

Responsible Down Standard International Working Group

Draft Review

June 28, 2018

Agenda:

1. Introductions, Announcements, and Housekeeping
2. Updates
3. Review criteria changes from version 2.0 to 3.0
4. Review data requests for audits
5. Draft Review

Updates:

- We are working on introducing a new model of certification. They are too big to fall into the Small Farm Module but do not have the business structures in place to qualify for the Contract Farm Group. We will be doing a pilot with two Certification Bodies.
- We have also sent out a questionnaire on Parent Farms to all of our Certification Bodies and have asked them to translate and send to their clients. It is not a requirement. We are hoping to get the results by the end of July.

Criteria Changes from Version 2.0 to 3.0

Critical Major			Major		
Module	V2.0	V3.0	Module	V2.0	V3.0
Farm	6	6	Farm	10	17
Slaughter	0	0	Slaughter	2	9
Transport	0	0	Transport	1	4
Small Farm	1	1	Small Farm	7	7

Minor			Recommendation		
Module	V2.0	V3.0	Module	V2.0	V3.0
Farm	22	19	Farm	17	14
Slaughter	8	5	Slaughter	6	4
Transport	3	1	Transport	2	1
Small Farm	0	0	Small Farm	0	0

There are a lot of changes to from the Minor to the Major category which could result in farms making a lot of changes.

We need to look at the criteria and determine which are going to be difficult for farms and which are going to be easier.

Proposed Changes

- **Terms of Reference:**
 - We have added a section where we explicitly outline the education and development of the supply chain in order to drive continuous improvement of best practices. You will see some additional training requirements, which are listed under specific criteria, but we do not have 'Education' per say as part of the standard. The reason for that is it would fall outside of the standard document and would just to towards the development of resources for the supply chain to use.

- **Scope:**
 - We have mentioned that we want to start collecting information from the Parent Farms. We may still add onto this.

- **The following suggestions are recommended to the IWG:**
 - These changes do not yet fall under any particular category in the standard.
 - *D. Introduce an optional declaration for suppliers: "All of our down, both RDS and non-RDS certified is self-verified to contain no live-plucked or force-fed material."*

- When you think about the principles and objectives of the standard, do you think it is a conflict for us to allow RDS suppliers to knowingly trade live plucked material? Is that something we want to eventually control? (Please provide feedback)
- **Requirement Types:**
 - There has been suggestions on changing some of the Minor requirements to Major
 - There has also been suggestions to change the number of days to prove compliance from 60 to 30 days.
- **Farm Module:**
 - Most of the changes in the Farm Module are changing the criteria level and then additional guidance. There has not been any new criteria introduced. Aside from adding a requirement to follow a template for documentation.
 - *Sections 10.1 – 10.4:* We won't be adjusting any of those but we are looking at how the RWS is referenced. It doesn't really effect any of the pertinent parts of the standard.
- **Slaughter Module:**
 - There has been a request for more guidance on Euthanasia. Euthanasia is something everyone wants to see as a Major requirement.
 - Data collection is something that is increased throughout the standard. We need to know where the farms are at currently in order to know what specific points need to addressed in the standard.
- **Transport Module:**
 - Birds should be fit for travel. Do not transport sick or injured birds.
 - Training for workers involved in transport.
 - Handling during of birds.
- **Audit Procedures:**
 - More guidance on the risk assessment.

Thoughts for Discussion

- Increase in criteria
- Increase in documentation:
 - Veterinary Health and Welfare Plan (template provided)
 - Record keeping

- Increase in information collected from the Certification Body

The result of this could potentially be an increase in the cost of certification and some farms might not be able to meet the criteria, but also an increase in the credibility of the standard.

Comment: This could also potentially affect the availability of the product.

Other Changes

- Improved risk assessment guidance
 - We just have a list of risk factors and we want to make it more clear which risk factor affects the outcome and what that outcome might be.
- Reorganized structure to align with the Responsible Wool Standard
 - We want it to be easier for auditors by creating better alignment.

Next Steps

- Schedule phone calls with voting members only.
- Review criteria changes, and pass as much as possible through consensus.
- Identify points that will need further discussion or voting.
- Proceed as needed to have a final IWG draft of RDS 3.0.
- The result will be a final draft that we will bring back to the full International Working Group.
- It will get presented for questions and comments again to the full Working Group.
- Then we will take that version through a public stakeholder review.

The goal is to have a draft for the public stakeholder review by September and then launch the standard at the end of the year.