

The State of Agribusiness Sustainability

2019 Business Purpose Scorecard™ from *TrueFootprint*

Do agribusinesses report on the impact and effectiveness of their sustainability activities and show they are delivering positive change?

We analysed the annual and sustainability reports of 24 agribusinesses. We discovered:

- Over 53% of the material indicators used for reporting are either indicators of inputs – for example how much was spent, or how much natural resource was used – or of outputs, for example what activities were conducted
- Only 44% of the indicators showed outcomes, the actual results of activities, and essential data is often missing that would make benchmarking possible
- Our analysis shows that it is possible to report outcomes for all material sustainability topics
- We conclude that agribusiness does not account for most of the value it creates. It does not do enough to show that it is delivering positive change.

The 2019 TrueFootprint Business Purpose Scorecard for Agribusiness

Introduction

Companies are under great pressure to make positive contributions to pressing environmental, social and economic issues. This pressure comes from the combined expectations and scrutiny of asset managers, stock exchanges, current and prospective employees and consumers (see Box 1). A KPMG survey of corporate responsibility reporting found that 93% of the world's 250 largest companies now publish sustainability reports. The survey also found that 75% of the largest 100 companies across 49 countries do so. Twenty years ago, the reporting rates were 35% and 24% respectively¹. Today, a company's sustainability performance can be demanded by any of its stakeholders: their bank, insurers, supply chain partners, retailers, as well as the general public. Companies face an almost perfect storm of expectations to define their purpose and to be part of a positive change narrative.

Business Purpose Scorecard

In this 2019 TrueFootprint Business Purpose Scorecard™ for agribusiness we ask: if an agribusiness reports on its sustainability, how deep, comparable and informative is this reporting? Ultimately, our aim is to discover whether a company actually delivers positive change.

This report follows the same format of TrueFootprint's 2019 Business Purpose Scorecards™ for other industries.

Some general findings cut across all industries, but the core analysis is specific to agribusiness.

The Scorecard analyses the non-financial reporting of 24 agribusinesses to see how they perform along two dimensions:

1. *The relevant sustainability areas they are reporting on*
2. *Whether they are reporting on the outcomes and impact of their sustainability efforts*

By analysing these dimensions we discover which companies are reporting on what really matters, and whether they are delivering true change.

Sophisticated benchmarking will, over the coming years, pick out the leaders from the laggards. Companies that are serious about achieving their purpose have the opportunity to differentiate themselves from their peers by measuring and communicating the outcomes and impact of their way of doing business.

Ultimately, our aim is to discover whether a company actually delivers positive change.

¹ The Road Ahead: The KPMG Survey of Corporate Responsibility Reporting 2017
[\[https://home.kpmg/xx/en/home/insights/2017/10/the-kpmg-survey-of-corporate-responsibility-reporting-2017.html\]](https://home.kpmg/xx/en/home/insights/2017/10/the-kpmg-survey-of-corporate-responsibility-reporting-2017.html).

Box 1. Stakeholders Want Business to be Positive Change Agents

Investors: The Sustainable Stock Exchanges Initiative, for example, now has over 80 members. Exchanges from London to Singapore, and emerging markets in Asia, Africa and South America now provide guidance and sometimes requirements for thousands of public companies to report on their sustainability.²

Asset owners and managers: \$89 trillion in assets are managed by the members of the UN Principles for Responsible Investment (UN PRI), and 87% of them say they consider Environment, Social and Governance (ESG) criteria in their directly managed assets³.

Company law: All EU-based companies with more than 500 employees are required to publish reports on their policies in relation to environmental protection, human rights, social protection and the treatment of employees, anti-corruption and board diversity. This directive now covers over 6,000 companies across the EU⁴. The UK's new corporate governance code (2018) mandates that boards define a company's purpose.

Employees: In an international survey of millennials, who are the youngest workplace cohort (those born between 1983-1994), Deloitte found that employers were 'out of step' with that generation's priorities: 39% of millennials believe that businesses should try to improve society, but only 25% think that their employers make this a priority. Only 24% of millennials think that generating profits is a priority, but 51% think that it is their employers' priority⁵.

