/governmental actors work with both the private sector and civil society, it is important for these actors to perceive that the RSB has buy-in and participation of organizations with strong economic weight and influence from both the private sector and civil society. In addition, many governments find that they are working in somewhat of a vacuum, and the ability to share with the work of other governments and participate in an environment with their analogs from other countries is highly valuable. In most cases, governmental actors may want to participate in the RSB as they prepare their own regulations related to biofuel sustainability standards. Participation in the RSB may give such groups the opportunity to build upon the multi-stakeholder work of the RSB, and benefit them by allowing for an immediate jump to the most current body of knowledge on the topic.

5.2 Communication

Ensuring proper communications in a diverse and complex membership organization such as the RSB is a challenging yet critical exercise. There are a number of ways to reach out to stakeholders from the different sectors represented within the RSB, some of them requiring considerable efforts.

Electronic communication and teleconferences

Following its commitment to minimize its carbon footprint, the RSB mostly based the consultation of stakeholders on virtual dialogs through teleconference calls and other forms of electronic communication (emails, wiki). RSB members receive all event notifications and news by email. Consultation about a given topic starts with email exchanges within a chamber and is usually followed by a teleconference to finalize a common position, which will then be presented to the Steering Board (See *Decision-making process* above). The main limitation of this kind of communication is the technical barrier for some stakeholders with insufficient equipment or infrastructure. Furthermore, teleconferences with participants across the world involve inconveniences due to the different time zones.

Pros and Cons for electronic communication and teleconferences are summarized in the following table:

PROS	CONS
- Cheap - Low Carbon - Reasonable anticipation needed - Limited time to dedicate - Can be frequent	- Technical Barrier (equipment, language) - Time differences (teleconferences) - Limited progress through email - Teleconferences are too short to deal with some topics in depth - Lack of group dynamics and formation of personal relationships

In-person meetings

In order to address the lack of access to electronic communications by some stakeholders, in-person outreach meetings are held periodically throughout the world, such as during the

revision periods of the RSB Standard. The global outreach process established a strong global network for the RSB, and many important stakeholder relationships were cultivated during this period. In-person meetings are also useful to gather experts around a given topic to be discussed. The main inconveniences of in-person meeting are the cost in money and greenhouse gas emissions. In absence of funding for travel sponsorship, important stakeholders from non-profit organizations might be unable to participate.

Pros and Cons for in-person meetings are summarized in the following table:

PROS	CONS
- Broader outreach in a given region or given sector - Better group dynamics by meeting in person - Efficiency. Possibility to discuss more topics, more in-depth	- Funding is needed to ensure balanced participation - Greenhouse gas emissions due to travel - Several days dedicated to each event - Long anticipation needed to plan events

6. Conclusion

As a membership-based organization that draws its strength from the depth and diversity of stakeholders represented, the need for a strong stakeholder mapping strategy is critical to the Roundtable on Sustainable Biofuels. The geographic scope of RSB activities is huge – encompassing nearly all areas of the globe, spanning different types of ecosystems and different cultural settings. The issues addressed are equally complex, from social issues such as human and labor rights, to food security, to biodiversity and water impacts – the need for stakeholders with a diversity of real-world experience in the topics addressed is critical. And finally, a strong communications strategy, one that allows for dialogue and sharing of ideas, and promotes collaboration and consensus building between disparate groups, is the lynchpin to the RSB's progress forward. As an organization that draws its strength from the buy-in and support of industry, NGOs and civil society organizations throughout the world, it will be critical that the RSB continue to develop and strengthen its stakeholder outreach and communication strategies in the years to come.

ANNEX I

RSB Members (as of January 20, 2011)

CHAMBER 1
Argentine No-till Farmers' Association (Aapresid)
Bio Partners Limited
BIOFUELS ASIA PRIVATE LIMITED
Biogreen Oil BV
Bionavitas, Inc.
Canola Council of Canada
Colombian National Federation of Oil Palm Growers-Fedepalma
Cosmo Biofuels Group (represented by Cosmo Biofuels Sdn Bhd)
D1-Fuel Crops Limited
Jatoil Limited
Jatropha Sustainable Biofuels Alliance
JOil (Singapore) Pte Ltd.
KULIM (MALAYSIA) BERHAD
KUOSOL
LiveFuels Inc.
NANDAN BIOMATRIX LIMITED
National Corn Growers Association
ProCana Lda.
Solazyme Inc.
Sustainable BioBrazil – Co2 Star
United Soybean Board

