



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International Federation
of Organic Agriculture
Movements



United Nations Conference
on Trade and Development

INTERNATIONAL TASK FORCE ON HARMONIZATION AND EQUIVALENCE IN ORGANIC AGRICULTURE

071214_kp
071215_db

**Seventh Meeting of the
International Task Force on Harmonization and Equivalence in Organic Agriculture
26-29 November, 2007
Bali, Indonesia**

REPORT

ITF Secretariat
Diane Bowen Secretary
d.bowen@ifoam.org
phone +1 414 352 5789
fax +1 253 669 7921

Katharina Pfundt Coordinator
k.pfundt@ifoam.org
phone +49 228 926 5018
fax +49 228 926 5099

Table of Contents

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY.....	3
WELCOME.....	4
STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT.....	4
ITF REPORTS AND UPDATES.....	4
PAPER: TOOL FOR EQUIVALENCE OF ORGANIC STANDARDS AND TECHNICAL REGULATIONS.....	5
PAPER: POTENTIAL NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF EQUIVALENCY OF STANDARDS AND TECHNICAL REGULATIONS.....	6
PAPER: OVERVIEW OF GROUP CERTIFICATION.....	6
PAPER: USING COOPERATION BETWEEN CERTIFICATION BODIES TO FACILITATE MARKET ACCESS.....	7
INTERNATIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ORGANIC CERTIFICATION BODIES (IROCB), 4TH DRAFT.....	8
STEWARDSHIP AND OWNERSHIP OF IROCB.....	9
ITF COMMUNICATION PLAN.....	10
ACHIEVEMENTS AND NEXT STEPS.....	10
DISCUSSION: BEYOND THE ITF.....	12
ADDENDUM 1 – PARTICIPANTS LIST.....	13
ADDENDUM 2 – AGENDA.....	15

Background and Summary

The 7th ITF meeting, convened in Bali, Indonesia, was attended by thirty-one participants; eighteen from governments, four from intergovernmental organizations, one from academia and eight from private sector certification bodies and non-governmental organizations. In the course of the meeting, participants: reviewed the first draft of a Tool for Equivalence of Organic Standards and Technical Regulations (EquiTool); reviewed the 4th draft of the International Requirements for Organic Certification Bodies (IROCB); discussed proposals for two forms of cooperation involving certification bodies; received information on the situation of group certification with specific reference to the situation in the United States; received information on potential negative impacts of equivalence, reviewed the draft ITF Communication Plan, and discussed the prospects for implementing ITF results beyond 2008 when the ITF will end.

Specifically, the 7th meeting achieved the following results:

Tool for Equivalence (EquiTool)

The ITF agreed that the tool is potentially useful and should be further developed, and gave input for the development.

Potential Negative Impacts of Equivalence

ITF has produced a resource which explains potential negative impacts of equivalence, and which can be used as a reference for developing sound equivalence agreements that avoid pitfalls.

International Requirements for Organic Certification Bodies (IROCB)

Meeting participants resolved 5 specific open issues in the 4th draft of this tool, and they provided several other recommendations for the final draft. The participants also decided that ITF should participate in ISO CASCO Working Group 29, which is preparing the revision of ISO 65, and advocate consideration of IROCB in the revision.

Stewardship and Ownership of IROCB

Participants recommended that after the ITF ends in 2008 IFOAM should become the short-term steward of the document, with support from FAO and UNCTAD, which should approve any changes to it. In the long term, IROCB should become either a Codex or ISO document and steps should be taken to begin implementing this.

ITF Communications Plan

The participants agreed on the general approach of the communications plan as well as on the challenges for communicating and advocating the ITF results.