Consumers: According to a Nielsen poll of 30,000 consumers in 60 countries, 66% of global respondents were willing to pay more for sustainably produced goods (compared to 50% in 2013). Lower income groups and younger consumers are among those most willing to pay a premium for sustainability. Consumers who are closest to the problems caused by failures of sustainability, that is people in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East, are 23-29% more willing to pay a premium than consumers in rich, industrialised countries. This should be good for business, since these regions are also the fastest-growing consumer markets. Nielsen also found that consumer goods with a demonstrated commitment to sustainability grew on average more than 4% compared to less than 1% growth for those without.⁶

Lower income groups and younger consumers are among those most willing to pay a premium for sustainability

² See <http://www.sseinitiative.org>

³ UN Principles for Responsible Investment, Annual Report 2018 (https://d8g8t13e9vf2o.cloudfront.net/Uploads/g/f/c/priannualreport_605237.pdf)

⁴ https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/company-reporting-and-auditing/company-reporting/non-financial-reporting_en

⁵ 2018 Deloitte Millennial Survey: Millennials disappointed in business, unprepared for industry 4.0

(<https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/global/Documents/About-Deloitte/gx-2018-millennial-survey-report.pdf>)

⁶ <https://www.nielsen.com/us/en/press-room/2015/consumer-goods-brands-that-demonstrate-commitment-to-sustainability-outperform.html>

Agribusiness's ability to become more sustainable will have profound implications for human development, ecology and climate change in the coming years. The livelihoods of more than 2 billion people depend on agriculture, making farming by far one of the world's most important sources of employment. As the world's population grows, more people join the middle-class, and per capita calorie intakes increase, global food production needs will need to outpace the rate of population growth.⁷

These needs can only be met with a fundamental systems change in the way agribusiness is currently done:

- Food production now accounts for about 70% of freshwater usage. Only 20% of cultivated land is irrigated, but irrigated land accounts for 40% of total food production.⁸ Farming cannot increase productivity using today's farming methods without jeopardising the world's freshwater resources. Water stress levels in many traditional farming regions, for example in California, Australia, the Cape Province in South Africa, the Middle East's 'Fertile Crescent' and large parts of China and India, are already at breaking point. Drip irrigation, which increases yields and reduces water and pesticide usage, is only deployed on 6% of irrigated farmland.⁹
- Expanded agricultural production is often coupled with deforestation and conversion of natural ecosystems that reduce biodiversity and natural forest cover. Approximately half the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of agriculture results from land use changes. Yet the pressure to expand growing areas is immense, since many traditional agricultural areas suffer from declining soil fertility and a reduction in organic matter and soil nutrient content.¹⁰

- Agriculture is responsible for 20-24% of GHG emissions, making it one of the biggest polluters.¹¹ This does not even include all transportation-related GHG emissions.
- In industrialised countries farming often employs no more than 2% of the labour force. But in Africa and Asia, farming remains one of the biggest employers.
- About 2 billion of the developing world's 3 billion rural people live on smallholdings that are smaller than 2 hectares. While these small farms employ a lot of people and are generally more productive per hectare than larger farms, the overwhelming majority of smallholder families are poor, food insecure, with only limited access to education, health, power, and sanitation. This helps to explain why most of the world's people who live in extreme poverty live in rural areas.¹²

The considerable challenge for the next decades is how to combine improvements in the quality of rural life with environmentally sustainable practices that also increase productivity.

The considerable challenge for the next decades is how to combine improvements in the quality of rural life with environmentally sustainable practices that also increase productivity.

⁷ A widely cited study estimated that global crop demands would double from 2005 to 2050. <https://www.pnas.org/content/108/50/20260>

⁸ <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/water-in-agriculture>

⁹ International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage, 2017-2018 Annual Report, p87 (http://www.icid.org/ar_2017.pdf).

¹⁰ <http://www.fao.org/3/CA3129EN/CA3129EN.pdf>

¹¹ <https://globalagribusinessalliance.com/who-we-are/>

¹² FAO, The Economic Lives of Smallholder Farmers, 2015, <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5251e.pdf>.

Goal

TrueFootprint set out to look at how agribusinesses report on sustainability. The question we ask is, how meaningful is the reporting and is it capturing the data that really matters?

Method

There are numerous standards and frameworks agribusinesses can use for their reporting.¹³ As a result of these many options, there is not much consistency between companies on the categories against which they choose to report. TrueFootprint suggests a simplified framework that can be used across a range of industries.

