

**Minutes of the Seventh Meeting of the Management Board (MBM7)
held on 25th March 2011 from 09:30 – 15:00 at the Johns Hopkins School of
Advanced International Studies (SAIS), 1717, Massachusetts Avenue NW,
Washington, DC, USA**

**Agenda Item 1: Opening of the meeting, adoption of the draft agenda
[Documents: MB/M/A(2011)1/REV1]**

1. The Chair (AG) opened the meeting and welcomed the Management Board (MB) members present: Alan Goldberg (AG), Herman Koëter (HK), Horst Spielmann (HS) and Michael Blackwell (MiB). He also mentioned that, unexpectedly, Kartika Liotard (KL) could not participate because of her required active participation in a session of the European Parliament on the same day. The meeting adopted the Agenda with 2 amendments: HS suggested that the Board should formally appoint MB as its 5th member. The meeting agreed that the date of Michael's written confirmation of acceptance of the Board's invitation (by email of 27 January 2011, copied to all members of the Board) should be considered as the formal date of his membership. AG suggested to inform the Board of the fund and awareness-raising meetings AG, HK and MiB had on the 24th March in Washington (during the lunch break). No other amendments or additions to the agenda were proposed.

**Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the minutes of the 6th MB meeting
[Documents: MB/M/MIN(2010)4].**

1

2. HK alerted the meeting of a typing error in the minutes: the document referred to in paragraph 9 should be ZT(2010)3, instead of ZT(2010). Apart from this correction the minutes of the 6th MB meeting were adopted without changes. The Chair reminded HK to ensure that before publishing the adopted minutes on the website, all names and descriptions which could lead to the identification of the persons mentioned, should be deleted, unless the person involved agrees having his name mentioned. **[Action Point 7.1].**

3. Subsequently, the Chair addressed the 17 action points:

- i. Action Point 6.1, 6.2, 6.4, 6.6, 6.8, 6.11, 6.14, 6.15, 6.17: done.
- ii. Action Point 6.3: HK mentioned that, again, he had not had the opportunity to work on this document. **[Action Point 7.2]**
- iii. Action points 6.5: Members confirmed that some action was taken but none of this resulted in a noticeable influx of new expert volunteers.
- iv. Action Point 6.7: no action was taken so far but HK will contact this individual to find out why he is so critical with respect to the OHP website. **[Action Point 7.3].**
- v. Action Point 6.9: AG could not remember what this was; it was decided to delete this item.
- vi. Action Point 6.10: These calculations were made and addressed under agenda item 5.
- vii. Action Point 6.12: HK has not yet received a response to his letter of invitation sent to the one candidate left from the previously agreed list and will follow up shortly **[Action Point 7.4].**
- viii. Action Point 6.13: the Secretariat has not received any suggestion so far. This issue was addressed under agenda item 8.
- ix. Action point 6.16: the Secretariat has not received any information from MB members on possible actions taken. This was addressed under agenda item 6.

Agenda Item 3: Update on ongoing or finished projects

[Documents: PRS/RT(2011)1/1; Draft MOU; M/A/ZT(2010)3/1; M/A/ZT(2010)3/2; M/A/RT(2010)8/1/REV1].

4. The Chair asked HK to report on the ongoing and finished projects since the previous MB meeting. HK referred to document MB/M(2011)1 that provides (in Annex 3) an overview of all projects from the start of OHP until today, ordered by zero-tariff (ZT), reduced tariff (RT) and full tariff (FT) projects. Before addressing the various projects a broader discussion developed on the 'operational level' of OHP and the need for a business model: MiB suggested that fees charged should comprise (i) actual expenses, (ii) overhead and (iii) reserves, the latter two being indirect operational costs which could be as high as 45%. HK expressed concern about the credibility of a charity organization with 45% overhead as this would be seen easily as an unacceptable rake-off. AG explained that the MB had agreed earlier on a business model that is based on building up a financial buffer capacity of about twice the annual running costs of the organisation and directing all additional financial resources into the OH Trust Fund. HK indicated that building up the capital sum of 2 years running costs could not be the only objective for the years to come: spending the greater part of all income on projects in developing countries would not only be in line with OH mission but would also build trust and credibility in the organisation: a track record of achievements seems at least equally important. For this reason HK had also decided not to cash yet his monthly remuneration, the agreement of which came into force 1st January 2010, but to keep this as an entitlement until the financial situation would allow these expenditures to be made without jeopardising the work in developing countries. HS added that we should at least start by making a budget estimate for each project, both those which bring in money and those which cost money. It was agreed that at a next MB meeting we should schedule adequate time to continue this very important discussion.

