

**MEETING SUMMARY:
RSB ANDEAN REGION STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH MEETING
MARCH 11-12, 2009
SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC**

Overview

On March 11-12, 2009 the Roundtable on Sustainable Biofuels, in collaboration with the Inter-American Development Bank, held a stakeholder outreach meeting in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, to review Version Zero of the draft Version Zero of the Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Biofuels Production, and the draft Scorecard developed by the IDB. The event began with the following guest speakers, plus representatives from the RSB and IDB:

Erick Felix, United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization examining the impact of biofuels on food security in Tanzania and Peru.

Gael Pressoir, CHIBAS Center, on agronomic requirements for *Jatropha Curcas* as a rural development energy crop.

Gary Mathieu from the Haitian Food Security Organization on the case of Haiti.

Doug Newman of the US International Trade Commission on trade policy, the CBI, and the Fuel Ethanol Quota

John Hessling of LACFIN on the cooperation between SECCI/IDB and private sector financing

(powerpoints of all presentations available on the Bioenergy Wiki).

After the presentations ended the group spent the afternoon of the first day reviewing the IDB scorecard, and offering comments on how to improve the tool. The second day of the event was dedicated entirely to the review of Version Zero of the RSB Principles and Criteria. Notes from meeting participants from the second day of the event are reported here.

Conclusions

In general, there was a lot of confusion in this meeting about how certification and voluntary standards work. Many participants had questions about how the value is absorbed in the value chain, and what is the roll of voluntary versus regulatory standards.

In regards to Principle 3 (GHG) one group reported that it will be impossible for many biofuels producers to measure their GHG emissions, and wondered if the RSB would provide a calculator or other tool. A group also mentioned the importance of the RSB identifying how the numerous methodologies for GHG calculations will be standardized. In regards to the preference to waste, it was noted that it is important to do GHG calculations based on what the

product was diverted from. There was a suggestion to include a list of crops that can be grown in certain areas, and their relative GHG profiles.

In regards to principle 5 (Labor Rights), there was a lot of discussion about the identification of vulnerable population groups, and the end to distinguish those groups in the language of the text. There was also significant discussion about the need to incorporate national laws into this particular principle.

While reviewing principle 6 (Food Security) one comment was that the principles seemed to address more rural than urban poor. The point was also made that it is not bad to have high agricultural prices, since that benefits rural agricultural populations. Because of the presence of a number of food security experts, there was a lot of discussion about the different forms of food insecurity, especially the difference between access and availability. The point was made that in some cases food security may decrease by planting energy crops, if that means that purchasing power increases. There was also a suggestion to incorporate the FAO's four pillars of food security into the RSB principle: Availability, Accessibility, Utilization and Stability. Finally, there was concern about the biofuels producer having the responsibility of assessing food security in the region of the project, as that would represent a conflict of interest. Food security should be assessed by an independent third party or government agency.

Reviewing principle 7 (Conservation of Biodiversity) it was noted there is a need for a reliable GIS tool that can help public, private and government sectors identify current land use in different countries. One group also asked if it might be possible to include offsets or ways to mitigate impacts on biodiversity. Also, there was a concern about unfair application of this principle – for instance in the example of the Brazilian Cerrado noted below. One other suggestion was that it would be useful to identify the type of agriculture potentially used in HCV areas, since some types of agriculture, such as conservation agriculture and small agricultural plots, have a much lower environmental impact. There was also a request for clear definitions of ecologic and conservation terms.

In the environmental principle related to soil (8), one participant noted that the RSB did not discuss the notion of degraded land that might be improved due to biofuels use. Another participant suggested changing the wording slightly regarding the term “soil health” and there was recognition of the reality of environmental impact of some kind from any agricultural activity. In the principle on water (9) it was noted that sub-surface water was not adequately addressed. Also, it was stressed that in regards to water, local conditions will always be of fundamental importance. For instance, the level of protection needed in an area will vary greatly depending on the availability of water in that region. It was also noted that language about water flow appeared to be absent, as was a plan to address the need for greater water needs due to growth in the future. Finally, it was noted that the principle calls for not depleting groundwater, however often times the amount of water available in aquifers and their recharge rates are not known in the developing world.

