



MEETING NOTES

**National Sustainable Agriculture Standard
Standards Committee Meeting
May 27-28, 2009**

**Facilitated by Leonardo Academy
Meeting Location: Pheasant Run Resort, St Charles, IL**

Day 1

9:00 am CST

Introduction – Michael Arny, Leonardo Academy

- Michael welcomed Committee and observers, introduced LEO staff, went over meeting facility details and logistics and gave opening remarks
- Review of Leonardo Academy standard development procedures
 - o Reviewed Committee Member responsibilities
 - Annual review of Committee membership
 - Automatic termination for failure to return two successive letter ballots
 - Automatic termination for failure to participate in at least 33 percent of the conference calls and meetings held by the Standards Committee
 - o Clarified difference between letter ballots and administrative ballots
 - Letter ballots apply to approval, revision, reaffirmation, withdrawal, substantial changes and interpretations of standards and have a voting period of 30 days.
 - Administrative ballots apply to editorial changes to a standard and other committee business. May be decided by a majority of the members present at a meeting.
 - o Reviewed Observer policy
 - Observers may not participate in the Standards Committee's discussions unless invited to speak by the Standards Committee Chair.
 - Observers may not disrupt Committee meetings and must agree to leave the meeting or conference call if the Committee Chair or the Secretariat finds the observer's behavior disruptive.
- Described progress since September 2008 meeting
 - o Task Force work
 - o Task Force Officer meetings (2)
 - o SCS-001 Copyright Transfer
 - o New Committee members: John Allan, American Frozen Food Institute; John Thorne, American Meat Institute; Constance Jackson, Corn Refiners Association; Jeff Barach, Grocery Manufacturers Association; and Jesse Singerman, Prairie Ventures (all within User Interest Category)
- Standard development process moving forward
 - o All decisions made along the way are subject to review by the Committee at the end of the process (prior to submitting final standard for promulgation)
 - o Recommendations from the Task Forces provide a platform for going forward. All documents developed by the Task Forces can be modified by the Committee later
 - o Subcommittees – the next phase of the process



9:15 am

Committee Members Present

- Molly Anderson – *Wallace Center of Winrock International*
- Bama Athreya – *International Labor Rights Forum*
- Jeff Barach – *Grocery Manufacturers Association (remote)*
- Jim Barrett – *University of Florida, Environmental Horticulture Dept.*
- Linda Brown – *Scientific Certification Systems*
- AJ Bussan – *University of Wisconsin, Dept. of Horticulture*
- Katie Davis – *Driscoll's Strawberry Associates (alternate for Brian McElroy)*
- Bryan Endres – *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Dept. of Agricultural and Consumer Economics*
- John Foster – *Earthbound Farm (remote)*
- Ximena Franco – *Asocolflores*
- Suzy Friedman – *Environmental Defense Fund*
- Grace Gershuny – *Independent Consultant dba GAIA Services*
- Hank Giclas – *Western Growers*
- Robert Guenther – *United Fresh Produce Association (remote)*
- Ani Gulati – *General Mills (alternate for Gene Kahn)*
- Will Healy – *Ball Horticultural*
- Jack Housenger – *Environmental Protection Agency*
- Luke Howard – *Homestead Farms, Inc.*
- Constance Jackson – *Corn Refiners Association (remote)*
- Jonathan Kaplan – *National Resources Defense Council (remote)*
- Colleen Kohlsaet – *Levi Strauss & Co.*
- Damara Luce – *Coalition of Immokalee Workers*
- Laurel Marcus – *California Land Stewardship Institute/Fish Friendly Farming Environmental Certification Program*
- Marty Matlock – *Center for Rural and Agricultural Sustainability, University of Arkansas (Day 2 only)*
- Kenneth McCauley – *National Corn Growers Association*
- Tracy Miedema – *Stahlbush Island Farms (remote)*
- Ronald Moore – *Moore Farms/American Soybean Association*
- Jeff Moyer – *Rodale Institute*
- Betsy Peterson – *California Seed Association*
- Jim Pierce – *Food Trade Sustainability Leadership Association*
- Stan Pohmer – *Pohmer Consulting Group*
- William Pool – *Wegmans Food Markets*
- Kam Quarles – *United Fresh Produce Association (alternate for Robert Guenther)*
- V. Phillip Rasmussen, Jr. – *Western SARE*
- Thomas Redick – *Global Environmental Ethics Council (alternate for Hector Quemada, Crop Technology Consulting Inc.)*
- Taylor Reid – *Michigan Organic Food and Farming Alliance*
- Minor Sinclair – *Oxfam America (alternate for Timothy Mahoney)*
- Jesse Singerman – *Prairie Ventures*
- Ann Sorensen – *American Farmland Trust*
- John Thorne – *American Meat Institute*



- Mike Wanless – *Napa Sustainable Winegrowers*
- Russell Williams – *American Farm Bureau Federation*
- Margaret Wittenberg – *Whole Foods*
- Jacques Wolbert – *MPS-ECAS*
- Bill Wolf – *Wolf, DiMatteo + Associates*
- Cecil Wright – *Organic Valley/CROPP Cooperative*
- Mark Yelanich – *Metrolina Greenhouses, Inc.*
- Tim York – *Markon Cooperative*

Observers Present

- Sharon Bomer – *Biotechnology Industry Organization*
- Gary Drimmer – *Drimmer and Associates International*
- Jane Earley – *Earley and White Consulting*
- Jody Endres – *University of Illinois, Energy Biosciences Institute*
- Annie Gardiner – *Green Penguin Communications (remote)*
- Linda Herbst – *UC Davis/Western IPM Center*
- Don Hodge – *US EPA Region 9*
- Kirsten Jaglo – *USDA Foreign Agricultural Service*
- Allison Jordan – *Wine Institute/ California Sustainable Winegrowing Alliance (remote)*
- Michael Keyes – *Scientific Certification Systems*
- Norma Keyes – *Cotton Incorporated (remote)*
- Carol Kramer-LeBlanc – *USDA Office of the Chief Economist*
- Satinder Sanghera – *Village Farms LP (remote)*
- Rod Snyder – *National Corn Growers Association*
- Warren Strauss – *Monsanto (remote)*
- Michelle Wander – *University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences (Remote)*

Committee Members Not Present

- John Allan – *American Frozen Food Institute*
- Steve Apfelbaum – *Applied Ecological Services*
- Hans Brand – *B&H Flowers*
- Casey Walsh Cady – *California Department of Food & Agriculture*
- Frank Casey – *Defenders of Wildlife*
- Douglas Johnson – *Environmental Intelligence*
- Jim Knutzon – *Farm Fresh Direct*
- John Kukoly – *QMI-SAI Global*
- David Pimentel – *Cornell University*
- Frans Wielemaker – *Dole Fresh Fruit International*

9:25 am

Review / Approve Sept 25 -26 2009 Meeting Minutes – Ron Moore, Committee Vice-Chair

- Russell Williams moved to approve the minutes
- Ken McCauley seconded
- Minutes approved



Review Motions from September meeting – Amanda Raster, Leonardo Academy

Adoption of Agenda – Ron Moore, Committee Vice-Chair

- Ron Moore announced the following modifications to the agenda:
 - o Needs Assessment Task Force report will precede Mission & Principles report
 - o Due to the absence of Funding Task Force Chair, Douglas Johnson, Michael Army will present the Funding Task Force report
- Agenda adopted

Goals of this Meeting – Ron Moore, Committee Vice-Chair

- Ron Moore gave opening remarks and described the goals of the meeting
 - o Task Force reports and Committee consideration of TF recommendations
 - o Agree on issues to be explored during standard development process
 - o Establish subcommittees to begin addressing identified issues
 - o Develop work plan for moving forward
- All Task Force reports and recommendations will be presented first, followed by discussion and voting

9:30 am

Review Task Force Objectives – Amanda Raster, Leonardo Academy

Task Force Reports and Recommendations (will include a 15 minute break)

Needs Assessment – Jim Pierce and Ken McCauley, Task Force Co-Chairs

- Jim Pierce gave opening remarks. The Needs Assessment Task Force took a 30,000 foot level approach and tried to develop a big picture perspective. What are the basic needs of stakeholders? What does the standard need to address? Not ready to explore what the standard will look like.
- Needs Assessment Executive Summary is posted to the Wiki. Task Force Leadership recommendations have been folded into the document.
- Each contributor presented the section of the document they wrote.
 - o Linda Brown presented the Basic Needs Section (in lieu of Doug Johnson) – This was approached from four different perspectives: 1) What needs should a standard fill? 2) What are the needs of the various stakeholders, as well as the needs of the environment? 3) What form does the standard need to take to achieve the desired beneficial outcomes? 4) What type of market incentive structures need to be addressed within the standard? Encouraged Committee to read through the Stakeholder Needs section.
 - o Linda Brown - Form of the Standard section identified 13 potential outcomes but did not suggest that any particular form be taken
 - o Stan Pohmer – We raised more questions that we come up with in going through this process. Where we do have recommendations, they are very broad. It is up to the full Committee to decide which direction we are going. Building Incentives section asked who would be the beneficiaries of a standard. There is a general direction we would like to propose to the Committee, but it is a tough one.
 - o Ken McCauley presented the Conclusion. Do we need a standard? Yes. We do need this if it can be done in a proper way. It should be based on continuous



improvement. A modular framework is a very important part of this. Certification and labels should not drive the process but could be a potential outcome. This is a good way to start.

