



Leuven Centre
for Global
Governance Studies



LICOS CENTRE FOR INSTITUTIONS
AND ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE

ESF Exploratory Workshop:

The Effectiveness of Voluntary Sustainability Standards

1-3 October 2014
Leuven, Belgium

WORKSHOP REPORT

ESF Exploratory Workshop: *The Effectiveness of Voluntary Sustainability Standards* – Leuven, 1-3 October 2014.

Authors: Emilie Bécault, Christiaan Boonen, Nicolás Brando, Samuel Cogolati, Martin Deleixhe, Rutger Hagen, Linda Hamid, Axel Marx and Nils Vanstappen.

© 2014 by Leuven Centre for Global Governance Studies. All rights reserved. No portion of this document may be reproduced without permission of the authors. Leuven: Leuven Centre for Global Governance Studies.

Please visit the [workshop website](#) for more information and pictures.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	4
Programme	6
Workshop Summary	11
Panel 1: The Effectiveness of VSS: Different Approaches	11
Panel 2 – The Governance of Natural Resources.....	15
Panel 3 – The Governance Of Natural Resources	19
Panel 4: The Governance of Agricultural Supply Chains (I)	24
Panel 5 – The Governance of Agricultural Supply Chains (II)	30
Panel 6 – The Governance of Agricultural Supply Chains (III)	34
Panel 7: The Governance of Social Dimensions of Sustainability Standards (I)	38
Panel 8: The Governance of Social Dimensions of Sustainability Standards (II)	42
Panel 9: Private Governance Arrangements and VSS	46
Conclusion by the conveners.....	51
List of Participants.....	54
Statistical Data of Participants.....	68

Introduction

From the 1-3 October 2014, the European Science Foundation, the Leuven Centre for Global Governance Studies (University of Leuven), and the LICOS Centre for Institutions and Economic Performance (University of Leuven) jointly organized an exploratory workshop on the effectiveness of voluntary sustainability standards. Voluntary sustainability standards (VSS) constitute a significant global governance policy instrument to regulate supply chains. A key outstanding issue in the study of VSS concerns their effectiveness. This workshop focused on analysing the effectiveness of VSS from a multi-disciplinary perspective with a specific focus on the governance of food, labour and natural resources.

Many aspects of the sustainability of the global economy are increasingly regulated by voluntary sustainability standards (VSS) such as Fair Trade, Forest Stewardship Council, Marine Stewardship Council, GLOBALGAP, etc. VSS verify the compliance of products or production processes with sustainability standards and communicates to consumers that certified products comply with these standards. There is no agreed general definition of VSS, but most often they refer to standards which are related to issue of environmental sustainability, human rights, social conditions, health safety and animal welfare. They are distinct from technical product or process standards.

The importance of voluntary sustainability standards is now widely recognized. The United Nations launched in March 2013 the UN Forum on Sustainability Standards, the WTO is wary of the potential of such standards to act as barriers to trade, the Worldbank and many technical cooperation initiatives are supporting the adoption of sustainability standards as tools to promote development. In the academic world legal scholars, economists, political scientists, geographers, anthropologists and ecologists are building a body of literature investigating these voluntary sustainability standards from different points of view, such as their (democratic) legitimacy or their articulation with other modes of regulation. Notwithstanding the importance of these research agendas, several outstanding questions remain. One key outstanding issue concerns their *effectiveness*, namely the question whether voluntary standards, as policy tools in their own right, are well-suited for achieving their purpose, namely to solve the problems they are focusing on (ie human rights abuses in factories, unsustainable management of forests, etc.). Little consolidated research addresses the question of effectiveness. Moreover, the basic question of how effectiveness should be conceptualised in the context of voluntary sustainability standards remains to a degree elusive. Different disciplines focus on different aspects. The workshop aimed to fill this void and consolidate research on the effectiveness of voluntary sustainability standards. The

workshop brought together leading experts from different disciplines to assess the state of the art on the effectiveness of VSS.

The three-day workshop kicked off with welcoming speeches by Dr. Axel Marx (University of Leuven) and Prof. Dr. Jo. Swinnen (University of Leuven) and a presentation of the European Science Foundation by Dr. Katarzyna Zawalinska (Scientific Review Group From the Social Sciences). This introductory session was then followed by nine consecutive panels, each addressing a particular dimension or topic related to the effectiveness of VSS.



From left to right: Dr. Axel Marx, Prof. Dr. Jo Swinnen and Dr. Katarzyna Zawalinska

Programme

Wednesday 1 October 2014

13:00-13:30: Registration

13:30-14:00: Introduction by the conveners

- Welcome by **Dr. Axel Marx** (University of Leuven), **Prof. Dr. Jan Wouters** (University of Leuven) and **Prof. Dr. Jo Swinnen** (University of Leuven)
- Presentation of the European Science Foundation by **Dr. Katarzyna Zawalinska** (Scientific Review Group from the Social Sciences)

14:00-15:30: PANEL 1 – THE EFFECTIVENESS OF VVS: DIFFERENT APPROACHES

Chair: **Prof. Dr. Jan Wouters** (University of Leuven)

- **Prof. Dr. Frans Van Waarden** (Utrecht University):
Effectiveness for What? Are Transactions there for the Transaction Costs?
- **Prof. Dr. Benjamin Cashore** (Yale University), **Prof. Dr. Steven Bernstein** (University of Toronto), **Prof. Dr. Jeremy Rayner** (University of Saskatchewan), **Mr. Michael Stone** (Center for Ecoliteracy), **Prof. Dr. Graeme Auld** (Carleton University), **Ms. Daniela Gohler** (Federal Ministry of Environment, Germany) and **Mr. Iben Nathan** (Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies):
How Can we Assess the Effectiveness of Private Sustainability Standards if the Greatest Results Have Yet to Occur?: The Role of Policy Learning and Policy Pathways
- **Prof. Dr. Stefano Ponte** (Copenhagen Business School):
Sustainability Standards and the Effectiveness of Transnational Governance: Lessons from Sustainable Biofuel Certification

15:30-16:00: Coffee/Tea Break

16:00-17:30: PANEL 2 – THE GOVERNANCE OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair: **Dr. Axel Marx** (University of Leuven)

- **Dr. Agni Kalfagianni** (VU University of Amsterdam) and **Dr. Philipp Pattberg** (VU University of Amsterdam):
Private Governance of Fisheries and Aquaculture: Assessing Effectiveness beyond Compliance

- **Prof. Dr. Graeme Auld** (Carleton University) and **Ms. Jennifer McKee** (Carleton University):
Enclosing Aquaculture: the Impacts of Interacting Public and Private Rules on Technological Innovation
- **Mr. Dennis Klink** (Berlin Graduate School for Transnational Studies):
Why norm localization matters! Explaining the effectiveness of sustainability standards in the global banana supply chain

19:00 - : Dinner

Thursday 2 October 2014

09.00-10:30: PANEL 3 – THE GOVERNANCE OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair: **Prof. Dr. Bart Muys** (University of Leuven)

- **Dr. Stéphane Guéneau** (Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement):
An evaluation model of forest certification scheme within "concentric circles"
- **Dr. Constance McDermott** (University of Oxford) and **Dr. Maria Tysiachniouk** (Centre for Independent Social Research):
Certification with Russian Characteristics: Implications for Social and Environmental Equity
- **Dr. Paolo Omar Cerutti** (Center for International Forestry Research), **Dr. Guillaume Lescuyer** (CIFOR and Agricultural Research Centre for International Development), **Dr. Raphael Tsanga** (CIFOR), **Dr. Robert Nasi** (CIFOR), **Dr. Paule Pamela Tabi Ekebil** (CIFOR), **Prof. Dr. Luca Tacconi** (Australian National University) and **Dr. Richard Eba'a Atyi** (CIFOR):
Social Impacts of the Forest Stewardship Council Certification: An Assessment in the Congo Basin

10:30-11:00: Coffee/Tea Break

11:00-13:00: PANEL 4 – THE GOVERNANCE OF AGRICULTURAL SUPPLY CHAINS (I)

Chair: **Prof. Dr. Jo Swinnen** (University of Leuven)

- **Dr. Bart Minten** (International Food Policy Research Institute):
Who benefits from voluntary sustainability standards (VSS)? Evidence from the coffee sector in Ethiopia

- **Dr. Greetje Schouten** (Wageningen University), **Dr. ir. Sietze Vellema** (Wageningen University) and **Dr. Jeroen van Wijk** (Maastricht School of Management):
The Diffusion of Global Sustainability Standards: An ex-ante Assessment of the Institutional Fit of the ASC-Shrimp Standard in Indonesia
- **Prof. Dr. Pieter Glasbergen** (Maastricht University):
Smallholders do not eat certificates. On the transformative capacity of private sustainability standards and certifications
- **Ms. Monica Schuster** (University of Leuven) and **Prof. Dr. Miet Maertens** (University of Leuven):
The Impact of Private Food Standards on Trade and Development: Evidence from Peru

13:00-14:00: Lunch

14.00-15:30: PANEL 5 – THE GOVERNANCE OF AGRICULTURAL SUPPLY CHAINS (II)

Chair: **Dr. Bart Minten** (International Food Policy Research Institute)

- **Ms. Yuca Waarts** (Agricultural Economics Research Institute):
Benefits for smallholder tea producers in Kenya. Impact assessment of Farmer Field Schools including training for Rainforest Alliance certification
- **Ms. Valerie Nelson** (University of Greenwich) and **Ms. Adrienne Martin** (University of Greenwich):
Of Expectations, Evidence and Effectiveness: Critical Reflections on Voluntary Sustainability Standards in Agriculture
- **Prof. Dr. Jo Swinnen** (University of Leuven) and **Ms. Kristine Van Herck** (University of Leuven):
Small farmers, Standards and Value Chains: Evidence from the Bulgarian dairy chain during EU accession

15:30-16:00: Coffee/Tea break

16:00-18:00: PANEL 6 – THE GOVERNANCE OF AGRICULTURAL SUPPLY CHAINS (III)

Chair: **Prof. Dr. Joachim De Weerd** (University of Antwerp & University of Leuven)

- **Prof. Dr. Monika Hartmann** (Universität Bonn), **Ms. Jeanette Klink**, **Dr. Nina Langen** and **Dr. Johannes Simons**:
Voluntary sustainability labels: Consumer knowledge, behavioral effectiveness and suitability of responsibility

- **Dr. Allison Loconto** (Université Paris-Est Marne-la-Vallée) and **Dr. Pilar Santacoloma** (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations):
Participatory Guarantee Systems as institutional innovations: are these effective governance arrangements?
- **Dr. Ulrich Hoffmann** (UN Forum on Sustainability Standards) and **Mr. Frank Grothaus** (UN Forum on Sustainability Standards):
Assuring Coherence between the Market-access and Livelihood Impact of Private Sustainability Standards
- **Prof Dr. Thomas Dietz** (University of Münster) and **Ms. Jennie Auffenberg** (Bremen International Graduate School of Social Sciences):
The Efficacy of Private Voluntary Certification Schemes. A Governance Costs Approach.

18:15-: City walk and dinner

Friday 3 October 2014

09:00-10:30: PANEL 7: THE GOVERNANCE OF SOCIAL DIMENSIONS OF SUSTAINABILITY STANDARDS (I)

Chair: **Dr. Axel Marx** (University of Leuven)

- **Ms. Izabela Stacewicz** (University of Reading) and **Dr. Chukwumerije Okereke** (University of Reading):
Bringing social issues to the fore: Understanding the effectiveness of Multi-stakeholder Initiatives
- **Ms. Maja Tampe** (MIT Sloan School of Management):
Resilience in the tropics: how to make social and environmental standards work in volatile commodity markets
- **Ms. Natasha Schwarzbach** (Bonsucro) and **Dr. Benjamin Richardson** (University of Warwick):
A Bitter Harvest: Child Labour in Sugarcane Agriculture and the Role of Voluntary Social Standards

10:30-11:00: Coffee / Tea Break

11:00-12:30: PANEL 8: THE GOVERNANCE OF SOCIAL DIMENSIONS OF SUSTAINABILITY STANDARDS (II)

Chair: **Prof. Dr. Jo Swinnen** (University of Leuven)

- **Prof. Dr. Martijn Scheltema** (Erasmus University Rotterdam):
The Need for an Integrated Comparative Approach of Effectiveness of Sustainability Initiatives and a Comparison of Two Examples
- **Dr. Sijeong Lim** (Stockholm University) and **Prof. Dr. Aseem Prakash** (University of Washington):
From Quality Control to Labor Conditions: How ISO 9001 influences Occupational Safety, 1993-2012
- **Dr. Walter Vermeulen** (Utrecht University):
Effectiveness of Private Sustainability Certification on Practices of Tea Production in Tamilnadu, India: Applying a Control Group Approach

12:30-13:30: Lunch

13:30-15:00: PANEL 9: PRIVATE GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS AND VSS

Chair: **Prof. Dr. Jan Wouters** (University of Leuven)

- **Dr. Stefan Renckens** (University of Toronto):
The effectiveness of public-private governance interactions in the European Union
- **Prof. Dr. Eric Lambin** (Stanford University):
Effectiveness and synergies of policy instruments for land use governance in tropical regions
- **Dr. Luc Fransen** (University of Amsterdam), **Dr. Jelmer Schalk** (Leiden University) and **Prof. Dr. Graeme Auld** (Carleton University):
Towards cross-organizational effectiveness of sustainability standards? A Social Network Analysis approach

15:00-15:30: Conclusion by the conveners

- Concluding remarks by **Dr. Axel Marx** (University of Leuven), **Prof. Dr. Jan Wouters** (University of Leuven) and **Prof. Dr. Jo Swinnen** (University of Leuven)

Workshop Summary

Panel 1: The Effectiveness of VSS: Different Approaches

The first panel of the workshop focused on different approaches to conceptualizing and assessing the effectiveness of VSS. It was chaired by Axel Marx and featured three contributions.

1. “How can we Assess the Effectiveness of Private Sustainability Standards if the Greatest Results Have yet to Occur?: The role of Policy Learning and Policy Pathways” **Prof. Dr. Benjamin Cashore** (Yale University)

Prof. Dr. Ben Cashore, Director of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, opened the panel by presenting a collaborative study that proposes a forward-looking approach to assessing, and influencing the effectiveness of VSS. In contrast with frameworks that look backward in order to assess the past performance of an instrument, Prof. Cashore and his colleagues developed a framework that seeks to capture the strategic interventions that emerge for agents seeking to shape and nurture instrument of choice in the future. It is an approach that considers both short-term results and the dynamic factors more likely to determine overall effects. To this end, the authors have used insights taken from two related strands of policy scholarship: the literature on “policy learning” among stakeholders that focuses on instrument choice; and the literature on “pathways of influence” in shaping policy responses across multiple levels of governance. The main goals of the study is to explain processes that are in the midst of institutionalization and identify strategic intervention to achieve greater influence as events unfold.

After a brief introduction, Prof. Cashore proceeded by presenting the four different pathways of influence through which non-domestic factors might shape and influence domestic policy-making. These are: international rules (e.g., issue-specific treaties and policy prescriptions of international organizations); international norms and discourse (especially norms that operate according to the logic of appropriateness); the creation of or interventions in markets (e.g., Boycott campaigns); and direct access to domestic policy processes (e.g., funding and education). According to the authors, the analytical disaggregation of these pathways of influence allows to identify the conditions along which a pathway is likely to produce change in practices and to what ends. In this regard, policy learning appears particularly relevant. But in analyzing these pathways however, particularly emphasis should be given to effective combinations of different approaches (i.e., basket approach that combines different pathways). In this context, Prof. Cashore argued, policy learning occurs when there is an awareness/deliberation over the causal effects of pathways among the diverse stakeholders, which might in turn improve effectiveness. To illustrate the utility of this framework for assessing “the effectiveness of voluntary sustainability standards”, Prof. Cashore’s presentation turned to the case of legality verification in the forestry sector. Legal verification is emerging as a global instrument to promote responsible forest management. It is mainly win-win oriented. Legal verification focuses mainly on illegal logging and not on

biodiversity or other factors. Loggers promote this legislation because it keeps competitors out of the market. The 'modest' problem of baseline forest practices are thus tackled but it is not contributing significantly to achieving biodiversity goals or other environmental goals.

2. "Effectiveness for What? Are Transactions there for the Transaction Costs?" Prof. Dr. Frans van Waarden (Utrecht University)



Prof. Dr. Frans van Waarden

The floor was then passed to Prof. Dr. Van Waarden (Utrecht University) who presented a contribution entitled "Effectiveness for What? Are Transactions there for the Transaction Costs?". Prof. Van Waarden started by mentioning the information asymmetry between buyer and seller and by explaining the several reasons why we might need certificates. For instance (a) certificates can come in handy for potential buyers who simply want value for their money. (b) They are also useful in a situation where sellers are tempted to cheat (e.g., halal food). They can also (c) remove the uncertainty a buyer faces about the possibility of cheating. And relatedly, (d) certificates can help to achieve a more equal power balance between

buyer and seller. As Prof. van Waarden added, the equalizing of the power balance is becoming more important because product value chains have become longer, making it harder for consumers to collect all relevant information (e.g. composition of products, risks, ...) on the products they want to buy.