Welcome

Professor Dr. Djoko Said Damardjati, Director General, Directorate General of Processing & Marketing of Agricultural Products delivered a welcome address to the ITF. Referring to the international summit on climate change in Bali, Dr. Damardjati noted the contribution that organic agriculture can make to solving the problem. He also mentioned the conference of organic producers in Bali and the positive outlook for organic agriculture in Indonesia. Indonesian understands organic as a production system that is tied to sustainability. Covering 16 million acres of land, Organic farming in Indonesia, mostly follows traditional practices. Indonesia has had government organic standards since 2003. The goal for 2010 is the development of the framework for organic certification and accreditation. As a step towards this, in 2006 a competent authority for organic food was created, with its main task to formulate policy for organic and traditional food systems and to develop a certification program. This initiative fits within the revised strategy of the Indonesian Agricultural Ministry, which is to focus, in addition to production, on the marketing of products in order to support farmers and their ability to produce and sell quality food.

Steering Committee Report

The Steering Committee gave a progress report based on the ITF goals, objective and work plan. According to its Terms of Reference, The ITF work is planned and implemented in Phases, including a review phase, a proposal formulation phase, and a phase to advise stakeholders and provide information on developments following the discussions of the proposals. The Steering Committee announced that the fourth volume of the ITF publication series is available in electronic format on the ITF website and that it will be formally published in early 2008.

The elements of ITF strategy were reviewed. These include:

- Production standards equivalent to a single international standard
- Mechanisms for the judgment of equivalence to the international reference standard
- One international requirement for organic certification bodies
- Common international approaches for recognition or approval of certification bodies

Items of the ITF work plan that are on the agenda of this meeting were put into the context of the four strategic elements.

ITF Reports and Updates

Reports were given on the following topics;

- European Union Regulation
- IFOAM Organic Guarantee System
- East Africa Regional Standards
- China
- APEC
- Italy

- Japan
- South Pacific Islands
- Dominican Republic
- Thailand
- Philippines
- India
- Tunisia
- Argentina
- Consumer perspectives

Member reports and presentations will be posted on the ITF website under the 7th meeting.

[Download country reports here.](#)

[Download presentations here.](#)

Paper: Tool for Equivalence of Organic Standards and Technical Regulations

[Download paper here.](#)

It was explained that this paper is a first draft to be further developed in 2008 through a consultation process. The Tool is to serve as a practical resource for government and private sector actors when deciding equivalence. It is mainly focused on how to make an equivalence judgment, but also includes steps to ensure transparency. The Terms of Reference called for the Tool to be consistent with the relevant equivalence frameworks established by the WTO and Codex Guidelines for Equivalence of Conformity Assessment (CAC GL 34), and to take into consideration the IFOAM procedure for approving standards. It was explained that the ITF's work on common objectives for organic standards was also incorporated into the Tool. The main body of the Tool is a set of steps to be taken by the parties discussing equivalence of one standard with another. The process is summarized in the following main steps:

- Clarify the objectives of the standards
- Specify the scope of standards
- Disclose the legal context for the standards
- Comprehensively compare the standards
- Establish a structured dialogue
- Make the process transparent

Discussion

It was suggested to clearly distinguish the Tool itself from the background information and supplementary information and resources. Furthermore, the second table, "IFOAM Criteria for Variations" should be reviewed and adapted to suit the ITF purposes. A secondary priority could be to review and further develop the common objectives in the third table of the paper. The Steering Committee strongly encouraged ITF members to develop and submit to the ITF Secretary their individual recommendations for revision of the Criteria for Variations and the Common Objectives of Organic Standards (second and third tables in the table). It was also suggested that the revised paper should further develop steps for maintaining equivalence. There was a request for the ITF members to declare whether or

not this tool would actually be used. Several ITF members supported the potential utility of the tool. There was also a recommendation to implement a beta test of the tool when it is finished but before final approval. Ownership of this tool will also be an issue, and it was also recommended that once the tool is finished that it should be brought to Codex Alimentarius, such as through the Codex Committee of Food Labeling (CCFL). The Codex Secretary clarified that the process for bringing something up is for member states and/or Observers to propose it as a new work item.

Participants concluded that tool is useful and improvement of it should continue. It should be further consulted, including certain aspects such as criteria for variations, in processes such as regional workshops as well as through written email consultation.

