

**Minutes of the Second Meeting of the Management Board (TBM2) of the
Orange House Trust Fund Foundation held on 21 April 2011 from 12:00 – 15:30 at
Rond Point Schumann 9, Brussels, Belgium**

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

1. The Chair, Herman Koëter (HK), opened the meeting and welcomed the Management Board (MB) members present: Dr Ezzeddine Boutrif (EB), retired Director, Nutrition & Consumer Protection Division, FAO; Prof Dr Coenraad Hendriksen (CH) of the University of Utrecht and the Netherlands Vaccine Institute, Bilthoven, The Netherlands and Prof Dr Horst Spielmann (HS) of the Free University of Berlin, Berlin, Germany. Unfortunately, the 2 remaining members of the Board: Ms Kalimi Mworio, Director, International Cooperation and Assistance, OPCW and Prof Dr Vittorio Silano, Chairman of the Scientific Committee of EFSA, sent their apologies for being unable to participate for health related reasons.
2. As this was the first MB meeting EB attended a brief introductory round was made. In his introduction EB mentioned among other things the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) as an organisation with similar objectives to Orange House. He suggested that it would be worthwhile to make contact with this organisation. **[Action Point 2.1]**
3. The Meeting adopted the draft Agenda without changes.

**Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the Minutes of the First Meeting of the Management Board
of the Orange House Trust Fund Foundation
[TFF/MB/MIN(2010)1; TFF/MB(2011)4]**

4. The Chair asked for comments on the draft minutes of the 1st MB meeting. Although there were no comments on the text as such, a number of comments were made with reference to the minutes:
 - a. With reference to paragraph 3 the meeting took note of document TFF/MB(2011)4 which provides further clarification about personal and joint legal liability and concluded that personal liability could not be excluded. Therefore, the MB further agreed that the Managing Director should explore insurance options that cover such liability and present a proposal for adequate insurance at the next meeting **[Action Point 2.2]**.
 - b. Related to this issue Members of the Board inquired how liability was addressed of experts involved in field projects. HK informed the meeting that routinely experts are all requested to arrange for personal insurances for medical care, accidents and liability to third parties. Incurred expenses related to such insurance(s) are all reimbursed. The MB agreed that the personal liability of experts on duty should be clearly explained to and agreed by experts prior to the mission **[Action Point 2.3]**.
 - c. Making reference to paragraphs 8a and 9, EB inquired whether criteria for priority setting are already available. HK informed the MB that criteria have to be developed but that so far all requests for assistance have been honoured, provided these requests were made in writing from a public entity (Ministry, agency, university). The Meeting agreed that criteria should address aspects related to both the recipient (need, impact) and the project itself (scientific rigour, manageability, efficiency, input/output, value for money). The Secretariat suggested to add this item to the agenda of the next meeting and prepare a document on the issue **[Action Point 2.4]**.

5. The meeting adopted the minutes without changes other than deletion of names as suggested in yellow marking by the Secretariat. The public version will be published on the web as soon as possible.

**Agenda Item 3 and 4: Minutes of the 5th, 6th and 7th meetings of the OHP Management Board
[MB/M/MIN(2010)3; MB/M/MIN(2010)4; MB/M/MIN(2011)1]**

6. The MB took note of the minutes of the 5th and 6th meeting of the OHP Management Board and did not need any further clarification. However, the meeting agreed that with 2 management boards there is a fair change of confusion which is referred to. However, repeating a full description all the time was not seen as very practicable. The Meeting agreed to use the following acronyms: TMB for the Trust Fund Management Board (T for trust) and PMB for the Partnership Management Board (P for partnership). Hence, reference to the 2nd meeting of the Management Board of the Orange House Trust Fund Foundation would be TMBM2. The Meeting requested HS and HK, who are members of both Boards to convey the message to the PMB **[Action Point 2.5]**.
7. The Chair asked HS to explain the highlights of the PMBM7, which was held in Washington DC and was the first meeting of Michael Blackwell, the new member of that Board. HS explained that the discussion summarized in paragraph 4 on the OHP's business model was quite interesting and timely. This discussion was linked to the other highlights: the discussion of projects, in particular the loss of the Abu Dhabi tender, the Cuba congress and the Food Labelling project and, ultimately the discussion on fund raising. EB expressed his regret for not being aware of the Abu Dhabi tender as he has very good contacts at adequately high levels in Abu Dhabi which could have made a difference in the selection outcome. HK mentioned that he had received signals that Qatar may be interested in a similar project as they will organise the next or after-next World Soccer Championship. EB, who has also very good contacts in Qatar will probe his contacts on this. He asked HK to send him the full tender submission so he could familiarise himself with the details of the offer OHP had made **[Action Point 2.6]**.
8. With respect to the fund raising discussion EB inquired whether OHP is in contact with the Industry Council for Development (ICD) as this organisation might be interested in our work. HK responded that OHP is not in contact with the ICD. It was suggested to contact ICD and seek cooperation/funding **[Action Point 2.7]**.