Prof. van Waarden's main argument is that what is important is not (only) information asymmetries (which transaction costs economics focuses on), but knowledge. Consumers, Van Waarden suggested, do not only need information, but also the means to process this information (e.g.: what to do when criteria are incommensurable or heterogeneous?). The number of certificates is growing rapidly in the quest to give buyers/consumers the information they need in buying a product. But because there are numerous certificates in existence, the market is becoming increasingly less transparent.

This demand for knowledge, Prof. Van Waarden argued, creates a supply of judgment devices and this explains why the commercial market for the certification industry is expanding so quickly (as self-certification cannot be trusted and the authority of states is limited to their jurisdiction). In particular, success in this market is dependent on the following factors: (a) an interest on the demand side, (b) the credibility of the label and (c) a balance between supply and demand of certified products.

With this having been said, Prof. van Waarden concluded by warning that due to a proliferation of labels, the market for certifications risks losing its transparency (that is a problem of overkill). This, in turn, might lead to mutual criticism between certifiers, a lack of overview for the consumers and a loss of trust in the certifying market. For Prof. van Waarden indeed, it is becoming apparent that the certification industry is growing in

importance and size. This industry is creating its own momentum and we could even conclude that the transactions are there for the transactions costs thereby creating a high employability. Prof. van Waarden called this the *homunculus problem*: we develop certifications because we do not entirely trust the products we buy (or their producers, sellers, ...), but if we cannot trust certifications (due to their proliferation and the consequent race to the bottom in standards) we have to develop ways to certify the certifiers. This, Prof. Van Waarden suggested, can create new issues of trust, setting in motion an infinite regression (because maybe we cannot trust the certifiers of certifiers ...) leading to a rise in transaction costs.

3. “Sustainability Standards and the Effectiveness of Transnational Governance: Lessons from Sustainable Biofuel Certification” Prof. Dr. Stefano Ponte (Copenhagen Business School)

The third and final presentation of the panel was given by Prof. Dr. Stephano Ponte from the Copenhagen Business School. In his paper, entitled “Sustainability Standards and the Effectiveness of Transnational Governance: Lessons from Sustainable Biofuel Certification.” Prof. Ponte sought to assess the lessons learned from, what he calls, the transnational hybrid governance (THG) of sustainable biofuels, with a special focus on the roles played by voluntary sustainability standards, the EU RED and the WTO. Prof. Ponted started by explaining why the study of biofuel is particularly relevant. The market of sustainable biofuel in the EU, he explained, is indeed a ‘captive market’ with all biofuel on the market being certified. It is in other terms, a laboratory case study of competition in the market for sustainability certifications.

Prof. Ponte then continued his presentation by explaining his preference for the concept of transnational hybrid governance. The basic idea is that it is often difficult, if not impossible, to keep private and public interests apart when looking at the dynamics of the interactions between businesses, civil society and public actors as they often depend on each other (especially in situations where *regime complexity* arises, that is, where hegemonic actors are absent). Problems in the biofuel industries for instance, led to the emergence of such a form of transnational hybrid governance: both public regulatory bodies and private sustainability certification schemes responded to a need for sustainability standards, but instead of developing these solutions in mutual isolation, they interacted in multiple ways.



Prof. Dr. Stefano Ponte

Prof. Ponte’s main case study is the formulation of sustainability standards in the EU with the issuing of the RED (Renewable Energy Directive) and the FQD (Fuel Quality Directive). In his view, these policies have been designed with the ‘WTO as the gorilla in the closet’. To avoid a confrontation with the WTO indeed, the EU left out social criteria to avoid the risk of litigation. While the regulation of biofuel sustainability might seem straight public in nature,

for Prof. Ponte, the EU needed the private certification schemes to extend its authority beyond territorial borders (while they, in turn, lean on the incentives set up by RED to establish their legitimacy as a market-based instrument of sustainability governance). This according to Prof. Ponte, tends to raise an important question: 'Do these interactions facilitate positive collective outcomes through upward normative pressures?'

To answer this question, Prof. Ponte offered an analysis of the trajectory of two sustainability standards compliant with the RED directive: 1) the Roundtable for Sustainable Biofuel (RSB) and 2) the International Sustainability and Carbon Certification (ISCC). His main conclusion is that while it is clear that the EU RED led to quicker adaptation of sustainability certification, there were no indication of any upward normative pressures that might have improved the effectiveness of the transnational hybrid governance of biofuel sustainability (e.g.: problems of forum shopping and race to the bottom in standards). In the case of RSB that provides the golden standard (being both democratic and inclusive), Prof. Ponte observed that they have a hard time establishing themselves in the market. He notably discovered that the more business-friendly ISCC actually discriminates against smaller, marginalized stake-holders and operates in a way that is less democratic.

Subsequently Prof. Ponte looked at another aspect of the THG of sustainable biofuels: the development of the RED in the shadow of the WTO. His concern was that since there is an important trade dimension to biofuels policy-making, the EU had to design the RED in the shadow of the WTO legal framework hence forsaking some social sustainability standards it might have implemented. This eventually did happen and while some private certification schemes filled in the gap left by the RED, it is possible that these will eventually come under WTO purview (although, Prof. Ponte said, this was unlikely). Given this case, Prof. Ponte concluded by saying that we should probably be more cautious about the possibilities provided by THG, in a sense that we should be more aware of its limitations in terms of effectiveness.

Panel 2 – The Governance of Natural Resources

The second panel of the workshop addressed the topic of the effectiveness of VSS but in the context of the governance of natural resources. It was chaired by Dr. Axel Marx (University of Leuven) and featured three paper presentations.

1. “Private Governance of Fisheries and Aquaculture: Assessing Effectiveness Beyond Compliance” **Dr. Agni Kalfagianni** (VU University of Amsterdam) and **Dr. Philipp Pattberg** (VU University of Amsterdam).

Dr. Agni Kalfagianni, from VU University of Amsterdam kicked off this panel by presenting a paper co-written with Dr. P. Pattberg (VU University of Amsterdam) and addressing the effectiveness the private governance of fisheries and aquaculture. One of the main conceptual point of the paper is that the concept of effectiveness should not be measured solely in terms of goal-attainment, but in broader terms: in ways that include three distinct potential effects of VSS: a) structural b) policy and c) cognitive effects.



Dr. Agni Kalfagianni

Following these conceptual clarifications, Dr. Kalfaginanni first discussed the results of the analysis of the structural effects of VSS on fisheries and aquaculture, conducted on the basis of three main indicators: 1) the relative size of certified markets; 2) the global geographic distribution of certified markets; 3) the effects of private fisheries and aquaculture standards on global trade and competition standards. On the one hand, the results demonstrated that the number of certified fisheries and the relevant market share of certified fish products has grown exponentially in the past fifteen years. On the other

hand, the authors found no evidence of significant shifts in trade as a result of fisheries certification at the global level, other than concerns about barriers for small-scale fisheries, particularly in the South. In the case of aquaculture, however, the authors found that the private rule-setting organizations have been successful in reaching key markets in terms of production, mostly due to the fact that the concentration of the certified market is in Asia.

Dr. Kalfaginanni then turned to a discussion of the analysis of the policy effects of VSS on fisheries and aquaculture, conducted through the lenses of three indicators: 1) endorsement by governments through green public procurement; 2) availability of public funding for supporting compliance; and 3) domestic policy responses to transnational certification schemes through development of public schemes with similar objectives. The authors found that states in the North support certification both in their public procurement policies and through the development of public funds that enable certification, but that they do not necessarily favor transnational private schemes. The authors also concluded that some developing countries incorporate private standards, particularly the Marine Stewardship

Council, in public regulation.

Finally, Dr. Kalfagianni proceeded with an discussion of the cognitive effects of VSS, using three main indicators: 1) the creation and organization of information and knowledge on sustainability challenges facing fisheries and aquaculture; 2) the distribution of knowledge and information; and 3) the uptake of information and knowledge by third-parties. The authors found that the cognitive effects of VSS revolved, in essence, around the development of 'objective' and 'scientific' metrics for sustainability, the generation of new data (e.g. data deficient fisheries) and awareness raising among Northern consumers and clients (e.g. about the use of new techniques).

As a conclusion, Dr. Kalfagianni summarized the key findings regarding each type of effects: 1) as for structural effects, the authors concluded that what matters more for changing markets is not *how much*, but *where* certification takes place; 2) in terms of policy effects, transnational private standards catalyzed action but their rule-setting authority is not uncontested; 3) in regard to their cognitive effects, VSS have been instrumental in generating 'scientific' measurements for sustainability and have been increasingly recognized as expert authorities; and 4) finally at the global level, voluntary sustainability standards have not resulted in fundamental structural change yet.

2. "Enclosing Aquaculture: the Impacts of Interacting Public and Private Rules on Technological Innovation" Prof. Dr. Graeme Auld (Carleton University) and Ms. Jennifer McKee (Carleton University).

The floor was then passed to Prof. Dr. Graeme Auld from Carleton University who presented a paper co-written with his colleague at Carleton University, Ms. Jennifer McKee, entitled: "Enclosing Aquaculture: The Impacts of Interacting Public and Private Rules on Technological Innovation". The paper focuses on salmon aquaculture in the Canadian province of British Columbia. Its main objective is to evaluate the impacts of VSS on technological innovation, and especially their capacity to have a sector entirely change the technology used in its processes, instead of simply improving the existing techniques. The technological change evaluated in the paper is the change from open containment pens to closed containment pens: a change which indeed could turn the entire aquaculture industry on its head (e.g. aquaculture could be moved away from oceans, and moved closer to the markets). In the course of their research, the authors also attempted to research the interaction between public and private initiatives.



Prof. Dr. Graeme Auld

Prof. Auld started by situating VSS within a certain typology of instruments. As he explained it, three types of instruments can be identified: 1) information instruments; 2) money instruments; and 3) rules instruments, categorized according to their means of influencing behavior. In his view, VSS can be categorized as rules instruments. However, Auld added that VSS (should) entertain relations with other types of instruments to make the picture more

complete.

Prof. Auld then argued that the VSS which would be used to shift from open to closed containment pens would be difficult to situate on the classic chronology of stages of organizational activity. These start with planning, move through acting, and end in outputs. Prof. Auld added a new category at the front of this chronology, namely the category of 'siting', during which stage corporations take spatial limitations to their economic activity into account.

Prof. Auld further described the different attempts in the public and private sphere to promote the use of closed containment pens. Despite several moratoriums on the openings of new salmon farms, public authorities (provincial, but most importantly federal) have not managed to conclusively promote closed containment pens, because doubts remain about the economic feasibility of this alternative. In the private sphere, no progress in the issue was made in the Organics or GAA mechanisms, but ASC offers regulatory relief to those corporations using closed containment pens, and is therefore, the first real promoter of this technological innovation.

Prof. Auld concluded his presentation by emphasizing three issues: 1) no real market or regulatory pull was created; 2) the creation of a technology push through rules instruments has also remained limited (there has been some progress through information and money instruments, however); and lastly 3) the paper marks the importance of the identity of the controller of the information, since this greatly influences the outcomes of public and private regulatory processes.

3. "Why Norm Localization Matters! Explaining the Effectiveness of Sustainability Standards in the Global Banana Supply Chain" **Mr. Dennis Klink** (Berlin Graduate School for Transnational Studies).

Finally, Mr. Dennis Klink from the Berlin Graduate School for Transnational Studies took the floor to present a paper entitled : "Why norm localization matters! Explaining the effectiveness of sustainability standards in the global banana supply chain". As this title clearly indicates, Klink's study focuses on the importance of norm localization, which he researched through the case study of the banana market. First, Mr. Klink started by providing



Mr. Dennis Klink

some background on the banana market. As he explained it, this market, is clearly uni-directional, with bananas being (almost) solely produced in the South, and (almost) solely consumed in the North. The key players in this market are the multinational corporations (MNCs) who control the trade. The banana industry was regarded as unethical for a long time, but this image has changed recently because of the adoption of more and more certificates. The question, however, remains what the real impact of these standards is?

The speaker then turned to a discussion of the concept of 'effectiveness'. Three stages of

assessing effectiveness of VSS were presented: 1) adoption; 2) implementation; and 3) problem-solving. It was noted that at each stage, different logics are at play. The VSS are adopted in the North. The logic of those adopting the VSS is, therefore, geared towards finding market-oriented solutions. Implementation happens at the intermediate level, by MNC specialists. The focus, here, is on finding compliance-oriented solutions. Problem-solving (should) happen(s) in the South, at the level of the producers. These producers push for production-oriented solutions. Mr. Klink then suggested that the intermediate level has received insufficient attention, while it is at this level that effectiveness of standards can be greatly impacted upon. He then added that the MNC specialists working at this level choose to implement VSS in countries which have favorable institutional environments, since they look for the best (read: most cost-effective) compliance opportunities.

To illustrate the importance of favorable institutional environments, Mrs. Klink conducted two case studies: one of Costa Rica and one of Ecuador. While both countries highly differ in terms of their institutional environment – examples of variables determining whether an institutional environment is favorable are the levels of education and professionalization, the share of “CSR-sensitive” groups in the domestic labor market – they are similar with regard to other aspects: Ecuador is the biggest exporter of bananas, while Costa Rica is the second biggest exporter, the major exporters overlap to a great extent, as do the major markets to which the produce is exported. Though both countries are similar in some respects, Ecuador knows a much lower degree of standard implementation (Klink focused on Global GAP and Rainforest Alliance standards implementation) than Costa Rica.

Lastly, Mr. Klink discussed to extent to which the adoption of standards was actually problem-solving at the level of the producers. Here, he noticed that while at the adoption phase, standards are broadly comprehensive, they become more selective when moving to the implementation phase, and even more selective when reaching the problem-solving phase. He found an explanation for this observation in the concept of ‘norm localization’, which refers to the fact that local producers need ‘willingness’ as well as ‘capabilities’ to ensure that the adoption and implementation of standards actually results in problem-solving. This, obviously, raises the question whether standards need not be more adapted to the local conditions in which they will be implemented.

Mr. Klink concluded by suggesting that the extent to which local ‘willingness and capabilities’ affect the capacity of standards to be problem-solving on the ground is understudied. He therefore proposed to perform more research on the importance of ‘norm localization’.

Panel 3 – The Governance Of Natural Resources

The third panel also addressed the topic of the governance of natural resources. It was chaired by Prof. Dr. Bart Muys (University of Leuven) and featured three contributions.

1. “An evaluation model of forest certification scheme within « concentric circles »” **Dr. Stéphane Guéneau** (Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement)

The first speaker of the panel, was Dr. Guéneau whose contribution provides an evaluation model for assessing the environmental impact of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) on forest management. This “concentric-circles” approach, as he called it, seeks to analyze environmental objectives not solely from the lens of efficiency but from a wider range of concepts. To illustrate the utility of his model, Guéneau used the case-study of forest management in Brazil. His main argument is that evaluation models should not rely on comparisons with standards proposed by the FSC, but rather with actual objectives of the environmental management of forests.



Dr. Stéphane Guéneau

Before presenting his own evaluation model, Dr. Guéneau first provided a brief overview of the alternative methodologies traditionally used to assess the impact of Voluntary Sustainability Standards (VSS). He pointed to the problems that may arise depending on the point of reference used for assessing impacts and suggested that the models of evaluation which take the FSC standards as a benchmark for the evaluation of environmental effectiveness in forest management do not necessarily achieve the aspired objectives due to a gap between the *de jure* standards and their *de facto* application. His critique of the study of corrective action requests (CARs) issued by third party certifying bodies is based on his analysis of FSC standards in Brazil where the actual standards enforced by the FSC did not match environmental aspirations. He argued that, although Brazilian forests are widely certified, the standards that are actually enforced did not achieve

the expected environmental objectives. In essence, the problem is that the standards are generally created through negotiated consensus, where different stakeholders have varied and asymmetric decision-making powers. This leads, to vague, subjective and weak standards that are adapted to the needs and interests of the largest stakeholders but that fail to be responsive to the needs and interests of the rest of the affected actors.

Having shown that taking the FSC standard as a point of reference for environmental aspirations of forest management in Brazil is inadequate, Dr. Guéneau proposed an alternative evaluation model: a concern-focused evaluation framework. Within this framework, he explained, the point of reference is not the FSC standard anymore, but rather

the actual environmental objectives to achieve. This approach, he added, requires a thorough analysis of data and research into the specific needs and interests of all the actors involved (international declarations and legal instruments, national scientific publications, expert reports, NGOs statements, etc.) to operate a reorganizing work in order to reveal some key points that are the least compelling environmental issues. The speaker mentioned four main objectives of environmental forest management: (i) avoiding large-scale conversion of natural forests, (ii) restoring the forest ecosystem, (iii) conserving key natural forest habitats, and (iv) maintaining ecosystem functions in production forests.

Dr. Guéneau then presented a concentric circles evaluation model to provide evidence of the environmental effectiveness of the FSC certification schemes. The first concentric circle that was assessed and defined is the measurement and comparison of the current state of affairs with the objectives to reach in order to solve the environmental problem that justified the creation of the scheme. The author noted that in Brazil, eight new criteria were added to FSC-standards at the request of environmental NGOs in order to fill the gap of the Brazilian legal framework with regard to illegal logging and forest communities' status. Except for a few exceptional situations, logging companies have to maintain 100% of their forest in their properties, although Brazilian law allows them to cut 20% of their land for other activities. With regard to FSC standards for plantation forests, however, forests restoration is no longer mandatory in cases of "justified conversion" of forests and the standards in question now allow companies to convert "a small percentage" of the Forest, to the extent that this conversion is legal. Dr. Guéneau concluded that, the extent of the gap between the environmental effectiveness benchmark and the Brazilian standard for plantation forest shows that the FSC forest management of plantations does not achieve the environmental objectives of "problem solving".

