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Background
- Deforestation and forest degradation account for 10-15% of global greenhouse gas emissions
- Deforestation is largely driven by global demands for food and other commodities
- Particularly mentioned as major ‘deforestation commodities’: palm oil, timber, pulp & paper, soy, and beef & leather
- Voluntary supply chain initiatives aim at reducing deforestation while enhancing production
- Insight in functioning of these initiatives is required

Contribution
- Framework of factors influencing functioning of supply chain initiatives
- Qualitative comparison of four supply chain initiatives

Comparison
Certification schemes versus moratoria
- Stricter and clearer criteria for moratoria, allowing for monitoring and enforcement, with low leakage (displacement to other areas) within the moratorium area
- High implementation of the moratoria, due to dependence on parties who established the moratorium
- Soy: perceived risk through exposure important to companies

Soy Moratorium and Cattle Agreement
- Similar setting with similar result. However, Soy Moratorium to end this year, while Cattle Agreement continues
- High effectiveness attributed to combined activities from NGOs, supply chain, national government and international government

RSPO and RTRS certification schemes
- Ambiguous criteria and low implementation, although higher for RSPO than for RTRS
- Brazilian soy producer think existing law suffices, while for RSPO the low price premium may be the reason for low compliance

Discussion and Conclusion
- Leakage a major risk – supply chain initiatives can only be effective if they have high sector participation and full spatial coverage
- Demand for sustainable production important, although exposure seem to have been key for the moratoria
- Technical and institutional possibilities for farmers to expand production without deforestation or with reduced deforestation not well understood
- Supply chain initiatives can contribute in combination with public policies that create incentives and take away institutional obstacles
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Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Soy Moratorium</th>
<th>Cattle Agreement</th>
<th>RSPO</th>
<th>RTRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certification type</td>
<td>Directed to supply chain</td>
<td>Directed to supply chain</td>
<td>Directed to supply chain</td>
<td>Directed to supply chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage depth</td>
<td>Sectoral</td>
<td>Sectoral</td>
<td>Sectoral</td>
<td>Sectoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of actors</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of compliance</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of compliance</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of substitution</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of leakage</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of implementation</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of implementation</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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