In regards to principle 11 (Economic efficiency), it was noted that although the desire to remove subsidies was noble, it was also unlikely to happen. In fact, it was noted that many biofuels benefit from incentive laws for renewable energy, and that appears to be contradictory to this principle. It was also recognized that often times some subsidies are important and useful, especially when they are needed to get an industry going, and these good subsidies should not be discarded. It was noted that energy balance took a very ancillary place in the RSB principles, and a suggestion was made to place greater emphasis on it. Finally, in regards to the use of GMO crops, the main issue raised by meeting participants was in regards to seed property issues, rather than environmental risks.

On the final principle (Land Rights) there was significant confusion about the purpose of the principle and the appropriateness for this to be addressed by the RSB. It was noted that in determining land values both market and non-market values should be included. Finally, one group noted that according to the RSB principles the biofuels producer would identify how to resolve land disputes as part of its ESIA, however this represents a conflict of interest, and land disputes should rather be address by the relevant local or national authorities.

OVERALL OBSERVATIONS/COMMENTS ON VERSION ZERO

- There is a strong **encouragement to find a way to keep the certification processes as simple as possible**, such that the fuel meets the objectives of the standard, but without implying a large extra charge to small producers.
- One group **questioned how this seal will enter into the market** and what incentives it will have through the market and financial entities.
- This is a preliminary general guide, but does not focus on case-by-case examples. It might be useful to have some case studies/examples.
- It would be good for the RSB to **identify the roll of the state and of the individual producer, and to clarify who plays what roll** in assuring sustainable biofuels production.
- The concept of “local” – to be able to better interpret the standard in the local context terms of reference are required focused on the local context. A “benchmark key.”
- It would be good to **describe the types of trade offs that are inherent in sustainable biofuels** in the preamble.
- There needs to be more focus on catering the standard to different scales of projects.
- It will be **important for the RSB to make reference to and adapt itself to the laws of individual countries** with respect to environmental regulation.
- Suggestion from one group that it might be useful for the RSB to attend the OAS Summit of the Americas meeting in Trinidad.
- One group felt that the **notion of energy balance was not adequately addressed in the principles**. It seemed to only be addressed as part of Criterion 11e, but the group felt that perhaps this should be a fundamental part of the RSB principles, and even deserve its own principle. A suggestion was made for the RSB to have a minimum energy balance of a 3:1 ratio, and if a particular project could not meet that it would not be eligible for certification.

- This standard seems to be very consumer oriented – everything is weighted to the benefit of the consumer, with a lack of provisions for farmers overall (ie. focuses mostly on minimizing the risks for biofuels impacts, and doesn't give enough weight to the need to develop energy security, and develop opportunities for farms. In the preamble there should be wording that promotes developing the biofuels sector and pulls in farmers better.)
- On page 5 of the document in Spanish the document identifies itself as a “Norma Para Biocombustibles Sostenibles” however one group noted that these are principles, not norms, and should not be identified as such at the top of this page.
- The production of biofuels should not diminish the sovereignty (political and economic) of the country.
- The RSB should promote societal inclusion in biofuels projects – partners in cooperation.

GENERAL QUESTIONS

- The RSB needs to clearly identify who will be the end user of the seal? It is one thing if it is a producer, or if it is a government, or if it is an institution that gives financial support, or for groups that certify, etc... It is important that the RSB be clear about this from the beginning, not in the midst of the language within the document.
- A group wondered how the certification will work in the chain of commercialization. Where, and under what conditions, can an organization put the label “Sustainable Biofuel.” In the case of organic, 95% of the ingredients must be certified (comply with the norms). In the case of biofuels, will the vendor/distributor need to purchase 100% sustainable product?
- How will the RSB use this standard to protect small producers from differential treatment?

