Synopsis of Stakeholder consultation
Theory of Change and Impact indicators

After initial consultation with stakeholders (who were notified via email with relevant documents available on the RSB.org website) additional impact indicators were added to cover issues they felt were important. These issues are:

- Water depletion and pollution of surface and groundwater resources – Indicators 23-26
- Occurrences of disputes and conflicts (in the future, we will look at how to report on how these disputes were resolved) – Indicators 33 and 34
- Biodiversity – Indicator 31

Stakeholders commented that it is also important to monitor a biofuel operations’ contribution to loss of diversity and ecosystem services. Since we cannot currently monitor at this level of specificity with our current data collection tools, this is something we will be working to monitor in the future. In the meantime, we will collect information about the country (or countries) where the operation is located, which gives insight to the broad biodiversity and ecosystem service issues the operation may be facing. To reflect this in the list of indicators, the category “Food security”, which encompasses indicators 28-30, has been changed to “Food security/Biodiversity/Ecosystem services”. After consultation with Members, we received feedback that a fairly easy number to collect that relates to biodiversity is the hectareage set aside as “protected” or “conservation” areas, measured by the new indicator 31.

For the future, we will consider gleaning data from full audit reports to collect more information regarding the problems identified in an operation, keeping privacy concerns in mind.

In addition, stakeholders asked whether the use of technologies (such as GMOs), and management of waste in biofuel operations brought clear environmental and social benefits, and whether they were appropriately monitored. RSB will be exploring whether these aspects bring clear environmental and social benefits, and developing impact indicators to measure this as part of the future M&E system. Compliance with RSB Standards implies a good waste management practice, and thus all POs are counted towards Indicator 27. Regarding use of technologies, currently, Principle 11 requires Participating Operators to make information regarding their technologies publicly available (unless limited by national law or intellectual property agreements). RSB is aware that there needs to be more clarity regarding how this Principle is being evaluated by auditors, and this will be a key point brought up during revision of the RSB Principles & Criteria in 2015.
We received feedback regarding stakeholder mapping – in some cases, the external stakeholders consulted in certification audits could have been better identified and used. It was suggested to expand the definition of “external stakeholder”, such that any required outreach is broader and more comprehensive, or that RSB makes more use of its multi-stakeholder network. In addition, we have started thinking about putting together a stakeholder list for auditors to reach out to, but this would most likely be done country-by-country. Stakeholders say, and RSB agrees, that improving this point could help develop data on external impacts.

It was suggested to assign a value to each impact indicator, and sum these values to give a value for the process. This approach will be further explored.