5. ZT(2010)1: Sponsoring the Pharmacology Havana 2010 Congress in December 2010. The congress was sponsored by a donation of €1000 and by waving the expense claim of HK who gave 2 presentations (on OHP and 'The use of Animals in Regulatory Risk Assessment', respectively). The MB had agreed earlier that a modest sponsoring was appropriate because of its capacity-building objective and because it would be a good opportunity for OHP to raise awareness of its mission and objectives. HK reported that the congress was less successful than expected: poor organisation, too much improvisation, too many presentations cancelled or replaced, time schedules and meeting room assignments that were changed at the last minute. Moreover, despite a clear agreement, the OHP logo was not printed anywhere on the congress material (in fact, none of the non-Cuban sponsors were mentioned in the congress material as a result of a so-called 'miscommunication'). The MB considered this a lesson learned and future requests for sponsoring will be considered with substantially more care.

6. RT(2011)1: Cooperation with the University of Khartoum, Sudan. Upon invitation HK participated in an international conference on health sciences organised by the University of Khartoum in February 2011 [see, PRS/RT(2011)1/1]. In the margins of the conference several discussions took place with representatives of the university to discuss further cooperation and follow-up to the training given on food safety in November last year. In anticipation of these discussions HK had prepared a draft MOU committing OHP to an annual training workshop. The MB was requested to consider the draft MOU and approve commitment to an annual training. Comments on the draft MOU were limited to a modification of paragraph 5 (to insert "human and other" resources in addition to "financial" resources). The MB agreed in principle to establish formal cooperation with the Khartoum University provided that the availability of financial resources are a condition '*sine qua non*'.

7. ZT(2010)3: Food safety seminars in Durban and Pretoria, South Africa. As part of a bigger mission [see project RT(2010)8 below] OHP gave a seminar in Durban on 9 March 2010

[see document M/A/ZT(2010)3/1 for the programme] and a second one in Pretoria on 16 March [see document M/A/ZT(2010)3/2 for the programme]. Whereas at the seminar of 9 March next to HK Iona Pratt (OHP expert volunteer) contributed an equal share to the programme, the seminar of 16 March was largely covered by HK covering 4 out of the 5 subjects. However he was assisted by Linda Jackson of the Food Safety Network of South Africa. She is an excellent microbiological risk assessor/ manager and a very eloquent speaker. Costs of hotel and meals were offered by the South African Association for Food Science and Technology (SAAFoST). On 17 March HK gave an additional 2 lectures at another SAAFoST Seminar in Johannesburg (see: <http://www.saafoست.org.za/Events/other/2011/Mar17/index.asp> for further details). Again transport, hotel and other small expenses were covered by SAAFoST.