Mission & Principles – Russell Williams and Grace Gershuny, Task Force Co-Chairs

- Russell Williams – Sustainability Principles Document was a very interesting exercise. Writing group consisted of Russell Williams, Grace Gershuny, Mike Wanless, Suzy Friedman and Linda Brown. Information presented in the document does not express full agreement, but in the interests of cooperation, we are putting this document out to the Committee to move the process along. This is very close to a consensus document for moving forward.
- Grace Gershuny – Drafting the document was a stimulating exercise and showed the potential of the kind of process we are engaged in to solve the issues that divide us. The document was put together with the intent that it would form the foundation of the standard we are to develop.
 - o Document starts off by setting the context. Writing group tried to not worry about specific language
 - o Principles outlined are very broad. The Task Force is not mandating specific practices about what people have to do or cannot do. These are broad goals of a sustainable agriculture standard. Specific practices may or may not be suitable for every kind of operation. These are guidelines.
 - o Statement of Purpose – again a very broad view.
 - o Working definition of sustainable agriculture – a condensed brief synopsis, taken from many of the reference documents that were assembled. Grace described some of the sensitivities to language and the efforts to develop language that was agreeable to everyone. Not everyone agreed 100% on the details but these are basic principles that we decided we can live with in order to move forward.
 - o Some principles were not agreed upon. Individuals were encouraged to draft issue papers to address these issues. We are not expecting to make decisions about these issues today; instead, they should be considered for the discussions moving forward.
 - o Framework – three legs of the sustainability stool
 - Environmental Principles
 - Economic Principles
 - These will need to be further defined. Could get muddy.
 - Social Principles
 - Adopted three principles that the standard should strive to meet
 - o Structural Issues – have an impact on how the standard will be framed
 - These had greater consensus than did the Principles for Sustainable Agriculture
 - o Issue Papers are listed for future consideration of including additional principles in the document

Reference Documents – Betsy Peterson and Bill Wolf, Task Force Co-Chairs

- Betsy Peterson – All of the Task Forces started from ground zero, with no Wiki. Reference Documents held nine meetings, with an average of ten committee members and observes



per call. Meeting notes are posted on the Wiki. The greatest achievement was building the Reference Library, which contains about 170 documents. Collecting references will be an ongoing process. The Reference Library contains a Search option. A Google Index of the Library is in the works; the index will be more specific in locating document pages where a particular key word is located. Overall, this Task Force took on a lot more work than anticipated.

- Bill Wolf – Standards comparison (side-by-side comparison rather than gap analysis) would give us an indicator of the state of the industry. How many standards are out there? How mature are they? Do they cover the three areas of sustainability? Initially the Task Force thought they could do the heavy lifting themselves but determined it would be best to approach the standards holders and ask them to participate in the project. Asked them to enter the data from their own standards into the template we created. 27 standards are currently posted (as titles) in the master comparison spreadsheet. Six standards are fully entered; there are many more private standards that we would like to enter. This is a resource tool to be used in the future, to give the Committee a baseline to draw from, to identify successful frameworks and successful ways to measure. Very few standards address all three components (GlobalGAP is an example of one that does). Recommended that a subcommittee would carry on the standards comparison project (Resources and Data management).

Metrics & Methodology – Molly Anderson, Task Force Co-Chair

- Molly Anderson – The Metrics Task Force held 9 conference calls. Metrics are the objective way to measure whether changes happen on the ground. Which metrics we use will be one of the critical decisions the committee has to make.
- The Metrics TF did not do its mandate, which was to compile a set of metrics and report back on their utility. It was apparent at the outset that this would be impossible until we decide what it is we want to measure (starting with the Mission & Principles recommendations). The Metrics work is only beginning. The Task Force is recommending that a Metrics subcommittee be formed to assess the potential metrics we could use and to determine how good they are.
- Molly presented a summary report of the Task Force work. The group did raise a lot of the issues that need to be considered when assessing the metrics that are currently out there.
- The Task Force compiled a spreadsheet of possible indicators (Common Ag Sustainability Metrics). Recommended that from this point forward, we refer to indicators as ‘criteria’ to help evade the issue of what is a standard and what is a standard system.
- Some of the issues that emerged during the Metrics discussions:
 - o Our options are to identify the best metrics (i.e. proxy metrics) already being used by other standard or, if there is not a good metric available, to develop the metrics ourselves with expert guidance.
 - o We want the standard to be accessible by all producers, thus there needs to be flexibility to address regional issues and other constraints. The tension there is between flexibility and credibility.
 - o Do we choose a single metric for each criterion or a suite of metrics?
 - o How much detail do we need for each metric?



- Should the standard be technology neutral? This determination has to come out of the full Committee.
- Should metrics on product quality be included? The TF did not come to a conclusion here. Sustainability is a higher attribute that comes out of agricultural systems, goes beyond basic product safety and quality. If agricultural products are not of good quality, it may not be important whether they are produced sustainably. After producer sustainability is determined, criteria along the supply chain can then be evaluated.
- What makes a metric legitimate?
- Presented Metrics recommendations:
 - Metrics should reflect the aspects of sustainability
 - Metrics should be of sufficient precision to determine where a farm/business is on the sustainability trajectory
 - Each standard should be supported by an appropriate metric that will show whether the standard has been met
 - Metrics should be documented with their source or justified with references to scientific literature (to determine its legitimacy)
 - Committee should establish a subcommittee to examine how metrics are being used (after criteria are set up), including quality assessment
 - Categories of metric development should be consistent with the categories used in the Reference Documents standards comparison
 - Aim for metrics that will be accessible to all producers (avoid “all or nothing” metrics)
 - Focus on on-farm production for the time being but eventually extend past the farm gate
 - Committee should establish a subcommittee to develop a Glossary of Terms to identify terms that we want to be using and ensure that we are being consistent with the state of the art in standard development and are using good, accepted definitions

10:45 am **Break**

10:55 am **Task Force Reports and Recommendations, cont.**

Funding – Douglas Johnson, Task Force Chair (unable to attend)

- Michael Arny reported on TF efforts, including a review of potential funding sources.
- Presented Funding Synopsis, drafted by Ann Sorensen, Doug Johnson and Amanda Raster.
- Leonardo Academy is now actively pursuing funding, per the formal agreement with SCS to transfer the copyright of the standard
- Linda Brown – Managing costs is also a funding issue. Suggested exploring alternative options for conference calls (Skype, webinar)
 - Amanda Raster – Skype may not be an option for everyone, as some participants call in while traveling. Webinar is likely a more viable alternative.



Outreach – AJ Bussan and John Thorne, Task Force Co-Chairs

- AJ Bussan reviewed Outreach TF efforts – TF Recruitment Letter, Standards Committee Gap Analysis, Stakeholder Categorization
- Outreach TF has not yet contacted specific groups; this is contingent on the recommendations from Mission & Principles regarding scope and is an important next step
- Presented Standards Committee Gap Analysis
- Presented Stakeholder Categorization
 - o 660 different groups, categorized by mission and industry sector
 - o Spreadsheet identifies areas where there is heavy stakeholder representation, as well as where stakeholder representation is lacking
- Recommendations
 - o Change structure of Standards Committee to increase producer participation (if Committee votes to keep standard activities within the farm gate initially) – Feed/Fiber, Livestock, Input Suppliers
 - o Also increase international representation on Committee
- Final Steps
 - o Follow up with decisions of the Committee
 - o Contact key groups and individuals to partner with through the process
 - o Communicate outcomes of this meeting to different stakeholder groups
- Ken McCauley clarified that corn and soy do represent feed
 - o John Thorne replied that there are currently no feed processing representatives on the Committee
 - o AJ Bussan – There are no forage/grazing/land management representatives
 - o Jeff Moyer – We need to consider adding livestock systems representatives
- Bill Wolf – The subcommittees will be bringing in as many additional participants as we will need. Did Outreach consider this instead of recommending an expansion of the Committee?
 - o AJ Bussan – Outreach wanted to identify current representation on the Committee before going through the efforts of bringing additional stakeholders to the table. This creates a Catch-22 because individuals that are not currently participating were not part of the Needs Assessment or development of the Mission & Principles recommendations
 - o John Thorne – Some of the most difficult decisions we will face on the Committee will impact a broad sector of agriculture that is not currently represented on the Committee.
 - o Bill Wolf – In Madison, we talked about the idea of incorporating these recommendations into the Standards Committee gaps, as well as how to structure the subcommittees. Reference Documents identified gaps in data collection – Agricultural Inputs. Suggested developing an Ag Inputs subcommittee to help this along without overburdening the Committee structure.
 - o Russell Williams – We need to consider the issue of buy-in. If the subcommittees do not have votes, they do not have much reason to participate.
 - o Linda Brown – Subcommittees will be populated by Chair (SC member) and Co-chair (subcommittee member). Viewpoints of subcommittee will be vetted to full Committee for consideration.