Paper: Potential Negative Impacts of Equivalency of Standards and Technical Regulations

[Download paper here.](#)

The ITF received a brief review of the following potential negative impacts of equivalence:

- Lack of transparency
- Potential discrimination against third parties
- Complexity of the process, making it mainly applicable in cases of major trade flows
- Unequal power of the customary parties in an equivalence negotiation (importing country vs. exporting country).
- High cost of implementation
- May hinder the development of new organic sources and only reinforce old trade links
- May impede the further development of international and regional standards because of the effect of changed standards on equivalence agreements.

It was recommended that these potential effects can guide the development of appropriate equivalence agreements, and are not intended to erect barriers to all such agreements.

Discussion

A question arose about whether equivalence may be becoming less important because of movements such as with Eurepgap and Soil Association to develop new categories of requirements in standards. In response it was pointed out that there are balancing movements toward systems that are oriented toward equivalence, such as IFOAM. It was concluded that equivalence is indeed costly to achieve and will be selectively determined but the net benefits probably outweigh the negative aspects.

Paper: Overview of Group Certification

[Download paper here.](#)

It was explained that this is an information paper based mainly on the discussion of the issue in the US and the ITF's interest is preventing new trade barriers. The presentation explained

the concept and historical development of group certification, the recent discussion in the USDA National Organic Program (NOP) on the validity of group certification and the recommendation of a subcommittee of the US National Organic Standards Board (NOSB) on the topic. Concerns about the recommendation indicated in the review paper include that:

- Separate definitions and procedures are suggested for initial and renewal on-site inspections, which would establish an unfair barrier to new entrants.
- Initial inspection of a group requires that each individual member of the group is inspected.
- Subsequent on site inspections have different procedures.

Discussion

The ITF participants concluded that the EU Commission allows group certification, even though some governments, such as Argentina, do not allow it due to concerns about threatening their equivalence determinations with the EU regulation EEC 2092/91. It was noted that in the case of the USDA, progress has been made because now the USDA is discussing how to accommodate group certification whereas nine months ago the message from NOP was that it would not be allowed at all. It was noted that in Japan, group certification is allowed for imports and also domestically, but in the latter case it does not reduce requirements for individual inspection. One participant noted that in the case of single big operations there is also no 100% observation/inspection of every site and facility. The importance of the group certification process to encourage production and market development, for example in Uganda, Philippines and Tunisia, was mentioned.

The issue of what could be the gaps in requirements to ensure good group certification practices, and how to cover them, was highlighted. One participant stated an opinion that there is fear in the US that organic integrity is under threat from group certification, but also the recommendation being formulated in the US is a step to deal with this fear. One potential result is that group certification becomes stricter and the farmer is “guilty until proven innocent” instead of supported within the system. One response if group certification is diminished as an option for farmers is to develop the local markets and participatory guarantee systems instead of relying so much on international trade. Participants discussed whether to formulate a statement on group certification to be delivered to the USDA. Instead, it was decided to decide on this and other options during the discussion of group certification requirements in IROCB.

Paper: Using Cooperation Between Certification Bodies to Facilitate Market Access

[Download Paper here](#)

Several potential avenues for market access were reviewed including the limitation to using these avenues. Cooperation between certification bodies is one such avenue, although on a lower level in the hierarchy of avenues. The following forms of cooperation involving certification bodies were presented:

1. The right of a certification body to delegate certification decisions to another certification body. Regulations are silent on this but ISO 65 and IFOAM Accreditation Criteria prohibit delegation of decision. Such delegation requires due

diligence of the delegating certification body. A potential disadvantage is laxity in diligence due to the certification body seeking market and financial advantages.

2. The potential direct approval of imports by certification bodies, rather than government. There are precedents for this in other sectors where the importers determine whether the product is compliant with a particular technical regulation or market requirement. On the other hand, certification bodies under some regulations (e.g. NOP) are required to accept all other NOP accredited certification bodies and not allowed to accept those that are not NOP accredited. Essentially NOP allows certification bodies to delegate their authority. Also, ISO schemes are operating in areas covered by regulations, but there are flexible arrangements to delegate certification. Implementation of this cooperation avenue would require agreements and supervisory mechanisms. A potential disadvantage is protectionism of one's own domestic clients.