CHAMBER 2
Abundant Biofuels Corporation
Addax Bioenergy Management SA
Archer Daniels Midland Company
Asociación Promotora de Combustibles Renovables ACR – GuatemalanRenewable Fuels Associaction
Bio Energy Resources Ltd
BioJet Corporation
Biotechnology Industry Organization (BIO)
BP Biofuels UK Ltd.
Brazilian Sugarcane Industry Association - UNICA
Bundesverband der Deutschen Bioethanolwirtschat BDBe (German Bioethanol Industry Association)
Canadian Bioenergy Corporation
Canadian Renewable Fuels Association (CRFA)

DSM Innovation Center
Genencor/Danisco
Gevo, Inc.
Great Plains Oil & Exploration-The Camelina Company
Imperium Renewable, Inc.
MALAYSIAN BIODIESEL ASSOCIATION (MBA)
National Biodiesel Board
Neste Oil Oyj
Novozymes A/S
Pangea - Partners for Euro-African Green Energy
Petrobras S.A.
POET
StatoilHydro
SUN BIOFUELS Ltd
Syngenta International AG
Vertical UK LLP (also representing COSAN S.A.)
Wilmar Oleo Pte Ltd.

CHAMBER 3
Airbus
Boeing
Delta Airlines
Greenergy International
IATA
Inter-American Development Bank (IADB)
International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association (IPIECA)
LANE & ASSOCIATES
Royal Dutch Shell (Shell International Petroleum Limited)
SAFUG- main contact - KLM
Verno Systems, Inc.

CHAMBER 4
Associated Labor Unions-Trade Union Congress of the Philippines (ALU-TUCP)
Commission for the Verification of Codes of Conduct (COVERCO)
National Union of Plantation and Agricultural Workers of Uganda (NUPAWU)
Sucre Ethique- Ethical Sugar- Azucar Etico- Açucar Etico

CHAMBER 5
Centro de Promoción y Desarrollo Rural Amazónico – CEPODRA
Fundacion Solar
German NGO Forum Environment & Development
Mali Folkecenter Nyetaa

My Village Organization (MVI)
National African Farmers Union of South Africa
Philippine Network of Rural Development Institutes, Inc. (PhilNet-RDI)
Rural Development Institute of Sultan Kudarat
TECHNOSERVE INC.
Trowel Development Foundation, Inc (TDFI)

CHAMBER 6
Amigos da Terra – Amazônia Brasileira
Applied Environmental Research Foundation(AERF)
Conservation International
East African Wildlife Society
Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)
National Wildlife Federation
Natural Resources Defense Council
Pinchot Institute for Conservation
Sierra Club
The Energy and Resources Institute India (TERI)
The Gold Standard Foundation
The Innovation Center for Energy and Transportation
The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)
United Nations Foundation
University of Botswana, Maun
Wetlands International (www.wetlands.org)
WWF International

CHAMBER 7
Icontec
Business For Social Responsibility (BSR)
City Planning and Development Office, Cebu City Government – Republic of the Philippines
CSIRO
Florida Agricultural & Mechanical University/StateWide Small Farm Programs
Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
Government of South Australia
Green Aviation International Association
Instituto de Energía (Energy Institute)
Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria (Programa nacional Bioenería)
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Kenya Forestry Research Institute
Life Cycle Associates LLC
Ministry of Environment - Peru (MINAM)
National Center for Appropriate Technology
National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL)

Office of Biofuels, Land and Property Management Authority, Government of New South Wales
Öko-Institut e.V.
Pace Energy and Climate Center
ProForest
REDIEX – Exports and Investments Network – Ministry of Industry and Commerce
SDA – Sustainable Development Advisors
SNV Netherlands Development Organisation
Stanford University - Sustainable Bioenergy Project, Woods Institute for the Environment
Sustainable Biodiesel Alliance
Sustainable Forestry Initiative Inc. (SFI)
Swiss Alcohol Board / Alcosuisse
Swiss Federal Office of Energy
Swiss Federal Office of Environment (OFEN)
The California Energy Commission
The Energy Biosciences Institute
The Institute for Emerging Issues (IEI), N.C. State University
UC Berkeley, Energy & Resources Group
UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development)
United Nations Environment Programme
US Commercial Service Liaison to African Development Bank

ANNEX II

List of Participants to the Expert Groups (as of Feb 2, 2010)