Principle 3: GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

GENERAL/PRINCIPLE

- Many times **the producer does not have the means to their measure GHG emissions.** Will there be a calculator developed that a producer can use?
- Suggestion to **remove the word “significantly”** as it is too subjective (multiple groups).
- Suggestion to **add “from the perspective of a life cycle analysis.”**
- Some worry was expressed about selecting the best methodology for implementation.
- It would be good for the RSB to include a direct link to the IEA projections, and show exactly how to use those numbers in the project's GHG analysis.
- The RSB needs **to identify whose job it is to standardize the methodology.**
- The key guidance on this principle states that the aim is to establish a methodology that can be written into standards – one group felt that was really the roll of a regulator standard, such as GBEP.

- One group noted that although the principle is good, the modeling and methodology is what is complex, and where there may be disagreements.
- In regards to **using wastes, the GHG benefit needs to account for where the product would have gone otherwise.**
- There was a question as to whether this principle was also being used as a proxy for measuring energy balance. Suggestion to split this into two: One – What is the energy balance of the value chain? Two - What is the land use, based on true GIS mapping, with different areas labeled as go or no-go?

CRITERIA

3a The use of a particular biofuel will be largely dependent on what is possible in a particular area. Be good for RSB to have an idea or a list of what crops can be grown in similar areas, so that you can compare those crops, and their relative GHG emissions. If you are going to compare emissions, it should be in comparison to the alternative crops appropriate to the region.

3b

- One group suggested that it might be useful for the RSB standard to incorporate car technology into the standards. For example, promoting the use of flex-fuel vehicles as in Brazil.
- If the LCA boundaries are the field and the car tank, it will be necessary to include all of the infrastructure.
- There is **worry about the difficulty in measuring indirect impacts** – belief that the RSB needs to promote the standardization of a global methodology. Recommendation to have a consultation among the actors in the sector to define the methodologies.

3c

- In calculating default values suggestion to include the contribution of renewable energy relative to the energy matrix in the specific country. (?)
- A suggestion to take into consideration the positive externalities that might be generated from the conservation of other resources.
- It is **not possible for the RSB to use one set defined default value. The value will need to account for different feedstocks and value chains.** It would be good to know what are the different production models that will be valued.

3e In regards to the second bullet point, one group pointed out that if this standard is for local producers, you cannot request that it favor international collaboration. Suggestion to eliminate the second bullet point.

Principle 4: HUMAN AND LABOUR RIGHTS

GENERAL/PRINCIPLE

- Add the word “all” to the principle. “...and the well-being of **all** workers.” For instance, in certain countries there have been times where certain populations were not included (e.g. Trinidad household workers have not traditionally been protected.)
- A **suggestion was made to specify “women, people with disabilities and other vulnerable groups”** in the key guidance.
- In the key guidance there is a reference to *pequeños productores cautivo*, however, this word does not translate well from the English. **Suggestion to use the phrase “a cuenta propia.”**

CRITERIA

4a There was confusion about the phrase regarding countries that “prohibit collective bargaining,” because this is not the spirit of the ILO norms. The group asked that the RSB verify if the norms developed by the ILO are mandatory in all countries.

4c

- Can the RSB clarify if neighboring family farm is included?
- A group suggested adding “paying attention to local regulations in the country” to the phrase about child labor.

4d

- After social benefits specify those groups that are vulnerable, for instance by adding “on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender, age or sexual preference.”
- One group felt that there is currently discrimination in the United States as salaries drop due to the world economic crisis.
- Suggestion to specifically include gender in criterion 4d.

Add criterion 4g that “There will not be any type of discrimination by gender, race, religion, etc...”