First, we use the framework provided by the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the standard that has the most universal application and consensus. The 17 SDGs are the closest thing we have to a global standard. The world's governments, including local governments, are committed to them. The SDGs are also truly global in that they apply to every country, irrespective of its level of development. Moreover, over 70% of companies surveyed by PWC last year mention the SDGs in their reporting.¹⁴

Since companies almost never report systematically against all SDGs we use a simplified framework by grouping the 17 SDGs under 5 headings: the '**5 Ps of Business Purpose**'¹⁵:

- **People** covers health and safety, gender and inclusivity
- **Planet** is the use of water, land, ecosystems, and power as well as emissions and pollution
- **Partnerships** is engagement with local communities, especially to help them meet their basic needs
- **Prosperity** captures the economic and financial benefits that can arise from the business; and finally
- **Peace** includes conflict with communities and indigenous peoples, corruption and ethics, as well as human rights and respect for the rule of law

We suggest that *the 5 Ps* provide a useful framework for reporting with purpose and that companies are well advised to take a multifaceted approach to corporate responsibility. A scandal in one area (for example palm oil sourcing, which has an impact on Planet) can easily undermine achievements under the heading People or Peace.

¹³ These include the Global Reporting Initiative, the UN Global Compact, the IFC Performance Standards, the Sustainable Development Goals, the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, and reference to numerous certification schemes like Utz, Fairtrade, Forest Stewardship Council, Better Cotton Initiative, and others.

¹⁴ <https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/services/sustainability/sustainable-development-goals/sdg-reporting-challenge-2018.html>. The Norwegian sovereign fund, which is invested in over 9,000 companies, published its perspective on the SDGs last year: https://www.nbim.no/contentassets/092e192d14d34d8eaf6110b75a27977c/nbim_amp_1_18_the-sdgs-and-the-gpfg.pdf.

¹⁵ This 5 Ps approach is already in use by companies, like Belgian retailer Colruyt: https://issuu.com/colruytgroup/docs/colruyt_group_sustainability_report?e=29882345/63482505.

Matching the 17 SDGs to the 5 Ps of Business Purpose:

People



Planet



Peace



Partnerships



Prosperity



Ultimately, the most important question is whether a company actually delivers positive change. In order to answer this, we check to what extent a company reports:

- **Inputs:**

how much was spent on any given set of activities, how many people were employed, natural-resource and energy inputs

- **Outcomes:**

the direct measurable effects of activities and the rate of improvement against set targets; changes in outcomes are usually attributable to specific activities

- **Outputs:**

activities conducted to advance sustainability performance

- **Impacts:**

the ultimate measurable effects that are a combination of inputs, outputs and outcomes; they can be both positive and negative; some impacts are multi-causal so they may not be solely attributable to a single set of inputs or activities.

These distinctions tell us about the depth and the quality of corporate reporting.

























Within a single industry –agribusiness in this case– inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts are comparable, with the companies all doing roughly the same thing. If we compare different business sectors or companies within a single supply chain, one company's input will be another company's output. For example, energy is an input for an agribusiness, but it is the output of an energy producer. Furthermore, an energy supplier that delivers 100% renewable energy may also be helping the agribusiness achieve improvements in their overall GHG emissions 'impact'. Similarly, a consultant or technology provider that helps to achieve a major production efficiency gain is delivering an output that produces an outcome improvement for their customer.

For example, a company may donate labour and construction materials (inputs) for the building of ten new schools that are designed for 3,000 children in the local community (the output). But are all these children attending the schools? Are teachers teaching and are the children learning? These are all outcomes and they are measurable.

In turn, a large food brand commits to source 100% of its black tea, cocoa, coffee, and palm oil from certified sources. It has met those targets for all commodities except cocoa, which is only 40% certified. These numbers will look encouraging on an annual report. But certificates are outputs, not outcomes. The certificate does not reveal what is actually happening on the ground, for smallholders and their communities, or for biodiversity and the environment.

In this first agribusiness Scorecard we analyse the annual and sustainability reports of 24 agribusinesses to see how they perform along the two dimensions identified above: first, what categories do they report under, and, second, do they report on the outcomes and impact of their investments?

Agribusinesses Analysed for the 2019 Business Purpose Scorecard™:

COMPANY NAME	HEADQUARTERS	COMPANY NAME	HEADQUARTERS
Archer Daniels Midland	 USA	Halcyon	 Singapore
Bayer	 Germany	Louis Dreyfus	 Switzerland
Bunge	 USA	Mercon	 USA
Cargill	 USA	Netafim	 Israel
Chiquita	 USA	Neumann Kaffee	 Germany
COFCO International	 Switzerland	Olam	 Singapore
Del Monte	 Singapore	Sime Darby	 Malaysia
Dole	 USA	Sucafina	 Switzerland
ECOM	 Switzerland	Syngenta	 Switzerland
EDF&MAN	 UK	UPL	 India
Fonterra	 New Zealand	Wilmar	 Singapore
GAR	 Singapore	Yara	 Norway

Agribusiness is a diversified sector. With the Scorecard we are including the largest commodity traders and growers for a wide range of agricultural products, including cocoa, coffee, palm oil, tropical fruits, nuts, and milk. We have also included some of the most important crop sciences companies and the world's leading drip irrigation firm, since these companies are certain to play a role in the future sustainability of food production.¹⁶

The reporting period covers the most recent non-financial reporting. For the majority of the companies this is 2017, but in some cases the most recent report goes back further.