The second concentric circle studies the indirect effects and externalities of the conversion of grounds in forests. The question is to what extent the strengthening of environmental management measures in the certified forest unit may lead to harmful activities being transferred to adjacent areas. Leakage effects may be seen in the relocation of damaging activities in adjacent areas. It is therefore important to extend the geographical scope of the forest certification assessment.

The third, and last, concentric circle tests the ability of the FSC certification to positively influence public policies to provide solutions to the Brazilian forest environmental management problem. The author recalled that, by definition, certification is voluntary and does not apply to all operators. The question, therefore, is to what extent FSC can serve as a guiding principle capable of boosting public environmental action (e.g., adoption in 2006 of the Brazilian Law of Public Forest Management)?

2. "Certification with Russian Characteristics: Implications for Social and Environmental Equity" **Dr. Constance McDermott** (University of Oxford) and **Dr. Maria Tysiachniouk** (Centre for Independent Social Research)

The floor was then passed to Dr. McDermott (University of Oxford) and Dr. Tysiachniouk (Centre for Independent Social Research) who co-presented a study on forest certification in

Russia. Their paper applied theories of equity (McDermott et al 2013) and transnational “governance generating networks” (GGN) (Kortelainen et al 2010, Tysiachniouk 2012) to assess how forest certification is enacted in Russia. Drawing on eight years of field research, they compared and contrasted the engagement of shifting networks of Russian private sector, NGO, governmental and local community actors in implementing select social and environmental standards and how this impacts the relative effectiveness and continuity of the FSC in tackling core local community and environmental concerns.

Their case study suggests that much of the parameter-setting for what does, and does not, get addressed in certification’s “sites of implementation” happens outside of formal standards-setting processes. In regards to environmental standards, strong and stable transnational environmental networks have been relatively successful in implementing requirements to protect “high conservation value forests”. However equivalent multi-level networks are lacking for key social standards. While a national social NGO has had some success in promoting procedural equity through community participation, their case study showed no evidence of progress in addressing local community concerns for distributive equity. In particular, certification had failed to address local community concerns over the loss of small and medium forest enterprises, loss of local access to sawnwood and rising costs of fuelwood. These findings highlight the limited reach of global standards in the absence of strong multi-scale advocacy coalitions able to ensure effective and sustained implementation.

3. “Social Impacts of the Forest Stewardship Council Certification: An Assessment in the Congo Basin” **Dr. Paolo Omar Cerutti** (Center for International Forestry Research), **Dr. Guillaume Lescuyer** (CIFOR and Agricultural Research Centre for International Development), **Dr. Raphael Tsanga** (CIFOR), **Dr. Robert Nasi** (CIFOR), **Dr. Paule Pamela Tabi Ekebil** (CIFOR), **Prof. Dr. Luca Tacconi** (Australian National University) and **Dr. Richard Eba’a Atyi** (CIFOR)

Finally the floor was passed to Mr. Cerutti (Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)), who presented a collaborative study which is part of a broader research project being carried out under the auspices of CIFOR on the *social* impacts of forest certification in the Congo Basin. The study focuses on the Congo basin because it had - as of 2012/2013 - the largest area of certified natural tropical forests in the world (5.3 million ha). As Mr. Cerutti explained, the main goal of this research project is to provide a better understanding of the social impacts of FSC standards on a variety of factors such as: (i) the working and living conditions of logging companies’ employees and their families, (ii) the effectiveness and legitimacy of the institutions set up to regulate relationships between logging companies and neighboring communities, and (iii) the local populations’ rights to and customary uses of forests. In comparing these three categories between certified and non-certified forest management units (FMUs), the authors took into consideration two main concepts: (i) the legitimacy and (ii) the effectiveness of local institutions and benefit-sharing mechanisms. The concept of legitimacy can be taken to refer to the fairness of the information-gathering process. For a process to be legitimate then, it needs to consider “appropriate values, interests, concerns, and specific circumstances from the perspective of different users”. The

concept of effectiveness in turn, refers to the ability to influence the actions of logging companies to avoid or reduce potential conflicts with local populations, as well as to improve or at least maintain the quality of life of the concerned communities.

The variables used in comparing certified and non-certified of FMUs include alternative employment opportunities in the area, the dependence on cash crops for livelihoods and access to markets, the ethnicity, political/administrative jurisdictions, species harvested and markets served, “special zones” – e.g., set-asides, conservation buffers. The results were listed in three different categories: (i) working and living conditions, (ii) “institutions” and benefit-sharing mechanisms (e.g. taxes which are legally mandated to be distributed to the population, but paid to the population directly in cash), (iii) local customary uses. Cerutti stressed that the authors gathered data through direct, repetitive and thorough interviews with workers of 69 out of the 72 selected logging fields.

Mr. Cerutti concluded by summarizing the findings of the study: one of the main findings is that strong differences exist between certified and non-certified companies in the first two categories of social impact (the quality of working and living conditions of the workers, employees and their families, and the quality, legitimacy and effectiveness of the institutions and the mechanisms for sharing benefits). However a more nuanced difference was found in the impact of certification on customary practices, such as shifting cultivation or hunting. In essence, the study demonstrates that certified FMUs offer better working and living conditions to their employees; FMUs develop stronger and more inclusive institutions for deliberation and negotiation between the company and the local population; and FMUs manage more effectively the benefit-sharing mechanisms, finding innovative and local sensitive ways of dealing with issues that arise. According to the study, the fundamental triggers that lead FMUs to improve their social performance are: (1) the necessity of maintaining a permanent and more direct communication with the local population with the intention to reduce the chances of conflict that could interfere with production; (2) the stringent and periodic controls of the FSC to ensure the required standards; and (3) due to its potential to improve “reputational risk management” (p. 21). Furthermore, not only were these social impact variables (at least for the first two categories) different between certified and non-certified companies, but their study also showed that the interviewees felt that what made the difference between them was precisely the adoption of FSC standards. Interviewees affirmed that national laws on forest management are not as strict and high in their standards as the FSC, but that the latter is also regularly controlled, verified and updated depending on the needs and concerns of the working population.

Thus the study shows that there exists a clear difference between current certified and noncertified timber: certified companies tend to better implement legally-mandated social standards and this corrects negative governance externalities. Certified companies also tend to adopt stronger voluntary standards. However, and as Mr. Cerutti explained, the authors also stressed at the same time that while there is a clear association between all the companies inside of certification, this does not necessarily imply a causal relation between the positive social impacts and FSC certification. In other words, despite clear positive social impacts, they cannot be automatically related to FSC standards. Also, they noted that the

short-term positive impact of certified FMUs cannot be ensured in the longer term. Due to the fact that compliance with FSC Standards rests on the FMUs benefiting from it, if more profitable non-certified alternatives arise, it may well be that FMUs will stop complying with voluntary standards in order to gain more profit. Another relevant point that the authors mentioned is that the differences *within* certified FMUs are also very wide. Worth mentioning was finally that traditional customs have not been radically changed in the Congo basin, despite the adoption of FSC standards. The farmers' conceptions of certification are high, but their actual modes of production have not changed. The authors also observed a few counterintuitive findings, such as the fact that improved private schemes now serve as a disincentive for the State to fulfil its responsibilities to citizens or the fact that public officials use certification standards as a threat to achieve their political agenda. In his conclusion, Mr. Cerutti emphasized that governmental authorities should put forward more stringent policies and mechanisms so that the FMUs that are not certified may be compelled to improve their environmental and social impact as well.



From left to right: Dr. Constance McDermott, Dr. Stéphane Guéneau and Dr. Paolo Omar Cerutti

Panel 4: The Governance of Agricultural Supply Chains (I)

Panel 4 was the first of three panels focusing on the governance of agricultural chains. It was chaired by Prof. Dr. Jo Swinnen (University of Leuven) and included 4 contributions.

1. “Who benefits from voluntary sustainability standards (VSS)? Evidence from the coffee sector in Ethiopia” **Dr. Bart Minten** (International Food Policy Research Institute)

This panel was opened by Dr. Bart Minten (International Food Policy Research Institute) who presented a collaborative research paper on the impact of VSS on coffee producers in Ethiopia. He started his presentation by explaining why this research is highly relevant: first existing studies are mostly inconclusive, where positive impact is mixed with no positive results. Second, the case of Africa has not been analyzed in enough detail and especially in regard to the impact of VSS on the coffee sector. Dr. Minten then gave a thorough introduction of the situation of VSS in the coffee industry in Ethiopia, emphasizing the relevance of standards such as Fair Trade or Organic: the two biggest VSS in the country. The data for their study was acquired through a large survey with 1600 producers from 12 different coffee zones in Ethiopia and of 5 different types of coffee. The other data used for the research came from the census on export transactions, where data on prices, weight, and economic benefits could be assessed.

For the methodology, the authors relied on the analysis of a fixed effect model of coffee prices in the country. This allowed them to study the variables that affect it, in order to localize the relevance of VSS in the final price of the product. The authors concluded from their “fixed effect model” that there is a gap between the benefit that is generated from premium VSS products, and what is gained by producers. This, Dr. Minten explained, is due to the fact that a great part of the added profit from premium status does not arrive to the producers, but stays with the unions, being spent on certification standards, or being kept by the company that sells and not by the producers.

As part from this analysis, the authors have started expanding their analysis to a more ample study of the social and environmental impact of coffee VSS on Ethiopia. One of their main conclusions thus far is that VSS have not made a large impact on the organic production of coffee, due to the fact that most coffee producers in the region do not use chemicals (be they certified or not). In relation to social data, their research shows that the differences in child labour and in primary schooling for local communities between VSS producers and non-VSS producers is very small. Dr. Minten ended by saying that the authors’ collaborative research work on the social and environmental impact of VSS on the Ethiopian coffee sector is still ongoing, and that they intend to offer a fuller account of these two aspects in future contributions.

2. “The Diffusion of Global Sustainability Standards: An ex-ante Assessment of the Institutional Fit of the ASC-Shrimp Standard in Indonesia” **Dr. Greetje**

Schouten (Wageningen University), Dr. ir. Sietze Vellema (Wageningen University) and Dr. Jeroen van Wijk (Maastricht School of Management)

The second speaker of the panel was Dr. Greetje Schouten (Wageningen University) who presented the main findings of a collaborative research paper on the diffusion of global sustainability standards. In this study, the authors sought to evaluate the “efficiency” of voluntary standards and especially their capacity to take into account the specific situation of local communities and small farmers. Their main argument is that certifications generate externalities that may exclude the smallholders from having any decision-making powers, leaving the important decisions to those who are big enough to make global partnership for the development and structuring of standards. Dr. Schouten stressed that there is an ‘institutional distance’ between the global decisions made by the standard developers, and the reality of the local communities affected by them.

The authors approached the issue of social impact and inclusion from an institutional lens, with the intention to detect how the global partnerships that create the standards can form provisional institutions, and how these institutions turn into the ones that develop and structure the consequent standards. This institutional analysis was done through the case study of the Aquaculture Stewardship Council (ASC) standard for the Indonesian shrimp sector.

As Dr. Schouten explained, the theoretical framework starts from the basic assumption that sustainability partnerships develop into proto-institutions that may or may not become stable institutions for the promotion of a specific standard depending on their ‘fit’ with local specificities. This transformation, she suggested, can happen in two ways (if they do institutionalize completely): either they reproduce existing institutions in a wider organizational field; or they transform current local institutions so to adapt what exists into what is aimed at. According to Dr. Schouten, what this means is that an analysis of the institution-creative process allows one to see in what ways are the global partnerships capable of adapting and transforming so to ‘fit’ in with the needs and requirements of specific cases in each local community. The authors argued that some degree of ‘fitting’ is required for these partnerships to develop into full institutions, if they do not fit, the chances of positive impact on the local community is minimal.

They analyzed the institutional development in relation to each case ‘fitting’ with the needs, interests and demands of the local community. As they conceptualized it, the ‘fit’ represents the manner to which the institutional interests of the organization tend to match with those of the consumers, governments, NGOs and producers. They evaluated the degree of institutional fit through three variables: technical, cultural and political fits. The development and transformation of institutions depend on how these proto-institutions do fit with the technical, political and cultural characteristics of the local community. As Dr. Schouten explained, there are three degrees of ‘fit’: it may be very high, and the proto-institutions merge naturally with the local institutions and communities; there can be a medium fit (process of fitting) where there is some friction but there is a possibility of both the local institutions and the global partnerships to change in order to adapt and fit in with

each other; and a last case is that of low fit (friction), this means that the fundamental technical, political and cultural characteristics of both the global partnership that develops a standard and the local community are 'unmergeable', making it very difficult for the global partnerships to develop or transform strong institutions in the local communities where they work.

In conclusion, Dr. Schouten stressed that one of the main goal of the paper was to shift the attention away from an analysis of the potential local benefits of certification standards toward and analysis of the ways in which the specificities of a local community may have a large impact on a standard's potential for generating institutional and social benefits. The authors main argument is that the 'institutional fit' may very well determine the potential effectiveness of a given standard in a given community. This means among other things, that in the absence of institutional fit, the chances of the standard to generate positive results will reduced exponentially.

3. "Smallholders do not eat certificates. On the transformative capacity of private sustainability standards and certifications" Prof. Dr. Pieter Glasbergen (Maastricht University)

The floor was then passed to Prof. Dr. Glasbergen (Maastricht University) who offered a critical evaluation of the positive and transformative effects of private sustainability standards on the life and wellbeing of smallholder producers. He started his presentation by questioning the widespread idea that VSS can actually generate a positive outcome on the life of small agricultural producers. The main problem, as he explained it, is that VSS are imposed on them as external constraints that are created not for their own benefit but rather for that of the consumer(s). Prof. Glasbergen then stressed that for a social and environmental benefit to be achieved in agriculture, a more structural or drastic change is ultimately required: certifications and voluntary standards alone cannot achieve the expected outcomes.

After this brief introductory remarks, Prof. Glasbergen proceeding by explaining his findings regarding the effectiveness of voluntary standards. As he suggested, his analysis focuses on evaluating their impact on the livelihood of the smallholders who have them imposed on their production. The problem is that because certifications take a top-down approach in the regulative mechanism, the decisions are made by the North generally in the interests of their consumers and without regard for the impact these measures might have on smallholders. Another relevant factor of his approach is that it does not take expected outcomes and benefits as an ideal to achieve, but rather leaves the category empty so that the empirical study with real life farmers can fill it in with the actual expectations and requirements of the subject it is studying.

Talking about the studies that have found a positive impact of certifications on the smallholders, the speaker argued that results on this field tend to be highly inconclusive (while some show great improvements, others find minimal or no positive impact), the reason being that one cannot rely on a specific case to defend the whole certification

structure. The author used the case study of smallholder farmers in Indonesia (from research carried out by five of his PhD students) to analyze the impact that voluntary standards have on their livelihood. The first result he gave is that certification for the smallholders is nothing more than a set of technicalities that they have to comply with in order to better their economic prospects. Smallholders, according to Prof. Glasbergen, tend to follow the certification procedures more as a marketing tool, rather than because they are conscious of the social or environmental impact it generates; smallholders' main concern is to increase their revenue, regardless of what the certifications signify.

In this paper, Dr. Glasbergen also argued that the potential improvements that certification generates on a smallholder's livelihood are more tied to the improvement of his production methods (training, higher productivity, better quality products) rather than to the premium status of their product created by the certification. In any case, he intended to show that, at least in the Indonesian case of coffee and palm oil smallholders, their profit is slightly higher than the not certified, but not enough to consider it as a positive result for certified smallholders.

Furthermore, that paper casted doubts on the positive impact of voluntary standards in a more ample manner. Prof. Glasbergen argued that the current proliferation, overlap and confrontation of voluntary standards has made it very difficult to objectively assess which standard should be followed. Also, as mentioned before, he suggested that the benefits generated by certified smallholders are not directly related to the certification, but could be considered as indirect effects that are not necessarily linked to the standard per se. If there were alternatives to increase their production and benefits, smallholders would not tie themselves to the standards but would look for personal improvement. He affirmed that the institutionalization of certification in the local communities of smallholders depended on the personal benefits it generates to them; in other words, standards work as long as they generate a greater profit to the producers, but if these same producers were to encounter better alternatives, they would not stay within the certification scheme because they do not understand its conceptual value; they see certification just as a marketing tool that improves their market reach and their sales.

Prof. Glasbergen hence concluded the presentation by further questioning the transformative capacity of voluntary standards. His main point was that if they can in some way improve the environmental and social issues around Third World agriculture, they are not the key to solving the problem. Ultimately, a more "systemic change" is required for achieving real and long-lasting social and environmental improvements. The use of certifications by smallholders is currently pursued only for purely economic reasons; According to Prof. Glasbergen, if we desire larger social and environmental changes, we need a more holistic and systematic transformation of the agricultural structure.