8. RT(2010)8: GHS training in Durban and Pretoria, South Africa: At the request of the South Africa Ministries of Environment and Labour, respectively, and of the Responsible Packaging Management Association for Southern Africa (RPMASA), OHP developed a two day practical training and capacity building workshop on the Globally Harmonised System for Classification and Labelling of Chemicals and Chemical Mixtures (GHS). In line with the MOU between OHP and UNITAR, the latter organisation participated and assisted in the work. The training workshop was given twice: on 10-11 March in Durban and on 14-15 March in Pretoria, South Africa. In total 5 OHP Expert Volunteers from Europe, New Zealand and Uruguay were involved as trainers. Both workshops were attended by approximately 70 attendants largely from the public sector with some participation from the private sector. The organisation paid for hotel expenses, meeting venues and several meals. From the completed training evaluation questionnaires (50-75% of the trainees completed the forms) it appeared that the overall level of appreciation was 4.02 on a scale from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) in Durban and 4.23 in Pretoria, respectively, which are both rather high scores. Although South Africa is committed to implement the GHS in all sectors (transport, supply and use) in 2011-2012 knowledge and understanding at higher government level is fairly limited. The government decision (Ministry of Environment) to apply the GHS also for waste management was (rightly so) criticized by the technical staff at governmental level who are charged with the compliance monitoring of the GHS. OHP was requested by the Ministry of Environment to draft a note on the pro's and con's of applying the GHS to waste management. HK will share this note with the MB for information **[Action Point 7.5]**

9. RT(2010)1: EU-China Trade Project 2 (EUCTP2): This very big project is carried by three parties: CARDNO (see: <http://www.cardno.com/EmergingMarkets/default.aspx>), Development Solutions (see: <http://www.development-solutions.eu/> and OHP (www.orangeOhouse.eu) The project is expected to start before Summer 2011 and will run for at least 4 years. The part OHP will be covering is food safety risk assessment and management. OHP has agreed to commit between 160-200 man days per year to the project which is expected to result in the donation of 65-80 K€/year by the voluntary experts involved. Discussions about the Plan of Activities, including input, output and impact criteria will start in April/May.

Agenda Item 4: Project RT(2010)9: the Abu Dhabi Proposal
[Documents: Project Proposal, Project Clarification, Project Amendments]

10. The Chair requested HK to provide an analysis of the process and eventual loss of the project to the other remaining competitor. *[The next 2 paragraphs will be shortened and less specific for the web version of the minutes]* HK explained that it all started in September 2010 with the informal suggestion of a close acquaintance of his, working as an expert at the Abu Dhabi Food Control Agency, that OHP should make a bid on a tender for assistance with the development and implementation of a national agriculture and food policy, covering all aspects of the food chain and specifically tailored to the needs of the Emirate. The tender had been published twice before but bidders were all considered not up to the task. Next, as

part of a prerequisite, OHP established a joint venture with an organisation registered at the Chamber of Commerce in Abu Dhabi. Four of OHP's most senior and high profile experts put our bid together which was submitted in October 2010. In November OHP was informed that we were shortlisted; this message was accompanied by a series of clarifying questions to which a response was submitted in mid November. Late December OHP was invited to come to Abu Dhabi in early January to present and explain its proposal as one of the two finalists. Sensitive issues were: (i) the time needed, (ii) the (lack of) physical presence of the OHP experts in Abu Dhabi and (iii) the training of staff during the project (which was not part of the tender). Overnight, a final proposal was put together and submitted the next day. In February the message was received saying: "OHP is no longer in serious contention for award due to financial aspects even though your company was technically shortlisted".

11. The Chair asked for an estimate of time invested and financial costs: HK responded that the total expenses amounted to €7,732 [see also document MB/M(2011)3] excluding bank transfer and currency exchange costs (for tender security transfer) and that all 4 experts together had spent approximately 45-50 man days on the project. The meeting further wondered if chances of winning the bid would have been higher if more experts would have been involved. HK responded that more experts would have made it far more difficult to arrive at a coherent set of policies and that competing against the 6 weeks as apparently offered by the competitor without any doubt means that they consider a totally different product. From the onset the OHP experts made it clear that they would not want to compromise on quality as this could damage their currently very high reputational status. The MB would appreciate to receive a copy of the presentation made in Abu Dhabi **[Action Point 7.6]**.