Principle 5: RURAL AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

GENERAL/PRINCIPLE

- Suggestion to add “in the area of influence of the project” to the end of principle 5.
- Question as to how “local” is defined.
- One group felt that to contribute to the development of “rural and indigenous people” was very demanding, and would limit some projects.
- One group suggested a review of the principle to ensure that those vulnerable populations that the RSB hopes to address are in fact being identified and protected. Some discussion on this point, for instance, how come there was no language here for vulnerable urban populations, though another point was made that urban populations aren’t precluded from protections. No consensus reached on this point.

CRITERIA

5a

- One group asked the RSB to define the indicators referred to by the phrase “measured improvements in the social and economic indicators” and indicate how they will be measured. The group pointed out that the economic indicators are much easier to identify and measure, and may be used as a proxy for the social indicators, which are much more vague and difficult to measure.
- One group felt that criterion 5a was overstepping the boundaries of the RSB and that “it is suicide to impose on biofuels the responsibility of the government.”
- Suggestion to replace the terms “guarantee” and “must” with terms such as “contribute” and “aspire” as the spirit of the criterion. The group also suggested adding that groups need only comply with community development “if there are benefits”
- Group suggests eliminating all of the text in the key guidance from “the following best practices...” onward.

5b

- Add to the text of the criterion so that it reads “special measures that benefit **and encourage the participation of** women, youth, ...” making this statement stronger and placing more emphasis on this language.
- The term indigenous might be interpreted very differently in different countries. The term “vulnerable populations” is better.
- The term “large producers” needs to be defined clearly.

Principle 6: FOOD SECURITY

GENERAL/PRINCIPLES

- Who are we trying to protect? Farmers, urban poor? There is a trade off between wanted to get greater value for the farmers and rural poor? Rising food prices is not always a bad thing. Many environmental groups complained about low agricultural prices in the past, and now these same groups are complaining about high agricultural prices.
- Example case studies on Land Use: In DR – until sugar ethanol quota filled, no land can be used for energy that can be used for food. In Guyana, only new land used for energy projects.
- In principle 6 there was a suggestion to modify the language by adding “biofuels **feedstock** production should not impair food security.”
- Regarding those factors that impact food security, the group discussed that some projects that improve rural development will indirectly help with food security because people will have more money to purchase food. For that reason the group felt it would be good to reference the principle on rural development in Principle 6.
- Discussion as to why wastes are given special preference within these principles? Perhaps there are other possibilities of ways to do biofuels projects that also do not impact food security (e.g. improving yields, finding co-products, multiple uses, etc).

- Governments may have some of the analysis done by the world food program. Perhaps the RSB should look at how the WFP does the assessments and whether they do periodic monitoring of food security to help with assessments. Link to WFP?
- This principle caused a bit of confusion – if a farmer decides to grow soy for a couple of years, the group felt that it was not fair for biofuels policy to punish that farmer for using the land as he or she felt was appropriate, when food security is a more general problem. Discussion of cause and effect – it does not make any sense to fault biofuels for food insecurity problems. In terms of the design of the idea of the point it presents biofuels as a problem for food security, and this is not the problem. The RSB should start by defining food security first. For example – using yellow corn for human consumption, and to use dried distiller’s grain (DDG) as an animal food is not the same thing. The group posed the dilemma between food and fuel, as one that should be examined by country, and that biofuels should not be seen as necessarily threatening food security. The way 6.b is written it distorts a true analysis of food security. An example was given of a poor region that would get very low yield if a farmer were to grow a food crop, but a higher yield if an energy crop were grown. In this case, food security might be better improved by planting the energy crop that will generate greater income, than the food crop that will have poor yield. The point is to show that the conditions will vary greatly by region and for that reason it is very difficult for one standard to address all of the regional circumstances. Group posed the option of establishing Terms of Reference that can put the standard into a local context.
- This is a regional problem - food security in the European Union is very different from food security issues faced in Haiti.
- The biggest barrier to food security on the island of Hispaniola is lack of access to credit, which prevents the cultivation of land. There is land available, but no credit available, so not enough food is grown.
- Suggestion to replace the principle on food security with the four pillars of food security as established by the FAO: Availability, Accessibility, Utilization and Stability.