Allowance of these mechanisms could signal the private sector, certification bodies and traders to cooperate better. Even though it might appear to loosen control, greater cooperation could actually reduce the risk for fraud. It was proposed that ITF recommend these two options.

Discussion

Some participants advocated that international harmonization around a single standard would be a more effective solution than these avenues of cooperation. It was clarified that delegation of decision would work within a given accreditation or some other type of trust-building system such as peer review or bilateral review. Participants discussed whether recommending delegation of decision would appear to be too revolutionary because it contradicts the ISO requirements, which the ITF has supported, and also not to jeopardize the uptake of ITF Tool. It was suggested that ITF request ISO to explain the reason for prohibiting delegation of decision and also to become involved in the ISO 65 process and take it up there. Participants were informed that in June 2007 the IROCB working group recommended that ITF participate in the ISO 65 revision, and as a result the draft ITF budget for 2007-2008 includes funding for representation to the ISO CASCO 29 Committee, which is working on the ISO 65 revision.

International Requirements for Organic Certification Bodies (IROCB), 4th Draft

[Download paper here.](#)

After receiving a presentation of the concept and development of the IROCB, the ITF participants formed four small working groups to address five topics. The results of group work were presented and discussed, leading to the following conclusions.

1. Group Certification (Section 3.2.4): The suggestions of the groups for various changes to terminology in this section will be taken into consideration by the author for the next draft. Also, it was agreed that a reference to practice codes for group certification should be made instead of inserting detailed requirements into the document.

2. Responsibility for Certification Decisions (Section 2.1.3): Of the diverse solutions presented for this topic, the text proposed by Group A, referring to ISO Guide 68 was chosen to be included in the next draft in square brackets.
3. Training (Section 2.2.2): The language requiring the certification bodies to “provide training” should be modified. The emphasis should be on ensuring competence rather than on the more prescriptive provision of training.
4. Retention of Certification (Section 3.4): Participants agreed that the revised language in the 4th draft is appropriate.
5. Quality Management (Section 2.5.1): Participants concluded that the content on Quality Management in the 4th draft is appropriate and that no changes should be made.

General Discussion

It was suggested to add a reference to compliance with legislation, and agreed that this would be placed in the introduction. A question was asked about whether there should be time-limited requirements on certification bodies’ responses to notification of change by operators. This was noted as related to client services, which is generally not addressed in various certification documents, and none of the main certification requirements includes this detail. However, participants recognized the importance of the matter for operators, and therefore decided that the ITF will encourage certification service to be timely and otherwise attentive to the operators. Finally, it was suggested to reference IFOAM Accreditation Criteria in the introduction, along with ISO Guide 65. ITF members were invited to submit additional written comments to the Secretary by 15 January, 2008.

Stewardship and Ownership of IROCB

[Download paper here](#)

The ITF examined criteria for IROCB ownership that were developed by the participants of the ITF Workshop on Certification Requirements in 2006. One participant advocated that the criteria be weighted in importance, and that the recognition by governments is assigned the highest importance. There was also a question whether ownership needs to be defined, especially since the ITF is only an open-ended platform. However, it was recognized that without ownership, IROCB might not be taken up by key actors. Also, it is essentially a standard and there must be some capacity to revise the document. It was suggested to bring the document to Codex Alimentarius and ISO, and then clarified by the Codex Secretary that in the case of Codex, it must be proposed as a new work item by member countries or the three ITF sponsoring organizations rather than only handed in as a reference. It was noted that both the Codex and ISO processes have a very long time line and a short-term solution is also needed for IROCB. Regarding the shorter term, it was suggested that one of the three ITF sponsor organizations be charged with responsibility for IROCB, and several participants suggested that this should be IFOAM, which will always have an interest in organic. It was, however, noted that a weakness of the IFOAM option is that IFOAM has not been recognized by governments. Therefore, it should remain the responsibility of the other two organizations to support IFOAM’s stewardship of the document and to approve any changes to it. For the longer term, it was agreed to introduce IROCB by way of our participation in the development of the ISO Guide 65 revision, and also to explore the best

way to introduce it as a work item in Codex. ITF members who are also involved with Codex and ISO should take it up.