GHG Expert Group

First Name	Last Name	Organization
Dulce	Benke	UN Foundation
Doug	Berven	POET
Barbara	Bramble	NWF
Jessica	Chalmers	Winrock
Marta	Chrusch	BP
Rob	Cox	IPIECA
Bruce	Dale	Michigan State Univ
Isabel	Ferreira	International Air Transport Association (IATA)
Mireille	Faist	EMPA
Joe	Fargione	Nature Conservancy
Kevin	Fingerman	UC berkeley
Uwe	Fritsche	Oeko Institut
Fred	Ghatala	Canadian Bioenergy Corporation
Edgard	Gnansounou	EPFL
Anand	Gopal	UC berkeley
Nathanel	Greene	NRDC
Klaus	Hennenberg	Oeko Institut
Jill	Heyde	Wetlands Int'l
Jason	Hill	UMN
Khoo	Hock Aun	Cosmo
Mark	Jacobs	Meridian / CSBP
Ingo	Klenk	eBIO
Jesper	Kløverpris	Novozymes
Florian	Kraxner	International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA)
Jean-Francois	Larive	Concawe
Jonathan	Lewis	Clean Air Task Force
Isaias	Macedo	UNICA
Jerome	Malavelle	UNEP
Rick	Malpas	Shell
Liz	Marshall	WRI
Laszlo	Mathe	WWF
Rethabile	Melamu	Univ of Cape Town
Ian	Monroe	Stanford University
Michael	Obersteiner	International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA)
Don	O'Connor	GHGenius c/o NBB and USB
Richard	Ottinger	Pace Law School
Guillermo	Romero	Paraguay Ministry of Industry and Commerce
Rich	Plevin	UC berkeley
Gert	Prins	Crocklaan oils / RSPO
Guido	Reinhardt	IFEU

Jürgen	Reinhard	EMPA
Thomas	Roetger	IATA
Matt	Rudolf	RSB
Marcel	Silvius	Wetlands Int'l
Kathrine	Vad	E4Tech
Pierre-Antoine	Vernon	European Biodiesel Board
Harro	Von Blottnitz	Univ of Cape Town
Francois	Vuille	E4Tech
Michael	Wang	Argonne National Labs
Jeremy	Woods	Imperial College
Rainer	Zah	EMPA
Victoria	Junquera	RSB

Indirect Impact Expert Group

Bruce	Dale	Michigan State University
Christine	Dragisic	Conservation International
Joe	Fargione	Nature Conservancy
Erika	Felix	FAO
Luis	Fernandez	Stanford University
Kevin	Fingerman	UC Berkeley
Martin	Fraguio	Maizar
Uwe	Fritsche	Oeko Institut
John	Gander	BioPartners
Fred	Ghatala	Canadian Bioenergy
Holly	Gibbs	Stanford University
Anand	Gopal	UC Berkeley
Bemmy	Granados	Conservation International
Nathanael	Greene	NRDC
Steven	Gust	Neste Oil
Philip	Heirigs	Chevron Global Downstream LLC
Klaus	Hennenberg	Oeko Institut
Jill	Heyde	Wetlands International
Jorge Antonio	Hilbert	Inst Nac Tec Agropecuaria (INTA) Argentina
Khoo	Hock Aun	Cosmo Biofuels
Victoria	Junquera	RSB
Ingo	Klenk	Südzucker AG Germany
Jesper	Kløverpris	Novozymes
David	Lapola	University of Kassel
Jerome	Malavelle	UNEP
Rick	Malpas	Shell
Michelle	Manion	NESCAUM
Laszlo	Mathe	WWF
Ian	Monroe	Stanford University
Jose Roberto	Moreira	CENBIO – Brazil
Siwa	Msangi	IFPRI
Andre	Nassar	ICONE
Michael	Obersteiner	IIASA
Michael	O'Hare	UC Berkeley

Martina	Otto	UNEP
Luis	Panichelli	EPFL
Guillermo	Romero	REDIEX Ministy of Industry and Commerce Paraguay
Daan	Peters	Netherlands Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning & the Environment
Rich	Plevin	UC Berkeley
Ana Paula	Ramos	Petrobras
Jonathan	Reeves	FAO/GBEP
Andrea	Rossi	FAO
Don	Scott	National Biodiesel Board, U.S.
John	Sheehan	University of Minnesota
Annie	Sugrue	RSB
Susan	Sanchez	Life Cycle Associates
Paul	Thompson	UK Renewable Energy Association
Stephen	Thornhill	University College Cork / IFPRI
Kathrine	Vad	E4Tech
Francois	Vuille	E4Tech
Jeremy	Woods	Imperial College
Richard	Ottinger	Pace Law School