CRITERIA

6a

- Does this criterion address local food security impacts only, or does it also address international food security issues? If the criterion only addresses local impacts, some unintended biofuels crops might qualify. For example, would this mean that corn ethanol could qualify despite its potential macro impact on food insecurity?
- RSB appears to identify two different aspects of food security that need to be addressed: access and availability.
Availability = agricultural sector, production, improving yields, etc...
Access = Income, distribution. It is available and you have the money to buy it.
It is important that a particular biofuels project address the type of food insecurity prevalent in a particular area.

- There are many crops, like soybeans, that are multi-purpose (food and fuel). Could just **add “multi-purpose crops” to the list of crops that receive particular preference in 6a.**

6b The language about biofuels producers not impacting staple crops might give the impression that biofuels producers also grow agricultural crops. However, since biofuels producers may not actually grow the crops at all, in order to meet this principle the RSB would need to ensure they cannot **purchase** crops that endanger food security.

6b The RSB criterion calls on the individual producer to assess local food security, when in fact that would lead to a conflict of interest. It would be much better to have an independent third party or government agency assess local food security.

Add 6c Production systems that include the use of small farmers would help improve the food security of small farmers, by raising incomes.

Principle 7: CONSERVATION OF BIODIVERSITY

GENERAL

- It is important to begin the analysis from the viewpoint that humans have already destroyed many ecosystems. Important not to blame biofuels for all of the negative impacts.
- One group noted that it would be incredibly valuable to have a global GIS tool that can concretely evaluate land biodiversity. Perhaps this could be provided to, and evaluated by, local government GIS agencies.
- Note - FAO excludes certain areas (e.g. forested areas, HCV, etc...) during their mapping of suitability of biofuels production locations (such that it will not impact food production.) Perhaps these same areas might apply to GHG reductions?
- One group wondered – If we are going to impact species diversity by initiating biofuels projects in threatened areas, how can a project mitigate or offset its impact? It would be good for the RSB to identify what “tools” a project has.
- There was a feeling that in some cases this principle may be unfairly applied. For instance, the Brazilian Cerrado is very diverse, and also rich soils and very large biofuels potential. In many ways it is similar to the great plains of the United States, which were cultivated years ago and now are very productive to the United States. It might be seen as unfair then, to now prohibit Brazil from cultivating their high potential region. No consensus on the issue, although one suggestion was that perhaps the IPCC could compensate Brazil monetarily for not impacting the Cerrado.
- One group felt that there was some contradiction between the key guidance in principle 7, that allows for exploitation of HCV areas if conservation values are left intact, and criterion 7a, which states that HCV areas must be conserved. Clarification needed.

- There was a question as to whether it is appropriate for the producer to also play the roll of the conserver of the same territory.
- Definition and explanation of IBAT is needed.
- One participant suggested the concentration of ecosystem services and biodiversity and protecting it in “National Parks.”
- No mention of the type of agriculture practiced. This is important because certain types of agricultural – conservation agriculture and small producers for instance – would have a much lower impact on a HCV area.

CRITERIA

7a There is a very strong need for a global GIS tool, that has resolution at the local level. Ideally such a tool would have both, but cost will be a big issue. Perhaps the GIS tool should only be used as a screening tool, until a high level of local resolution can be achieved.

7b The last sentence of the key guidance reads: “locally defined.” Who will define these? They may not be defined by government, so who has the responsibility at the local level?

7c/7d The definition and size of the buffer zones and ecological corridors is difficult, but can be understood. One concept that is missing is ‘fragmentation of habitat’ – if you don’t have a large enough habitat area to maintain species/ecosystem diversity it can reach a point at which begins to deteriorate. Suggestion for the RSB to add language that biofuels should “seek to minimize fragmentation of habitat.”