4. "The Impact of Private Food Standards on Trade and Development: Evidence from Peru" **Ms. Monica Schuster** (University of Leuven) and **Prof. Dr. Miet Maertens** (University of Leuven)

The fourth and final speaker of this panel was Ms. Schuster (University of Leuven) who presented a paper co-written with Prof. Maerterns (University of Leuven) on the impact of food standards on trade and development, with a special focus on the case of Peru. Similarly to Prof. Glasbergen's study, their analysis is mainly concerned with clarifying how the proliferation of VSS has affected the livelihood in developing countries. In contrast to the mainstream literature on this topic where efficiency of a voluntary standard is assessed by its impact on trade, on producers, or on workers, the authors propose to look at the impact of voluntary standards on exporters, so to assess their efficiency for the other values. Their objective was to develop a micro analysis of how the private standards affect these actors in the value chain.

The paper focuses on the case of Peruvian food production, specifically on the asparagus industry, due to the fact that is one of the biggest certified export industries in this country. Their methodology is based on the analysis of the certification of private food standards by firms, on the export volumes and values, on the sourcing behavior of firms, and on the employment conditions. Their data was acquired through custom databases, tax administration data and airport logistic's operators. The paper also makes use of primary sources of information, such as company surveys and worker survey, merging these two into one unified panel.

From their analysis of this primary and secondary sources of information from the perspective of export of the certified product, the authors arrived to specific conclusions of the impact for each of the three above mentioned values: in the case of trade, firms with private standards had generally better export performance. The only other category of firm that performed comparably good was the firms that had the intention or were in the process of getting a certification. In the case of farmers, the authors' research concluded that certification vertically integrates producers in the value chain, hence the reason why bigger producers hoard most of the certified production, while small producers tend to be excluded from the certified export market, due to the high costs for the smaller producers to achieve the standards. In the case of the workers and the working conditions, their research shows that labor standards improve employment conditions by compelling firms to follow more strictly their national labor legislation. But the authors affirm that the positive impact does not go further than what is minimally required: workers have more legal contracts, firms comply more with the legislation on minimum wage, and certification also increases the training and preparation of contract workers. Notwithstanding these positive outcomes, the authors argue that labor standards can enforce better working conditions, but that these are limited to what the national regulations and legislation demand.



From left to right: Prof. Dr. Pieter Glasbergen, Dr. Greetje Schouten, Dr. Bart Minten and Ms. Monica Schuster

Panel 5 – The Governance of Agricultural Supply Chains (II)

The fifth panel of the workshop also dealt with the topic of the ‘Governance of Agricultural Supply Chains (II)’. It was chaired by Dr. Bart Minten (International Food Policy Research Institute) and three papers were presented.

1. “Benefits for Smallholder Tea Producers in Kenya. Impact Assessment of Farmer Field Schools Including Training for Rainforest Alliance Certification”
Ms. Yuca Waarts (The Agricultural Economics Research Institute)

The first speaker was Ms. Yuca Waarts (The Agricultural Economics Research Institute) who presented a paper entitled “Benefits for Smallholder Tea Producers in Kenya. Impact Assessment of Farmer Field Schools Including Training for Rainforest Alliance Certification.” As the title suggests, the main purpose of the contribution is to assess the impact of Farmer Field Schools (hereinafter “FFS”) on smallholder tea producers in Kenya.

The implementation of the FFS programme, which included trainings for Rainforest Alliance certification, was evaluated between 2010 and 2014. In terms of methodology, the overall design employed for this assessment was a longitudinal impact evaluation using panel data that include the baseline data (2010), which measured the outcome before the intervention, and follow-up data (2012 and 2014). The data was gathered through surveys with farmers and data sheets of tea factory companies and the evaluation combined the difference-in-difference approach, propensity score matching, and regression analysis to identify the impacts of other factors such as agro-ecological conditions and the implementation of other interventions, such as Rainforest Alliance certification.

First, as far as the results of the impact study are concerned, Ms. Waarts observed a steady improvement of professionalization of the FFS participants in terms of improved knowledge and implementation of good agricultural practices. Second, the study also uncovered positive changes in the farmer’s decision-making process. Training and knowledge acquired from the training were by far the most mentioned reasons for changes in decision making. Third, the author also found that the FFS programme also had spill-over effects through experiments and sharing of information with other non-participant farmers. Fourth, the study unveiled an increase in the average yield (kilogram green leaf per bush) of all farmers, but that among the different groups, the increase was significantly higher among FFS participants. Fifth, Ms. Waarts found that FFS participants reported a significantly higher income from other sources than the non-participants in the programme. Finally, the impact study showed that, despite the increase in green leaf productivity, profitability of tea production has dropped on average in 2014, mostly due to lower bonus payments. However, the study also uncovered that the decrease in profitability was slightly lower among FFS participants.



Ms. Yuca Waarts

In a conclusion, it was stated that between 2012 and 2014, 1) the FFS programme has had positive effects for smallholder tea producers especially immediate and intermediate outcomes; 2) FFS participants showed a high level of satisfaction with FFS activities and extension services; 2) FFS training and activities have led to improved decision-making by farmers on the essential good practices; 3) FFS participants have become significantly more active in experimenting with agricultural practices and sharing information with others; 4) FFS participants have significantly improved their green leaf yield; and 5) the majority of FFS participants have diversified their income. But despite these findings, Ms. Waarts concluded, there is still room to improve the profitability of sustainable tea by increasing production scale or the income of the farmers through diversification of income from other sources.

2. “Small Farmers, Standards and Value Chains: Evidence from the Bulgarian Dairy Chain During the EU Accession” **Prof. Dr. Jo Swinnen** (University of Leuven) and **Ms. Kristine Van Herck** (University of Leuven)

The second paper for this panel is authored by Prof. Dr. Jo Swinnen and Ms. Kristine van Herck (both from the University of Leuven) and entitled: “Small Farmers, Standards and Value Chains: Evidence from the Bulgarian Dairy Chain During the EU Accession”. The paper focuses on the drivers behind the recent farm restructuring in Bulgaria. More precisely, the paper attempted to find out how farm survival and growth in the Bulgarian dairy sector are influenced by factors such as 1) more stringent food quality and food safety regulation; 2) changes in milk procurement systems; 3) increasing off-farm employment alternatives.



Ms. Kristine Van Herck

In terms of methodology, panel data was collected in 2003 (before EU accession) and 2009 (post-accession) from two main sources: 1) in depth interviews with seven dairy companies, which vary in size and structure and 2) a survey of 296 rural households from 19 villages in five districts in the North and South Central region of Bulgaria.

First, the authors found that standards for raw milk quality in Bulgaria have been gradually aligned with the more stringent EU standards in the period of 2003-2009 and that the efforts to increase these standards have led to changes in 1) the organization of milk collection and 2) farm assistance programs. As far as milk collection is concerned, the authors noted a rapid growth in direct procurement (e.g. some dairy companies even stopped procuring raw milk from the milk collection points). However, despite this growth in direct procurement, procurement from milk collection points remained important for the other dairy companies in order to have sufficient supply of raw milk. With respect to farm assistance programs, the study showed an increase in the number of dairy companies offering such assistance programs between 2003 and 2009. The study also unraveled that the aforementioned changes have had a positive impact on milk quality.

Second, the authors found that, between 2003-2009, a massive number (124) of households

stopped delivering milk to dairy companies, while other households (117) stopped all dairy productions (reasons include: health problems or old age of household members, the profitability of other agricultural productions, other non-farm employment etc.). The authors further noticed an evolution toward a bimodal farm structure, i.e. 1) on the one hand, small semi-subsistence farms producing mainly for home consumption and village sales, selling surpluses to the dairy company and 2) on the other hand, large, full-time commercial farms.

Lastly, the authors reached the following conclusions: 1) there has been a large outflow from dairy farming, namely more than 50 % of the farms active in 2003 stopped their activities by 2009; 2) factors affecting farm survival were ageing of the households and off-farm employment alternatives (in turn, increased food standards and supply chain restructuring were not perceived as important drivers behind the large outflow from dairy farming); and 3) factors that affected farm growth were integration in modern supply chains and farm assistance, as well as the evolution toward a bimodal farm structure with small semi-subsistence farms on the one hand and large commercial farms on the other hand.

3. “Assuring Coherence between the Market-Access and Livelihood Impact of private Sustainability Standards” **Dr. Ulrich Hoffmann** (UN Forum on Sustainability Standards) and **Mr. Frank Grothaus** (UN Forum on Sustainability Standards)



Mr. Frank Grothaus

Finally the floor was passed to Mr. Frank Grothaus from the United Nations Forum on Sustainability Standards) who presented the paper entitled: “Assuring Coherence between the Market-Access and Livelihood Impact of private Sustainability Standards”.

Mr. Grothaus started his presentation by noticing that private sustainability standards (hereinafter “PSS”) have rapidly expanded in the last few years. The author noticed that PSS have the potential to support the achievement of public policy objectives

related to sustainable development, including better market access, and to contribute to sustainable market transformation, improved rural livelihoods and poverty alleviation. However, it was added that the multiplicity and increasingly stringent, complex, multi-dimensional as well as often overlapping requirements of PSS schemes have created confusion at both producers and consumer’s end, and have moreover posed a number of systemic challenges, in particular to small-scale producers in developing countries (*inter alia*, due to associated high-compliance costs and the risk of marginalization of smallholders and less developed countries).

The speaker further noticed that recent data on the sales of standard-compliant products disclosed a discrepancy between production volumes of standard-compliant products and the volumes of these products actually sold as PSS compliant. This discrepancy, it was argued, might be an indication of over-estimation of the standard-compliant market share. It was also found that surges in production are in most cases associated with commitments of

major companies to source according to certain standards and associated expectations of future sales. The paper also unraveled that most of the major commodity markets are characterized by declining or modest price premiums and that higher premiums can be realized in cases with low supply-demand ratios (e.g. Fairtrade/Organic double certified coffee).

The presenter suggested that the abovementioned systemic challenges and trends also explain the rather modest increases in available household incomes, which are a key indicator of food security, as well as livelihood improvements and pro-poor effects. According to the authors, upscaling the impact of private sustainability standards for market transformation and pro-poor development might be hindered by the following factors: 1) competitive pressure on key corporate players might limit their interest in and preparedness for upscaling the reach of PSS beyond a certain critical mass of better organized and logistically well-located producers; 2) many PSS are unlikely to create on their own sufficient impact and leverage for real transformational change; and 3) the pressure of conventional markets on costs of production that do not internalize environmental damage or true social costs and the additional costs of PSS compliant producers, in particular for inspection and certification, remain a serious hurdle for increasing the market share of PSS beyond a certain threshold.

Finally, Mr. Grothaus argued that what is required to maximize and scale up the market-transformational impact of PSS is a coordinated public, civil society and private engagement at various levels. Furthermore, the authors suggested that PSS need to reduce their level of complexity, proliferation and overlap, as well as their conformity assessment costs, while sustaining their integrity. The presenter concluded that, without the pro-active engagement of governments in supporting PSS mainstreaming, it is unlikely that these standards can reach market shares much greater than the present level.

Panel 6 – The Governance of Agricultural Supply Chains (III)

The 6th panel of the workshop, chaired by Prof. Dr. Joachim De Weerd (University of Antwerp & University of Leuven) focused also on the topic of the effectiveness of VSS within the context of the governance of Agricultural Supply Chains (III). Three papers were presented.

1. Voluntary sustainability labels: Consumer knowledge, behavioral effectiveness and suitability of responsibility” Prof. Dr. Monika Hartmann (Universität Bonn), Ms. Jeanette Klink, Dr. Nina Langen and Dr. Johannes Simons

The first speaker of the panel was Dr. Monika Hartmann (Institute for Food and Resource Economics, University of Bonn, Germany) who presented a paper written with Ms. Jeanette Klink, Dr. Nina Langen, and Dr. Johannes Simons entitled: “Voluntary sustainability labels: Consumer knowledge, behavioral effectiveness and suitability of responsibility.” In this paper the authors proposed to evaluate the effects of VSS in relation to consumers’ knowledge and interest in the health and sustainability standards of meat products. In theory, VSS have developed with the aim to increase consumers’ trust and confidence in the products they consume. Indeed, modern agriculture poses challenges for customers and this for several reasons: (i) the food chains are increasingly complex, (ii) consumers’ expectations have changed quite tremendously, (iii) the agricultural sector has suffered a lot in recent years from food safety crisis and other scandals. However, due to the high level of fragmentation and overpopulation of VSS products on the market and their low market share in many countries, consumers’ knowledge and trust in such products is not as high as one would expect. Other reasons could explain such phenomenon including but not restricted to: the unavailability of sustainable products, their high price, scarce or unreliable information, lack of relevance of the issue, lack of personal responsibility, perceived lack of effectiveness (“I, as a customer, cannot change the system through my behavior”).



Prof. Dr. Monika Hartmann

The authors designed an online survey that focused on three main points. First, the survey inquired into the consumer’s knowledge and acceptance of the current standards in the German meat sector. Interestingly, most consumers did not have an opinion on those issues. A minority even answered that they approved current methods of how animals are slaughtered and kept in Germany. Only about 30% of the people considered itself knowledgeable.

Second, the survey asked consumers to rank their perception of the relevance of six fields of action (the environment, animal husbandry, slaughtering, animal transport, food safety, and working conditions). Animal husbandry was considered to be the most important issue. Working conditions and environmental

aspects ranked much lower. The survey also asked consumers to choose in a list of actors (meat processing industry, slaughterhouses, government, farmers, butchers, independent certification bodies, others) who should take responsibility for achieving the standards in each of these areas. The results showed that the consumers see the accountability at the level of those actors directly related to the respective field of action. Remarkably, consumers themselves do not think they can take up large scale responsibility. The authors suggested that consumers probably do not feel they can generate a real change or lack the information required to feel responsible and act on that basis. Respondents also indicated that the government and independent certification bodies should control and inspect the different fields of action in the meat supply chain. Consumers said they preferred labels as a source of information about the responsible conduct of actors in the meat value chain.

Finally, the authors looked at the consumer's knowledge and trust in the perceived impact of such sustainability labels. They investigated in particular whether consumers knew 13 different labels (seven organic labels, two labels referring explicitly to animal welfare, the "GS" as well as a "GMO" free labels and two fake labels). The findings showed that most respondents (88%) knew the German organic label. However, consumers were much less aware of other labels.

2. "Participatory Guarantee Systems as institutional innovations: are these effective governance arrangements?" **Dr. Allison Loconto** (Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique) and **Dr. Pilar Santacoloma** (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations)



Dr. Allison Loconto

The second speaker of third panel on the governance of agricultural supply chains, was Dr. Allison Loconto from the Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA) who presented a paper entitled "Participatory Guarantee Systems as institutional innovations: are these effective governance arrangements?". The paper, co-authored with Pilar Santacoloma (FAO), addresses the question of whether and how VSS can work as incentives for local farmers to adopt more sustainable agricultural practices. The authors took as their basic assumption the idea that institutions mobilized through a governance arrangement may enable local producers to be linked with multiple stakeholders who provide support for the adoption of sustainable practices. In

particular, the authors focused on the innovative Participatory Guarantee Systems (PGS) which represent in their view an opportunity to strengthen the legitimacy of the standard-setting system, by creating a direct line of communication with the micro agents. The objective of PGS is to create local networks where the different parts of the value chain can communicate and deliberate together over their standards in a local context. The authors proposed PGS as an alternative certification model that aims at guaranteeing the organic quality of a product through the direct participation of many different stakeholders in the development of standards and practices.

To develop this argument, the authors launched a call for case-studies proposals on institutional innovations in linking sustainable organic agriculture with the wider market. Their intention was to select the most relevant initiatives that showed a deep participation of all relevant agents on the decision-making process of sustainability standards, and how these influenced their potential to open their products to the wider market. They chose six case-studies (Bolivia, Colombia, India, Namibia, Philippines and Uganda) from different parts of the world and different products so that the cross-examination of the different cases could lead to more general conclusions on the effectiveness of PGS. For each case-study, the authors analyzed which actors had an active participation in the deliberative procedure; they looked at how collective action was mobilized for tackling the issue of “unsustainability”; and, finally, they assessed the capacity of each of these methods in institutionalizing a more sustainable and organic agriculture in the local communities.

What their study demonstrated is that for PGS to “do well” in a specific community, they have to be implemented at two levels: at the local level, there must be stable and strong communication between all agents involved in order to experiment different alternatives and resolve the problems that are identified in existing systems; at the transnational level, PGS must receive both financial support and thorough training and transmission of knowledge from national and transnational actors. The authors emphasized in particular the importance of knowledge transmission: the role of building capacity and understanding, they argued, is fundamental for the effectiveness of PGS in a governance framework.

There is a debate in the literature between the flexibility of standards to accommodate them to local characteristics (making them more legitimate), and the effectiveness of mandatory and objective (usually global) verification of standards, which may be less legitimate (due to it being imposed), but much more effective in generating the expected sustainability outcomes. According to the authors however, PGS seem to represent a good balance between flexibility and effectiveness. Indeed, PGS can be adapted to local conditions, making standards more legitimate by accommodating them to the needs and interests of the local population, while, at the same time, maintaining a stable communication with the more stable and rigid global principles.

3. “The Efficacy of Private Voluntary Certification Schemes. A Governance Costs Approach.” **Prof Dr. Thomas Dietz** (University of Münster) and **Ms. Jennie Auffmanberg** (Bremen International Graduate School of Social Sciences).

