Better Cotton Producer Unit Support Visit

For use with Better Cotton Principles and Criteria (v2.1)

Smallholder Farms
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# Introduction to the Producer Unit Support Visit

The Producer Unit (PU) Support Visit is required for all PUs during the timeframe of their active licence. This assessment is to be conducted by an Implementing Partner (IP) Representative and take place in either the second or third year of the active licence period. The PU Support Visit does not directly affect the status of a PU’s license to sell Better Cotton. It is intended as a learning visit to help the IP identify where further support is needed.

The objectives of the Support Visit are to:

1. Evaluate the PU’s progress against its Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP), identify challenges, and develop solutions (together with the PU Manager and Field Facilitators)
2. Review the effectiveness of the PU’s internal management system and training/awareness raising efforts, and determine if any changes are needed
3. Verify whether the PU is still fully compliant with the Core Indicators; identify any gaps and agree on corrective actions to address these
4. Understand where the PU needs additional capacity building support and training (including skills development or training of PU staff as well as for farmers)

A critical part of the PU Support Visit is developing an[**Action Plan (see Section 6)**](#_6_Action_Plan)that sets out specific improvements. These can address gaps in meeting the Core Indicators, areas from the CIP, or areas where further training/ support is needed to build the competency of the PU Manager or Field Facilitators.

**Guidance**

The PU Support Visit is designed to complement (not replace) regular support and field visits by the Implementing Partner. It is a tool to check in on a PU’s level of compliance with the Better Cotton Principles and Criteria, evaluate progress against the Continuous Improvement Plan and identify where the PU needs to make improvements to operations and systems during the lifespan of their active licence. It is the IP’s responsibility to schedule and conduct the Support Visits during the second or third year of a Producer’s active licence.

**Please note**: Support Visits cannot be conducted by the PU Manager (or another staff member) of the same PU that is being assessed. More information on who is qualified to conduct the PU Support Visits and the expected format and timing of the visit can be found in the Assurance Manual available on the [*Assurance* page of the Better Cotton website](https://bettercotton.org/better-cotton-standard-system/assurance-program/).

Outcomes of the Support Visits and Next Steps

1. During the Support Visit, the IP Representative (who carried out the visit) with input from the PU Manager is to develop an [**Action Plan (Section 6)**](#_6_Action_Plan). This Action Plan is to improve the performance of the PU and reduce the likelihood of recurrent gaps or the identification of non-conformities during a Licensing Assessment or Surveillance Assessment.
2. The IP Representative carrying out the Support Visit should complete the report (including any actions/ improvement recommendations) and share back with the PU Manager within 3 weeks of the visit
3. Copies of the PU Support Visit report and Action Plan are to be shared with your Better Cotton Country Team representative
4. If an IP determines that a PU has significant gaps [(as identified in Section 5)](#_5_Better_Cotton) in meeting any of the Core Indicators, the IP is expected to notify the Better Cotton Country team in writing of the issue. **Please note:** This information will not lead to an automatic licence cancellation but may result in an additional surveillance assessment being carried out

Advice on navigating this document

Please turn on the ‘Navigation Pane’ (under ‘View’ menu) to allow easy referencing of report sections.

**Note:** Once you have completed the entire form, please save as PDF using the Reference Number as the file name. The Reference Number is *PU code\_Implementing Partner\_PU Support Visit\_Season\_Month-Year, e.g.* ***AUWA23\_Cotton Company\_PU Support Visit\_09-2020***

# 1 Summary Information (Producer Unit and Visit)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Producer Unit Name** |       | **Producer Unit Code:** |       |
| **Name of PU Manager** |       | **How long has the PU Manager been in place *(specifically in this PU)*** |       |
| **Number of Field Facilitators in the PU *(as of the visit date)*** |       |
| **Implementing Partner** |       | **Local Partner (if applicable**) |       |
| **First season participating in the BCI Programme** |       |
| **Location**  | Town/ village:       |
| State and Country:       |
| **Season current licence granted**  |       |
| **Visit conducted by** | Name:       |
| Organisation/ Role:       |
| **Start date of visit** | Start date (dd/mm/yyyy)       | Start time:       |
| **End date of visit** | End date (dd/mm/yyyy)       | End time:       |

# 2 Producer Unit Staff (PU Manager and Field Facilitators)

The Producer Unit (PU) staff (PU Manager and Field Facilitators) play an integral role in the implementation of the Better Cotton Initiative Programme.