7d A clear definition of “Ecological Corridors” is needed. There was a question as to whether the restoration of ecological corridors was within the scope of a biofuels project, no consensus reached on the issue. One group even suggested changing “protected **or** restored” to “protected **and** restored.”

Principle 8: SOIL

GENERAL/PRINCIPLE

- Suggestion to change the term “soil health” to “soil biophysical conditions” in the entire section.
- Nowhere in this principle is the concept of marginal or deteriorated land mentioned. Maybe describe the potential for biofuels to improve soil quality?
- One group suggested that it is going to be impossible to have any agricultural activity without some environmental impacts. Suggestion to change the word **avoid** with the word **minimize**.

CRITERIA

8b

- In the key guidance of the Spanish version the “)” needs to be closed after “etc.”
- Suggestion to change the wording of the key guidance to read “in order to enhance soil physical health **preferably** on a watershed scale.” The reason to add preferably is that some watersheds can be very large, and it may not be practical to operate at that level.

Principle 9: WATER

GENERAL

- Definition needed of “minimize.”
- Clarify that this principle is not solely intended to address surface water, but also underground water sources.
- For this principle, the local conditions are always going to be of fundamental importance. The level of protections necessary are going to vary greatly if we are areas that have stressed/over-taxed water supply versus areas that have lots of available water.
- Add text that the project will “use technology that optimizes the use and the conservation of water.
- It appears that this principle only addresses agricultural uses, not water use during processing/conversion. This should be included.
- If possible and practical, biofuels producers should attempt to enhance water availability to the local community (encourage proactive and positive behavior.)

CRITERIA

9c

- Nothing about conserving water flow – suggestion to add language that the project will conserve the ecologic flow.
- It is important to plan for potential increases in water use, both from the community and the project, so that communities are not impacted in the future. Or does 9b (water management plan) address this?
- How do you handle the underground water recharge rates? The criterion calls for not depleting groundwater resources, but in many places in the developing world the science to know the recharge rates for water resources does not exist. In some places the total underground water resources are not known.
- Suggestion to add “Where irrigation infrastructure is to be developed, the most efficient technology possible in the country should be sought.”

Principle 10: AIR

GENERAL

- Question in the Spanish if “al minimo” is intended to translate to benchmark? Check translation? Also see principle 9.

CRITERIA

10b Suggestion to add a phrase that burning in “open fields” will also be avoided.

Principle 11: ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY, TECHNOLOGY, AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

GENERAL

11a

- Seems ridiculous... if the USA and EU were to remove subsidies it would be great, but it is clear that is not going to happen.
- In some countries (including in the Dominican Republic) there are laws that offer incentives to develop renewable energies (and biofuels) – this is contradictory to the principle.
- Add “where subsidies are required to help develop projects, the subsidies should not distort the market place or disadvantage communities or consumers, etc...” Note – “Good subsidies” should be available for those that truly need them. At times, “priming the pump may be necessary” (temporary subsidies to get an industry going).
- Add “and social stability.”

11b

- Improvement of **energy balance is only addressed as a sub-point, but may be the single most important** criteria. Energy balance should become a stand-alone principle.
- Suggestion to change wording from *productivity per hectare* to *productivity per input*.
- Energy balance is not comparable between countries and should be rethought.
- Continuous improvement forever? Suggestion to add “until optimal conditions are reached.”

11c The group felt that the key guidance in 11c was better written than the language in the criteria itself. The emphasis should be on the importance of those potentially impacted by a project understanding the risks of that project.

11e A big issue with GMO is the way that some companies have come to own the genes/seeds, and force farmers to sign a contract. Group had a long discussion as to whether the intellectual property issues should be addressed by the RSB. Some felt yes, others felt not

the role of the RSB. No consensus, however group expressed greater concern with the social impacts of GMO crops than the environmental risks posed.