Finally, Ms. Auffmanberg (Bremen International Graduate School of Social Sciences) took the floor to present a paper co-written with Prof. Dr. Thomas Dietz (University of Münster) entitled: “The Efficacy of Private Voluntary Certification Schemes: A Governance Cost Approach.” This paper is a study of how VSS can be effective in promoting environmental and social objectives from a governance costs approach. The authors focused on three variables to define the level of efficiency of VSS: (i) what sustainability standards actually demand, (ii) how strong the enforcement mechanisms are to implement these standards, and (iii) how the last two variables can affect a product’s proliferation on the market. The

study relies on the assumption that the stricter the standards, the better the enforcement systems and the bigger the market share, the higher will be the factual impact of a particular certification program.



Prof. Dr. Thomas Dietz



Ms. Jennie Auffenberg

Ms. Auffenberg and Dr. Dietz proceeded by evaluating some of the most important certification schemes in the global coffee industry (Rainforest Alliance, UTZ, Fair Trade, 4C and Organic), and looked at how these variables affected each other in each case. Through a qualitative comparative analysis of the data, their results showed that as expected, the stricter standards and enforcement mechanisms led to a smaller impact on the market due to increased production and governance costs, hence, an increased price for consumers. On the one hand, the authors found that production costs of high standards and strict enforcement mechanisms vary depending on the producer and that they tend to be higher in the first steps of the process, but lower when the producers have already established a system in accordance with the standards. Governance costs required for keeping up with the enforcement of standards reduce a product's potential proliferation due to its higher price. On the other hand, they observed that certification schemes with more flexible standards and loose enforcement mechanisms had bigger market shares. This allowed them to conclude that the capacity to motivate both consumers and producers through certification while, at the same time, maintaining high sustainability and social standards was restricted by the high governance costs that cannot be fully compensated by the market.

Panel 7: The Governance of Social Dimensions of Sustainability Standards (I)

Panel 7 was chaired by Dr. Axel Marx (University of Leuven) and focused on the social dimensions of sustainability standards. It featured three presentations.

1. “Bringing social issues to the fore: Understanding the effectiveness of Multi-stakeholder Initiatives” **Ms. Izabela Stacewicz** (University of Reading) and **Dr. Chukwumerije Okereke** (University of Reading)

The first speaker was Izabela Stacewicz (University of Reading). She presented a paper co-written with Dr. Okereke (University of Reading) and entitled “Bringing social issues to the fore: Understanding the effectiveness of multistakeholder initiatives.” The presentation started with the observation that Multi-stakeholder Initiatives (MSIs) studies have often overlooked the social pillar of these schemes (possibly because of the fact that social standards are sometimes presented as too subjective). The main objective of this study then was to fill this gap by discussing the issue of land rights, and how they are taken into account by VSSs, most importantly those of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and the Roundtable for Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO). As Ms. Stacewicz explained, the issue of land rights was selected because of the severe social consequences which could result from a lack of compliance with these rights.



Ms. Izabela Stacewicz

The authors defined the concept effectiveness by referring to three variables “which are widely promoted in the literature”: i.e., compliance, uptake and stringency. Compliance refers to the strictness of the assessment and auditing process. Uptake in turn, is defined as the adoption or endorsement of sustainability roundtables by numerous actors from different stakeholder groups, types of actors involved, geographic origin and the collective market share of products certified under a particular scheme. Finally, the concept of stringency measures the extent to which standards entail strict prescriptions.

The authors then proceeded by demonstrating non-linearity/complexity in interactions between stringency and compliance in practice. They pointed to a number of issues that could hinder the effectiveness of initiatives protecting land rights. There is first, the issue of standardization and variability. As standards – in this case RSPO and FSC standards – often differentiate between minor and major issues of non-compliance, this can result in different levels of stringency (the second variable of effectiveness). Second, compliance with national or sub-national law can be at odds with compliance with MSI standards. Third, some indigenous people are suspect towards the very concept of land rights. Ms. Stacewicz indeed explained that as soon as they accept the concept of rights, other parties will more easily find a way to circumvent or nullify these rights (since these other parties are more familiar

with the system of rights). Fourth, stringency is limited by a lack of detail in the standards. The lack of detail in the standards is often due to a lack of knowledge about, for example, which cultural sites should be protected according to the indigenous people. Last but not least, an issue exists at the level of the auditing bodies: auditing bodies not only have different capabilities for assessing the compliance with certain standards, they also often apply the standards in a different way. This implies that not all audits take place with the same stringency.

In light of these findings, Ms. Stacewicz ended the presentation by saying that measuring MSIs' effectiveness by reference to the notions of stringency and compliance may lead us to overlook the nuances of the commodities' contexts. In her view, the current top-down compliance mechanisms do not sufficiently capture the social impacts associated with land rights issues. In this respect, more attention should be devoted to the relationship between principles, standards, commodity characters and the nature of MSIs to understand their effectiveness.

2. “Resilience in the tropics: how to make social and environmental standards work in volatile commodity markets” **Ms. Maja Tampe** (MIT Sloan School of Management)

The floor was then passed to the second speaker of the panel, Ms. Maja Tampa (MIT Sloan School of Management) who presented her research paper on: “Resilience in the tropics: how to make social and environmental standards work in volatile commodity markets”. In this paper, Ms. Tampe introduces the concept of ‘organizational resilience’ or ‘resilient upgrading’ as a necessity for farmers to resist to the exogenous shocks, which often occur in the volatile market of commodities. She defines resilience as the capacity to bounce back from adversity in a strengthened manner thanks to a set of robust organizational structures, production knowledge, and interdependent relational assets.

To make her argument, Ms. Tampe drew upon two conceptual frameworks. First, the framework of ‘agricultural upgrading’, which fits within the broader global value chain framework itself. In this framework, the focus is on lead buyers and suppliers: that is, on the ability of suppliers to learn from the lead buyers, and the conditions under which lead buyers support suppliers. The second framework is that of ‘local standard implementation’. The premise of this framework is that social and environmental standards start a dynamic adaptation process, during which farmers can learn from engaging with these standards. In other words, standards generate new relationships as well as new knowledge. However, we see variation in the success of suppliers working with these standards.



Ms. Maja Tampe

As Ms. Tampe suggested, her main goal in this paper was to account for such variations, by looking at which knowledge and which relationships are

the most important. The certified value chain mechanisms promises to cut out the (often suspect) middle man and to establish direct relationships with foreign buyers instead. They also promise premiums. Despite these apparent benefits of adopting certification, not all certified farmer groups succeed.

The research method applied a comparative case study and used process tracing across and within cases. Two farmer cocoa groups (which are called Aroma Amazónico and Fortaleza del Valle) in Ecuador were matched on several characteristics, such as starting date, existence of lead buyer relationships, and evidence of having built new knowledge and relationship. The agricultural upgrading literature would have expected both farmer groups to succeed. However, one actually failed to survive an exogenous shock (both lost their lead buyer in 2008) and the other is still resilient and upgrading. A closer look at the history of these two rural enterprises shows that they built different types of resources to be deployed in the moment of crisis. The most important resources to cope with shocks were relational, procedural, and structural, such as diverse and dense networks, deep production knowledge, and lean cost structures—shaped by farmer groups’ actions and choices rather than the actions of lead buyers. The comparative case study thus contributes to the debate on lead buyers’ ‘guiding hand’ by showing how farmer agency shapes upgrading trajectories, and it illustrates the importance of resilience in the elite markets created by standards and certification.

In her conclusion, Ms. Tampe proceeded by pointing to some possible ways forward. Two suggestions were made in this regard. First, standards could focus more on equipping farmers with the knowledge, capabilities, and tools needed to play on a more level field with buyers. Incorporating this element would allow for the actual strengthening of farmers and farmer groups. A second possibility is the development of ‘communities of shared fate’ between farmers and buyers through risk- and profit-sharing financial devices to deal more appropriately with the volatility inherent in commodity markets.

3. “A Bitter Harvest: Child Labour in Sugarcane Agriculture and the Role of Voluntary Social Standards” **Ms. Natasha Schwarzbach** (Bonsucro) and **Dr. Benjamin Richardson** (University of Warwick)



Dr. Benjamin Richardson

The third speaker of the panel was Dr. Benjamin Richardson (University of Warwick) who presented a research paper he co-authored with Ms. Natasha Schwarzbach (Bonsucro) on the role of VSS in the fight against child labour in the sugarcane industry. Dr. Richardson started the presentation by sketching some of the main problems that arise when it comes to address the issue of child labour. Firstly, it is difficult to determine the age of children in several countries, as well as their work-life (because employed children often have a very diverse array of tasks). Secondly, the scope of child

labour is very broad and makes it difficult to detect in all its forms (e.g., a young girl doing domestic chores could also be qualified as child labourers). He recalled that many forms of child labour exist and not all of them are intrinsically bad. In his view, it is possible to categorise three kinds of abuse that children could suffer in sugarcane agriculture: (i) hazardous work, (ii) harmful adult work, and (iii) exploitative work. Lastly, Dr. Richardson suggested that although the goal of eradicating child labour sounds great, the question remains as to what will happen with these children once they are unemployed. The obvious problem is that it is not always easy to find a sufficient alternative for these children.

Dr. Richardson then turned to an examination of some of the challenges that have confronted recent efforts to eradicate the problem of child labour. Several reasons explain why child labour still remains such a stubborn aspect of the sugarcane sector: the lack of recognition of child labour as a problem, the difficulty of deciding who is responsible for preventing and eradicating it, the challenges that governments face in enforcing legislation due to a lack of monitoring capacity, and the lack of identification of the best interests of children.

Dr. Richardson's presentation continued with a comparison of different certification systems currently in use in the sugarcane industry so to show the different forms this 'private' governance mechanism can take in respect to child labour. These included: Bonsucro, Fairtrade International and Programa Empresa Amiga da Criança (PEAC). To be certified by Bonsucro, cane suppliers are prohibited to employ children. Fairtrade International is broadly similar: certification can only be obtained if no child labour is used. However, Fairtrade International goes further and requires certification seekers to address the root causes of child labour (e.g. building schools). The emphasis is less on enforcement here. PEAC (which exists only in Brazil), finally, certifies companies instead of products. It focusses on companies on the level of the mills, rather than on farmer level. PEAC acts in concert with local state authority, and is very active in advocacy (they focus on advocacy and lobbying rather than enforcement). It acts more at the buyer level than at the farm level. The standard upheld by PEAC is that companies should not employ children under 16 and not employ any children in dangerous activities.

In light of these findings, Dr. Richardson concluded by saying that the focus of these standards is rather on gradually making things better, rather than on enforcing the rules of the standards; these are Voluntary Sustainability 'Clubs', rather than Voluntary Sustainability 'Standards'. The speaker also wondered whether it would be possible to start an institutionalized dialogue on the effectiveness of certain standards. Finally, he suggested to 'breach the public-private firewall', essentially making a case for more cooperation between private standard-setters and states (possibly with the help of international governmental organizations, such as the ILO).

Panel 8: The Governance of Social Dimensions of Sustainability Standards (II)

Panel 8 was the second panel discussing the governance of social dimensions of sustainability standards. The chair was Prof. Dr. Pieter Glasbergen and three presentations were held.

1. “The Need for an Integrated Comparative Approach of Effectiveness of Sustainability Initiatives and a Comparison of Two Examples” **Prof. Dr. Martijn Scheltema** (Erasmus University, Rotterdam)

Prof. Martijn Scheltema opened the panel with a presentation of a paper entitled: “The Need for an Integrated Comparative Approach of Effectiveness of Sustainability Initiatives and a Comparison of Two Examples”. Prof. Scheltema’s main argument in this paper is that we need an interdisciplinary framework to discuss effectiveness issues. In his presentation, Scheltema mainly focused on the legal perspective on effectiveness. In so doing, he first discussed why assessing the effectiveness of standards could be useful, or even necessary. In his view, the different approaches to measuring effectiveness are sometimes contradictory and intertwined hence the reason why we need a more interdisciplinary framework. Academics and standard-setting organizations are obviously interested in measuring the effectiveness of standards, but it is important to note that governments might also be interested in the effectiveness of VSS. If they try to incentivize corporations to adopt certain social and environmental precautions through requiring the adoption of certain VSS in order for a corporation to be able to participate in a public procurement procedure, these corporations might challenge the procedure on the basis of the principle of equality: Why is certification under a certain standard more important than certification under another standard? Moreover, researching the effectiveness of VSS standards might be interesting from a point of view of WTO and competition law.



Prof. Dr. Martijn Scheltema

As Dr. Scheltema explained, despite the importance of assessing the effectiveness of VSS, no common, interdisciplinary definition exists to date. The existing approaches (legal, economic, social and behavioral) need to be integrated. As mentioned above, Dr. Scheltema has focused solely on the legal approach in his presentation (in contrast with his paper¹).

The speaker suggested that from a legal approach, there are different angles from which effectiveness can be conceived.

¹ In his paper, he also applied the different approaches to two case studies: FSC and UTZ Certified. However, no time was left to discuss these two case studies in the presentation.

The first one is the question of objectives. The objectives of VSS, and how these objectives will be reached needs to be made clear. A clear legal perspective is needed because governments need a solid judicial framework in deciding which standard is best. This way governments can remain objective and can choose. A second important aspect is the issue of 'conflict of law' rules. Though there is, evidently, no conflict of law in the strict sense of the word when a private standard contains obligations contrary to the obligations under local or national law, important legal questions are raised by this issue. An example of such conflicting obligations can be found in the case of deforesting permits in Indonesia. When you obtain a permit for a certain area, you are required to deforest the entire area. However, this possibly conflicts with some of the provisions on 'indigenous grounds' in certain forest governance standards. As Dr. Scheltema observed, there are no general rules on what to do in this case. Adding to the confusion is the fact that different private standards can also contain conflicting obligations.

A third aspect is the question of enforcement. Can compliance with standards be enforced? And if so, how is this enforcement shaped? From a legal perspective, it seems that this enforcement is mainly operated through contractual mechanisms. This avenue of enforcement creates several issues, since parties can only enforce the terms of contract on their co-parties to the contract; a buyer – who often controls the contractual relationships scheme – cannot, for example, immediately impose conditions on the smallholders, since he goes through the intermediary. The buyer does have some leverage to force the intermediary to adopt certain clauses in his contracts with smallholders. However, the possibilities for enforcement remain limited.

A fourth, and last, aspect is the issue of dispute resolution; if disputes are not resolved, effectiveness is decreased. In many instances, there are no alternatives to grievance mechanisms. Therefore, the effectiveness of these grievance mechanisms should be ensured, *inter alia* by making sure escalation mechanisms are in place (communicating grievances to the higher levels, if no (appropriate) action is taken at the lower level.

2. “From Quality Control to Labor Protection? ISO 9001 and Occupational Safety, 1993---2012” **Dr. Sijeong Lim** (Stockholm University) and **Prof. Dr. Aseem Prakash** (University of Washington)

The second speaker of the panel was Dr. Sijeong Lim (Stockholm University) who presented a paper she co-wrote with Prof. Dr. Aseem Prakash (University of Washington) entitled “From Quality Control to Labor Protection? ISO 9001 and Occupational Safety, 1993---2012”. In this paper, the authors studied the second order effect on occupational safety of ISO 9001, the most widely adopted voluntary standard in the world. ISO 9001 looks indeed into quality assurance and customer satisfaction. The second order effect researched is the impact of quality improvement (through adoption of ISO9001) on the safety of the work environment (e.g. poor quality can lead to unsafe working environments). The analysis covers 92 countries for the period 1993-2012. The presentation followed the paper closely. The research focuses on the second order effect and technocratic labor rights protection. Companies that introduced ISO 9001 are known to have improved their quality, their efficiency, experienced

marketing benefits and have had an improved financial performance. Employee benefits are a second order effect, which is endogenous to the first order effects.

These benefits are:

- Reducing stress and injuries
- Reducing unsafe work practices (which can be a source of inefficiency)
- And it may improve workplace safety



Dr. Seijong Lim

Dr. Lim explained that ISO 9001 is very popular: in 2012 more than one million companies were certified in 165 countries; this means there is one certified organization for every 2.500 workers. Next to a direct effect for certified companies, a spillover can also occur where other companies adopt certain ISO 9001 standards. This leads to the following hypotheses:

H1. Increased country-level ISO 9001 adoption is associated with improvement in national occupational safety.

H2. How would weak public governance in the area of labor protection affect the hypothesized effect of ISO9001 (H1)?

Both effects should become more pronounced when public governance is weak. After a statistical analysis, H1 was considered proven with a 0.035 to 0.047% decrease in fatal injury rate and some evidence was found for H2. Hence, it was concluded that due to increasing globalization, induced quality pressures have as effect that workers safety is improved and may even outperform voluntary standards specific to labor rights.

3. “Effectiveness of Private Sustainability Certification on Practices of Tea Production in Tamilnadu, India: Applying a Control Group Approach” **Dr. Walter Vermeulen** (Utrecht University)

Finally Dr. Walter Vermeulen (Utrecht University) took the floor to present a paper entitled: “Effectiveness of Private Sustainability Certification on Practices of Tea Production in Tamilnadu, India: Applying a Control Group Approach”. For this paper, Dr. Vermeulen analyzed to what extent firms in developing countries are reacting to VSS. Dr. Vermeulen used an atypical research team for this effort: he worked with Indian students, who were not specialised at all in the field of VSS. The working method consisted of a comparison between a group of 19 certified farms and a control group of 41 non-certified farms. The fieldwork consisted partly of a questionnaire, given to farm managers, and partly of field visits. Compliance with standards was checked on the ‘planet’² and on the ‘people’³ side.