- Russell Williams – Would be doing an injustice to inputs if he were to vote for them on issues that would pertain to them. Suggested that they have spot on the Committee in order to ensure full rights.
- Bama Athreya – The Stakeholder Categorization will have to be reviewed. There are a number of organizations that fit into multiple categories, but each was assigned to only one category.
- Molly Anderson inquired whether the four interest categories (Producers, Users, Environmentalists, General Interest) are mandated by ANSI.
 - Michael Arny – Leonardo Academy’s procedures state the four interest groups, but we are open to recommendations from the Committee on additional stakeholders to consider

Task Force Leadership Recommendations from March 25th Meeting – Ron Moore, Committee Vice-Chair

- Ron Moore presented the three leadership recommendations:
 - The standard should end at the farm gate
 - The standard should initially be limited to crop production
 - The standard should be performance oriented
- No further input from Committee members

11:35 am

Elephant Issues

- Ron Moore invited Committee to air ‘elephant issues’ for further discussion
 - Russell Williams – Acceptability of various technologies in the standard (agricultural, fertilizer, biotechnology)
 - Taylor Reid – Use of precautionary principle as a basis for determining the inclusion of various technologies, products and processes within the standard
 - John Thorne – Coexistence – try to be as inclusive as possible and develop coexistence between the existing agricultural systems (conventional, organic and biotech crops are often side-by-side). The desired outcome would be for neighboring farmers to cooperate and prevent their activities from adversely affecting their neighbors systems (create buffers, etc.) .
 - Jeff Moyer – Time and sustainability – All of the practices we use today, no matter what the system, may not be sustainable in the long term.
 - Molly Anderson – Are all three aspects of sustainability (social, environmental, economic) sufficiently represented on the Committee? Balance of the three.
 - Grace Gershuny – What constitutes valid scientific data, documentation and research? Whose science is acceptable and whose is not?
 - Bill Wolf – How inclusive is the definition of ‘sustainability’? This is a moving target. Is there some minimum measurement tool to determine whether an entity is moving toward sustainability? Not all agriculture is sustainable today. We have to embed the concept of continuous improvement in the standard but we also have to develop a scoring system that encourages this over time. In sum - Minimum thresholds for a sustainability scorecard/measurement
 - Colleen Kohlsaat – How this standard will impact the sustainability efforts of other communities around the world?



- AJ Bussan – Even though it has been implied that the standard will be backed by scientific data, it does not specifically address this in the Mission & Principles document.
- Jim Pierce – Cumulative affects of individual farms and how we will measure and assess criteria (i.e. Macro-metrics)
- Two issues were brought up that will be discussed during TF reports and recommendations discussion
 - Hank Giclas – Whether the standard should end at the farm gate
 - Ani Gulati – Is there a need for a standard?

12:00 pm **Lunch, Vermeer Room**

1:00 – **Discussion and Vote on Task Force and Task Force Leadership Recommendations**
3:00 pm *Approximately 15 minutes per recommendation*

Task Force Leadership recommendations:

- Standard Should End at the Farm Gate
 - Grace Gershuny clarified that this is a starting point; we are limiting the scope of where we start but we are not limiting the potential to expand beyond the farm gate in the future. This is to ensure that the process is more manageable in the first phase.
 - Katie Davis – How are we defining ‘farm gate’? Does this include packaging, transportation?
 - Ron Moore – Yes, anything that occurs before the product leaves the grower’s hands is considered the farm gate. For soybeans, this is up to the elevator or processor.
 - Hank Giclas – External pressures on the farm fundamentally have to be addressed.
 - Mike Wanless – It’s a fact of business that someone requires the grower to package or not package.
 - Ken McCauley – It is important to note that the modular approach is designed to address the externalities. We do need to develop a baseline.
 - Jim Pierce – Needs Assessment document addresses the idea of externalities; we will assess where farm practices impact beyond the farm gate.
 - Stan Pohmer – Just looking at farm gate right now is daunting in itself. Although we recognize the fact that this is a system that goes all the way to the consumer, we will be here for decades if we try to address this in one fell swoop. We will need to encompass the entire system eventually, but we need a reasonable starting point.
 - Hank Giclas – Is not trying to fight for taking a system-wide approach from the outset. Is more interested in recognizing that some of the demands from upstream have impacts on the farm. There are many stakeholders from retail and food service involved in this process. What is their role in the discussions if we are ending the standard at the farm gate?
 - Russell Williams – The make-up of the Committee is currently deficient. We are simply trying to focus on production agriculture right now. What would the Committee make-up look like if we move further down the supply chain



- (using transportation as an example)? To go from input to consumer is an impossible task right now.
- **Motion 1:** Bill Wolf moved to accept the Task Force recommendations as a whole.
 - John Thorne seconded the motion.
 - Ani Gulati asked for clarification on the recommendations.
 - Clarification provided.
 - Discussion
 - Molly Anderson expressed concern with ‘Standard Should be Performance Oriented’ as written. Conflicts with the way the Mission & Principles document is written, as well as with the Metrics recommendations.
 - **Motion 2:** Russell Williams moved to divide the question to consider all three separately.
 - Mike Wanless seconded the motion.
 - Motion passed unanimously. Each TF Leadership recommendation will be considered individually.
 - Discussion of Farm Gate recommendation resumed
 - Jim Barrett – We will run into issues regarding what constitutes the ‘farm gate’ as we move forward. It is both an ownership as well as a process issue. We may want to change the terminology to reflect ownership more adequately.
 - Grace Gershuny – Does not have a problem with this point. Does have a problem with word-smithing in a large group. Suggested that all of these be voted on as matters of adopting in principle, with the proviso that the language be revised to include a more accurate description of what we are trying to get at.
 - Russell Williams – Asked terminology group to use the term ‘farm gate’ and then define it accordingly so that the document does not have to be modified.
 - Ani Gulati – Wouldn’t it make more sense to address the Needs Assessment recommendations before voting on what the standard should look like?
 - Ron Moore – The Committee can decide which order it would like to proceed. The TF leaders recommended presenting their recommendations first.
 - Grace Gershuny – Part of the quandary is that the decision to proceed is contingent on what the scope of the standard is.
 - Michael Arny recommended to have all of the discussions on the recommendations today and to table all of the votes until tomorrow.
 - Bama Athreya—There cannot be intelligent questions about the individual Task Force recommendations until the leadership recommendations are discussed.
 - Bill Wolf – The motion was made to try to get a sense from the group around these concepts. The leadership presented these principles as a representation of their work. The issue is one of a straw vote – are these



recommendations in line with what everyone feels that we can accomplish? If there are no objections to these concepts, we can table the motion about the specific wording and move forward to the Task Force recommendations.

- Hank Giclas – Is it the bold face recommendation that we are voting on or does it include the sublanguage?
 - Bold face
- Ani Gulati – For purposes of this vote, we are assuming that the Committee thinks there should be a standard.
 - Ron Moore - Yes
- Linda Brown - If we are just voting on the bold face, we should insert 'initially' into the line to reflect what is in the sublanguage.
- **Motion 3:** Linda Brown moved to amend the statement by adding the word 'initially' to the first bold face line: 'The standard should initially end at the farm gate.'
 - Luke Howard seconded the motion.
 - Amendment passed unanimously.
- Mike Wanless – Is there any way to amend the motion to include all of the sublanguage?
 - Grace Gershuny – Has a concern about the sublanguage as it does not provide an adequate explanation.
 - Hank Giclas – Cannot accept the language as is.
 - Katie Davis – Based on the clarity we received earlier about the definition of farm gate, we need to understand that there is not much expertise on the Committee in terms of packaging, cooling, refrigeration.
 - Ron Moore called for a vote on the proposed amendment
 - Three or four in favor. All others opposed. Amendment failed.
- Ron Moore called the vote on the recommendation: Standard Should Initially End at the Farm Gate
 - Recommendation passed unanimously.
- Standard Should Initially Be Limited to Crop Production
 - Russell Williams – Would the committee be expanded to include livestock representatives if we decide to cover livestock?
 - Michael Army – Yes, we would take the Committee's recommendations seriously.
 - Ken McCauley – We need to discuss the modular approach as well.
 - Jeff Moyer expressed concern about separating out livestock production from plant production regarding manure management. Manure is the connection between plants and animals. There are a lot of issues related to the sustainability of an operation that make livestock difficult to separate out at the beginning.
 - Grace Gershuny – We looked at manure as a fertility input. Manure management is part of soil management.
 - **Motion 4:** Grace Gershuny moved to amend the recommendation to state 'Standard should initially be limited to soil and crop management.'



- Amendment seconded.
- Discussion
 - Jeff Moyer – Where does water fit into the component of soil management?
 - Grace Gershuny – Along with agroecosystem indicators, which will be taken up by one of the recommended subcommittees.
 - Suzy Friedman – If we are not including livestock, where do you draw the line on a dairy operation that is growing corn and soybeans?
 - Ken McCauley spoke against changing the wording. The initial wording gives us room to work.
 - Ron Moore agreed. There are already manure management regulations in place.
 - Molly Anderson – Isn't the point of standards to go beyond regulations?
 - Tom Redick – We could define crop production to include everything that goes into producing the crop. Management is implicit in production and does not pertain only to soil but also to energy, climate, etc.
 - Margaret Wittenberg – We need to also include soil viability, not just contamination.
 - Luke Howard – If we forcefully include livestock in this language, we have to consider that we do not have sufficient representation on this committee to move forward. We can include livestock at a later point.
 - AJ Bussan – The Outreach TF would recommend livestock representation if the Committee wanted to expand the scope to livestock. However, there are recommendations on the floor that we should develop this standard modularly. There are many issues related to livestock production that we are not ready to move into yet.
 - Grace Gershuny – Does not have a problem with including soil, etc. in Committee's definition of 'crop production.' Also recommended that we have representation on the Committee from livestock before we move in that direction.
 - **Motion 5:** Grace moved to withdraw her amendment.
 - Motion seconded.
 - No objections. Motion passed.
 - Ron Moore called the vote on the recommendation: Standard Should Initially Be Limited to Crop Production.
 - Most in favor. A few objections. Recommendation passed.



