



# GLOBAL ROUNDTABLE FOR SUSTAINABLE BEEF

## Climate Working Group

### Minutes

Monday, March 13, 2023  
2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Central U.S./Canada Time

#### Members Present:

Brenna Grant - CRSB  
Samantha Werth – USRSB  
Juan Batista – National Organization for  
Agrifood Quality  
Emily Stackhouse - Alltech  
Kristi Block – North America Meat Institute  
Matthew Cleveland – ABS Global  
Megan Meiklejohn – Savory Institute  
Terry Ward - Zinpro

Hernán Villalobos - McDonalds  
Sabreena Larsen – Acceligen  
Paul Pacheco - Frigomanu  
Ben Hancock – Beef & Lamb NZ  
Nick Jolly – Beef & Lamb NZ  
Roberto Rubio - MACS  
Jan Heinrich – EcoSecurities  
Sebastian Vangeli -  
Alice Rocha – UC Davis

Staff Present: Katie Ambrose, Ruairaidh Petre, Julie James, Josefina Eisele

---

#### 1. Opening Remarks and Introductions

*Brenna Grant / Sam Werth*

Seeing trends and interests in self- assessments for producers interested in learning more about their emissions, how specific is it, support for producers, and what their next steps might be. Invited Dr. Ben Hancock to come and present work on GHG calculator tool.

#### 2. Beef and Lamb New Zealand – Producer GHG Calculator

*Dr. Ben Hancock*

Goal of the project was to create a calculator that accounts for existing data and giving farmers the power to know their emissions profile. It offers an alternative to processor-level emissions trading scheme, which would not capture “good behaviors” and lacked incentives for farmers to change behavior to reach objectives.

The GHG calculator is a free, farmer friendly tool (B+LNZ tool) to represents a farm system, allowing them to know their numbers and start to plan for future actions. Other existing tools did not account for flux of animal numbers, and diversity of farms were not represented.

The Ministry of Environment created emissions “cloud” per animal, but this new tool differentiates between animals based on livestock class, rather than treating them all the same. It also takes grazing allocation (i.e., animals coming from different farms) into consideration.

The GHG calculator does not ask farmers to do more work, and is focused on resources that farmers already have, like stock reconciliation, fertilizer use, and vegetation cover estimates. However, mitigation/management applied, cropping of arable land, and milking cows are not included.

Calculator looks at how many animals are on farm, how long they spend there, grazing practices. Tool uses GWP100, as it is a more common metric for GHGs. Results present emissions associated with net contributions and sequestration that occurs too. While other tools are bottom-up, this approach is top-down. The tool was most recently updated in June and July 2022 and still undergoing further development.

The B+LNZ GHG calculator tool already launched online. It is currently kept simple and meant to reflect business as usual. Important to having farms being aware of what is happening on their operations and what will happen in the future to avoid any surprises. About 94-96% farmers using this tool over the last two years

Overall, they’ve been tracking between farm variation too, but all are following the same basic pattern, and reducing scale up/down error between the different tools that currently exist.

Some items of discussion: the tool includes forest accounting because they wanted to include depreciation of forest land over a longer period to avoid misinforming farmers. There is no accounting for soil carbon sequestration, but the NZ government has not recognized it yet, so it is not currently included in the tool

Use of GWP\* still up for debate in the tool; farms are getting larger, so there would be a net contribution of methane, despite national decrease, so it makes more sense to use GWP\* at the national level to report absolute numbers, rather than on the individual farm level.

Lastly, potential mitigation techniques are not included based on NZ government announcements and could be included in the future based on what the NZ government officially recognizes as a means of reducing methane; sequestration and mitigation would likely be applied as a post hoc approach.

### 3. Debrief/discussion on webinar

Webinar has been moved, changed to February 23, 2023. Will provide excellent background into how different international standards operate with respects with one another and how their interact in the supply chain.

### 4. GHG protocol update/feedback

GHG protocol is currently in consultation process to update their standards. These are protocols to be used for corporate reporting (like science-based targets, etc.). GRSB

carbon footprint guideline vs. GHG protocol is different, because GHG protocol operates at the corporate level and uses a different functional unit.

There are 4 different task forces meeting right now to get the work done before March 6, with submission on March 14. Focus on identifying key themes within different standards and identifying what is working for livestock standards and what is not.

Discussion on the value of such work that allows corporate vs. product standards to be comparable.

Product standard looks at only the beef life cycle, focusing on cradle to grave, with emissions given per kg beef live weight or per carcass weight. Corporate looks at total emissions for their operation, with different scopes operating at different levels (scope 1 = building; scope 2 = supply chain; scope 3 = emissions from beef purchased)

There's increasing pressure from corporations to get these scope 3 targets set for companies. Each company setting a target sets a precedent for others, which can lead to issues if some targets are not possible for others to meet.

Should the GRSB carbon footprint guideline be submitted to be recognized by GHG protocol, specifically for scope 3 emissions? As it stands, it meets GHG protocol requirements and is very broad. There are more benefits to having it recognized than not.

Important question is not necessarily if the methodology is good, but rather are the targets being set feasible? Metric chosen needs to align with the goal, and most goals are using GWP100 indicators, whereas others are based on GWP\*, and that can lead to disconnect between targets and goals and how to achieve them. Need to be focused on greater clarification on purpose and objectives for GHG protocol

Lack of specificity is a significant complaint for the GHG protocol, and the GRSB guidelines offer more specificity to beef products, with various forms of allocation.

Action item put forth by Brenna Grant to proceed with submission, supported by Nick Jolly.

**Next Climate Working Group Call – April 10, 2023, 1:00 – 2:00 p.m. Central US/Canada**