Agenda Item 5: Project RT(2010)6: Food Communication Project
[Documents: D/RT(2010)6/2/REV3; D/RT(2010)6/3; D/RT(2010)6/4

12. The Chair asked HK to introduce the various documents and explain the progress of the project. HK explained that document D/RT(2010)6/2/REV3 is the final project description, taking into account suggestions, comments and concerns expressed during the various meetings with stakeholders. Document D/RT(2010)6/3 is basically a list of project building blocks and an action plan, together with a time table of milestones. Document D/RT(2010)6/4 is the budget estimation for OHP as one of the three participating parties. HK further explained that the one contentious issue is the overall costs of the project, which, for OHP alone was estimated to amount to €400,000 for the first year. The other parties estimated €250,000 and €100,000 respectively which results in a total of €750,000 excluding expenses (meetings, travel expenses, etc. totalling another €80,000 - €100,000). In addition to these amounts which together seem unacceptable for sponsors, the enthusiasm of the major food producers has decreased now it becomes obvious that the EU legislation for food label requirements will be watered done substantially.

13. The Board suggested to reduce the work package for the first year rather than try to fit all work into too small a budget. This was earlier suggested by HK to the others but one party in particular was not keen on this approach. HK will speak again with all parties and push for a reduced work package. The main reason why costs are adding up quickly is the merger of the originally 2 projects (on food information to consumers and addressing ethical/fair elements, respectively). There is generally a lack of understanding of the forest of existing ethical claims in the world and, in particular, how well or how poor these claims are based on criteria that are quantifiable and allow for compliance monitoring. It was suggested that in particular the US members of the Board make an effort to explore if and which US based stakeholders would be interested to be frontrunners in the area of electronic food information provision to consumers. AG suggested the Diabetic Association and Weight Watchers. Other potentially interested parties include: PepsiCo, P&G and the retailers

Wegmans and Whole Foods. It was agreed that AG and MiB will jointly take action. **[Action Point 7.7].**

Agenda Item 6: Approval of the Draft Management Plan, Budget Allocation and Day-Tariff for 2011

[Documents: MB/M(2011)1/REV1 + Annex 2]

14. The Managing Board carefully reviewed the draft Management Plan and suggested to delete the 3rd paragraph on page 6 describing the project proposal for a food and agriculture policy development which OHP had not been awarded (see Agenda Item 4 above). The Board was reminded of the key priorities for 2011 (page 2 and 3): ensuring adequate financial resources to run the organisation and allow an adequate number of free services to developing countries in a manner that is most efficient. The MB approved the Management Plan with the minor changes suggested. The MB also approved the tariff to remain the same as applied in 2010. With respect to the budget for 2011 the Board approved the budget execution over 2010 and the projected budget for 2011. However, the Board was also aware that revenues in 2010 had been very limited (not yet €9,000) and that through fund raising and paid field projects in 2011 the total sum of at least €224,000 should be raised in order to remain viable and meet our mission. HK mentioned that the EUCTP2 project should require already in 2011 substantial human resources and, consequently, would provide a financial input (through charging for man days) of approximately €60,000 - €70,000.

15. Following a discussion about fund raising efforts, the MB agreed the following:

- a) All will make substantial fund raising and project acquisition efforts, making use of personal networks and contacts **[Action point 7.8]**. Most information and other relevant documents are available from the OHP website. In addition, HK will send the most recent update of the OHP slideshow to all members of the Board **[Action Point 7.9]**;
- b) All MB members will keep a log of their respective (or joint) fund raising and acquisition efforts including details such as dates, people met, etc. and HK will make an inventory of all such activities well ahead of the next MB meeting **[Action Point 7.10]**
- c) AG and MiB will consider options for starting a corporate sponsorship council approach, open to both the public and private sector and with an annual fee. Once a year a special meeting for such sponsors could be organised, bringing them up-to-date on the latest developments and projects **[Action Point 7.11]**
- d) A template for a formal letter of introduction should be made that could be used by all Board members in making the first contact with an entity which may be interested in supporting OHP; the Board agreed that HK should make the first draft of such a letter **[Action Point 7.12]**.