- Standard Should be Performance Oriented
 - o Molly Anderson supported this in principle but pointed out that the M&P and Metrics TFs recognized the need for a hybrid approach. Occasionally there are not sufficient performance metrics out there. Perhaps this is implicit in saying that this is performance 'oriented' but would be more comfortable stating that performance metrics are preferred or an alternative.
 - Russell Williams clarified that where a performance metric is available, it should be used.
 - Molly Anderson – Is this adequately encompassed by the current language? Should we say 'Performance standards are preferred if available and feasible'?
 - Constance Jackson – This is where the word 'oriented' comes in. This is an acknowledgement that there is leeway if a performance standard is not available
 - Mike Wanless suggested the language: "Standards should preferentially be performance-oriented"?
 - Luke Howard – 'Performance' is a tough word to define. Should it state the standard should be 'economically, social, and environmentally' oriented?
 - Jim Pierce offered alternative language: 'Standard should be performance oriented with outcome-based measures, recognizing that process or practice based measures may be preferable in some cases.'
 - o Jonathan Kaplan – This discussion triggers a fundamental question, as it assumes that we will identify a standard for each of the commodities that are grown. Performance standards probably differ widely for each of these commodities. Do we have the resources to carry the different performance standards? Or do we take a different direction and develop a set of performance metrics that we can standardize? We should not assume that we can or should develop one standard or metric for all of the different commodities.
 - Grace Gershuny – This is a good question. There is a lot of explanation missing from this that will have to be developed, especially site-specific conditions and monitoring.
 - o **Motion 6:** Molly Anderson moved to amend the language according to Jim Pierce's recommendation.
 - Motion seconded.
 - Discussion
 - Russell Williams – The second part of the amendment is a caveat for people to prefer practices.
 - Constance Jackson – Same interpretation. Performance-oriented provides flexibility.
 - AJ Bussan – What will be the procedure for determining when practices are preferable? Scientific validity?
 - Tom Redick – Practices are a part of a performance measurement.
 - Bama Athreya – We do not have to go out of our way to define what is preferable. There will be an element of common sense here.



- Russell Williams – If there are ever claims made about this, we need to be able to back up those claims. You can do that with a performance metric. However, when there is no metric for performance, than we have to use practice.
 - Ron Moore called for a vote on the amendment.
 - Amendment failed.
 - Bryan Endres called a request for division.
 - In favor – 13; Opposed – 25. Amendment failed.
- Grace Gershuny – Some of the problem here echoes that of the Mission & Principles discussion. The idea is to provide direction for how we want the standard to be structured, not to provide a mandate. There is going to be a great deal of interpretation when we get down to the specific standards that are being developed in the subcommittees.
 - Bill Pool agreed. We are not trying to be 100% precise but directionally correct.
 - Molly Anderson called a vote on the recommendation: Standard Should Be Performance Oriented.
 - A few objections. Recommendation passed.
- Jim Barrett recommended that we communicate very clearly to the outside what these votes means. It may mean one thing to the Committee, but individuals who were not privy to these discussions might interpret these votes as mandates. We voted on general guidance principles for moving forward.

3:00 pm

Discussion and Vote on Task Force Recommendations, cont.

(Ron Moore suggested continuing the discussion of the individual Task Force recommendations, rather than starting the discussion of subcommittees and issues. No objections.)

Needs Assessment

- Ani Gulati – The Executive Summary was not explicit as to why these standards are needed
 - Ken McCauley – Although we did not agree at first on whether or not there is a need, as we went along, there was consensus that if this is done right, there is a need. Would like to personally be able to say that, if confronted, his crops qualify as ‘sustainable.’
 - Jim Pierce – This was brought up in all of the conference calls. There is a fair amount of deliberate consumer confusion. Also, we often discussed the Stewardship Index for Specialty Crops. This standard could be a close parallel for commodity crops.
 - Linda Brown called attention to the ‘Basic Needs’ Section and the ‘Stakeholder Needs’ Section
 - John Thorne – The sustainability need has not yet registered within the general public. It has mostly been recognized by processors and retailers as a way to differentiate themselves. What needs do standards fill for producers? There are already a number of federal initiatives in place that encourage improved practices. Where do these fit in?
 - Grace Gershuny – The need is for synthesis and a systemic way to put this all together, to not compartmentalize all of the different components and initiatives.



-
- Molly Anderson – Although the Needs Assessment TF did not answer the question of whether there is a need, the question is whether there is significant recognized need for this to move forward. The question on whether we should proceed has already been answered.
 - Ani Gulati – Consumers are not demanding this. Also, the FTC is exploring this territory.
 - AJ Bussan – A lot of the opposition to this process is on the basis of whether or not this is needed. Countered this point by stating that processors and retailers are increasingly being asked to improve practices and to provide more a ‘sustainable’ product.
 - Hank Giclas reiterated the point that the demand is not coming from consumers but from processors and retailers.
 - Linda Brown – Some of these points were documented in Section 3 of the Summary document.
 - Minor Sinclair – Is confused by the sense that this is not consumer driven. If there are so many standards, where are they coming from? These are not necessarily coming from the middleman – there is a consumer appetite for this. This is a key motivation for us being here.
 - Bill Pool – Wegmans’ customers are not asking for sustainable products. They do not ask about how their food is grown, what the soil management practices are, etc. They are more concerned about the quality of their food, the health benefits, how to recycle the packaging, etc.
 - Katie Davis – There is data showing that consumers are interested, maybe not in sustainability per se, but in environmentally friendly or responsible products. Gave statistics from Food Marketing Institute. Although sustainability may be not be understood by consumers, this standard could serve as a bridge and educate the consumer on what sustainability entails.
 - Stan Pohmer explained that, in his section of the report, he attempted to frame a number of avenues we can take. Did not recommend a specific direction.
 - AJ Bussan – The ultimate measure of consumer demand is whether they are willing to pay more for a locally-produced or sustainably-produced product. There are no consumers included in the Standards Committee. There was one consumer group in the stakeholder categorization. Recommended partnering with industry up and down the supply chain to give this process more potential to move forward.
 - Colleen Kohlsaas – During the life-cycle assessment of Levi Strauss’ product, cotton production phase had the highest hit. Levi’s had previously been focusing on factory operations, etc. Now they are focusing on production and supply but cannot find a standard anywhere in the world that defines what sustainable production is. That is why she is part of the process.
 - Russell Williams – Consumers want a Lexus for the price of a Volvo. We need to be careful when considering popular sentiment. This sentiment is basically ruling science right now. We will need to educate consumers on what sustainability IS and not what they perceive it to be. The trade-off for what they want is paying more.
 - Bill Wolf requested that we accept the Committee reports and vote on the recommendations tomorrow.



- Ken McCauley – Most of the recommendations in the Needs Assessment report were covered in the Task Force leadership recommendations.
- Michael Arny – Leonardo Academy and the TF leadership will have to explain what the high-level items adopted earlier will mean in practice. The recommendations of the Task Forces go a long way in clarifying what the TF leadership recommendations actually mean.
- **Motion 7:** Jim Pierce moved to accept the recommendations of the Needs Assessment Executive Summary.
 - Mike Wanless seconded the motion.
 - Discussion
 - John Thorne – We spent a lot of time earlier talking about three individual points.
 - Russell Williams recommended that when we improve these documents, we incorporate consistent language from document to document.
 - Grace Gershuny – The question of consistency of language is premature. The language passed in the points this morning needs to be clarified further. The TF recommendations help to do that. The agreement we made to accept those statements earlier was under the predication that the TF recommendations would clarify the supporting language.
 - **Motion 8:** Russell Williams moved to amend Bullet #5 of the Executive Summary Conclusion to be consistent with the language accepted earlier.
 - John Thorne seconded the motion.
 - Discussion
 - Linda Brown – The intent of this point was communicated more broadly in the document.
 - Russell Williams – We do not want to send mixed messages, however, to people who were not privy to these conversations.
 - Bill Pool recommended denoting language issues with an asterisk and note that the language will be made consistent at a later date.
 - Tom Redick clarified that the proper way to identify language issues is to bracket the text.
 - Stan Pohmer suggested filing the Task Force reports as reference documents. The conclusions and recommendations can be pulled out and considered for guiding principles in the further development of the standard.
 - Jim Barrett – These are Task Force recommendations. The votes we made earlier today were Committee decisions. It is important to notice the difference.
 - John Thorne – The Outreach Task Force made a number of recommendations that are contingent on the voting outcomes for the other TF recommendations. The Committee will not want to vote up or down on the



-
- Outreach document else they will be voting to include livestock in the scope.
- Russell Williams – Is ok with the TF documents as long as they are recognized as guidance and are not binding.
 - Stan Pohmer – Are we going to use these as living documents and recognize that these documents are going to change? These are not static points.
 - Molly Anderson – We can make a footnote in each of the TF documents that the points are consistent *in intent* with the TF leadership recommendations that were voted on earlier today. This would communicate to the outside that the Committee views these as compatible.
 - Tom Redick suggested copying the recommendations to another document and footnoting the issue with consistency.
 - Ron Moore called the vote to amend Bullet #5.
 - Russell Williams called to modify the amendment to state that an asterisk will be included at the end of each Task Force document stating that these recommendations and the corresponding language are to be read in context with the recommendations passed by the Committee earlier today.
 - Jim Pierce seconded the amendment.
 - Amendment passed unanimously.
 - Jonathan Kaplan – What did the Needs Assessment TF envision regarding Bullet #1, that we should proceed with the development of this standard?
 - Grace Gershuny – To what extent is the committee adopting the recommendations vs. accepting the recommendations?
 - Russell Williams – Recommended removing the work ‘practice’ from the first bullet, given the agreement that the standard will be performance oriented.
 - Hank Giclas – Has had discomfort with the word ‘standard’; however, the first page of the Needs Assessment document identified what is meant by the term ‘standard.’ That language up front, as well as the asterisk motion adopted earlier, provides him with reassurance.
 - Jonathan Kaplan – We still have a lot of uncertainty about the bigger issues, such as if this is going to be a prescriptive standard.
 - Molly Anderson – The quickest way we can move past that is to adopt the Task Force reports. There is no purpose of having a separate discussion about what it is we are creating; this is premature.
 - Molly Anderson called the question on whether the Needs Assessment recommendations can be accepted in their entirety.
 - One opposed. Motion passed.
 - Russell Williams – Does the rest of the document simply serve as reference?