² Referring to the environmental aspects of the standard.

³ Referring to the social aspects of the standard.

Interestingly, on the people side, non-certified farms complied for 70-80% with the standards (compared to 100% for certified farms). Similar results were found for the obligation to provide for sufficiently long maternity leave: there was no non-compliance for certified farms, but the cases of non-compliance for non-certified farms only amounted to 22%. Economically, certification clearly entailed benefits for the companies who obtained it, despite the fact that the costs of their input had gone up, as well as the productivity per hectare. A large difference was found in the vision of the future of certified and non-certified farms. Certified farms were much more positive.



Dr. Walter Vermeulen

From this research, Dr. Vermeulen concluded that the theory of change seemed (roughly) confirmed, but that questions on causality remained. Moreover, there were some unexpected issues: profitability seemed to have a downward trend for certified farms, and a part of the control group was close to and open for certification. Their optimism for the future is probably linked to their better connection to the market. They did point out that it is hard for them to find good staff and believe this will worsen in the future. The question, however, remained if the major issues were addressed? These major challenges are: keeping work and lives in tea business

attractive, raising the wages in comparison with the cities, and raising the knowledge level. As mentioned above, Dr. Vermeulen considered the theory of change to be largely confirmed.

Panel 9: Private Governance Arrangements and VSS

The final panel of this workshop, chaired by Prof. Dr. Jo Swinnen focused on the topic of private governance arrangements and VSS. It featured three presentations.

1. “Private Governance Space and the Impact of EU Regulation” **Dr. Stefan Renckens** (University of Toronto)

Dr. Stefan Renckens from the University of Toronto opened the panel with a presentation of a paper entitled “Private Governance Space and the Impact of EU Regulation.” Central to Dr. Renckens’ s contribution is the interaction between transnational private governance and public governance. In order to get a grip on this interaction he set himself the task of showing (a) how and (b) why public authorities intervene and (c) how this affects the effectiveness of both private governance schemes and the hybrid governance systems that result from these interventions.

A public authority – Dr. Renckens argued – can intervene with a private governance’s functioning in four ways that together form the private governance’s *governance space*: (a) standard setting, (b) the introduction of procedural rules, (c) the provision of supply chain information and (d) the transformation of incentive structures.

As to the first method: a public authority can set a legal baseline that should be adhered to by firms as well as by private standard setting organizations. The main challenge here is that the level at which the baseline is set is subject to political conflict (a challenge – he noted – that was also treated by Prof. Cashore): strict standards are bound to lead to a decrease in corporate participation, but this may also be an explicit goal (as to drive out lower-performing private programs). In either case, we also have to take into account that private governance schemes can go beyond the public baseline, covering lacunas in public regulation (and allowing public authority to learn from private standards).

Public authority can also delegate part of the standard setting to private governance schemes (to extend, for example, the geographical reach of rule enforcement), yet regulate such delegation through the introduction of procedural rules. To give an example: through the introduction of procedural rules (both mandatory and voluntary) public authority can intervene in the internal organization of private governance schemes.

A third way to intervene is to regulate the use of a private initiative’s supply chain information: a public authority can, for example, impose mutual recognition among different initiatives thus facilitating the trading of products sold in two jurisdictions were different



Dr. Stefan Renckens

standards apply. A public authority can do this through, among other things, the development of its own public label as such regulating the use of private labels (forcing the private labels to either adhere to its standards or banning them altogether).

Finally, a public authority can also intervene in the incentive structure: it can, for example, require firms to have their operations certified in order to get access to a market. But why would the EU want to intervene in private governance? Dr. Renckens argued that these interventions were attempts to (a) solve the problem of fragmentation (second-order information asymmetries) and (b) to further domestic private interests (that is, to benefit local firms or farmers). Furthermore, he argued that the influence of these two drivers of public intervention is mediated by the agency of private governance actors; while some of the latter may in certain instances be in favor of public intervention, conflicting interests with public authorities may nonetheless lead to a lesser degree or different type of intervention, with private governance actors striving to retain a sufficient part of their pre-existing governance space.

Having established the analytical framework, Dr. Renckens then set out to focus on two cases of public intervention with private governance in the EU. One of his cases was the EU intervention into organic agriculture (an attempt to benefit local farmers, *green* the common agricultural policy, and limit the amount of private claims regarding “organic” or “natural” agricultural products). He noted that initially the organic agriculture organizations (i.e. IFOAM) were actually in favor of the EU setting the legal baseline, but once intervention was proposed to be expanded (e.g. the EU tried to *de facto* impose mutual recognition in 2007) they objected. This led to intense negotiations which resulted in, amongst other things, the EU developing a mandatory public label for organics, yet allowing private standards and labels to be used as well.

Dr. Renckens concluded that at first sight EU interventions might seem (and to a certain extent are) significant: the EU created a legal baseline (which is hard to undo) and a public label for organics was developed, as was a mandatory 10% target for the uptake of sustainable biofuels, which is mainly assured through private certification programs. However, these interventions pose no real challenge to private governance as an institution. Actually, private governance actors have become a significant interest group, that has the ability to impact the type and degree of EU intervention.

2. “Effectiveness and synergies of policy instruments for land use governance in tropical regions” Prof. Dr. Eric Lambin (Stanford University)

The second speaker was Prof. Eric F. Lambin (Université catholique de Louvain and Stanford University) who presented his research on the “effectiveness and synergies of policy instruments for land use governance in tropical regions.” The main focus here is on the coalitions of public and private actors that try to directly influence land use by designing market-based or demand-led policy instruments. However, the evidence for the effectiveness of these policy instruments is thin and the results are mixed. The main challenges to research being that (a) the causal link between initial triggers and outcomes is

difficult to prove because of multiple confounding factors, (b) selection biases are often unavoidable and (c) differing institutional contexts have to be taken into account.

Before looking into two cases (treating two different policy instruments), Dr. Lambin presented an overview of the different possible interactions between policy instruments (or actors). Instruments can be (a) *complementary*, in which case either agendas reinforce each other (when, for example, private standards fill policy gaps), actors pursue the same goal but target different actors (in which case they operate synergistically) or functions are divided (if, for example, private certification schemes implement norms developed by governments). However, there are also cases of (b) *substitution* where another governance entity replaces the private-led mechanism and cases of (c) *conflict* in which competing governance systems undermine each other.

The first case that was presented was an assessment of coffee certification schemes in Colombia, a study conducted with Dr. Ximena Rueda (Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia). These coffee certification schemes were adopted by the farmers because of incentives that were mostly non-economic and social (e.g.: an improved organization of the household). The research also showed that the benefits were not primarily of an economic nature, but mainly social (knowledge creation, acquisition of skills, bridging of standards, ...) and environmental. Especially the environmental benefits were significant: because certified farmers had adopted more environmentally friendly practices than non-certified farmers, the former's lands showed more signs of reforestation and increased tree-cover. Dr. Lambin attributed a special role to the Colombian Coffee Growers' Federation in this process: they created supply chains, increased coordination between actors in the supply chain, participated in export trade and helped deepen relationship with clients.

The second case, conducted with Dr. Pénélope Lamarque, focused on the instrument of geographical indications: these do not inform consumers on how the good was produced, but *where* it was produced (hence linking production to the socio-economic and environmental attributes of specific places). More specifically, Dr. Lambin analyzed the case of cheese production in the Alps through the lens of the EU GI designations Protection of Designation of Origin (PDO) and Protection of Geographical Indication (PGI). He noted that the more stringent label PDO led to more biodiversity and more extensive land use, outperforming the label PGI (that was developed in a more top-down way as farmers were only marginally involved in PGI development and perceived lower benefits). Also in this case he noted the importance of local factors, pointing to the positive role played by the Parc Naturel Régional du Massif des Bauges.

Dr. Lambin concluded by suggesting that the interventions by private-driven mechanisms, public actors and civil society may complement each other through the following sequence of events: (a) information campaigns create a widespread perception of an environmental problem, (b) standards for sound land use practices are defined by involving various mixes of stakeholders, (c) policy instruments allow implementation of these standards at an acceptable cost for private actors and, finally, (d) monitoring and auditing contribute to

enforcement. For this to be effective private and public regulations of land use have to align.

3. “Towards cross-organizational effectiveness of sustainability standards? A Social Network Analysis approach” **Dr. Luc Fransen** (University of Amsterdam), **Dr. Jelmer Schalk** (Leiden University) and **Prof. Dr. Graeme Auld** (Carleton University)

The final speaker of the panel was Dr. Luc Fransen (University of Amsterdam). His paper co-written with Dr. Jelmer Schalk and Prof. Dr. Graeme Auld entitled “Towards cross-organizational effectiveness of sustainability standards? A Social Network Analysis Approach” seeks to study the interconnections among VSS. These might – he argued – have important implications for sustainability governance: competition between VSS organizations can lead to detrimental consequences and in the case of sustainability problems that exceed the scope of single private regulators there is a danger of fragmentation. However: they could also evolve towards becoming a close-knit community and this could promote coordination. This is why it might be important to map the ties between different policy makers through a systematic multidimensional analysis of their structure.



Dr. Luc Fransen

Studies so far have concluded that while community formation and cross-referencing exists, and meta-standards programs are emerging, sustained differences among professionals working for different standards persist. However, Dr. Fransen continued, this research worked with databases that were dated and incomplete. His own research tries to fill the gaps by constructing an original database focusing on (a) mapping the professional and educational backgrounds of all current staff and governors of VSS organization, (b) people moving between organizations, (c) membership and linkages among VSSs in meta-standards programs, (d) ongoing partnerships and collaborations among VSS organizations and (e) identifying uptake and recognition of policy ideas and tools in policy documents of various VSS organizations (e.g. cross-references).

Empirical set-up of the project would be to focus on 17 key VSS organizations in agriculture, looking at (a) professional resumes ('02-'12) on VSS websites and LinkedIn, (b) meta-standard participation in '13, (c) cross-references in the latest versions of standard policy documents and (d) mention of partnerships and collaborations in these same standard policy documents.

Through Social Network Analysis these ties could then be analyzed. Research into ties among

professionals showed that, in statistical terms, the network is not dense. Hence, it could be concluded that inter-organizational activity in transnational private governance in agriculture is still limited. However, the analysis of meta-standards showed that linkages through meta-standardization are much more frequent showing promising signs of coordination and collaboration. On the other hand, analysis of cross-references showed results that were less promising: standards hardly ever referred to each other, although ILO appeared to be central in social standards and WHO and AFO in environmental standards.

Dr. Fransen concluded that there were few signs of professional community formation, but also proof of linkages through meta-standards (although there were also signs of different communities of meta-standard groups). On the other hand there were few cross-references (but many standards sharing cross-references to IGOs).

Conclusion by the conveners

Dr. Axel Marx (University of Leuven) concluded the workshop with some remarks on the workshop's contributions and on the opportunities for future research on the topic of the effectiveness of VSS. He began by thanking all the participants for a set of excellent papers, comments, and debates. He noted that he had been extremely pleased with how the interdisciplinary exchange of information and approaches had unfolded. The mission of the Leuven Centre for Global Governance studies, he recalled, is to spur interdisciplinary research and the workshop in his view, showed that interdisciplinary encounters are very worthwhile and can generate a lot of insights.

Dr. Marx then proceeded with two reflections on VSS. The first had to do with how we should evaluate the success or failure of VSS. Dr. Marx recalled that much optimism accompanied the earlier scholarship on VSS as illustrated by a quote from Cashore et al. (2004) book (see also presentation by Allison Loconto) which described VSS as "the most startling institutional innovation in the last 50 years." But in recent years, Dr. Marx noted, a more pessimistic view of VSS has emerged. Several studies in the workshop for instance, showed relative modest success of VSS, and some analyses have been even more critical. This pessimism is also reflected in a number of recent publications that increasingly question the very foundations of voluntary forms of governance, both in terms of effectiveness and legitimacy. For Dr. Marx this raises the question of whether we are becoming too critical of VSS: in other terms, is the increasing dissatisfaction with the performance of VSS really justified? In this regard, he noted, what is relevant is the question of benchmark. For instance, the idea that we would be able to enforce the eight ILO core conventions operationalized in many specific standards, through private enforcement will full compliance by the firms or the rule-takers, is a high bar to reach. These objectives actually cannot be realized and this might force us to reflect upon which benchmarks we use when assessing the success and failure of voluntary standards. This, he said, was one of the central aims of this workshop and all the contributions gave a lot of food for thoughts.

In a second set of reflections about VSS, Dr. Marx suggested that another key aim of the workshop had been to canvas the current research on VSS and identify key gaps in knowledge. Most of the contribution offered a lot of interesting empirical research, most often case based, which shows that "effectiveness," as could be expected, is fundamentally conditional on many aspects. Three of them, Dr. Marx continued, are worth mentioning:

First, he explained, the notion of effectiveness is conditional on what is understood by effectiveness and how it is measured. The aim of the workshop has been to bring together several different perspectives on and approaches to the question of effectiveness focusing on different parameters, direct and indirect effects, short-term and long-term effects, etc. As the discussions showed, there is currently no real consensus on how to operationalize effectiveness and many different approaches were in effect presented. According to Dr. Marx,

this means that we can broaden the concept note on the concept of effectiveness and further refine it. In his view, the workshop provided a wealth of information on how to proceed with such an endeavor and develop a framework that further elaborates on the different dimensions of effectiveness.

Dr. Marx's second point was that effectiveness is also conditional on internal aspects and dynamics related to the standards in their institutional design and development. This, he added, relates both to individual standards as well as the standards world as a complex system and how they interact. On the level of individual standards the contributions, critically focused on compliance design (auditing) and sought ways for further improvement. This, Dr. Marx added is related to the research he is currently conducting on the possibilities and constraints of complaint systems in voluntary standards as one way to strengthen their design. Some other contributions focused on the so-called rule-takers and looked at adoption mechanisms to understand the potential impact and effectiveness of standards. On the level of the system in turn, discussions centered on issues of fragmentation and path dependency. Special attention was given in particular to creating favorable or unfavorable conditions to generate adoption of high standard systems with stringent compliance procedures. In this regard, he suggested, significant differences exist between sectors in which voluntary standards are involved as a comparison between forestry and biofuels showed.

As a third point, Dr. Marx recalled how several papers (especially country case studies) highlighted the importance of external conditions - such as political institutional fit, the political institutional context in which they operate, market structure and dynamics, etc. - in determining their effectiveness. Here many factors came to the front. The country case studies in particular demonstrated the importance of these factors. Prof. Lambin also mentioned this in its last intervention. On this topic, Dr. Marx suggested that what is particularly interesting is the interaction between public and private forms of governance.

On a concluding note, Dr. Marx made it again clear that several factors and dynamics come into play when assessing the issue of the effectiveness of VSS and that future efforts to understand effectiveness in relation to these proliferating forms of governance should bring these together, if possible in an overall framework. On the basis of the papers presented at the workshop and on other contributions in the literature, Dr. Marx suggested that this now becomes a very interesting task. Once we have such framework he added, we can situate the different contributions in this framework, identify the key insights and results, but also identify the gaps in knowledge on which we can work further.

Dr. Marx closed the workshop by informing all the participants on the **follow up**. First, a report on the workshop will be made publicly available. Second, the PPT presentations will be accessible via a secured site. Third, the organizers will pursue one or two publication projects. Mention was made of a collectively published output, and that the preferred option thus far would be to pursue a special issue in a journal, probably a journal which is open to an interdisciplinary approach accommodating papers from different disciplines and with a focus on sustainability. Dr. Marx clarified that no journals had yet been shortlisted and

that any suggestions in this respect, would be greatly appreciated. It could be also possible to apply to two journals. Dr. Marx said that some follow-up information will soon be provided in this regard. Fourth, future action will be taken to explore the possibilities of developing a research proposal in the context of Horizon 2020. After expressing much gratitude to Ms. Dominique De Brabanter for her assistance with the organization of the workshop, Dr. Marx thanked again all the members of the audience for their active participation and interest in the workshop and wished them a safe travel back home.

List of Participants

Jennie AUFFENBERG is a PhD Fellow at the Bremen International Graduate School of Social Sciences. Before coming to Bremen, she worked as a research assistant at the Department of Economic Sociology at the University of Vienna and the Center for Social Science Methodology at the University of Oldenburg where she participated in the Collaborative Research Center 597 "Transformations of the State". She holds a Diplom degree in social sciences from the University of Goettingen. In her research, Jennie focuses on marketization of public services and employment relations, as well as non-state market regulation.

Graeme AULD is an Associate Professor at Carleton University in the School of Public Policy and Administration, with a cross appointment in the Institute of Political Economy. He is a Research Fellow with the Carleton Centre for Community Innovation and a Faculty Associate at the Governance, Environment, and Markets Initiative at Yale University. With broad interests in comparative environmental policy and global environmental governance, his research examines the emergence, evolution and impacts of non-state and hybrid forms of global governance across economic sectors, particularly fisheries, agriculture and forestry. Secondary interests include the design and efficacy of information disclosure and transparency policies and climate change policy. He has published widely on environmental certification programs and environmental policy and governance. He is co-author (with Benjamin Cashore and Deanna Newsom) of "Governing Through Markets: Forest Certification and the Emergence of Non-state Authority" (Yale University Press, 2004), and the author of "Constructing Private Governance: The Rise and Evolution of Forest, Coffee, and Fisheries Certification" (Yale University Press, Forthcoming 2014).