The last sentence is very poorly phrased. An expert in the group clarified that it would be difficult and/or impossible to prevent gene migration, and might even present legal problems. Risks associated with gene flow is species and gene dependent. Question as to what risks does the RSB hope to mitigate? Perhaps address those risks specifically.

Principle 12: Land Rights

GENERAL

- It is very important that experts review the legal revisions to use the correct precise words.
- It is important to watch out for large companies that purchase a third of a country

CRITERIA

12a

- This language is confusing and needs clarification. Different members of the group had completely distinct interpretations of this principle, and that it perhaps appears to say that the local communities cannot legitimately contest land rights.
- Suggestion was made: Put a period after “defined and established.” Change last sentence to: “Lands that are in contest by local communities will not be used.”
- Group felt that 12a did not make sense. Pancho Villa analogy – that it does not make any sense for to go to the authorities to ask for permission to plant something, when every country has its own norms. Suggestion to eliminate the key guidance under criterion 12a.

12b In regards to compensation value: Who is going to figure out the compensation value? The **compensation should take into consideration the market value, and also the non-market value of the land (the services that the land provides to the community.)** Group discussed the example of Sierra Leone, which has published national land valuations based on agricultural value, which might serve as a baseline valuation for the land.

12c This criterion states that the ESIA shall identify mechanisms to resolve land disputes, however since the ESIA is developed by the biofuels project, it will be biased in how it suggests resolving land disputes. The group **suggests that the RSB delete the reference to the ESIA because relevant local or national authorities should be the ones that resolve such a dispute.**

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Last Name	First Name	Organization
Abreu	Federique	IICA Institute of applied science and Technology
Croal	Collin	Biiogasoil Dom. s.a
Da Silva	Debrair	Ecofuel
Grilló	Ignacio	Los Sitios Grupos
Martin	Fernando	Caricom Secretariat
Waterman	Leighton	Embajada USA
Witney	Thomas	
Acuña		
Chinchilla	Alonso	IICA
Bart-		
Alexander	Karen	Network of NGO ´S
Bisonó Pérez	Sixto	Biogasoil Dominicana, SA
Bros	Omar	CTD
Calixte	Aldrin	Haiti Survie
Cheaz	Juan	Oxfam
Felix	Erika	FAO
Fuentes	Homero	Coverco IUCN-ORMA, International Union for Conservation of Nature, Regional Office for Mesoamerica
Garcés	Gabriela	IDB
Sánchez	Esther	Universidad de San Carlos
Garcia	Erick	
Gonzalez	George	
Hessling	John	Lacfin
Japa	Juan A	Coopcaña
Japa T	Juan R	Coopcaña
Javier	Ramón	Jatropha del Caribe
Judge	Timothy	Masada Resource Group, LLC
Lecorps	Arlan	Marndr Coordination Nationale pour la Sécurité Alimentaire (CNSA)
Mathieu	Gary	
Meerganz Von		
Medeazza	Gregor	IDB
Molina	Carlos	IDB
Newman	Douglas	US Comission on International Trade
Nurse	Leonard	Cermes, uwi
Pressoir	Gael	Fondation Chibas Ministerio de Agricultura, Recursos Naturales Y Desarrollo Rural
Prophete	Emmanuel	
Puigbo	Juan	Jatropha del Caribe
Reginald	Noel	Biocarburants D'Haitis, s.a
Robbins	Kathleen	Green Microfinance
Rudolf	Matt	Roundtable on Sustainable Biofuels Servicio Holandés de Cooperación al Desarrollo – SNV
Sosa	Bella	
Soto Muñoz	Gabriela	Catie
Suarez	Carlos	Embajada USA

Sued Vega Champentier Ximenez de Rivera Zapata	Dalia Orlando Martha Rafael	Oxfam Inter - American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture Fundacion Solar R.J. Zapata & Asocs
---	--------------------------------------	---