- Yes.

Mission & Principles

- Grace Gershuny clarified that the background statement is not part of the recommendations. The principles are what should be considered as recommendations. The intent was that these principles would be incorporated as the foundation for creating the standard.
- **Motion 9:** Grace Gershuny moved that the Committee accept the statement of principles as identified in the Sustainable Principles Document Items II – V, with the background and issue papers serving as reference documents.
 - Motion seconded.
 - Discussion
 - Bill Pool – Question about Section III (Working Definition(s) of Sustainable Agriculture), Bullet #4: “Integrate ecologically based production models and biologically derived materials”
 - Grace Gershuny – Ecologically based production models look to the entire ecosystem as a model for production
 - Bill Pool – Does this imply that a production system that does not follow this model is not sustainable?
 - Grace Gershuny – There is no such implication in this statement. We are simply identifying this as where we want to move towards
 - Ken McCauley – What about the concept of biologically derived materials? Where does this put commercial inputs (i.e. fertilizer)?
 - Grace Gershuny – There is no prohibition in this statement. It is simply encouraging the incorporation of biologically derived materials.
 - Russell Williams – Unfortunately, biologically derived materials includes petroleum. This discussion could get into a very long debate.
 - Katie Davis pointed out that the statement says ‘aim to’ which may take away the focus that we are putting on this issue.
 - Mike Wanless – Bullet #4 does not preclude the previous statement in Bullet #3.
 - Molly Anderson – Bullet #3 and Bullet #4 are very different. We would be best to accept this document as what came out of a very lengthy process.
 - Grace Gershuny – We have to respect the fact that these concerns have been aired in the Task Force discussions. The final language is a product of trying to be mindful of those concerns and that the qualifying statements are simply broad principles; they are not identifying or precluding specific practices as in or out.
 - Jim Barrett – The motion is for the Committee to accept these recommendations – not to just accept the report. Also, a lot of industries out there will probably read this and interpret it



incorrectly. If we come out of here with this language, we will turn off a great many people. We need to modify the language

- Jeff Moyer – This brings up the issue of time – the idea here is to create a standard that is not the status quo, to move us toward a place where no one is yet.
- John Thorne – It does not serve our purpose to create documents that do not convey what we mean. If we have objections to certain portions of this, we need to bracket them so it goes in the record that we did not agree.
- Bryan Endres – The first word of this sentence is ‘integrate,’ which implies that these materials can be added into a system. It does not preclude the use of others. Therefore, is not concerned with the bullet point.
- Ken McCauley – ‘Biologically derived materials’ excludes certain inputs that are very important to conventional growers. Would feel more comfortable if there was clarification that this clause does not exclude those materials.
- Hank Giclas – Would be comfortable deleting the last four words (‘and biologically derived materials’) and leaving it open-ended, otherwise it sounds like a mandate.
- Katie Davis reiterated that it says ‘aim to’...’integrate ecologically based production models and biologically derived materials.’ Would anyone striving to include sustainable practices object to incorporating compost, cover crops, etc?
- Tom Redick – Again, this can be bracketed and clarified that this should be read in the context of the other recommendations that were passed.
- Jim Barrett encouraged the Committee to think of this language from the perspective of those who want this process to fail. This is what they will go to in order to find something wrong.
- **Motion 10:** John Thorne moved to add an asterisk to the end of the recommendations similar to that at the end of the Needs Assessment, with the following language: “The recommendation should be read under the full context of the Committee’s previous actions regarding the Task Force leadership recommendations.”
 - Motion seconded.
 - Discussion
 - Jesse Singerman asked for clarification how the TF recommendations relate to Bullet #4.
 - Russell Williams provided clarification.
 - Ron Moore called the vote to add an asterisk and recommended language to all TF reports.
 - Motion passed.



-
- Damara Luce – Was there discussion about including the word ‘farm workers’ in Bullet #6? Farm workers in today’s agricultural system contribute greatly to sustainability.
 - Grace Gershuny had suggested during the Task Force discussions that farm workers be considered as producers but this was not accepted by the rest of the Task Force. There is a lot of room for interpretation as to how you define who the farmer is. Also society covers farm workers.
 - **Motion 11:** Russell Williams moved to modify Bullet #6 to include ‘farm workers’.
 - Motion seconded
 - Discussion
 - John Thorne suggested to not modify the bullet but to segment it off as an asterisk.
 - Molly Anderson – To leave this group (i.e. farm workers) out would be egregious.
 - Katie Davis – It is absolutely vital that farm workers be called out. Farmer and farm worker are not synonymous. If we do not distinguish them, we risk excluding a tremendous contribution to agriculture that needs to be included in the environmental, social and economic discussions about what is sustainable.
 - Bill Wolf supported editing the document and adding a footnote that this was added by the full Committee. Called the question for objections. No objections.
 - Ron Moore called the vote to amend Bullet #6, including the asterisk and footnote.
 - A few objections. Motion passed.
 - AJ Bussan expressed concern about the lack of reference to scientific evidence and research in the Statement of Purpose.
 - Grace Gershuny – Would like to refer this question to the ‘elephant’ list and to suggest that people create discussion documents that address questions pertaining to what is considered legitimate research and acceptable scientific fact and to what extent scientific facts are part of a standard that is attempting to define a social good.
 - Tom Redick – We do need to recognize before we leave here that there are procedures subject to the scientific method that we can agree to as ‘science.’
 - Grace Gershuny – This document is a starting point for developing principles. The incorporation of contentious issues is expected. We acknowledge that there are things missing but we will not be able to address them within the context of this particular meeting.



4:55 pm

Review Issues Tabled for Day 2 — Amanda Raster, Leonardo Academy

- Finish discussion of Mission & Principles, Metrics & Methodology, Reference Documents, Funding and Outreach TF recommendations
- Michael Keyes suggested revising the agenda for Day 2 to cover the issues we need to cover.

5:00 pm

Adjourn

* * * * *

Day 2

9:00 am

Present Revised Agenda – Ron Moore, Committee Vice-Chair

- *9:05 am*: Continue Discussion and Vote on Task Force Recommendations from Day 1; *11:30 am*: Discuss SCS-001 Copyright Transfer; *1:30 pm*: Discuss Potential Subcommittees & Issues; Vote on Formation of Subcommittees; Schedule Next Meeting
- **Motion 12**: Linda Brown moved to discuss the SCS-001 copyright issue to later in the day and to address subcommittees earlier.
 - o John Thorne seconded the motion.
 - o Discussion
 - Ron Moore explained that this was moved forward in the agenda because some Committee members were leaving the meeting early.
 - Linda Brown – Of equal concern to Committee members is having input on the subcommittees.
 - Ron Moore called the vote to discuss SCS-001 copyright issue at end of day.
 - Motion passed unanimously.

Review Issues Tabled for Discussion

Mission & Principles, Reference Documents, Metrics & Methodology, Outreach Task Force recommendations

9:05 am

Continue Discussion and Vote on Task Force Recommendations from Day 1

Mission & Principles

- **Motion 13**: AJ Bussan moved to include phraseology in the M&P Statement of Purpose that this standard will be based on scientific principles.
 - o Tom Redick seconded the motion.
 - o Discussion
 - Taylor Reid suggested putting off this conversation until we discuss the elephant issues.
 - Grace Gershuny suggested accepting this one change to the document and accepting the rest of the document so we can move forward.
 - Norma Keyes – Science based what?
 - Taylor Reid – So much of sustainability is based on values. Science is not always the best measure of equitability.
 - Russell Williams – Values have impacts and can also be measured through the social sciences.



- Bama Athreya – It is very hard to edit and get the language right with a committee. We should focus on what we want this statement to convey.
- Philip Rasmussen – There is a statement like this in SARE’s mission and purpose. We have never had a problem with the statement, and we realize that science does not hold all truth. SARE has funded a lot of projects that address equitability. There is no problem with this statement as long as we have a mechanism later on for how this is interpreted.
- Tom Redick – Rural sociologists are scientists that study equitability.
- Taylor Reid – Is ok with the inclusion as long as we recognize that ‘science-based’ is not an exclusionary term.
- Mike Wanless – If we move ‘science-based’ to the “ecologically responsible, equitable, economically viable...” clause, it will make more sense.
- **Motion 14:** Grace Gershuny moved that the ‘science-based’ statement be moved to the list of clauses.
 - Taylor Reid and Bama Athreya seconded the motion
 - Discussion
 - Michael Keyes – Not all valid production systems have been evaluated by science. The way this is written might weigh this toward a US based interpretation of what science is.
 - Vote on Grace Gershuny’s amendment to AJ Bussan’s motion.
 - 32 in favor; 8 opposed. Amendment passed.
 - Clause now reads: *“The purpose of a sustainable agriculture standard is to encourage the widespread adoption of agricultural production and handling practices that are ecologically responsible, equitable, economically viable, science-based, meet global demand for a full range of agricultural products, and ensure that future generations are able to meet their own needs.”*
- Ron Moore called the vote to approve the amended clause, including ‘science-based’ reference, in the document.
 - Motion passed unanimously.
- Ron Moore called the vote on the original motion to adopt the recommendations of the M&P Sustainable Agriculture Principles Document (Items II-IV).
 - Motion passed unanimously.