Findings

How well do the companies perform? Do they tend to report on just inputs and outputs, or do they pay equal attention to outcomes and impact?

The first striking finding is that a third of agribusinesses we analysed produce no sustainability reporting. By contrast, in the mining industry we have found reporting to be 100% among large mining companies.

Why might this be the case? One explanation could be that many agribusinesses do not have brands that are consumer facing, so they are subject to less public pressure. But mining companies are hardly household names and virtually none of them are consumer facing. Moreover, consumer facing downstream companies (food and beverage companies and large retailers) have put pressure on the agribusiness industry. This has contributed to standard setting and sustainability certifications for a wide range of products like cocoa, coffee, cotton, fish and seafood, palm oil, soybean, sugar cane, and tea.

A more plausible explanation seems to be that most the companies that fail to produce sustainability reports (6 out of 8) are privately held companies.

The first striking finding is that a third of agribusinesses we analysed produce no sustainability reporting.

As we noted above, dozens of stock exchanges, including many of the most important ones, now provide strong guidance and some even requirements to produce nonfinancial sustainability reporting. The failure to report does not mean these companies are worse than others – it simply means that stakeholders have no means of assessing their performance.

We found that across the companies that did report on their sustainability, 53% of the material indicators used consisted of input and output indicators; 44% of the indicators were outcome indicators, and only 2% of the total were impact indicators (*Table 1*). Whereas mining companies reported with an average of 32 material indicators, the agribusiness sector only reported an average of 17 indicators.

We found that 53% of the material indicators used consisted of input and output indicators; 44% of the indicators were outcome indicators; only 2% of the total were impact indicators (*Table 1*).

¹⁶ Syngenta (a large crop chemical and seeds producer) and Netafim (a maker of drip irrigation solutions with a 30% global market share) are subsidiaries of ChemChina and Mexichem, respectively. They publish sustainability reports independently of the parent company. At Bayer, crop sciences and animal health is only one of three divisions of the German chemicals company. Bayer does not break down sustainability by divisions so the company analysis includes its other divisions, pharmaceuticals and personal health. We have omitted another large crop sciences company, DowDuPont, because the company will be subdivided into three firms in 2019.

Table 1. Agribusiness Reporting up to 2017

CROSS-INDUSTRY INDICATORS	INPUTS	OUTPUTS	OUTCOMES	IMPACT
Number of material indicators	51	126	146	8
Percentage	15.4%	38.1%	44.1%	2.4%

Our analysis has also enabled us to compile a state-of-the-art Scorecard that combines the best-practice reporting indicators found across the industry. We picked key material indicators derived from annual and sustainability reports, identifying a total of 94 material indicators in current use. This compares with 122 material indicators in the mining industry.

The state-of-the-art Scorecard represents the current collective wisdom of the industry. Our findings from the state-of-the-art Scorecard (*Table 2*) shows that a better balance between outcome and impact indicators is possible. It also shows that with an average reporting of 17 material indicators, the average agribusiness only reports a fraction of what it could be reporting to give a full picture of its sustainability performance:

Table 2. Agribusiness State-of-the-Art Indicators

STATE-OF-THE-ART INDICATORS	INPUTS	OUTPUTS	OUTCOMES	IMPACT
Number of material indicators	15	35	39	5
Percentage	16.0%	37.2%	41.5%	5.3%

Why does all this matter? And does this analysis tell us anything useful we need to know about the actual sustainability impact of the industry?

One way to illustrate the importance of outcome and impact reporting is with what are perhaps the most important non-financial metric: total fatalities and the injury frequency rates. More than half of agribusinesses list these outcome figures openly in their reports.

Now imagine a hypothetical company that reported that it spent \$25 million in the past year to improve health and safety (an input). They might also report that 98% of their employees received health and safety training, and that this is a 5% improvement over the previous year's training compliance (two output indicators). But they decided not to report the outcome, namely the result of those investments. Are their employees safer? Have the fatality and injury rates improved as a result of these investments?