Agenda Item 7: Approval of the financial balance 2010

[MB/M(2011)2; [MB/M(2011)3]

16. The Chair asked HK to introduce the item. HK explained that document MB/M(2011)2, being the accountant's official financial balance for 2010 in the format and layout as required by the Belgian authorities is not yet available. The document will be ready by the end of April and forwarded, together with an explanatory note by HK, to all Members of the Board for their approval and to AG and HS for their approval and signature **[Action Point 7.13]**.

17. Document MB/M(2011)3 is the cumulative financial report from the start of OHP in May 2009 until 18 February 2011. It provides details of all expenditures and incomes for all projects, the Management Board and the Secretariat. Several members of the Board were of

the opinion that the level of detail provided was unnecessary detailed for a public document. HK indicated that he considers the details relevant for the Board and that for reasons of efficiency so far he had not prepared a summary version for the website. He also saw no harm in providing details. HS saw an issue the way the remuneration of the Managing Director was addressed as this could be wrongly interpreted, despite the clarifying footnote. It was not included in the balance of 2010 and may result in the perception of OHP being extremely efficient. The Board agreed on the compromise that this overview should no longer be accumulative but cover the current calendar year only, as of 2012. **[Action Point 7.14]**

Agenda Item 8: Management Board Functioning

18. The Chair remarked that most of this agenda item was already covered under items 3 and 6 of the agenda. The Meeting agreed that a further expansion of the Board would be preferable (see also Action Point 7.4). If that person is not available our search should be for 2 women in order to achieve a better gender balance (now 4 men/1 woman). The geographical preference is clearly for Africa and Eastern Asia and the individual profiles would preferably cover communication skills and experience and/or financial policies (not accounting). All MB members were requested to search for such individuals and submit names together with a short biosketch to the Secretariat who will compile them into a document for the next meeting **[Action Point 7.15]**. As agreed earlier in contacting potential candidates for availability, no promises should be made.

19. At the request of MiB, HK explained the essential differences and links between the MB of OHP and the MB of the OHTFF. Essentially the MB of the OHTFF has as its major tasks: (i) setting priorities for projects in developing countries, (ii) evaluate priority projects with respect to input, output, impact and efficiency, and (iii) fund raising for the Trust Fund. The MB of OHP is factually the executive body for the management of the OHP as an organisation, including the Secretariat, the website, and recruitment of experts, as well as all projects (paid and unpaid). The MB of OHP has also the task to raise funds and acquire paid projects to cover the expenses of the Secretariat and feed the Trust Fund.

6

Agenda Item 9: OHP website

20. The Meeting was informed of the latest update of the website with updated CVs and DOI's of the MB members as well as the 2 members of the Project Leadership Team. Unfortunately, the CV and DOI of KL have not yet been received **[Action Point 7.16]**. The MB expressed its appreciation and concluded that the website is very informative indeed. Next time it might be considered to add some photos to illustrate the subjects and make the website more lively.

Agenda Item 10: Short presentations of MB members on issues of interest to OHP

21. The Chair proposed to move this item to the next meeting because of lack of time **[Action Point 7.17]**.

Agenda Item 11: Any Other Business

22. HK asked MiB to provide him with the details he wish to appear on his OHP business cards. AG and HS indicated that they did not yet need new business cards **[Action Point 7.18]**.

23. AG suggested to arrange the next (8th) MB meeting (MBM8) in Brussels back-to-back with the third meeting of the MB of the Trust Fund Foundation (MBMTFF2), preferably in September or October 2011. AG offered to inform HK in the next couple of weeks about

dates which may allow him to travel on another budget than that of OHP. MiB may do the same. HK will check availability of the Members of the MBMTFF at their next meeting on 21st April in Brussels and communicate preferred dates to all as soon as possible **[Action Point 7.19]**.