Reference Documents, Metrics & Methodology, Outreach, Funding

- Ron Moore suggested accepting all of the recommendations put forth in the remaining Task Forces in order to move the discussion along.
- Michael Army – In order to save time, if these are not controversial issues, the Committee would accept the Task Force recommendations as they are and the subcommittees would continue to work on these issues.
- Tom Redick – This would not foreclose anyone in the future from going back to those reports and discussing the recommendations.
- Grace Gershuny – There has been discussion about one of the reports having not been adequately put through the Task Force review process.



- **Motion 15:** Betsy Peterson moved to accept all of the remaining TF reports as reference documents.
 - o Motion seconded.
 - o Discussion
 - Bama Athreya clarified that, in accepting these reports, we are not endorsing the recommendations.
 - Ron Moore – Yes, this is not an endorsement of the recommendations as these are ongoing efforts.
 - Motion passed.

10:00 am

Create Subcommittees

Place Elephant Issues in a Subcommittee for Further Exploration – Dr. Marty Matlock, Committee Chair

- **Motion 16:** John Thorne moved to amend the agenda to discuss the elephant issues for one hour before discussing the creation of subcommittees.
 - o Mike Wanless seconded the motion.
 - o Discussion
 - **Motion 17:** Linda Brown moved to amend John Thorne’s motion to start discussing subcommittees in order to have a place to put the elephant issues (e.g. keep the agenda as is).
 - Margaret Wittenberg seconded the amendment to the motion. Having the subcommittees figured out first will make it easier to figure out where to place the elephant issues. Subcommittees are important to this process.
 - Stan Pohmer – We already have a history of putting the cart before the horse. We could be putting the cart before the horse again. The discussion of issues should drive the creation of subcommittees, not the other way around. We need to discuss the issues before establishing what the subcommittees will be.
 - Linda Brown agreed, in part. We understand what the issues are and can identify the subcommittees in which these discussions can take place. Is concerned about cutting off the conversation at one hour on topics that are of great importance to the committee. People may feel that within that one-hour format, their issues were not attended to adequately.
 - No second. Motion withdrawn.
 - Marty Matlock called the vote on the motion to discuss the elephant issues first.
 - Motion passed unanimously.
- Bill Wolf has worked with a group of people to develop a compromised approach on the subcommittees and the elephant issues. Getting all of these issues on the table is important. Suggested reviewing the proposal.
 - o **Motion 18:** Bill Wolf moved to spend 15 minutes discussing the subcommittee proposal, as put forth by Molly Anderson.



- Russell Williams called for unanimous consent to amend John Thorne’s amendment to include a discussion of Molly Anderson’s proposal for 15 minutes prior to a one-hour discussion of the elephant issues.
 - Amendment passed by UC.
- Marty Matlock called the vote on the amended motion to proceed with Molly Anderson’s proposal, followed by a one hour discussion of the elephant issues.
 - Motion passed unanimously.
- Molly Anderson presented the proposed subcommittee structure.
 - Objective was to reduce the volume of subcommittees and to make a more workable structure. Subcommittees were set up to make the issues workable and feasible as well as to find real homes for the elephant issues. We will not have full closure on these issues today as they have been on the table for decades. Fourth objective was to carry forth the Task Force work.
 - Overview of the suggested subcommittees and their tasks
 - Bill Wolf stated that the point of the proposal is to get to the actual work of writing standards – developing criteria, identifying metrics. The first three subcommittees are targeted to focus specifically on that work (Criteria Development for Economic Sustainability, Social Sustainability and Environmental Sustainability). Operational issues are in one subcommittee (Structure and Process of Standard Development). Reference work is in one subcommittee (Reference Library). Inputs and technology work is in one subcommittee (Inputs and Technology).
 - **Motion 19:** Bill Wolf moved to accept the subcommittee proposal.
 - Motion seconded.
 - **Motion 20:** Ken McCauley moved to table the subcommittee motion until a specific time later today.
 - Tom Redick seconded the motion.
 - Bill Wolf – Are we allowed to discuss a motion to table a motion?
 - Marty Matlock – No.
 - Marty Matlock called the vote on the motion to table the subcommittee motion.
 - Motion passed unanimously.
- **Motion 21:** Jim Barrett moved that the Committee adopt the following statement: *“Our goal is to develop a measurable standard for increasing the sustainability of agriculture methods that are based on verifiable metrics and will allow for any agricultural technologies.”*
 - Russell Williams seconded the motion.
 - Discussion
 - Ken McCauley spoke in favor of the motion.
 - John Thorne also spoke in favor. It is important to realize that the agricultural technologies this refers to will be regulated at the federal and state levels.
 - Michael Keyes also spoke in favor of the motion. This is exactly what we need to give all constituents the footing they need to move this forward. His



only concern is how this would affect the Mission & Principles recommendations.

- Jim Pierce spoke in opposition to the word ‘allow.’ This word can and will be disseminated beyond this meeting and will have impacts that we cannot control. The statement should convey that any and all technologies will be accepted if they fit into a sustainability framework.
- Russell Williams – ‘Allow’ was a compromise. The word ‘consider’ or ‘evaluate’ weakens the statement.
- Margaret Wittenberg supported Jim’s Barrett’s proposed statement. Suggested that we include this statement in our discussions.
- Taylor Reid stated that the intent here is not to disallow any specific agricultural technologies. Can we say ‘not disallow’?
- Russell Williams supported an affirmative statement. The motion on the table can be a separate motion or we can move to add the statement to the Task Force recommendations adopted yesterday.
- Ken McCauley – Farmers are prohibited from using anything that is not approved. However, some technologies do not have an approval process (e.g., GPS).
- **Motion 22:** Mike Wanless moved to amend the statement to say ‘legal agricultural technologies’
 - No second. Motion withdrawn.
- Ken McCauley – The point with this motion is to be simple and allow for room to move within it.
- Marty Matlock – The subcommittees will still be able to address the uncertainties, the details, the implications of what this means.
- Russell Williams – This amendment does not preclude further discussion. However, we do not want to qualify this to death, we both have constituencies we need to answer to.
- Kirsten Jaglo read a statement from the USDA: *“With respect to sustainable agriculture, all agriculture must be able find a place within a sustainable framework. No one system or method of production will meet the needs of an entire U.S. market, or continue to provide the low cost and abundant food supplies necessary for the U.S. to maintain its export markets and provide food assistance abroad to those in need.”* This proposed statement would be consistent with USDA policy.
- Grace Gershuny – ‘Measurable and ‘verifiable’ are redundant.
- **Motion 23:** Grace Gershuny asked for unanimous consent (UC) to delete the word ‘measurable’ before ‘standard.’
 - Amendment passed by UC.
 - Amended statement reads: *“Our goal is to develop a standard for increasing the sustainability of agriculture methods that are based on verifiable metrics and will allow for any agricultural technologies.”*
- John Thorne supported this language without making changes to the last clause



- AJ Bussan suggested modifying the clause to state ‘available agricultural technologies’.
- Minor Sinclair – The term seems contradictory. The language indicates that we will allow agricultural technologies that do not increase sustainability.
 - Tom Redick disagreed. This statement can only be read one way.
- **Motion 24:** Bama Athreya asked for UC to modify the statement to read: *“Our goal is to develop a standard that is based on verifiable metrics and will allow for any technology that increases agricultural sustainability.”*
 - Amendment passed by UC.
- Cecil Wright – Does technology include IPM, crop rotation, organic, GE/GMOs? He will have to report this to constituency.
 - Yes.
 - Ron Moore – This is also includes GPS, nanotechnology, etc.
 - Cecil Wright – Can we put this on the record that there is a lot of effort put into this particular word and that we can revisit exactly what ‘technology’ includes?
 - Bill Wolf – This statement has been worked out well to say that this is about verifiable metrics. However, we are still putting the cart before the horse but for a different set of reasons. Our mission is to build a standard and to define a set of metrics. What we are now saying is a healthy thing to say. However, our job and legacy is to develop the metrics by which the sustainability of all of these technologies will be measured.
- Marty Matlock called the vote on whether to adopt the statement.
 - Motion passed, with one objection.
- John Thorne suggested talking about the balance of all three aspects of sustainability on the Committee.
 - Taylor Reid – This specific bullet point is referring to balance on the Committee, not how the pillars are balanced within the framework of the standard. Hesitates to get into that at this point.
 - Marty Matlock – Agenda item closed.
- Marty Matlock brought Bill Wolf’s motion regarding the proposed subcommittees (and its second) back to the table.
 - Bill Wolf requested that the proposed subcommittees be written on the white boards, inquired about the ANSI charter in relation to subcommittee structure, and suggested that the current Task Force chairs be considered for leading the eight subcommittees (this was all offered as context for evaluating the proposal).
 - Bill Wolf explained the subcommittee structure. Advocated adopting this as soon as possible and begin work immediately to refine it.
 - Jonathan Kaplan reiterated Suzy’s comment from earlier regarding the level of detail. We cannot start work until we know exactly what we are trying to develop here.
 - Hank Giclas supports Jonathan’s comment in terms of a sequential process. The sequence of Subcommittee #5 needs to be determined. Also expressed reservations about looking at economic sustainability separately.