ITF Communication Plan

[Download paper here](#)

The ITF discussed the communication plan presented by the Steering Committee. Translation was seen as an important aspect. The ITF agreed that all the main communications instruments, e.g. power point, brochure, information sheets, plus the main papers should be translated into Spanish. There was a request for translation of the power point and brochure into French. One participant advocated tailored communications for the politicians, wherein the message is pointed in terms of the problem and proposed solution. It should not be too technical. We should have a message about what we want our communication targets to do. There could be two types of briefing packages – one general and one for governments. In both cases, the information kit will be digested information and not overly technical. Also, the ITF should use communication vehicles that target politicians, such as leading agricultural publications and the media. Codex CASCO and intergovernmental organizations such as UNECE and the four UN Commissions were also suggested as avenues for getting to the governments. The Steering Committee mentioned the possibility of consulting with ITF members on the communication documents, because there are such diverse targets who need different types of communications.

Messaging will also be done through events. It was recommended that ITF should try to get our main messaging into regional events, since it does not have the capacity to call unique meetings and workshops. Participants mentioned various regional events that could be used, and the Steering Committee invited ITF members to put their suggestions and related information in writing and submit it to the ITF Secretary.

The Steering Committee invited ITF members to submit proposals for regional workshops. One participant requested to have more information from the Steering Committee about what kind of feedback they were looking for the workshops to supply. This would affect the types of workshops proposed. The Steering Committee encouraged ITF members to answer this question and propose what the workshops should achieve.

Regarding media relations, FAO has a great capacity and can get the major media's attention.

The chair concluded that the participants agreed on the general approach to the communication and the challenges.

Achievements and Next Steps

Tool for Equivalence: The ITF discussed whether and how the next draft of the tool can be tested. It was suggested that the tool could be tested by IFOAM when evaluating the standards of the major importing countries with the IFOAM Basic Standards; however there

should also be a testing by government. One participant suggested that countries that are actually preparing requests for equivalence can test the tool. It was stated that India would definitely use this tool. It was also suggested that China and India could get together and test it using their standards. The testing should be done and results available before the final adoption. This would mean that the testing would occur during the summer of 2008. It was stated that international standards and procedures must also be employed for equivalence discussions. In response, it was clarified that tool can be used by using ones own standards as reference, but also in the framework of an international standards, using the international standard as the reference standard. The tool preface could state that for import approval the reference standard should be the international standard. For example, the new EU regulation text on equivalence refers to taking Codex Guidelines into account. It was suggested that China take its standards and Codex standard and analyze equivalence with the US. The purpose of the tool is to enable the parties to judge the identified differences in the standards.

The ITF discussed asked who could be interested to participate in a working group. It is very important to include people who are actually going to use this tool as civil servants; then the input to it is more real. There were no volunteers during this session. ITF members were encouraged to give further consideration to volunteering for the working group when sending in the final comments on IROCB Draft 4 by 15 January.

IROCB: There was a request for further clarification on how to consult the document with local constituencies. It was suggested that in the future there could be a Terms of Reference on what to now do with the document in the local constituencies e.g. in regional workshops. It was clarified that for IROCB the document is in a final stage and the work is more to disseminate the results. The participant from India stated that the Indian government would be willing to use this tool. The consultation on IROCB from this point forward should be more focused on the big picture of the utility of the tool. However, comments for changes will not be ignored. ITF will write a small guidance note on what to do with IROCB in the regions e.g. in regional workshops and other dialogues. It was also suggested to focus outreach for input on the main importing systems and also on those who are developing their systems. Regarding sending an ITF representative to CASCO, there should be clear proposals to make, e.g. on group certification and delegation of decision. There should be a briefing for the representative and a guidance paper for conducting the representation. Guidance paper should be sent to the ITF members so that they can share it with their CASCO representatives.