*Please complete the table based on your assessment of the PU Manager’s knowledge and collective knowledge of the FFs. You will find guidance below the table to support with the selection choice.*

In the [**Action Plan (Section 6)**](#_6_Action_Plan) you will include specific areas where the PU staff could benefit from additional training/ support.

| **Principle / Topic** | **PU Manager**  | **Field Facilitators** | **Principle/ Topic** | **PU Manager** | **Field Facilitators** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Crop Protection** | [ ]  Strong[ ]  Average[ ]  More training needed | [ ]  Strong[ ]  Average[ ]  More training needed | **Fibre Quality** | [ ]  Strong[ ]  Average[ ]  More training needed | [ ]  Strong[ ]  Average[ ]  More training needed |
| **Water Stewardship** | [ ]  Strong[ ]  Average[ ]  More training needed | [ ]  Strong[ ]  Average[ ]  More training needed | **Decent Work** | [ ]  Strong[ ]  Average[ ]  More training needed | [ ]  Strong[ ]  Average[ ]  More training needed |
| **Soil Health** | [ ]  Strong[ ]  Average[ ]  More training needed | [ ]  Strong[ ]  Average[ ]  More training needed | **Continuous Improvement Plan** | [ ]  Strong[ ]  Average[ ]  More training needed | [ ]  Strong[ ]  Average[ ]  More training needed |
| **Biodiversity** | [ ]  Strong[ ]  Average[ ]  More training needed | [ ]  Strong[ ]  Average[ ]  More training needed | **Data Management** *(including quality, accuracy and completeness)* | [ ]  Strong[ ]  Average[ ]  More training needed | [ ]  Strong[ ]  Average[ ]  More training needed |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PU Manager Understanding:** * **Strong:** the PU Manager has an impressive level of knowledge relating to the principle in question. He/she is also very familiar with local key sustainability concerns or challenges associated with this principle.
* **Average:** the PU Manager is knowledgeable about high priority areas but there are a few gaps in understanding.
* **More training needed:** the PU Manager lacks knowledge on the entire principle or key components of the principle i.e. no understanding of pest scouting techniques or the benefits of restoring on-farm biodiversity levels.
 | **Field Facilitator Understanding:** * **Strong:** Most or all FFs have impressive knowledge relating to the principle in question. They are also very familiar with local key sustainability concerns associated with the different principles.
* **Average:** Some FFs have strong knowledge and others have a more basic understanding on the topic. Or as a collective, the FFs are knowledgeable about high priority areas but there are a few gaps in understanding.
* **More training needed:** Most FFs have key gaps in understanding;lacking knowledge on the entire principle or key components of the principle i.e. no understanding of pest scouting, techniques or the benefits cover cropping.
 |