-
- Bill Wolf – The subcommittees will have to have overlap. Historically, these areas have been looked at separately.
 - **Motion 25:** Jonathan Kaplan moved for there to be an explicit clause that requires interaction across the subcommittees regarding social, economic, and environmental components of sustainability.
 - Motion seconded.
 - Discussion
 - Jonathan Kaplan—Not convinced about the sequence.
 - Grace Gershuny – The sequential issue is also on her mind. The level of detail is one that will have to be worked out in the context of site-specific, performance-based metrics.
 - **Motion 26:** Russell Williams – Subcommittee #8 (Inputs and Technology) is unnecessary. These issues will be discussed in all of the other subcommittees. If we are taking information from input providers, they need to have representation on the committee. Moved to eliminate subcommittee #8.
 - Tom Redick seconded the motion.
 - Discussion
 - Bill Wolf strongly advocated that there is a need for this subcommittee, as originated in the Reference Documents TF. A motion was passed in Ref Docs to form two subcommittees, one of which included Inputs. This came about because there was very little data coming in about agricultural inputs. Also because the Outreach TF made a recommendation that there is a gap in participation in this process from inputs. Looking at that list, we would have to add 30 different types of organizations that would need representation on the committee (fertilizer, seeds, compost, equipment, etc.) We need this information brought to the table as a category. The concept was to organize this into a subcommittee that would bring this information to the table in an organized form. This subcommittee needs to be feeding data to all of the other subcommittees as well. Objects the motion to delete subcommittee #8. Understands the recommendation to remove the statement about the precautionary principle



- Jack Housenger expressed concern about information coming from input companies.
- Russell Williams – The discussions about precaution are going to happen in the three principle committees. You could appropriately integrate this group into Outreach or Criteria for Development without having a separate committee do all of these things.
- Tom Redick suggested adding this to Subcommittee #5, Item h - Farm management plan
- Grace Gershuny – Her understanding of Bill Wolf’s idea was that this would be an information resource to inform the development of the standards. Suggested incorporating #8 to #4 and adding the language ‘information’.
- Cecil Wright – Keep in mind that we are looking at a year cycle here. There will be options for us to change as we go along. We need to keep this somewhere, whether it is here or moved somewhere else.
- John Thorne – Is in support of eliminating #8 as a stand-alone but in favor of incorporating continued information from inputs as we move forward.
- Michael Keyes – Supported maintaining #8 where it is. We know this is a sensitive issue for all involved, but we do not have the data about inputs that we need.
- Betsy Peterson – Supported moving the language in #8, as the concepts are incorporated in #6. Ag inputs are highly regulated by state and federal law. There is no reason to have this category as a stand-alone.
- Taylor Reid – There are bigger issues than whether inputs are regulated or not. We are building a sustainability standard here and will be determining whether or not these inputs are sustainable.
- Marty Matlock called the vote on the motion to remove #8 from the subcommittee proposal.
 - Motion passed.



- **Motion 27:** Bill Wolf asked for UC to move language from what was previously #8a to #4d.
 - Grace Gershuny seconded the motion.
 - Discussion
 - Hank Giclas agreed with making the move. However, items in #6 and #8 seem to inform a lot of the criteria that will be developed in the first three subcommittees. Also favored collapsing the number of subcommittees from a resource standpoint. The fewer number of subcommittees to track and engage in, the better off the Committee members are. Suggested collapsing the first three subcommittees into one.
 - Sharon Bomer – What information is being sought here? All of the research information on inputs is publicly available.
 - Taylor Reid – Why are we avoiding the discussion of the precautionary principle?
 - Grace Gershuny – Would like to not lose the discussion of the precautionary principle, but it does not belong in this particular spot. Proposed voting on the amendment as proposed by Bill.
 - John Thorne – The amendment on the floor as written is adequate. Discussion of the precautionary principle will occur in all of the subcommittees.
 - Marty Matlock called the vote on moving #8a to #4d.
 - Motion passed unanimously.
- Ron Moore asked how the Task Forces would be integrated into the subcommittee.
 - Bill Wolf provided an explanation.
 - Ron Moore expressed concern about Subcommittee #6 (Regulatory Interface and Agricultural Policy) and whether or not the Committee should even approach the issues of import, export, international trade; ag subsidies; ‘cheap’ food policy (items b, c and d).
 - Bill Wolf – This subcommittee captured issues that were discussed earlier in other committees. Each subcommittee will need to write its work plan, objectives and goals when it forms. The concern was what role the standard plays in each of these areas.
 - **Motion 28:** Ron Moore moved to remove items b, c and d from Subcommittee #6.
 - Russell Williams seconded the motion.
 - Discussion
 - Stan Pohmer – Items c and d might not be appropriate, but we need to be careful to ensure that this standards maintains harmonization with existing standards regarding import, export and trade.



- Bryan Endres – Agrees with Stan. Leave b.
- Kirsten Jaglo – Does not understand the purpose of this subcommittee.
- Russell Williams – We do need to be mindful of trade policy. Suggested deleting ‘agricultural policy’ from the name of the subcommittee and leaving item b. We can make this quick by adopting the bold points and making the bullet points reference materials to inform the decision-makers when these subcommittees are formed.
- **Motion 29:** Ron Moore amended his motion to keep Item b and to remove Items c and d.
 - Motion passed unanimously.
- AJ Bussan – What influence will ag subsidies and cheap food policy have on sustainability? If we remove this language, where will these issues be addressed?
- Russell Williams – Much like the precautionary principles, these discussions will be had in each of the subcommittees. We need to be careful with using the word ‘policy.’
- AJ Bussan – How can we move forward within the context of these subcommittees if they are not self-governing?
- Michael Arny – The subcommittees work at the direction of the full Committee. One of the things the Committee needs to count on is that, within their range of purview, the subcommittees will bring forth information to the full Committee.
- Stan Pohmer – Served on three of the Task Forces actively. Although we are identifying key areas that we are asking the subcommittees to review, this is not exclusive. The subcommittees may identify different areas that are not covered within the charge that they need to explore. These are simply guidelines to provide structure. Each of the subcommittees will take on a life of its own.
- Jesse Singerman – Would like to keep the items in to ensure that the subcommittee does consider them.
- Russell Williams – The subcommittees will do this regardless. When the Standards Committee gives directions to the subcommittees, it can imply that they have a measure of autonomy. We do not want to limit them from what they can explore or what



- they can talk about. Full Committee members will be participating on each of the subcommittees.
- Carol Kramer-LeBlanc supported Russell Williams' idea that these issues (ag subsidies and cheap food policy) would be covered in both the economic and social criteria subcommittees. There is a risk in looking at these policies in their entirety, in isolation from other concepts addressed in other subcommittees.
 - Tom Redick – In deleting ag subsidies, you are actually putting this where it belongs. This is a general idea that will surface in all of the other subcommittees, a more comprehensive approach.
 - Michael Keyes – The issue here is actually the way statement #6 has been written. It is intended to say 'interface with regulatory and agricultural policy' but does not read that way.
 - Marty Matlock called the vote on whether to remove Items c and d.
 - Motion passed.
 - **Motion 30:** Russell Williams asked for UC to amend title of Subcommittee #6 to read 'Interface with Regulatory and Agricultural Policy.'
 - Amendment passed by UC.
 - **Motion 31:** Russell Williams moved to adopt the titles of Subcommittees #1-7 and to refer to the supporting language as reference material.
 - Motion seconded.
 - Discussion
 - Bama Athreya expressed concern with Subcommittee #7 (Fundraising and Outreach). Subcommittee #5 (Structure and Process) requires extensive outreach to other programs and Subcommittee #6 (Regulatory Interface) would require outreach to government agencies. Suggested that the Committee consider the scope of Subcommittee #7 to include fundraising and communications, remove item b.
 - Grace Gershuny supported the intention of Russell Williams' amendment but does not want to lose the ideas that have been brought forth from other discussions that have been captured as examples of concerns that need to be included in the subcommittee discussions. Also, suggested that #5g (discussion of what constitutes scientific evidence) should include a statement to identify reasonable evidence of no harm to serve as guidance.
 - Marty Matlock suggested that this is within the purview of the subcommittees to determine.



- Bryan Endres – The committee as a whole meets infrequently. We need to be able to go on the record and take positions on these sub-bullets. For that reason, opposed the motion.
- Grace Gershuny supported the motion.
- Marty Matlock called the vote on whether to adopt the Subcommittee titles only.
 - Jonathan Kaplan opposed the motion. The subcommittees will determine what they are going to look that. These items serve as guidance as to the important issues the subcommittees should be looking at.
 - 18 in favor. 19 opposed. Motion failed.
- **Motion 32:** Bama Athreya asked for UC to change the title of Subcommittee #7 to read Fundraising and Communications, with the removal of Item b.
 - Amendment passed by UC.
- Linda Brown – The bulleted items do not fully address the scope of the funding for this process.
- **Motion 33:** Linda Brown asked for UC to add a sub-bullet to Subcommittee #7: ‘assist in fundraising for the duration of the process.’
 - Amendment passed by UC.
- AJ Bussan pointed out that the Outreach TF is now in Subcommittees #5 and #6.
- **Motion 34:** AJ Bussan asked for UC to add Item i to Subcommittee #5: ‘make recommendations on Standards Committee composition.’
 - Amendment passed by UC.