A company can report how much it spent on improving its water usage or on its carbon footprint (inputs), and that it rolled out its new policy across 70% of its operations (an output). But supply chain partners and major institutional investors really want to know how efficient they are (for example how much water or energy they use per tonne of agricultural product, an outcome indicator), and ultimately the effect on their total greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) (the impact).

Hallmarks of transparency

Outcomes and impacts may be positive or negative. It is a hallmark of a company's transparency and accountability that it is willing to report negative as well as positive data. A death is always negative. But an improvement in the fatality or injury rate is positive news. Similarly, while GHG emissions are negative, an improvement in efficiency per tonne of agricultural product produced can be a powerful step in a positive direction.

Outcome and impact indicators also gauge effectiveness. Outcome indicators make meaningful comparisons between companies possible, whereas an input or an output may simply be a function of size. Prime examples are the total recordable injury frequency rate and the total recordable injury rate. These rates concern the number of fatalities, lost time injuries, substitute work, and other injuries requiring treatment by a medical professional, often measured per two

hundred thousand hours worked. Irrespective of company size these are roughly comparable outcomes. So is the gender pay gap, or the percentage of women and the percentage of local hires at various levels of management and the board of a company.

When the outcome and impact are combined with inputs and output data this gives an indication of efficiency. How much resource was required to achieve a particular end?

Teams whose key performance indicators (KPIs) consist in the main of inputs and outputs are not being assessed for the efficiency and effectiveness of their work. Our analysis suggests that a step-change in reporting – and therefore also in results – is a relatively easy win because good practices are already being implemented within the industry. What is missing is systematic implementation since there are pockets of best-practice spread across the industry.

We think it is possible – and highly desirable – to achieve a better balance between the indicators. This includes those categories of reporting where outcome and impact measurement are the weakest.

To have a better appreciation of where there is more settled good practice and where there is ample room for improvement, we break down the indicators into the *5 Ps of Business Purpose*:

Table 3. 5 Ps Scorecard of Agribusiness Sustainability Reporting

CROSS-INDUSTRY 5 Ps ANALYSIS	INPUTS	OUTPUTS	OUTCOMES	IMPACT
People	17 (16%)	18 (17%)	73 (68%)	0 (0%)
Planet	17 (11%)	63 (41%)	64 (42%)	8 (5%)
Partnerships	14 (30%)	25 (54%)	7 (15%)	0 (0%)
Prosperity	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
Peace	0 (0%)	19 (95%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)

A finding that stands out from this *Table 3* is that out of 24 agribusiness companies directly employing more than a million people, who are sourcing from hundreds of thousands of farmers and smallholders, there are virtually no material indicators for prosperity. A combined total 78% of all indicators are in the People category (mainly for health and safety) or the Planet category. Agribusinesses do minimal reporting on Partnerships with communities in which they operate (14% of the total), on Prosperity (only 1%) and Peace (6%).

Zooming in on the Planet indicators, almost no agribusiness reports whether their sourcing or production has a net negative, neutral or positive effect on soil quality and erosion, on water or effluents. The large agribusinesses tend to report their total GHG emissions, but only some report their emissions as a ratio of their outputs, for example as kg of CO₂ per metric tonne of produce, or as kg of CO₂ per €1,000 of external sales. When we look at the state-of-the-art Scorecard (*Table 4*) that picks out the best material indicators in current use across the industry the picture does not change much.

Table 4. 5 Ps Scorecard Based on Agribusiness State-of-the-Art

STATE-OF-THE-ART 5Ps	INPUTS	OUTPUTS	OUTCOMES	IMPACT
People	2 (8%)	3 (12%)	20 (80%)	0 (0%)
Planet	12 (26%)	14 (30%)	15 (33%)	5 (11%)
Partnerships	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Prosperity	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Peace	0 (0%)	14 (78%)	4 (22%)	0 (0%)

Large agribusinesses tend to report their total GHG emissions, but only some report their emissions as a ratio of their outputs, for example as kilograms of CO₂ per metric tonne of produce

Financial institutions often have a preference for the ESG terminology, which stands for Environment, Social and Governance. The 5 Ps of Business Purpose can also be mapped against ESG reporting standards, where E = Planet, Social = People + Partnerships + elements of Prosperity, and Governance = some dimensions of People, especially gender distribution on boards, and some aspects of Peace.

If we analyse the agribusiness industry using the ESG framework we find that the categories of reporting for the Environment and the Social are quite well balanced, but that Governance reporting is lopsided, with 95% of its indicators being output indicators.