24. The meeting adjourned at 15:00 without further discussions.

See next page for the list of action points

(it is suggested to print the Action List and keep it at hand)

Some notes on the introductory meetings at the World Bank, USDA and ILSI North America on 24 March.

AG, MiB and HK explained to HS that exploratory meetings took place the day before (24 March) with representatives of the World Bank, USDA and ILSI North America, respectively. The World Bank representatives were very interested in the work of OHP and that they frequently need the knowledge and expertise of external experts. OHP was advised to frequently check the UN Marketplace website for projects related to food and/or chemical safety. In particular Task Team Leaders (TTL) would be good contact points for offering OHP's services. OHP was requested to send an email with more details about OHP and particular the areas of expertise covered. This would then be shared with appropriate TTLs. Obviously follow up is needed.

At the USDA the OHP MB members were warmly welcomed by a number of project/programme representatives who all showed a great interest in the work of OHP. Contact details were shared with several of the staff present and this was followed by email exchanges. The USDA is very interested in working with OHP experts and we may be contacted for assistance in the future. For both the World Bank and the USDA it seems very important to strengthen contacts by frequent updates on activities.

The brief visit to ILSI North America was cordial but less forthcoming in terms of cooperation or joint projects. We were referred to the International Food Policy Research Initiative (IFPRI) as a possible link to cooperation.

SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS

Action Point 7.1: HK will publish the minutes of MBM6 on the website but without reference to individuals, as appropriate.

Action Point 7.2: HK will develop the first draft of the Rules and Regulations and to include the procedure for adherence to the Code of Conduct and the policy for documents to be confidential.

Action Point 7.3: AG received one highly critical comment on the OHP website; HK will follow-up with this person.

Action Point 7.4: HK will contact, again, the one candidate left over from the list of potential MB candidates.

Action point 7.5: HK will share this note on the pro's and con's of applying the GHS to waste management with the MB for information.

Action Point 7.6: HK will send the PDF file of the AD presentation to all members of the Board.

Action Point 7.7: AG and MiB will jointly make an effort to bring the food communication project to the attention of potential US based producers and retailers. HK will send a very short slide presentation on the subject complementing the documents presented at the MBM7.

Action Point 7.8: All MB Members will start making serious fund raising and project acquisition efforts making use of personal networks and contacts.

Action Point 7.9: HK will send the most recent update of the OHP slideshow to all members of the Board.

Action Point 7.10: MB members will keep a log of their respective (or joint) fund raising and acquisition efforts and HK will make an inventory of all such activities well ahead of the next MB meeting.

Action Point 7.11: AG and MiB will consider options for starting a corporate sponsorship council approach, open to both the public and private sector and with an annual fee.

Action Point 7.12: HK will make a proposal for a template of a formal letter of introduction that could be used by all Board members in making the first contact with an entity which may be interested in supporting OHP.

Action point 7.13: Document MB/M(2011)2 will be ready by the end of April and forwarded, together with an explanatory note by HK, to all Members of the Board for their approval and to AG and HS, in particular, for their approval and signature.

Action Point 7.14: The financial overview should no longer be accumulative from the start of OHP but cover the current calendar year only, starting in 2012.

Action Point 7.15: All MB members were requested to search for MB candidates and submit names together with a short biosketch to the Secretariat who will compile them into a document for the MBM8.

Action point 7.16: For KL to submit a recent CV in the OHP format and a completed DOI as soon as possible.

Action point 7.17: for HK to add agenda item 10 to the agenda of MBM8.

Action Point 7.18: MiB will send details to be put on his OHP name cards to HK.

Action Point 7.19: AG offered to inform HK in the weeks after the MBM7 about dates for MBM8 which may allow him to travel on another budget to Brussels than that of OHP. MiB may do the same. HK will check availability of the Members of the MBMTFF at their next meeting on 21st April in Brussels.