12:30 pm Lunch, Vermeer Room

1:30 pm Continue Discussion about Subcommittees and Elephant Issues

- **Motion 35:** Jonathan Kaplan moved to add a sub-bullet to Subcommittee #5 to ‘expedite recommendations about the types of standards to be developed and the level of detail to be expected.’
 - Amendment passed by UC.
- **Motion 36:** Jonathan Kaplan moved to add a clause at the bottom of Section #3 (under species diversity) to include about ‘other issues.’
 - Amendment passed by UC.
- **Motion 37:** Betsy Peterson moved to merge Subcommittee #6 (Regulatory Interface) with #4 (Reference Library and Information).
 - Bill Wolf clarified that Item f is already occurring within the Reference Documents work.
 - Amendment passed by UC.
- **Motion 38:** Bill Wolf –There is a lot of concern about the issues and functions of these subcommittees. The process would be better served if the sub-items served as guidance rather than as exclusive directives of the subcommittees. This was not written so that these



items would serve as the subcommittee's work plan. Moved to include the sub-items as reference. Offered second motion for later consideration– that all of the Standards Committee Officers and Subcommittee Leadership become a 7th Committee.

- **Motion 39:** Grace Gershuny moved to reconsider the previous vote (Motion 31) regarding adopting the proposed sub-items as guidance.
 - Motion seconded.
 - Discussion
 - Jacques Wolbert pointed out that there were fewer people in the room than during the earlier vote. Opted for keeping the previous vote.
 - Jesse Singerman suggested adding an asterisk to clarify.
 - Grace Gershuny withdrew her motion.
- **Motion 40:** Grace Gershuny moved to adopt the current list of subcommittees, all of their bullets, all of the minutes from previous Task Force call and all relevant subordinate material as guidance for the subcommittees moving forward.
 - Russell Williams – These materials are all in the record and will be looked at regardless.
 - No second to the motion.
- **Motion 41:** Bryan Endres moved to add an asterisk at the end of the proposed subcommittee list with language stating that this document serves as guidance, that these items are not limiting and that the subcommittees have the discretion to develop their work plans and to add to this list.
 - Motion passed by UC.
- **Motion 42:** Bill Wolf moved to formalize the leadership of the subcommittees into a seventh subcommittee – Executive Committee (comprised of the chairs/co-chairs of each subcommittee and the Standards Committee Officers).
 - Motion passed by UC.
- Marty called the vote on the original motion to adopt the proposed subcommittee document.
 - Motion passed unanimously.
- **Motion 43:** AJ Bussan moved for the recommendations of the Outreach TF to be accepted, with specific emphasis on increasing the number of representatives in the Producer category, particularly feed and fiber, with the caveat that at least two weeks are allotted for the Committee to identify additional individuals for consideration.
 - Motion seconded.
 - Discussion
 - Bama Athreya – These recommendations do not represent consent by the full Outreach TF nor do the recommendations match the findings of the stakeholder categorization.
 - John Thorne – The gap analysis has been before the Outreach TF for many weeks to review and comment. There were at least two conference calls in which this analysis was discussed.
 - Bama Athreya supported the gap analysis but reiterated that the recommendations do not match the findings of the stakeholder



categorization. The gap analysis should be placed before the new leadership committee for them to review and make their own recommendations.

- Linda Brown – There are concerns from a number of groups that they are under-represented on the Committee. There is much more work to do in identifying gaps in representation before any decisions are made.
- Jonathan Kaplan agreed that this is a premature motion. Additional deliberation about the gap analysis is needed. On the issue of balance – any motion put before the Committee regarding additional seats needs to address the balance set out in Leonardo Academy’s guidelines currently. There are some groups identified as environmental groups that are not actually environmental groups.
- John Thorne – When we think about the impacts of the sustainability standard, it will be applied in the farm gate. The Mission & Principles document we adopted states that we will focus on food, feed and fiber. Reading the list of members in the Producer Category, there are three commodity growers represented on the Committee. There is no representation of fiber in the production area and indirect representation of the feed sector. Recommended adding an additional seat to cover feed and fiber.
- AJ Bussan – Has yet to see in the documentation that there is mandate to have 25% representation across all of the categories. The procedures state that no group shall be a majority of the Committee composition.
- Grace Gershuny objected to the list of individuals recommended. The Committee should not be charged with putting forward a slate of names as this was not generally circulated as an intent and there was no opportunity for other Committee members to offer or add to the list of names.
- AJ Bussan – The motion allows for expansion of this list. Recognized the sensitivity around other stakeholders to be identified.
- Katie Davis – The full Outreach TF did not have the opportunity to review the recommendations.
- Amanda Raster clarified that the Outreach TF did have the opportunity to review the document twice – prior to the conference call as well as after
- Ron Moore – These are only recommendations and should be perceived that way. The Executive Committee should review any names for consideration as additions to the standards committee, as well as whether expansion is necessary.
- Tom Redick – There are many folks not on the Committee who have concerns about representation. With the Executive Committee having oversight, you will avoid accusations about additional members being picked by the ‘wrong’ people.
- Hank Giclas spoke in favor of the motion, as long as we are talking about the creation of a seat and not the addition of particular names. This is just a recommendation and needs to be inclusive.
- Bill Wolf favored tabling the motion. We have already accepted the Task Force’s work. There are other gaps in the Committee that have become



- apparent throughout this meeting. We need to continue this work in subcommittee.
- Linda Brown – If these are envisioned as new seats, this potentially creates an imbalance that will require the addition of seats in other categories as well. This is a longer conversation.
 - Marty Matlock suggested that we have an up or down issue. Call for a five minute break.
 - AJ Bussan withdrew his motion.
- **Motion 44:** AJ Bussan presented an alternative motion that the Outreach TF recommendations be utilized by the Executive Committee to put forth to Leonardo Academy additional stakeholders to consider for representation on the Committee, within a time frame of 60 days.
- Motion seconded.
 - Discussion
 - Grace Gershuny – We already considered the work of the Outreach TF, so this motion is redundant.
 - Marty Matlock – This is a clarifying charge that the recommendations of the TF be taken up by the Executive Committee within a given time frame.
 - Jonathan Kaplan – All we see are the recommendations without any context as to how they were developed. We need to look at our existing slots and whether there are current members that are not active that could be considered for replacement by new members.
 - Tom Redick – The Executive committee will be transparent so everyone can see how the recommendations are considered.
 - AJ Bussan – The recommendations should come from the Executive Committee, be slated to the full Committee for vote, then slated to Leonardo Academy. This should be done as quickly as possible to allow the new members to get engaged in the subcommittee work in a timely manner.
 - Ron Moore – The authority for adding committee members lies exclusively within the jurisdiction of Leonardo Academy.
 - Russell Williams – We cannot put this off for six months because we need the input from potential additional members during the subcommittee process.
 - Marty Matlock – The greatest indicator of legitimacy is representation. Those who are not active should be replaced and those that are participating should be representative of agriculture at large.
 - Linda Brown – We do not anticipate voting on anything in the near term so why the deadline of 60 days.
 - Russell Williams – We are looking at potentially four months from now for a Committee expansion, considering the Committee voting process and Leonardo’s considerations.



- Tom Redick – There are active pending appeals about representation. If we do not address this now, these appeals will be re-activated and we will end up in front of ANSI’s ExSC again.
- Marty Matlock called the vote on the Outreach TF recommendations.
 - Motion passed.

3:30 pm

Discuss SCS-001 Copyright Transfer

- Michael Arny provided context on the copyright transfer. SCS committed in writing to transfer the copyright to a charitable nonprofit and that any revenue from the sale of the standard would be used to support the ongoing maintenance of the standard. SCS is currently contemplating the charitable nonprofit to whom the standard will be transferred.
- Marty Matlock clarified that the transfer would be of ownership, not solely of licensing.
- Hank Giclas – Transfer of ownership of the final product that comes out of this body?
- Marty Matlock – Yes.
- Linda Brown – Michael Arny captured very well what the MOU states and what the intentions of SCS have been. SCS is interested in having suggestions made to their senior management.
- Bill Wolf – SCS has financed all of the work in this process to date. This has been an extraordinary effort on their part to bring all of us together and they should be praised for their support of this process.
- Stan Pohmer – With the Committee setting aside the DSTU and moving forward with a PINS process, isn’t this now an industry standard?
- Hank Giclas echoed Bill Wolf’s sentiment. Is there a decision point for the Committee on this matter or is this simply a briefing?
- Marty Matlock – Essentially a briefing but also an opportunity to voice concerns, if any. While SCS is funding this, we as Committee members are too. Do we have a say in this, what responsibilities do we have, how do we move forward?
- Hank Giclas – Is it important for us to make those determinations sooner rather than later, in terms of fundraising?
- Grace Gershuny suggested that this be a mandate for the Fundraising and Communications Subcommittee and Executive Committee in conjunction, to develop proposals to forward to the Committee for consideration.
- Stan Pohmer – At what point in time does the work of this body get transferred?
- Linda Brown – As soon as the charitable nonprofit organization is identified and accepts the charge.

Schedule Next Standards Committee Meeting and Set Work Progress Goals

- Bill Wolf – We should move forward with transitioning the Task Force work into subcommittee as soon as possible and identify Interim Subcommittee Chairs, with the permanent chairs being elected by the TF itself.
- Marty Matlock recommended that the Executive Committee assist with the transfer of information.
- Jonathan Kaplan – Our process is not terribly efficient for running these meetings. Can we scale back our commitment to Robert’s Rules and spend more time talking about the issues?

