

Brief minutes of the 2nd Joint Meeting of the Management Boards of the Orange House Partnership (PMB) and the Orange House Trust Fund Foundation (TMB) held as conference call on 26 June 2012 from 15:00-16:10 (GMT+1)

Abbreviations used: AG= Alan Goldberg, CH= Coenraad Hendriksen, EB= Ezzeddine Boutrif, HK= Herman Koëter, HS= Horst Spielmann, KL= Kartika Liotard, KM= Kalimi Mworira, MB= Michael Blackwell, VS= Vittorio Silano.

Agenda item 1: Opening of the meeting, adoption of the agenda
[Document: JM/M/A(2012)1/REV]

1. The Chair (AG) concluded that the number of members participating was below the quorum for making decisions: only 4 member were present (AG, CH, HK and HS). HK informed the meeting that based on responses on availability received from the 9 members of the PMB and TMB together, 26 June appeared to be the best date with 7 members present. However, on 18 June EB informed the secretariat that he would be unable to attend because of an unexpected late change in his agenda commitments. Furthermore, at the start of the meeting it appeared that both MB and VS were apparently unable to connect to the conference call and respond to messages sent subsequently.
2. The Chair suggested to address only the most urgent matters and handle other issues by email. The meeting agreed to this approach and invited HK to mention the most important issues. These were agenda item 7 (Update on the food labelling project and items 8/9 (the poor financial situation and future prospects)

Agenda item 7: Update on project RT(2010)6: Food Labelling
[Documents: L(2012)08; R/RT(2010)6/2; L(2012)09; Financial Project Summary]

3. The Chair invited HK to introduce this agenda item. HK explained that the kick-off meeting of the food labelling project (formally renamed as the Food Information Transparency Initiative – FITI) in March this year went well [see report R/RT(2010)6/2], despite the fact that no financial commitments were made during the meeting. Also after the meeting there were not many stakeholders (both from the public and the private sector) stepping forward to offer financial contributions to the project. This caused one of the partners (Schuttelaar & Partners) to step down from the project as they expected that chances for proper financing would be extremely low.
4. Despite the lack of financial support, the remaining partners decided not to give up and, subsequently, planned the next meeting at the European Parliament on 7 June hosted by a few MEPs [see letter L(2012)08]. However, close to the date it appeared that for various reasons the number of available MEPs would be much smaller than expected. Furthermore, the number of confirmed participants appeared lower than desirable. For these reasons and because of 2 new developments (a sudden strong interest in the project of the Environment Directorate of the European Commission and a potential possibility to team up with a consortium including TNO, VitalinQ and the Groningen University Medical Center, addressing healthy ageing through better and easy accessible food information) it was decided to postpone the meeting to a later date (autumn). See letter L(2012)09.
5. The financial situation of the project is not very healthy as shown in the Financial Project Summary: there is only some €5000 left of the €20,000 earmarked by the

sponsor (Dutch Ministry of Health) to cover project costs. This amount is hardly enough to cover expenses of a 3rd meeting.

6. From the discussion of the Joint Meeting attendants, a number of suggestions surfaced, including: (i) as full transparency seems to be the big hurdle for the food industry to participate, consider to put that element on the backburner and focus on the easy information elements; (ii) try to get funding through governments, start with a limited project objective to show the proof of principle; (iii) contact ZonMw, the Dutch executive government agency for funding of new science and technology projects; and (iv) aim at foundations with a mission fitting with the FITI project objectives [**Action Point 1:** for HK and possibly other members of the Boards to make an effort to follow up on suggestions i, 11 and iv].
7. HK mentioned that a small scale version of the project would not be easy as the further development of a marketable smart phone application would still require an investment of more than €100,000. Although downplaying the 'transparency' aspect would take the heart out of the project but could be considered as an option to get it started. CH proposed to arrange for a meeting of HK and him with the Director of ZonMw and this suggestion was greatly appreciated [**Action Point 2:** HK and CH to meet with the ZonMw Director].
8. The Chair concluded that apparently the current project approach is not selling well and that giving the project another spin by aiming at nutrition and the elderly and other vulnerable segments of our societies may be more successful. CH and HK will take this message to their meeting with the Director of ZonMw.