Paolo CERUTTI is a scientist with CIFOR working under the Forests and Governance Programme. Based in Nairobi, Kenya, since 2013, he has been working with CIFOR in Yaoundé, Cameroon, since 2004. Paolo holds a PhD in Environmental Governance from the Crawford School of Economics and Government/the Australian National University, and a Masters in Remote Sensing and Natural Resources Evaluation from Agronomic Institute for Overseas Countries (IAO)/Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Florence, Italy. Prior to joining CIFOR as a Junior Professional Officer of the United Nations in 2004, Paolo was a visiting scientist at the United States Geological Survey, and an assistant forest expert to the Coordinator of the Albanian National Forest Inventory.

Joachim DE WEERDT is an economist living and working in the Kagera region of Tanzania. He started off there while doing field work for his PhD 1999-2001. At the time he was studying social networks and informal insurance in small, rural African communities. After completing his PhD he returned to Kagera to set up EDI. Joachim and business partner, Louise Broadbent, set up a two-person office at a friend's house in Bukoba. EDI has become Tanzania's number one survey house, employing over 70 members of staff. As Research Director, Joachim established EDI's survey arm, the preferred partner for organisations that are serious about

the quality of their survey work in Tanzania. EDI's ground troops have conducted interviews with well over 100,000 households on dozens of different survey assignments. The foundation of all this work is the premise that poverty research should adhere to rigorous academic standards if it is to lead to policies that effectively combat poverty. EDI strives to deliver work that is of sufficient standard to be published in top peer-reviewed academic journals.

Thomas DIETZ is Professor (Junior professor) for Politics and Law. Before coming to Muenster he was a Postdoctoral Fellow in the Institute of European and Comparative Law at the University of Oxford and a member of Wolfson College. Thomas holds an MA in political science from the University of Bonn and a PhD in law from the University of Bremen, where he also worked as a research fellow at the Collaborative Research Center 597 "Transformations of the State". His research is focused on the areas of International Politics, International Law and Global Governance. Thomas particularly aims at exploring how private governance beyond the classical nation state is created by transnational actors. The evolution of private transnational governance is described, explained and evaluated pertinent to its political consequences.

Luc FRANSEN is Assistant Professor of International Relations at the University of Amsterdam. He received his PhD in Social Sciences at the University of Amsterdam in 2010 and has held research and teaching positions at the European University Institute, Yale University, Leiden University and the Amsterdam Institute for International Development. His research investigates how, why and to what effect various types of global governance of social and environmental conditions of production evolve, diffuse and interact. His most recent book *Corporate Social Responsibility and Global Labor Standards* (2012, Routledge) analyzes the evolution of, business demand for and competition between transnational private labor standard organizations. Next to that, his work has been published in various international journals, including *Governance*, *Socio-Economic Review*, *Review of International Political Economy*, *Organization*, and *Regulation & Governance*.

Pieter GLASBERGEN is honorary professor at Maastricht University (International Centre for Integrated assessment and Sustainable development ICIS) and emeritus Professor of Environmental Studies, Policy and Management at Utrecht University and the Dutch Open University. He studied Sociology and Political Science, and obtained his Ph.D. in 1979. He was (Co-)Founder of the social scientific Environmental Studies bachelor program, the master program Sustainable Development track Environmental Policy and Management, and the research program Governance for Sustainable Development at Utrecht University. Next to this, he was Founder of the social scientific long distance teaching program in the bachelor and master program Environmental Sciences at the Open University. He was Visiting professor at Yale University, Universidad Nacional Costa Rica, Indian Institute of Technology-Kanpur, University of Washington, the Royal Institute of Management Bhutan, and RMIT University Melbourne. His research focused on the governance for sustainable development. His recent research is on global cross-sector partnerships for sustainable development.

Frank GROTHAUS is Member of the United Nations Forum on Sustainability Standards (UNFSS) Support Team in Geneva, and Consultant in the Division on International Trade in

Goods and Services, and Commodities, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). He works mainly on issues at the intersection of trade and sustainable development. Previously, he was Research Assistant at the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD) - Global Platform on Climate Change, Trade & Sustainable Energy and China Programme, Geneva. He was also an intern at the Delegation of the European Commission to the United Nations, Economic Affairs Section (Trade, Development and Environment), in New York. Mr. Grothaus holds a Master of Laws (LL.M.) with a focus on international trade and environmental law, from Maastricht University.

Stéphane GUENEAU, b. 1966, works as researcher for the French research Centre CIRAD (Centre de coopération internationale et de recherche agronomique pour le développement), MOISA research Unit. Prior to joining Cirad, he worked as Researcher for the French think-tank IDDRI (Institute for sustainable development and international relations). Since 2013, he is a research associate at University of Brasilia, Centre for Sustainable Development, and a Visiting Professor at Federal University of Maranhão in São Luis, Brazil. He holds a Ph.D. in Environmental Sciences from Agroparistech and an MSc in Economics from Montpellier University, France. He teaches at Master and Doctorate Levels, on global environmental governance, environmental policy, and social and human sciences methods. His researches deal notably with environmental effectiveness of voluntary schemes and public-private articulation in environmental governance, particularly in the forest and agribusiness supply chains.

Monika HARTMANN holds the Chair of Agricultural and Food Market Research at Bonn University. Her group analyses drivers and obstacles of sustainable behavior of market participants. One focus of recent studies is to examine the extent, motivation and impact of economical, ecological and socially responsible conduct of firms in the food sector. In the area of consumer research, special attention is given to analyzing the perception, attitudes and preferences of consumers regarding more sustainable consumption.

Ulrich HOFFMANN studied economics and commercial law in Berlin and had an academic chair on economics of developing countries before starting his work at the United Nations. He is the senior trade policy adviser to the director of the International Trade Division at the secretariat of the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in Geneva. He is the editor-in-chief of UNCTAD's annual Trade and Environment Review, one of the flagship reports of UNCTAD. Dr. Hoffmann is also the coordinator of the UN Forum on Sustainability Standards (UNFSS), a joint initiative of five UN agencies (FAO, ITC, UNCTAD, UNEP and UNIDO). Dr. Hoffmann has extensive experience on public and private sustainability standards, inter alia as one of the coordinators of the FAO/IFOAM/UNCTAD International Task Force on Harmonization and Equivalence in Organic Agriculture.

Agni KALFAGIANNI is Assistant Professor (tenure-track) for Global Food and Environmental Governance at the Institute for Environmental Studies (IVM), VU University of Amsterdam. She is also senior research fellow of the Earth System Governance Project, the largest social research network in the area of governance and global environmental change. Agni

coordinates the global governance research cluster of the department of Environmental Policy Analysis (EPA) and is in charge of the institute's integrated theme on food, one of IVM's four central interdisciplinary research themes. She is also EPA's teaching coordinator and core member of her department's management team. Agni is Editor-in-chief of the Global Environmental Governance book series published by Routledge, Managing editor of the international peer-reviewed journal *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, and serves as member of the Editorial board of *Agriculture and Human Values* and *Fisheries and Aquaculture* journals. She has served as referee for numerous research grant committees in the Netherlands and internationally. She has published extensively on issues of effectiveness, legitimacy and justice of global food and environmental governance. Her work has appeared, among others, in *Agriculture and Human Values*, *Business and Politics*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, *Marine Policy*, and in edited volumes with major university press, e.g. MIT press.

Dennis KLINK is a research associate at the Centre for Social Investment in Berlin. He is also a doctoral student at the Berlin Graduate School for Transnational Studies (BTS), a joint graduate program of the Free University Berlin, the Hertie School of Governance and the Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin (WZB). In his PhD, Dennis looks at the Corporate Social Responsibility policies of Multinational Companies in the global banana industry. He is in particular interested in the diffusion and the effectiveness of transnational private labor standards. Dennis has also collaborated with and worked for a number of public entities, e.g. the Deutsche Gesellschaft für International Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) or the German Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (BMAS).

Eric LAMBIN, a geographer and environmental scientist, divides his time between the Université catholique de Louvain (Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium) and Stanford University, where he occupies the Ishiyama Provostial Professorship at the School of Earth Sciences and the Woods Institute for the Environment. His research tries to better understand patterns, causes, and impacts of land use changes in different parts of the world. He was Chair of the international scientific project Land Use and Land Cover Change (LUCC) from 1999 to 2005. He also contributed to the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. He was awarded the 2009 Francqui prize and is Foreign Associate at the U.S. National Academy of Sciences. His current research tries to understand how economic globalization affects global land use, and how private and public regulations of land use interact to promote more sustainable land use practices.

Sijeong LIM is a postdoctoral fellow at the Department of Political Science at Stockholm University. She received her doctoral degree in Political Science from University of Washington, Seattle. Her dissertation is entitled "Modes of Social Policy in the Developing World." Her substantive research interests lie at the intersection of international political economy and public policy. Her works examine how various dimensions of economic globalization influence public policy outputs and outcomes, in the areas of social, labor, and environmental policies. She is currently affiliated with a comparative environmental policy project entitled "Governing the Anthropocene – Environmental Policy and Outcomes in a Comparative Perspective (GRACE-EPOCOMP)."

Allison LOCONTO is a Research Officer at the French National Institute for Agricultural Research (INRA) and the Institute for Research, Innovation and Society (IFRIS); and Visiting Expert on Standards at the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Italy. Her research interests include governance by standards, innovations in certification systems, regulatory intermediaries, social innovation and the governance of transitions towards sustainable agriculture. Her recent work on sustainability standards has been published in the Journal of Cleaner Production, Regulation & Governance, and Science Technology and Human Values.

Miet MAERTENS is associate professor at the division of Bioeconomics, Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, KU Leuven, Belgium. She holds an MSc in Agricultural Sciences and an MSc in Economic Sciences from KU Leuven and a PhD from the Georg-August University in Goettingen, Germany. She is lecturing different graduate course in the field of agricultural and development economics at KU Leuven. Her research focuses on innovations in food supply chains and sustainable development – with a geographical focus on Africa and South-America. She has published a number of papers on the impact of food standards for developing country producers.

Adrienne MARTIN is Director of Programme Development and a Social and Institutional Development Specialist at the Natural Resources Institute, University of Greenwich. She has over 35 years of experience in international development and research relating to poverty, livelihoods and natural resources. She is an experienced monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment specialist and also focuses on gender and value chains, impacts of certification/labelling schemes, institutional development and capacity building, participatory methodologies and agricultural policy and institutions. She has conducted research on the impact and governance implications of voluntary sustainability standards. She has long-term experience in Sudan and Syria; and has completed short-term missions in 30 other countries in Africa, Asia and South America. Her current focus is on the development of institutional relationships and capabilities for equitable and pro poor agricultural innovation in the context of smallholder market integration. Adrienne is coordinating the gender and diversity analysis and related planning for two large cassava projects, the Cassava, Adding Value for Africa (C:AVA) and the Great lakes Cassava Initiative (GLCI).

Axel MARX studied sociology and political science at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, University of Hull and University of Cambridge. He is the deputy director of the Leuven Centre for Global Governance Studies. He is in charge of the day-to-day management of the Centre and conducts several externally funded research projects. Axel Marx' research focuses mainly on different aspects of private global regulation of markets including certification systems and set-theoretic comparative case methods. His academic publications have appeared in several leading international journals. In addition he has published several policy reports for the European Commission, Flemish Government and private donors.

Constance McDERMOTT chairs the Environmental Change Institute's Forest Governance

Programme at the University of Oxford. Her research addresses the linkages among diverse local, regional and global priorities for sustainable forest management. It examines both "new" and "old" institutions of forest governance, from market-based initiatives such as forest and carbon certification to sovereign state-based and traditional community-based approaches, to better understand how dynamics of trust and power shape environmental and social policies and facilitate or inhibit desired outcomes. Her methods range from locally focused case studies to large-scale comparative research examining cross-institutional and cross-boundary interactions. McDermott's work at ECI and the Oxford Centre for Tropical Forests includes an emphasis on the integration of forest governance into the global climate regime. Recent research directions include the examination of Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) initiatives, and the role of both pre-existing and new forest institutions for addressing REDD-related environmental and social mandates. Before beginning at Oxford in April 2009, McDermott worked for five years at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies where she served as Associate Research Scientist and Program Director of the Program on Forest Policy and Governance. She has conducted research and applied work in multi-stakeholder processes, forest and green building certification, intergovernmental forest-related governance, and international development in North and Central America, South Asia, and globally.

Bart MINTEN, a Belgian citizen, joined IFPRI as a senior research fellow in December 2006 and works with the Development Strategy and Governance Division. He is out-posted in Addis Ababa since June 2011 and is the program leader of the Ethiopia Strategy Support Program, a multi-donor financed five-year program that focuses on research, capacity building, and outreach and communication of research related to food and agricultural issues in Ethiopia. Before moving to Addis Ababa, he worked in the New Delhi Office where his work focused on the effects of changes in agricultural value chains on the structure of food systems in South Asia. Prior to joining IFPRI, he was a senior research associate for the Cornell Food and Nutrition Policy Program in Madagascar. He also has held the position of assistant professor at the Department of Agricultural and Environmental Economics, KU Leuven, as well as teaching positions at Cornell University and the University of Antananarivo, Madagascar. Bart received his Ph.D. in Agricultural and Resource Economics from Cornell University.

Bart MUYS is Full Professor at the Division of Forest, Nature and Landscape at the University of Leuven. He holds a Ph.D in Agricultural Sciences/Forest Ecology from the University of Ghent. Previously, he worked previously as the director of the Royal Institute for Sustainable Management of Natural Resources and Promotion of Clean Technologies in Brussels. His research interests include: sustainable development, sustainable forest management and planning and decision support for sustainable land and forest management. He has managed and coordinated over 35 research projects and has published 450 research papers, book chapters and reports.

Valerie NELSON is a social development specialist in the Livelihoods and Institutions Department, Natural Resources Institute, University of Greenwich. She worked in Belize and Mexico in agriculture and forestry, before joining Oxfam Policy Department and then took up

a position in NRI in 1996, and has worked in Africa, Latin America, Asia and the UK. She has varied experience in inter-disciplinary rural development research, and including a particular focus on voluntary sustainability standards and ethical sourcing. Since the late 1990s she has been conducting research on the difference made by sustainability standards and corporate codes of conduct, as well as the politics and governance of private standards (ESRC-DFID grant). She is currently the lead for the Equitable Trade and Responsible Business programme at the NRI. Valerie recently completed a 4 year study for DFID on the poverty impact of voluntary standards, and has undertaken a policy review for Irish Aid on their future support for fair and ethical trade. She has recently completed a study on the impact of Fairtrade in coffee for Fairtrade International and is currently evaluation lead for the Trade and Global Value Chains Initiative (DFID).

Chukwumerije OKEREKE was appointed Reader in Environment and Development in June 2011 at the University of Reading. He was previously a Senior Research Fellow and Head of Climate and Development Centre at the Smith School of Enterprise and the Environment, University of Oxford. He continues to be a visiting fellow of the Smith School and Oxford University's Environmental Change Institute (ECI). He is also a fellow and college adviser at the Green-Templeton College Oxford. Before joining Oxford, Chuks was a Senior Research Associate on the Post-2012 International Climate Policy programme at the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change, University of East Anglia. During his time in Oxford, Chuks was the founding Project Director of the Rwandan National Strategy for Climate and Low Carbon Development project funded jointly by the Climate Development and Knowledge Network (CDKN) and DfID Rwanda. He was also the Project Director of many other climate change and adaptation projects including:

- Climate Change Impact on Health and Response Options for the Pharmaceutical Industry;
- Opportunities for carbon emission reduction in sub-Saharan Africa
- Corporate climate strategies and the links with post-2012 climate policy.

Chuks is the moderator of United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) Climate Diplomacy Course and has served as a consultant to DFID, UNDP, the World Bank and a number of African Governments. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the journal *Global Environmental Politics*, the official journal of the Environmental Studies Section, International Studies Association (ISA). He is also a member of the Executive Committee, Environmental Studies Sections, ISA, a member of UNEP Principles for Sustainable Insurance (PSI) project and a member of the stakeholder advisory forum, Centre for Carbon Measurement and Governance at the National Physical Laboratory (NPL).

Philipp PATTBURG is associate professor for transnational environmental governance at the Institute for Environmental Studies (IVM) of the VU University Amsterdam. He is currently acting as the deputy department head of the Department of Environmental Policy Analysis. Pattburg is the chair of the Board of the Global Environmental Change Section of the German Political Science Association (DVPW) and a senior research fellow of the international Earth System Governance Project (ESGP). Pattburg has published more than 120 scholarly articles, book chapters, and reports. His work has appeared, among others, in *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, *Global Environmental Politics*, *Governance*,

European Journal of International Relations, and Science.

Stefano PONTE is Professor of International Political Economy at the Copenhagen Business School, and Co-director of the Copenhagen Business School Sustainability Platform. Prior to this he was a researcher at the Danish Institute for International Studies, and Visiting Scholar at the University of Padova and the University of Copenhagen. His research interests include: international political economy, global value chains and productions networks, biofuels, sustainability, and the political economy of development and of Africa. Professor Ponte studied Political Science at the University of Padova, and International Relations at the University of Chicago. He obtained his Ph.D. in Development Studies at the University of East Anglia.