Cooperation Between Certification Bodies: The concept of delegation of certification should be brought to ISO CASCO.

The Steering Committee asked participants to express their view on the recommendation that Certification Bodies be authorized to do import approvals. It was suggested that authorities should be consulted to see how feasible this could be and bring that feedback back to ITF. It was noted that the idea is supportive of the objectives of the ITF. ITF members were invited to submit other comments on this matter by 15 December.

Communications Plan: The Steering Committee asked for proposals for regional workshops by 30 March. The Chair invited ideas on key messages by 15 December. Participants suggested that the brochure should be developed by the end of March. A further suggestion was made to use case examples in the messaging. It was commented that members are already participating in events of IAF, ISO etc. so there should be messaging tailored for these groups.

Next Meeting: The Steering Committee proposed to have the next meeting in autumn at UNTAD or FAO in order to take advantage of strategic opportunities for outreach on the results and participation of members from key importing countries. The next meeting will mainly adopt IROCB and complete the EquiTool and key ITF recommendations.

Discussion: Beyond the ITF

The Steering Committee informed the ITF that donor organizations have encouraged proposals for new projects that expand upon the themes and results of the ITF e.g. assistance for implementation in a region. The Steering Committee encouraged ITF members to submit ideas for types of projects that could follow up on the ITF. There is already some outgrowth from ITF, for example, the APEC organic equivalence project as described in the member reporting and regional standards projects. A participant from China stated that China wants to play a role in APEC to implement the fruits of the ITF.

Several types of potential projects were identified. Information products might be useful to help members in their daily work to carry out the objectives of the ITF and reduce trade barriers in their own context e.g. via a future website. Guidance and ideas based on ITF results for appropriate regulation e.g. on importing, may be useful. An ITF follow up project could also play a role to promote and disseminate existing resources throughout the world, e.g. IFOAM guidance on group certification. (This is also related to accepting IFOAM standards as international standards.) There was a request for the Steering Committee prepare and consult with ITF members a concept note for work beyond the ITF. The Pacific Islands expressed that the ITF meeting experience has been a valuable training experience as they develop their organic agriculture support program.

Addendum 1 – Participants List

Last Name	First Name	Organization	Country
Chen	Yunhua	China National Accreditation Service for Conformity Assessment	China
Coli	Michela	Istituto per la Certificazione Etica ed Ambientale	Italy
de la Cruz Berganza	E. Manolo	Ministry of Agriculture of Guatemala	Guatemala
Eboku	David	Uganda National Bureau of Standards	Uganda
Echeverría	Felicia	Eco-Logica Certification Agency	Costa Rica
Kiarri	Eustace	Kenya Organic Agriculture Network	Kenya
Gouri	PVSM	APEDA	India
Hamm	Ulrich	Faculty of Organic Agricultural Sciences, University of Kassel	Germany
Hazelman	Stephen	Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)	Fiji Islands
Indramangala	Jintana	Department of Livestock Development, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives	Thailand
Ishikawa	Kiyofumi	Food and Agricultural Materials Inspection Center (FAMIC)	Japan
Kenji	Matsumoto	Japan Organic and Natural Foods Association	Japan
Maamer Belkhiria	Samia	Organic Agriculture Directorate, Direction Générale de la Production Agricole Ministère de l'Agriculture	Tunisia
Montenegro	Laura Cecilia	Argencert SRL	Argentina
Naqvi	Asad	United Nations Environment Program	Switzerland
Oyson	Teresita G.	Department of Trade and Industry, Bureau of Export Trade Promotion	Philippines
Sampaio	Cristiane	National Institute of Metrology, Standardization and Industrial Quality (INMETRO) - Conformity, Ministry of Development, Industry and Foreign Trade	Brazil
Sarmiento	Girlye	Center for International Trade Expositions & Missions / Dept. of Trade & Industry	Philippines
Seta	Ananto	Ministry of Agriculture	Indonesia
Shi	Xiaowei	Certification and Accreditation Administration of the People's Republic of China	China
Steidle	Mildred	Organic Services GmbH	Germany
Tafunai	Adimaimalaga	Women in Business Development Inc.	Samoa
Taniguchi	Yasuko	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Japan
Vivas	Lara	Bureau of Agriculture and Fisheries Product Standards	Philippines