Agenda item 8: Financial situation
[Documents: MB/M(2011)4; JM/M(2012)2]

9. From document MB/M(2011)4 (the financial situation on 31st December 2011 and document JM/M(2012)2 (the financial situation on 14 June 2012) it is very clear that OHP is lacking funds to continue carrying out its mission and objectives. Projects expected within the framework of the second EU China Trade Project (EUCTP2) as well as from national authorities have not materialised, largely as a result of the diminishing economical situation in Europe (EU countries give priority to involve their national experts in the project rather than outsourcing the work to independent organisations such as OHP).
10. Suggestions of Board members aiming at improving the situation included:
 - a. Invest in communication with potential sponsors/donors in high income countries as well as with the users of our services such as emerging economies (suggestion submitted in writing by EB) [**Action Point 3:** for all Board members];
 - b. Produce more attractive documentation/pictures/videos supported by examples of OHP projects (suggestion submitted in writing by EB) [**Action Point 4:** for HK];
 - c. Intensify the number of personal visits by members of the Board to donor agencies and countries to make contact with key decision makers and propose our services showing our comparative advantage (suggestion submitted in writing by EB) [**Action Point 5:** for all Board members];
 - d. Invest in time searching for calls for project proposals fitting with the mission of OHP (in particular the tenders published by the EU) and prepare good quality

- proposals (suggestion submitted in writing by EB) [**Action Point 6:** for all Board members];
- e. Follow up on earlier visits AG, MB and HK made to the World Bank, USDA and USAID [**Action Point 7:** AG will follow up on the letter of 15 May to Mr Voegele of the World Bank: letter L(2012)07];
 - f. Intensify the contacts in China, in particular with the EU Permanent Delegation and the EUCTP management [**Action Point 8:** for HK to take action];
 - g. For all members of the Board to search for national entities (governmental, organisations, private sector, foundations, etc.) which may become OHP sponsors [**Action Point 9:** for all Board members].

Agenda item 10: Any other business
[Document: Scholarship Fund Flyer]

11. The Chair expressed his view that OHP's involvement in scholarship funding should not be a priority and that establishing yet another foundation should be discouraged. HK explained that there is no need for another foundation as the existing OHTFF would be well placed to serve as such. The University of Wageningen would be happy to jointly seek sponsoring of the scholarship fund which would give good publicity to OHP. All agreed that this activity may open other doors.
12. The Chair mentioned that he would hardly be available until September and wished all a very pleasant Summer break. He closed the meeting at 16:10 (GMT+1).

Additional Notes from the Secretariat

- i. Agenda items 2 and 3 were not discussed. However, AG had made a suggestion for replacing paragraph 22 of the minutes of PMBM8 by the following "*AG mentioned his involvement in an activity of 3 programs at Johns Hopkins University (Ruth Faden, and Robert Thompson) on ethical food/bioethics. AG and HK identified Ethical/Fair Food as a possible OHP project and sought funding. When this did not materialize, it was included in the food labelling project. The Hopkins project, similar in title but focusing on different aspects of ethical food, is seeking foundation funding. He also mentioned his involvement defining criteria for a "mark of social justice" by the Conservative Jewish Movement of the US. The criteria for this mark were provided by a Professor at Cornell University. The original criteria suggested were unacceptable welfare criteria, and AG was able to have the animal welfare criteria rejected. The mark as currently defined meet the standards of Jewish law and social justice.*" **Action Point 10:** Members of the Boards are requested to approve or comment on this modification and either confirm approval of the minutes of the PMBM8 and the 1st Joint PMBM/TMBM or submit additional suggestions for changes.
- ii. Agenda item 5 was not discussed. Consequently, members of the PMB and TMB are requested to either confirm approval of documents TFF/MB/M(2011)5/REV and TFF/MB/M(2011)6/REV or submit additional suggestions for changes [**Action Point 11:** for all Board members].

SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS

Action Point 1: for HK and possibly other members of the Boards to make an effort to follow up on suggestions i, 11 and iv of paragraph 6 of these minutes.

Action Point 2: HK and CH to meet with the ZonMw Director.

Action Point 3: for all Board members to invest in communication with potential sponsors/donors in high income countries as well as with the users of our services such as emerging economies.

Action Point 4: for HK to produce more attractive documentation/pictures/videos supported by examples of OHP projects.

Action Point 5: for all Board members to consider personal visits to donor agencies and countries to make contact with key decision makers and propose our services showing our comparative advantage.

Action Point 6: for all Board members to invest in time searching for calls for project proposals fitting with the mission of OHP (in particular the tenders published by the EU) and prepare good quality proposals.

Action Point 7: AG will follow up on the letter of 15 May to Mr Voegelé of the World Bank.

Action Point 8: for HK to intensify the contacts in China, in particular with the EU Permanent Delegation and the EUCTP management.

Action Point 9: for all Board members to search for national entities (governmental, organisations, private sector, foundations, etc.) which may become OHP sponsors.

Action Point 10: Members of the Boards are requested to approve or comment on this modification and either confirm approval of the minutes of the PMBM8 and the 1st Joint PMBM/TMBM or submit additional suggestions for changes.

Action Point 11: for all Board members to either confirm approval of documents TFF/MB/M(2011)5/REV and TFF/MB/M(2011)6/REV or submit additional suggestions for changes.