**Agenda Item 5: Draft Code of Conduct
[TFF/MB/M(2011)1]**

9. The Chair briefly introduced the Code of Conduct. EB informed the Meeting that he was unable to open some of the meeting documents among which was this CoC. HK explained that the CoC is essentially the same as the one adopted by the PMB in 2009 but adapted to the TMB. The Board adopted the CoC and all signed the Code on the signature page (Annex 1).

**Agenda Item 6: CV template and Declaration of Interest (DOI) Form
[OHP CV template; TFF/MB/M(2011)1, ANNEX 2]**

10. The Chair explained that the DOI (annex 2 of the CoC document) is a slightly modified version of the DOI used until recently in OHP. In this revision it is more clearly indicated that 'interests' could be very positive and should be listed. In the revised form adequate space is added for this. In the second question those interests listed that may be or become a conflict should be mentioned. EB reminded the Meeting that he had no

chance to read the document. He and CH will send their signed DOI's to the Secretariat as soon as possible **[Action Point: 2.8]**.

**Agenda Item 7: Potential additional candidates for the TMB
[TFF/MB(2011)2]**

11. The candidates listed together with short biographies in document TFF/MB(2011)02 were all considered as valuable assets to the Board. Although he had made the suggestion, the Chair expressed some reservation with respect to the potential candidate from South Africa: her profile fits well with the needs of the TMB and her personality is very pleasant, but she is very hard to get hold of and is extremely busy already. It was also mentioned that the candidate suggested by the Chair of the PMB has recently left the Johns Hopkins University. The remaining candidates from India (suggested by CH) and the US (suggested by HK), respectively, were both considered as very useful extensions of the Board. However, since the two members of the Board who were unable to attend to this meeting, had not yet met the other members, the Board agreed to postpone any invitation until the current 6 members of the Board would have had the opportunity to get to know each other better and familiarise themselves with all details of the OHP work and mission. It was further agreed that all would consider potential candidates from Africa, Asia and/or South and Central America for future consideration **[Action Point: 2.9]**.

**Agenda Item 8: List of potential sponsor/donor organisations and other entities
[TFF/MB(2011)3]**

12. The Chair mentioned that the list provided was initially prepared for the PMB. He suggested that the 2 Boards would use the same list and add new potential sponsors and updates on contacts with (potential) sponsors on a regular basis. EB suggested to add the STDF (see paragraph 2) and the ICD (see paragraph 8) to the list. He further suggested GlobalGAP (a private sector body that sets standards for good agriculture practice) and referred to a US Programme set up to identify promising and bright people with leader capacity who are subsequently trained in the US. The Board discussed potential contacts and was aware that there are 2 types of contacts: (i) donors, providing gifts and funds to be used in accordance with our mission and (ii) sponsors, providing contributions to projects normally following applications for funding of project proposals. EB mentioned that there are also possibilities for OHP to work for FAO (to carry out or contribute to FAO projects). FAO's activities in Bangladesh could be such an example.
13. It was agreed that all should make an effort to identify potential donors/sponsors which will be added to the list **[action Point 2.10]**. Meanwhile EB and HK will work on an MOU between FAO and OHP which would facilitate mutual cooperation **[Action Point 2.11]**.

**Agenda Item 9: Update on current, scheduled and expected projects
[MB/M(2011)1/REV1]**

14. The MB took note of Annex 3 of the OHP Management Plan 2011. HK explained that many projects were already finished and highlighted project RT(2010)6 on page 2: "Harmonisation of food information". This project is now fully developed and ready to start. However, financial coverage is still an issue and more work is needed to obtain the necessary funding for the first year. Another project of interest is the cooperation with the university of Khartoum, Sudan. The PMB at its 7th meeting agreed on an MOU with the University of Khartoum thus committing OHP to provide an annual training of one week on food safety and food management issues. The Chair further mentioned that in the

future such a decision should not be made without the involvement and consent of the TMB.