# 3 Farmers and Workers

3.1 Farmers

The assessor is to select a representative sample of Learning Groups (LGs) for interviewing. This sample should take into account the variations within the Producer Unit. Factors that can be considered may include gender split of farmers within the LG; irrigation type; variations in landholding size; year of LG formation; location spread; villages with the largest number of LGs in the PU; Field Facilitators with the largest/smallest number of LGs under their charge etc. Please do not select based on ease of access.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **LG 1 CODE:**      **Field Facilitator Name:**       | **LG 2 CODE:**      **Field Facilitator Name:**       | **LG 3 CODE:**      **Field Facilitator Name:**       |
| Farmer Name | Gender (M/F) | Farmer Name | Gender (M/F) | Farmer Name | Gender (M/F) |
|       |       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **Does this Learning Group have access to demonstration plot(s):** [ ]  Yes [ ]  No | **Does this Learning Group have access to demonstration plot(s):** [ ]  Yes [ ]  No | **Does this Learning Group have access to demonstration plot(s):** [ ]  Yes [ ]  No |
| **Training Records** | **Are the training records accurate and complete in line with details provided by farmers interviewed?** [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Partially |
| **Capacity Building** | **Based on the interviews with farmers, what is their overall level of participation in BCI activities?** *(this includes training, LG meetings, home visits from FFs, demonstration plot visits etc)*[ ]  High – most farmers attend numerous PU activities or trainings each season[ ]  Medium - some farmers attend regular activities, others may only participate in one or two activities per season[ ]  Low – most farmers are not very engaged with the PU |

3.2 Workers

A representative sample of workers (when applicable) from all production areas should be selected for interviewing. Use this section to record details of workers interviewed. The assessor is to select the workers to interview.

**Note:** Worker names can be excluded if necessary due to confidentiality; in this case please provide a description of the worker’s role instead.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name or role** | **Gender (M/F)** | **Location of interview** | **Comments & interview topics covered** | **Training sessions the worker has attended *(Number and topic – also add information on other relevant programme activities i.e. access to demo plots)*** |
|       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |
| **Are the training records accurate and complete in line with details provided by workers interviewed?** [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Partially |

# 4 Continuous Improvement: Plan and Progress

This section is to evaluate the PU’s progress against its Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) and determine whether any adjustments are needed. Recommendations to improve the CIP plan and process will be captured in the [**Action Plan (Section 6).**](#_6_Action_Plan)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PLAN** | Are the identified **focus areas relevant**?*When thinking about relevance, consider whether the focus areas are locally applicable (i.e. sustainability issues associated with the region) and specific to the PU by looking at the internal assessment data gathered during the development process. You could ask the PU staff: ‘How did you identify CIP priorities?’ ‘Do you think the CIP focus areas are relevant to your LGs?’*[ ]  Yes [ ]  No **Comments:**       |
| Do the PU Manager and FF **have a good understanding of the CIP**?*This includes understanding of the identified focus areas, the interventions and progress made against the targets and plan. You could ask the PU Manager and a couple of FFs: ‘What interventions have been implemented and training conducted over the past few months?’ What actions are expected in the plan for the next couple months?’.*[ ]  Yes [ ]  No **Comments:**       |
| Has the Producer Unit **adapted their CIP after year 1 or year 2 following the monitoring processes?***You could ask the PU Manager and a couple of FFs: ‘Have you reviewed the progress and decided to de-prioritise focus areas?’ ‘Have the CIP priority/focus areas changed over time?’*[ ]  Yes [ ]  No **Comments:**        |
| **PROGRESS** | Has **progress been made in line with the CIP**?*For example, have interventions and activities outlined in the plan been implemented? Can changes in farmer awareness or practices be verified through farmer interviews?* [ ]  Yes [ ]  No **Comments:**       |
| Please comment on the **level of awareness of farmers** in relation to focus areas identified in the CIP      |
| Please comment on **farmer adoption levels** in relation to specific practices areas identified in the CIP      |
| List the **top two challenges** faced by the PU making CIP implementation difficult | **1**        |
| **2**       |

# 5 Better Cotton Principles and Criteria – Assessing Current Status

For the rest of the Support Visit, the IP Representative is to utilise the Principles and Criteria (P&C) matrix on the following pages to assess the current status of the Producer Unit. Better Cotton has developed an optional [Assessment Checklist](https://bettercotton.org/better-cotton-standard-system/assurance-program/) which may also be used to help guide the process and record notes in the field. The Conformity Indicator Level Guidance and [Better Cotton Principles and Criteria](https://bettercotton.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Better-Cotton-Principles-Criteria-V2.1.pdf) may also be useful reference material during the visit.