Wannamolee	Wibulwan	National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards	Thailand
Xiao	Xingji	China Organic Food Development and Certification Center	China
Zapata Gomez	Josè	National Program for Organic Agriculture, Organic Agriculture Control Office	Dominican Republic
ITF Steering Committee			
Doyran	Selma H.	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Codex Alimentarius Commission / Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme	Italy
El Hage Scialabba	Nadia	Food and Agriculture Organization	Italy
Rundgren	Gunnar	Grolink	Sweden
Twarog	Sophia	Trade, Environment and Development Branch, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development	U.S.
ITF Secretariat			
Bowen	Diane	International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM)	U.S.
Katharina	Pfundt	International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM)	Germany

Addendum 2 – Agenda

SEVENTH MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL TASK FORCE ON HARMONIZATION AND EQUIVALENCY IN ORGANIC AGRICULTURE

27-30 November, 2007

Bali, Indonesia

Agenda

Tuesday, 27 November

09:00-09:30	Welcome to the 7th meeting (Indonesia Ministry of Agriculture)
09:30-10:00	Agenda approval and Steering Committee Report
10:00-10:30	ITF reports: updates on recent developments
<i>10:30-11:00</i>	<i>coffee/ tea break</i>
11:00-12:30	ITF reports: updates on recent developments (continued)
<i>12:30-14:00</i>	<i>Organic lunch hosted by the Indonesia Ministry of Agriculture</i>
14:00-15:30	Tool for Equivalence of Organic Standards/Technical Regulations (Diane Bowen)
15:30-16:00	Potential Negative Impacts of Equivalence (Gunnar Rundgren)
<i>16:00-16:30</i>	<i>coffee/ tea break</i>
16:30-17:30	Group Certification (Mildred Steidle)
<i>19:00</i>	<i>ITF Welcome Dinner: hosted by the Indonesia Ministry of Agriculture</i>

Wednesday, 28 November

09:00-10:00	Cooperation among Certification Bodies (Gunnar Rundgren)
10:00-10:45	International Requirements for Organic Certification Bodies (IROCB) (Mildred Steidle)
<i>10:45 -11:15</i>	<i>coffee/tea break</i>
11:15 -12:30	Breakout group discussions on IROCB
<i>12:30 -14:00</i>	<i>Lunch hosted by the Indonesia Ministry of Agriculture</i>
14:00 -15:45	IROCB break-out group reports and general discussion
15:45 -16:30	IROCB ownership and next steps for the document
<i>16:30 -17:00</i>	<i>coffee/tea break</i>
17:00 -18:00	Communication & Advocacy Plan (Nadia Scialabba)

open evening for ITF members/ (ITF Steering Committee meeting)

Thursday, 29 November

9:00 - 10:00	Achievements of the 7th Meeting
10:00 - 10:30	Discussion: Next steps for ITF
10:30 - 11:00	coffee/tea break
11:00 - 12:00	Discussion: Beyond ITF
<i>12:00 -13:30</i>	<i>Lunch hosted by the Indonesia Ministry of Agriculture</i>
<i>14.30 -17:30</i>	<i>ITF Steering Committee Meeting</i>

Tour for ITF members hosted by the Indonesian Ministry of Agriculture:

- 13:30 – Departure from the hotel
- Visit Bali Organic Festivals
- 14:30 – Departure
- 15:30 – Visit Tanah Lot (one of the spectacular temple in Bali)
- 17:30 – Departure
- 19:00 – Cultural Dinner at Angsa Putih Restaurant

Friday, 30 November

- 07:00 -17:00 Organic Farm and Cultural Tour (see separate tour agenda)
hosted by the Indonesian Ministry of Agriculture
- 18:00 ITF Farewell Dinner: hosted by the Indonesia Ministry of Agriculture