Aseem PRAKASH is Professor of Political Science, the Walker Family Professor for the Arts and Sciences, and the Director of Center for Environmental Politics at University of Washington, Seattle. He is the founding, General Editor of the Cambridge University Press Series on Business and Public Policy, the co--editor of Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, and the incoming Associate Editor of Business & Society. He is the author of Greening the Firm: The Politics of Corporate Environmentalism (Cambridge University Press, 2000), the co-author of The Voluntary Environmentalists: Green Clubs, ISO 14001, and Voluntary Environmental Regulations (Cambridge University Press, 2006). His recent co-edited books include Voluntary Regulation of NGOs and Nonprofits: An Accountability Club Framework (Cambridge University Press, 2010), Advocacy Organizations and Collective Action (Cambridge, 2010), and Voluntary Programs: A Club Theory Perspective (The MIT Press, 2009). He serves as the Vice President of the International Studies Association for the period, 2014---2015.

Stefan RENCKENS is an Assistant Professor at the Political Science department of the University of Toronto, where he teaches courses on public policy at the Scarborough campus and on business and politics at the St. George campus. He holds a Ph.D. (2014) and M.Phil. (2011) in Environmental Politics from Yale University and Master's degrees in Political Science (2002), Economic Policy (2003), and Conflict and Peace Studies (2005) from the University of Leuven. His current research examines the development and impact of transnational private governance and the interactions with public policy. Current issue areas of interest include renewable energy, climate change, fisheries, forestry, electronic waste, agriculture, and sustainable/fair trade.

Ben RICHARDSON is Assistant Professor in International Political Economy (IPE) in the Department of Politics and International Studies at the University of Warwick. His research relates to the IPE of trade and development, with a focus on agriculture and sugar in particular. He is the author of Sugar: Refined Power in a Global Regime (Palgrave Macmillan, 2009) and has published articles about sustainability standards in Globalizations (on land grabbing), in International Theory (on experimentalism) and in New Political Economy (on the marketization of sustainability).

Pilar SANTACOLOMA is an Agribusiness Economist working at the Agroindustry Division in FAO. She holds a Ph.D. in Agriculture Economics from the Hohenheim University, Stuttgart, Germany and MSc in Agriculture Economics at the National University, Bogotá, Colombia. Her work has focused on value chain development, strengthening producer-buyer linkages, analysis of agribusiness capabilities needs, food security through the commercialization of agriculture, food safety and quality standards, fostering agro-entrepreneurship and assisting Ministries of Agriculture in formulating implementation plans for agricultural sector development. The most recent publication is a series of 13 country case studies on Agribusiness Public-Private Partnerships.

Jelmer SCHALK is Assistant Professor of Public Administration at Leiden University. He obtained his PhD from the Interuniversity Center for Social Science Theory and Methodology (ICS) at Utrecht University. During his PhD research he was a visiting scholar at the Eller School of Management at the University of Arizona and a research fellow at the Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP). His fields of expertise include public management, interorganizational networks, social network analysis, governance, strategic decision-making, policy implementation, local government performance and policy performance. His work has appeared in various international journals, including *The Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *European Union Politics*, *Local Government Studies*, and *The American Review of Public Administration*.

Martijn SCHELTEMA is professor at Erasmus University Rotterdam (the Netherlands), appointed on the chair Enforcement issues in private law. He participates in the BACT program of Erasmus University, an international multi-disciplinary program (in which researchers from e.g. US, UK, Germany and France participate). The program now focusses on regulatory governance (i.e. the optimal 'mix' between public and private regulation and enforcement). He also participates in the international EDLE-program (which is co-funded by the European Commission) in which research is conducted on private law and economics. He researches the effectiveness of international private regulation in the CSR arena. He is currently researching (amongst others) (possible) economic effects of the Global Compact and measuring human rights impact (also) including affected communities. He has been (co-)author of over 60 academic publications.

Martijn Scheltema is board member of ACCESS (www.accessfacility.org). ACCESS is an international organization endorsed by the UN Working Group on Business and Human Rights (supported by the Dutch and Norwegian government) and advertises and facilitates the use of non-judicial mechanisms in company-local community disputes. ACCESS amongst others hosts a large number of case stories concerning non-judicial mechanisms from a multi-stakeholder perspective. Beside this, he is board member of the CSR committee of the International Bar Association (an association with over 50.000 members (attorneys and legal counsels) in more than 170 countries). Martijn Scheltema is attorney at law/partner with Pels Rijcken & Droogleever Fortuijn (the Hague, the Netherlands). He is a (Dutch) Supreme Court and international lawyer. He deals with a wide range of procedural matters, and has expertise in international arbitration and the ensuing setting aside proceedings. He has been involved in a number of defining cases in this area. His field of work includes international dispute settlement in relation to corporate social responsibility (CSR). He also has been

counsel in several Dutch landmark cases on human rights. He is arbitrator of the Dutch Institute for Arbitration (Rotterdam, the Netherlands). Furthermore, he is, amongst others, member of the board of the Dutch Lawyers Association (NJV, the biggest Dutch association of lawyers) and the Dutch Association of Civil Law and editor of legal Dutch journals.

Monica SCHUSTER is a PhD candidate at the division of Bioeconomics, Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, KU Leuven, Belgium. She holds a M.Sc. Degree in Economics and Social Sciences from L. Bocconi University in Milan, Italy. Her PhD research focuses on the trade and welfare implication of the agro-industrial export sector in Peru, with a special emphasis on the effects of private food standards. Prior to her PhD she worked as a Young Professional for the German International Cooperation (GIZ) in Northern Uganda.

Greetje SCHOUTEN is a postdoctoral researcher at the Knowledge, Technology and Innovation group and at the Public Administration and Policy group at Wageningen University. In 2013 she defended her PhD. dissertation entitled: 'Tabling Sustainable Commodities through Private Governance: Processes of Legitimization in the Roundtables on Sustainable Palm Oil and Responsible Soy'. This dissertation presents four empirical analyses which each shed light on a different aspect of legitimization processes of so-called Roundtables. Roundtables are global multi-stakeholder platforms that aim to make an entire agricultural commodity chain more sustainable. Their decision-making processes include business actors and NGOs; state actors are formally excluded. Roundtables use sustainability standards and certification as main instrument to ensure compliance. As a postdoc she is involved in two research programs: the value chain track of the Partnerships Resource Centre and the SUSPENSE-INREF program of Wageningen University.

Natasha SCHWARZBACH currently serves as Head of Engagement for Bonsucro (London), and in addition was appointed as Interim General Manager in March 2014. As Head of Engagement, Natasha oversees Bonsucro's outreach activities in its key markets, and is the key point of contact for members and other stakeholders. Natasha has worked at Bonsucro since July 2008. During this period, she created the architecture for the Production Standard, created and lead the global Stakeholder Outreach programme and the strategic development and execution of the rebranding. She has also coordinated Bonsucro's EU RED submission, developed the auditor training strategy and helped coordinate the first Bonsucro certification. Natasha brings more than 20 years' experience and a proven track record in building partnerships, market linkage, marketing and project management.

Izabela STACEWICZ is a PhD candidate in the Human Environments Research Group at the University of Reading, UK. Izabela's research examines the effectiveness of Social Impact Assessment in addressing the Roundtable for Sustainable Palm Oil's social objectives. Izabela holds an MSc in Environmental Management (University of Reading, 2013) and a BSc in Environmental Science (University of Southampton, 2008). Before commencing her PhD, she was Engagement Manager for four years at sustainability platform 2degrees, where she worked on numerous collaborative projects with multi-stakeholder organisations, retailers and NGOs, to progress their sustainability goals.

Johan SWINNEN is Professor of Development Economics and Director of LICOS Center for Institutions and Economic Performance at the KU Leuven. From 2003 to 2004 he was Lead Economist at the World Bank and from 1998 to 2001 Economic Advisor at the European Commission. He has been advisor to many international institutions and governments. His research focuses on institutional reform and development, globalization and international integration, media economics, and agriculture and food policy. His latest books are “Global Supply Chains, Standards, and the Poor” and “From Marx and Mao to the Market”. He has been a guest editor for World Development, Development Policy Review, The World Economy, the European Review of Agricultural Economics, and is associate editor of the American Journal of Agricultural Economics. He is also a senior research fellow at the Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS), Brussels; coordinator of the European Network of Agricultural and Rural Policy Research Institutes (ENARPRI); member of the Advisory Committee of the Regoverning Markets Global Project; and of the Programme Committee of the International Agricultural Trade Research Consortium (IATRC). He holds a Ph.D from Cornell University.

Maja TAMPE is a PhD candidate at the Institute for Work and Employment Research at the MIT Sloan School of Management, advised by Professors Thomas Kochan, Richard Locke, Michael Piore, and Matthew Amengual. As a scholar of organizations and sustainable development, her research interests include organizational cultures and practices, the political economy of development in agricultural supply chains, and the regulation of social, environmental and labor standards. Her ongoing research projects include a comparative case study of certified cocoa farmer groups in Ecuador, a longitudinal impact evaluation of voluntary sustainability standards in the Ghanaian cocoa sector, and a participant-observation study of how buyer-farmer relationships respond to the introduction of sustainability standards in the Northeast of Brazil. She won several grants, including from the Dissertation Proposal Development Fellowship of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), the Itaú Fund for Sustainability in Latin America and the MIT Carroll L. Wilson Award. She earned a Master in Public Administration from the Harvard Kennedy School of Government and a Master in Political Science from the University of Münster, Germany.

Maria TYSIACHNIOUK holds a Master of Science in Environmental Studies from Bard College, NY, a PhD in Biology from the Russian Academy of Sciences, and a PhD in Sociology from Wageningen University (2012). She has taught at Herzen Pedagogical University in St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg State University, Johns Hopkins University, Dickinson College, PA, Ramapo College of New Jersey, Towson University, and short courses at several universities in Europe. Since 2004 she has studied global governance through FSC certification. Since then she has combined her research with practitioner’s work in the FSC system. Since 2012 she has conducted extensive research on transnational oil production chains. Maria Tysiachniouk has written more than one hundred eighty publications on topics related to transnational environmental governance, edited several books, and has had fieldwork experience in several countries and regions. She is currently Chair of the Environmental Sociology group at the Center for Independent Social Research, St. Petersburg, Russia and a post-doctoral researcher at the University of

Wageningen, the Netherlands and doing intense field research on global governance of natural resources, including forests, mining and oil.

Kristine VAN HERCK is a PhD student at the LICOS Centre for Institutions and Economic Performance at the University of Leuven (KUL). She has a M.Sc. degree in Agricultural Sciences. She has fieldwork experience in agricultural supply chains in Bulgaria, and has been involved in research projects of the FAO, EBRD, the European Commission, and World Bank. Her research interests include, among others, EU Common Agricultural Policy, food security, GMOs and agricultural and food supply chains, in particular in Central and Eastern Europe.

Frans VAN WAARDEN (1950) studied liberal arts and sciences at the University of Toronto (1968-1972) and sociology at the University of Leyden (1972-1975), where he also defended his Ph.D. in 1989 on 'business interest associations in the Dutch construction industry'. He taught at the Universities of Leyden and Konstanz and Utrecht. He was visiting scholar at the Center for European Studies of Stanford University, the University of Leipzig, the Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien, the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies NIAS, and the European University Institute in Florence, where he held a Jean Monnet Fellowship at the Robert Schumann Center for Advanced Studies. His interests include phenomena at the boundaries of politics, economics, law and history (in particular economic and business history), seen through the eyes of a sociologist, i.e. political sociology, economic sociology, and sociology of law. Currently the main focus is on the governance of markets, regulation and political institutions. He is also one of the coordinators of the EU KP7 funded research project 'bEUcitizen. Barriers towards EU Citizenship', which is being coordinated by Utrecht University and in which 25 universities, spread out over Europe, participate. Earlier on he has published on labor relations, co-determination, history of technology, textile industry, industrial policy, collective action, business' associations, corporatism, state-industry relations, innovation, comparison of legal systems, epistemic communities, European integration, notably transposition of European directives in national law and now European citizenship.

Jeroen VAN WIJK (PhD) is Associate Professor in the area of Business and Development at the Maastricht School of Management. He studied sociology at Leiden University and international relations at the University of Amsterdam. From 1989-1999 he worked as researcher at the University of Amsterdam where his interest was on social impacts of innovation, basically social aspects of agricultural biotechnology and of intellectual property protection in emerging economies. Between 1999 and 2009, he was employed as lecturer in Business and Development at the Rotterdam School of Management – Erasmus University. His present research at the Sustainable Development Center of Maastricht School of Management focuses global value chains, partnerships, and state building. His main theoretical interests include international political economy, institutionalism, and global value chain analysis.

Walter J.V. VERMEULEN is Associate Professor at Utrecht University. His research focus was originally on the implementation of environmental policies and application of sustainable

innovations in production and consumption systems, both in the Netherlands and in developing countries (South Africa, Bhutan, China, India). After 2002 the research has also shifted towards the international dimension of sustainable development (partly connected to the start of our international master program “Sustainable Development”, of which Vermeulen is the program leader). Vermeulen chairs since 2008 a special track on this subject in the annual International Sustainable Development Research Society conferences, convening scholars from all continents. He is also President of the International Sustainable Development Research Society and member of the Editorial Board of four international journals in the field of Sustainable Development and Corporate Social Responsibility. He is Program Leader of the Utrecht University International Master in Sustainable Development.

Yuca WAARTS holds an MSc in Agricultural and Environmental Economics from Wageningen University (2003) after which she worked at an NGO to ensure economic development while conserving or enhancing biodiversity. Yuca works at LEI Wageningen UR since 2008. She conducts research around two themes: i) impact evaluations of public and private standards and other types of interventions such as training programmes and service delivery aimed at smallholder producers in developing countries and their producer organizations, and ii) sustainable solutions for food loss and waste reduction and the recycling of (urban) organic waste streams. Both types of research are conducted in the Netherlands, Europe as well as developing countries for different types of clients: businesses, standard setting bodies, governmental agencies etc. Next to a scientist, she is an experienced project manager, working with partners and team members from all over the world. She aims to deliver high quality research results in accessible reports and brochures as well as through face-to-face discussions, (virtual) seminars and conferences.

Jan WOUTERS is Jean Monnet Chair ad personam EU and Global Governance, Full Professor of International Law and International Organizations, and founding Director of the Institute for International Law and of the Leuven Centre for Global Governance Studies, an interdisciplinary centre of excellence, at the University of Leuven (KU Leuven). In Leuven, he teaches public international law, law of international organizations, the law of the World Trade Organization, space law and international humanitarian law. As Visiting Professor at Sciences Po (Paris), Luiss University (Rome) and the College of Europe (Bruges) he teaches EU external relations law. He is a Member of the Royal Academy of Belgium for Sciences and Arts, is President of the United Nations Association Flanders Belgium, and practises law as Of Counsel at Linklaters, Brussels. He is Editor of the International Encyclopedia of Intergovernmental Organizations, Deputy Director of the *Revue belge de droit international* and an editorial board member in ten international journals. He has published widely on international, EU, corporate and financial law (including 50 books, 100 international journal articles and 150 chapters in international books). His recent books include *The United Nations and the European Union* (2006), *Multilevel Regulation and the EU* (2008), *The Europeanisation of International Law* (2008), *European Constitutionalism Beyond Lisbon* (2009), *Belgium in the Security Council* (2009), *Accountability for Human Rights Violations by International Organizations* (2010), *Upgrading the EU’s Role as Global Actor* (2011), *The European Union and Multilateral Governance* (2012), *International Prosecutors* (2012), *Informal International Lawmaking* (2012), *Private Standards and Global Governance* (2012),

China, the European Union and Global Governance (2012), The EU's Role in Global Governance (2013), National Human Rights Institutions in Europe (2013) and The Law of EU External Relations (2013). Apart from his participation in many international scientific networks, he advises various international organizations, trains international officials and is often asked to comment international events in the media. He is coordinator of a large-scale FP7 Programme FRAME, "Fostering Human Rights Among European (External and Internal) Policies" and of the InBev-Baillet Latour EU China Chair at KU Leuven.

Final list of Participants

Agni Kalfagianni
Bart Minten
Benjamin Cashore
Maria Tyschiakniouk
Constance McDermott
Dennis Klink
Frans Van Waarden
Luc Fransen
Graeme Auld
Monika Hartmann
Paolo Cerutti
Pieter Glasbergen
Stefano Ponte
Frank Grothaus
Martijn Scheltema
Stefan Renckens
Sijeong Lim
Walter Vermeulen
Eric Lambin
Benjamin Richardson
Izabela Stacewicz
Allison Loconto
Greetje Schouten
Stéphane Guéneau
Thomas Dietz
Maja Tampe
Yuca Waarts
Monica Schuster
Jan Wouters
Axel Marx
Jo Swinnen
Joachim De Weerd
Bart Muys
Kristine Van Herck

Statistical information on participants (age bracket, countries of origin, M/F repartition)

GENDER	M: 22	F: 12
AGE BRACKET	<40: 14	>40: 20

COUNTRY	Belgium: 8
	Canada: 2
	Denmark: 1
	Ethiopia: 1
	France : 2
	Germany: 3
	Kenya: 1
	The Netherlands: 8
	Russia: 1
	Sweden: 1
	Switzerland: 1
	UK: 3
	US: 2