Use the [**Action Plan (Section 6)**](#_6_Action_Plan) to record any areas where the PU is not currently fully compliant with Core Indicators. The IP Representative and the PU Manager, together, populate the Action Plan with improvement actions to implement.

# Principle 1: Crop Protection

| **Indicator No.** | **Current Status** | **Specific Evidence/ Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1.1.1** A locally adapted and time-bound plan, based on agro-ecosystem analysis and which identifies appropriate specific practices to implement the five components of Integrated Pest Management, is established.*[(i) growing a healthy crop;**(ii) preventing the build-up of pest populations and of the spread of disease;**(iii) preserving and enhancing populations of beneficial organisms;**(iv) regular field observations of the crop health and key pest and beneficial insects;**(v) managing resistance.]* | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Has a baseline survey been conducted to understand what pesticides are in use within the PU?      |
| **1.1.3** A timeline for implementing the 5 components of the Integrated Pest Management plan is established. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **1.1.4** There is no calendar or random spraying. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Please comment on the awareness of FFs and the farmers on pest scouting techniques such as Economic Threshold Level (ETL)      |
| **1.2.1** All pesticides used are registered nationally for the use on cotton.  | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Are farmers using combinations of pesticides / ‘cocktails’?     If yes, are these nationally registered?     If yes, what are the common combinations used?      |
| **1.2.2** All pesticides used are correctly labelled in at least one *de facto* or *de jure* official national or applicable official regional language. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **1.3.1** Pesticides listed in:(i) Annex A and B of the Stockholm Convention; or(ii) Annexes of the Montreal Protocol; or(iii) Annex III of the Rotterdam Convention;are not used. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **1.4.1** The Producer has a plan to phase out by 2021 pesticides listed in category 1 of the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS); 1a of the World Health Organization classification (WHO). | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Is the plan being implemented effectively?     Are farmers aware of the need to phase out by 2021 where these pesticides are in use?     Does phase out by 2021 seem achievable?      |
| **1.4.2** The Producer has a plan to phase out by 2024 pesticides listed in category 2 of the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS); 1b of the World Health Organization classification (WHO). | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **1.5.1** The Producer has a plan to phase out Pesticides defined as carcinogenic, mutagenic or reprotoxic (CMR) substances according to Categories 1a and 1b of the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS). | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **1.6.1** The Producer must ensure that any person who prepares and applies pesticides is:(i) Healthy;(ii) Skilled and trained in the application of pesticides;(iii) 18 or older;(iv) not pregnant or nursing. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **1.7.2** Minimum Personal Protective Equipment is worn while preparing and applying pesticides, which includes protection of the following body parts from dermal absorption, ingestions and inhalation:(i) Face and airways: eyes, ear canal, nose, scalp(ii) Limbs: arms, forearms, palms, legs, feet (iii) Abdomen and genital area. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Are farmers aware of the importance of minimum PPE?     Has any training been conducted?     Could PU staff identify locally adapted solutions / suggestions?     Are there specific body parts that farmers are not consistently covering (e.g. eyes or feet)? If there are areas, what barriers are there?       |

# Principle 2: Water Stewardship

| **Indicator** | **Current Status** | **Specific Evidence/ Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2.1.1** A time-bound Water Stewardship Plan is defined that addresses each of the following components:(i) Mapping and understanding of water resources;(ii) Managing soil moisture;(iii) Applying efficient irrigation practices to optimise water productivity (applicable to irrigation farms only);(iv) Managing water quality;(v) Engaging in collaboration and collective action to promote sustainable water use. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **2.1.2** A timeline for implementing the five components of the Water Stewardship Plan is established. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **2.1.9** Opportunities for collaboration and collective actions (beyond the Producer’s unit of production) to achieve sustainable water use are identified.  | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Which collaboration and collective actions have been identified?      |
| **2.1.10** By March 2022, collaboration and collective actions (beyond the Producer’s unit of production) towards local sustainable use of water are implemented as per opportunities identified in the Water Stewardship Plan. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |

# Principle 3: Soil Management

| **Indicator** | **Current Status** | **Specific Evidence/ Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3.1.1** A time-bound soil management plan is defined that addresses each of the following components: (i) Identifying and analysing soil type; (ii) Maintaining and enhancing soil structure;(iii) Maintaining and enhancing soil fertility; (iv) Continuously improving nutrient cycling. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **3.1.2** A timeline for implementing the four components of the soil management plan is established  | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **3.1.3** Soil testing is conducted that includes NPK and pH analysis. A minimum of 1 soil test per Learning Group on a minimum of 20% of the Learning Groups within a Producer Unit must be conducted each year, and with different Learning Groups each year, so that all Learning Groups are covered over a period of 5 years. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Have the results of the testing been shared with FFs and farmers?     Has the outcome of the soil tests been taken into account with the subsequent soil treatment?      |

# Principle 4: Biodiversity and Land Use

| **Indicator** | **Current Status** | **Specific Evidence/ Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4.1.1** A time-bound Biodiversity Management Plan that addresses each of the five following components, is defined:(i) Identifying and mapping biodiversity resources;(i) Identifying and restoring degraded areas;(iii) Enhancing populations of beneficial insects, as per the Integrated Pest Management plan (Principle 1);(iv) Ensuring crop rotation;(v) Protecting riparian areas. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **4.1.2** A timeline for implementing the five components of the Biodiversity Management Plan is established. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **4.1.3** Biodiversity resources are identified and mapped. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Have the mapping exercises been completed for both on farm and off farm species?      Please comment on the relevance of the focal species      |
| **4.1.4** Degraded areas on the farm are identified. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Does the PU Manager and FF have a good understanding of the concept of degraded areas?      Could any degraded areas be seen around the farms or villages?     Where degraded areas have been identified, have any interventions or actions been outlined to improve the areas?       |
| **4.2.1** In case of any proposed conversion from non-agricultural land to agricultural land, the BCI High Conservation Value (HCV) risk-based simplified approach must be implemented | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |

# Principle 5: Fibre Quality

| **Indicator** | **Current Status** | **Specific Evidence/ Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5.1.1** Good management practices for the harvest and storage of seed cotton are adopted. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |

# Principle 6: Decent Work

| **Indicator** | **Current Status** | **Specific Evidence/ Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **6.1.2** The Producer has a time-bound plan for the prevention of child labour in accordance with ILO Convention 138. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **6.1.3** There are no workers below the age of 15 (14 in certain specified countries), or below the minimum age for employment defined by local law (whichever is higher) unless they meet all of the following conditions: (i) the child is helping on his/her own family’s farm; (ii) the child's work is structured so as to enable him/her to attend school;  (iii) the child's work should not be so demanding as to undermine his/her education; (iv) the child should not perform tasks that are hazardous for him/her because of his/her age;  (v) the child must be guided – both in terms of learning skills and supervision of tasks – by a family member;  (vi) the child has received appropriate training. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Did the PU Manager and FF identify any possible risks of child labour in the PU where the necessary conditions were not being met?      |
| **6.1.4** A written child labour policy, specifying under which circumstances and for which tasks children can or cannot work or be employed and why, has been communicated to farmers/workers/employees. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **6.2.1** Hazardous work is not conducted by workers under 18. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Based on interviews with farmers, are they aware of what activities can and cannot be conducted by those under 18 (i.e. what is considered are hazardous)?       |
| **6.3.1** All forms of forced or compulsory, including bonded or trafficked labour, are prohibited. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Based on interviews with farmers, are they aware of what forced or compulsory labour is and why it is prohibited?      |
| **6.4.3** The Producer Unit has a time-bound plan to improve the position of disadvantaged groups. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Describe the progress made against the disadvantaged group plan and list the evidence observed where appropriate      |
| **6.5.2** There is no evidence of any policy, practice or customary rule that results in the payment of unequal wages on the basis of gender to workers who perform the same job. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **6.13.1** Farmers in the PU are aware of the legally applicable minimum wage/s (statutory national or regional minimum wage applicable to agriculture, collectively agreed wage, industry minimum). | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**What is the reference material used by the PU to determine the national or regional minimum wage?     Could the PU Staff outline the minimum wage value?     Could farmers recall the minimum wage value?      |
| **6.19.1** Use of corporal punishment, mental or physical coercion, sexual harassment or physical or verbal abuse or harassment of any kind, is prohibited. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |

# Principle 7: Management System

| **Indicator** | **Current Status** | **Specific Evidence / Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **7.1.1** A Continuous Improvement Plan is available, implemented and monitored according to the applicable BCI Continuous Improvement planning process, and reviewed annually. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **7.2.1** A training plan identifying the key sustainability issues to be addressed for the Producer, the name of training provider(s), scheduling and expected participants is available and implemented. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Has the training plan been followed? Were there any issues which resulted in the inability to follow the plan?       |
| **7.2.2** Training materials for Better Cotton Initiative farmers and workers are available to cover Better Cotton Initiative Principles and Criteria Core Indicators, with a focus on key sustainability issues in the local context. Best practices (validated locally) related to production are shared with Better Cotton Initiative farmers through appropriate dissemination material in local language. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Have different training mechanisms been used? Please provide examples of training materials i.e. demonstration plots, videos, booklets, games       |
| **7.2.3** The Producer reports annual data on number of Better Cotton Initiative farmers and workers trained by gender and topic to demonstrate the implementation of the training plan. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **7.2.4** The Producer operates a system to: (i) Assess and document the level of adoption of practices promoted through training;  (ii) Identify and address the risks associated with adopting the practices promoted through training; (iii) Evaluate the training materials continuously to improve their content and delivery. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Comment on the accuracy of the adoption practice records     Please provide details on the system used to identify risks      |
| **7.3.1** The Producer collects and maintains accurate and complete Producer Unit data in the format required by the Better Cotton Initiative. This will include (but not be limited to) name and contact information of Producer Unit Manager; list of farmers organised into Learning Groups (for smallholder Production Units); age, gender, education, level of farmers; expected seed cotton production per farmer and area under cultivation; geo-location of Producer Units; names of gins. The Producer Unit data is updated annually, at the latest by the end of sowing. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Can you comment on the accuracy and completeness of the data based on the interactions with BCI Farmers?     Has the data been updated before the end of sowing?      Is there a method to validate / cross-check the data?       |
| **7.3.2** The Producer maintains a farm-level record keeping mechanism (e.g. Famer Field Book) for essential production data on inputs and outputs in an accurate manner. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Do all farmers have a Farmer Field Book (FFB) or farm-level record keeping system?      How do farmers fill out their FFB or farm-level record keeping system?     Can you comment on the accuracy and completeness of the data based on the interactions with BCI Farmers?     Is there a method to validate / cross-check the data?       |
| **7.3.3** The Producer operates a system to collect, compile and report complete and accurate Results Indicator data in accordance with the Results Indicator Reporting template. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |       |
| **7.3.4** The Producer creates and maintains a profile of the farm labour force, including estimates of numbers of workers, as per the Better Cotton Initiative defined worker categories and disaggregated by gender. The labour profile is updated annually, at the latest at the end of sowing. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Has the labour profile been updated for the current season?      |
| **7.3.5** The Producer ensures that all farmers within the PU maintain receipts of sales of Better Cotton, including the buyer name, date, and volume, for at least one year and is able to collect and submit these sale records to BCI upon request. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Are farmers aware of the need to maintain sales information?      |
| **7.4.1** The Producer operates a system to: (i) Identify and address the risks of non-conformity with core indicators; (ii) Plan and enforce the implementation of Corrective Actions resulting from monitoring activities. | [ ]  Indicator fully met[ ]  Minor additional work needed[ ]  Major gaps identified |      **Additional question(s)**Please provide details on the system used by the Producer Unit     Has the system identified any risks of non-conformity over the past 6 months?       |

# 6 Action Plan

The Action Plan is the key outcome of the PU Support Visit. It is a mandatory part of the process which sets out clear and specific improvements needed to either fully meet Core Indicators, strengthen the skills of PU staff, and/or strengthen progress against the CIP.