15. Possible new projects may include: (i) EU Commission request to assist Belarus with the establishment of food safety and management policies (an RT project generating resources), (ii) the organisation and development of a chemical safety conference in South Africa for sub-Saharan countries, requested by the OPCW (an RT project which is likely to be budget-neutral), (iii) GHS training in South East Asia, requested by UNITAR (an RT project which may require some resources), (iv) advising the South Korean authorities on the set up of an environmental risk assessment laboratory that is fully in compliance with GLP (a small FT project generating resources), (v) assisting a South African food industry association with the validation of an analytical-chemical analysis approach for the detection of the use of approved food additives at levels well above those set in food standards (a small FT project, generating resources) and (vi) assisting Azerbaijan with the establishment of a food safety agency and training government officials in food risk assessment (a ZT project requiring full funding). Once more details are available of those requests which require OHP funding, these projects will be submitted to the TMB for its evaluation **[Action point 2.12]**.

Agenda Item 10: OHP Management Plan 2011
[MB/M(2011)1/REV1; MB/M(2011)1/REV1/ATT]

16. The Board took note of the Management Plan, the tariff scheme for 2011 and budget allocation. Taking into account the discussions of projects and finances in the context of other agenda items, the Board had no further comment.

Agenda Item 11: Acquisition efforts

17. This agenda item is strongly linked to agenda item 8. The Chair made reference to the discussion of this subject by the PMBM7 as described in paragraph 15 of the minutes of that meeting [see agenda item 4 above, document MB/M/MIM(2011)1] and suggested that the TMB could adopt a similar pro-active approach. The TMB agreed to be pro-active and to share all individual acquisition efforts with the Secretariat. **[Action Point 2.13]**.

Agenda Item 12: Any other business

18. Name cards: Name cards will be printed for all members of the TMB, following the template of the OHP name cards provided to the PMB members and senior experts. However, the Board agreed on the following modifications:

- a. Under the logo, the word 'Partnership' will be replaced by 'Trust Fund Foundation' with the subscript: ANBI, which stands for: non-profit foundation for public welfare (see the Bye Laws and CoC)
- b. The sentence below the logo will read: 'Offering assistance, advice and training to developing countries as a contribution to globally sustainable human and environmental food and chemical safety'.

All agreed to inform the Secretariat of the details they wish to see on the card in addition to their MB function (Chair, Secretary, Financial Officer, Member) such as titles, phone, fax, mobile and address details. **[Action point 2.14]**

19. The Website: The Meeting agreed that the website should be modified in a way to give more visibility to the Trust Fund Foundation, rather than sitting under one of several buttons on the home page. The Meeting agreed that such could be achieved by modifying the home page in such a way that one has to make a choice for either

Orange House Partnership or Orange House Trust Fund Foundation. HK will discuss this with the webmaster **[Action Point 2.15]**.

20. Next Meeting: The MB agreed to organise its 3rd meeting back-to-back with the PMBM8 in late September or October with a joint session and a joint dinner. The Secretariat will circulate a proposal for dates **[Action Point 2.16]**.

SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS:

Action Point 2.1: For HK to contact STDF and explore options for cooperation.

Action Point 2.2: The Managing Director will explore insurance options that cover personal liability of MB members and present a proposal for adequate coverage at the next meeting.

Action Point 2.3: HK will address personal liability of experts on duty in a letter of agreement to be confirmed prior to the mission(s) involved.

Action Point 2.4: HK will add the issue of project selection criteria to the agenda of the next meeting and prepare a document on the issue.

Action Point 2.5: HS and HK, who are members of both Boards, will inform the MB of OHP of the acronyms agreed by the MB of the OHTFF to be used for each Board.

Action Point 2.6: EB, who has very good contacts in Qatar will probe his contacts for the country's need for a food policy. HK will send him the full tender submission.

Action Point 2.7: HK in consultation with EB to contact ICD and seek cooperation/funding.

Action Point 2.8: EB and CH will send their signed DOI's to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

Action Point 2.9: All will consider potential candidates from Africa, Asia and/or South and Central America.

Action Point 2.10: All should make an effort to identify potential donors/sponsors which will be added to the list, once received by the Secretariat.

Action point 2.11: EB and HK will work on an MOU between FAO and OHP which would facilitate mutual cooperation.

Action Point 2.12: Once details are available of new requests for assistance which require OHP funding, these projects will be submitted by the Secretariat to the TMB for its evaluation.

Action Point 2.13: All agreed to be pro-active and share all individual acquisition efforts with the Secretariat.

Action Point 2.14: All agreed to inform the Secretariat of the details they wish to see on their name card in addition to their MB function (Chair, Secretary, Financial Officer, Member) such as titles, phone, fax, mobile and address details.

Action Point 2.15: HK will discuss with the webmaster modification of the OHP home page to accommodate a better visibility of the Trust Fund Foundation.

Action Point 2.16: The Secretariat will circulate a proposal for TMBM3 back to back with PMBM8 with a joint session and joint dinner.