Table 5. ESG Analysis of Agribusiness

ESG ANALYSIS	INPUTS	OUTPUTS	OUTCOMES	IMPACT
Environmental	17 [11%]	63 [41%]	64 [42%]	8 [5%]
Social	34 [21%]	44 [28%]	81 [51%]	0 [0%]
Governance	0 [0%]	19 [95%]	1 [5%]	0 [0%]

Positive Trends

Some of the trends we are observing in agribusiness make us hopeful:

- Agricultural commodity trading has been dominated by a handful of companies, several of them over 100 years old. Agribusiness traders that do over \$10 billion in annual sales now also include more recent entries formed in the last 40 years. Both among the older industry leaders and among the younger ones are companies that have made a commitment to putting sustainability at the heart of their business. One company reports systematically and almost exclusively on the outcomes of their sustainability investments. Another trader is rolling out full impact traceability to the farmer group level in the coming years.
- Some companies have made breakthroughs in reducing their GHG emissions per unit of production.

- There is a push among downstream customers who use palm oil for certification that is traceable to the plantation-level, not just to the mills. Plantation-level traceability provides far greater assurance that the palm oil is truly produced according to the 'no deforestation, no peat, no exploitation' policy that all large producers now adhere to.¹⁷

See *Appendix 1* for the 2019 TrueFootprint Business Purpose Scorecard for agribusiness.

Our analysis has also enabled us to divide the 24 companies in this Scorecard into 4 bands according to the depth and detail of their sustainability reporting. Since the Scorecard is not a league table, these findings are not published as part of this report.

¹⁷ <https://www.wilmar-international.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/No-Deforestation-No-Peat-No-Exploitation-Policy.pdf>

Considerations

Based on the 2019 TrueFootprint Business Purpose Scorecard, here are a few things to consider:

A certificate is an output, not an outcome: There are hundreds of certification schemes for agricultural products around the world, and a dozen that are widely used by major brands. Even a highly-regarded certificate is an output, not an outcome or an impact. In a separate analysis we have found that responsible and ethical sourcing certification organisations under-perform agribusiness in the quality and depth of their own outcome and impact reporting. If an agribusiness is serious about reporting its sustainability it cannot rely on certification to actually know whether it is making a contribution towards net positive, neutral, or negative outcomes and impacts. In some cases the certifier may be able to help in producing and certifying those findings. But in many cases they do not produce these data.

Sustainability needs to include farmers, labourers and rural communities: Environmental sustainability cannot be achieved at the expense of farmers and rural communities. They must both be beneficiaries of these changes in production as well as the drivers and owners of this change. This is at present the weakest aspect of agribusiness sustainability reporting. A step-change is possible if rural communities are empowered to drive this change and they are rewarded for the results they achieve.

Agribusiness can achieve a step-change in trust with consumers: Scandals in recent years about tainted ingredients, the environmental footprint of palm oil, soy, cotton, and wood, and the social conditions of workers that grow coffee, tea, cocoa and catch fish have damaged trust in some of the world's most valuable brands. Telling a fresh, transparent and impactful story along the various dimensions of key SDGs is an opportunity for agribusiness to support brands in renewing trust and creating a positive link between consumers and producers.

About TrueFootprint

TrueFootprint has developed the first bottom-up impact verification solution. Our approach is scalable, low-cost and empowers communities to take ownership of the solutions to improve their lives.


We help companies report the outcomes and impact of their business and operations and to increase the return on investment of their sustainability projects. We achieve this through a unique combination of technology and community engagement. We work with the beneficiaries of a company's sustainability projects: your employees and the communities where you operate. Our technology empowers these people to collect data and to take ownership of the investments. The people at the base of supply chains deliver the outcome data on your investments because it works for them. It's good for them and it's good for your business.

TrueFootprint builds upon 15 years of pioneering experience in bottom-up monitoring of public projects and development projects worth over \$1B in a dozen countries in Africa, Asia and the Middle East.

TrueFootprint is supported by a team of advisors and associates with decades of experience in agriculture, responsible sourcing, mining, technology, product development, business integrity, compliance, consumer reviews, finance, asset management, sustainability, climate change, international development, and economics.

TrueFootprint is based in Cambridge, UK.

Fredrik Galtung, CEO/Co-Founder

 +44.7979648877

 fredrik@truefootprint.com

 fredrik.galtung

 [linkedin.com/in/fredrik-galtung-7084954/](https://www.linkedin.com/in/fredrik-galtung-7084954/)