During the Support Visit, the IP Representative (who carried out the visit) should populate the Action Plan together with the PU Manager. The Action Plan should set out specific actions to be taken, along with the timeline and name of person responsible.

* Part one of the plan covers the CIP improvements and areas where PU staff could benefit from additional training or support. It is **mandatory** to complete this part.
* Part two of the plan should be used to record any areas where the PU is not currently fully compliant with Core Indicators. **All indicators where major gaps have been identified during the visit must be included in part two of the action plan.**

| **Indicator No. or focus area** | **Describe the specific gap or areas where more support is needed** | **Improvement Action** ***What needs to be done / what changes need to be made?*** | **Name of responsible person** | **Timeline** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PART ONE** | ***[Example]****PUM knowledge and confidence with soil management practices*  | *During discussions with the PU Manager, it was clear that they did not have a strong awareness of the benefit of cover cropping and crop rotation. Having this knowledge will help to change behaviours at the field level.*  | *PU Manager to conduct refresher training with IP Coordinator on soil management techniques and provide details on the benefits.* | *PU Manager and IP Coordinator* | *Over the next month (complete by March 2020)* |
| ***[Mandatory section]***Skills/knowledge building for PU Manager      | *Note here the specific areas where further training or support would be useful (e.g. presentation skills, knowledge of beneficial insects)*      |       |       |       |
| ***[Mandatory section]***Skills/knowledge building for FFs      | *Note here the specific areas where further training or support would be useful (e.g. presentation skills, knowledge of beneficial insects)*      |       |       |       |
|  | ***[Mandatory section]***CIP Improvements      | *Note here any adjustments or changes needed to the CIP to ensure it is relevant and implemented*      |       |       |       |
|  | ***[Optional section]***      | *Note here any additional improvements or changes that do not apply specifically to the PUM capacity, the CIP or Core Indicators.*       |       |       |       |

| **Indicator No. or focus area** | **Describe the specific gap or areas where more support is needed** | **Improvement Action** ***What needs to be done / what changes need to be made?*** | **Name of responsible person** | **Timeline** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PART TWO** | ***[Example]****1.7.1* | *Training has taken place on the importance of PPE whilst preparing and applying pesticides. PU staff are familiar with locally adapted solutions and recommend these. Farmers are aware of the importance and have access to PPE. However, 7 out of 15 farmers interviewed do not cover their hands.* | *Further training to be conducted focusing on the health impacts. Rallies and engaging relatives to express the negative impacts of not wearing PPE. PU Manager to discuss with IP Coordinator to see if different glove suppliers can be found.*  | *PU Manager* | *Next PPE training due to take place in June 2020* |
| ***[Example]****4.1.3* | *On-farm and off-farm mapping was conducted 2 years ago. However, the maps have not been updated to reflect current biodiversity status to help inform the Biodiversity Management Plan and monitor improvements.* | 1. *IP to carry out refresher webinar on best practice mapping techniques and share examples with the PU Manager.*
2. *PU Manager and FFs to conduct mapping exercises to update the maps.*
 | *IP Coordinator and PU Manager*  | *Over the next month (complete by March 2020)* |
|  |       |       |       |       |       |
|  |       |       |       |       |       |
|  |       |       |       |       |       |
|  |       |       |       |       |       |
|  |       |       |       |       |       |
|  |       |       |       |       |       |
|  |       |       |       |       |       |
|  |       |       |       |       |       |
|  |       |       |       |       |       |
|  |       |       |       |       |       |
|  |       |       |       |       |       |
|  |       |       |       |       |       |
|  |       |       |       |       |       |