Leather and the EUDR - responses to claims of the leather industry

Leather industry associations, particularly the Confederation of National Associations of Tanners and Dressers of the European Community (COTANCE), have been mounting a concerted campaign aimed at excluding leather from the EU Regulation on Deforestation-Free Products (EUDR). Most recently, they have argued that leather should be removed from Annex I.

The undersigned organisations have prepared this document to challenge six false claims made by the industry and present evidence to support leather's continued inclusion in the law. Our position is summarised here, with more detailed analysis to be found in Annex A below.

False claim	**Counter-arguments**
Leather is not directly linked to deforestation	Cattle ranching is the leading driver of global tropical deforestation, particularly in the Brazilian Amazon. Bovine cattle are reared for both meat and leather, with the EU the second largest market for Brazilian leather. Multiple investigations have linked European leather to cattle ranching causing deforestation.
Academic research has concluded that leather is not a driver of deforestation	The main study cited by the leather lobby as evidence that leather is not a driver of deforestation is a flawed, industry-commissioned report. Other peer-reviewed academic studies have drawn a clear link between leather and deforestation.
Leather is a waste product from meat production	Leather is a highly lucrative commodity. Europe imports €1.3 billion worth of bovine leather and hides annually, and European leather processing generates €125 billion in turnover. With so much value added downstream, the leather industry clearly has the capacity to ensure the raw materials it depends upon are deforestation-free.
The demand for leather has no influence on the supply of cattle hides	When margins are tight, the revenue from hides can determine whether a slaughterhouse makes a profit or a loss. Brazilian leather exports generated US$1.26 billion in revenue in 2024, supporting the continued operation and expansion of the cattle industry.
Non-EU supply chains will not set up costly cattle traceability systems just for a residue of meat production	The EUDR is already incentivising producers in Brazil to invest in traceability to support continued exports of beef and leather, with multiple schemes in development or operation.
Leather hides should be excluded from the EUDR because other cattle products (including dairy and collagen) are excluded	The feasibility study informing development of the EUDR prioritised commodities based on trade volumes, past and projected deforestation rates in the countries of origin and the EU share of global demand. Beef and leather were identified as priorities – dairy and collagen were not.

Signatories:

Annex A: Technical briefing

False Claim 1: Leather is not directly linked to deforestation

Cattle ranching is the leading driver of global tropical deforestation, with over 90 per cent of deforested areas in the Brazilian Amazon cleared to make way for pastures, often illegally. Cattle are reared for meat, leather and other products. While most Brazilian beef is consumed domestically, 80 per cent of Brazil's bovine leather is exported and the EU is its second-largest market. Brazil is the largest source of bovine hides for the Italian tanning industry, supplying nearly a quarter of the industry's total wet blue hides. Europe's bovine leather supply is therefore inextricably linked to the deforestation that occurs where the cattle is produced.

Recent investigations have drawn a clear link between the European leather sector and deforestation:

- *The Hidden Price of Luxury*, Earthsight, 2025: linked Italian leather suppliers of luxury fashion brands to illegal deforestation and Indigenous land rights abuses in the Brazilian Amazon.
- Compliance Checker Company Profile: JBS, AidEnvironment, 2025: JBS's beef and leather operations in Brazil to seven potentially EUDR noncompliant case studies.
- *Hide on the Highway*, Rainforest Foundation Norway, 2024: linked 'Italian' leather to imports of Brazilian hides exposed to recent deforestation (after 1 January 2021).
- *Cash Cow*, Global Witness, 2022: connected Italian tanneries to slaughterhouses that purchased cattle from ranches operating on tens of thousands of football fields worth of illegal Amazon deforestation.
- *Deforestation in the Driver's Seat*, Environmental Investigation Agency, 2022: showed links between illegal deforestation and automotive leather supply chains of relevance for the EU.
- *Nowhere to Hide*, Stand.earth, 2021: linked 100 fashion brands to Brazilian tanneries exposed to risks of Amazon deforestation.
- *Driving deforestation*, Rainforest Foundation Norway, 2021: highlighted European car companies' exposure to over a million hectares of deforestation.
- *Grand Theft Chaco,* Earthsight, 2020: traced leather produced on stolen Indigenous land in the Paraguayan Chaco to the seats of Europe's luxury cars.

Several of these investigations demonstrate that leather entering the EU market would not have complied with the EUDR had it been in effect at the time. Often, this leather is not just produced on deforested land, but also linked to illegal practices, breaching both the law's deforestation and legality requirements.

Part of the reason why leather is linked to such high forest and human rights risks is that Brazilian supply chains of beef destined for the EU are subject to certain inspections and traceability for sanitation requirements which non-food products, including leather, are not subject to. Because of this, some tanneries source their hides from clandestine slaughterhouses or major slaughterhouses that have no policies for monitoring their cattle supply chains for legality or deforestation. This lack of oversight also generates higher risks that cattle may originate on ranches that encroach upon indigenous lands and protected areas or are otherwise engaged in deforestation or violations of laws.

A previous analysis comparing deforestation risk among commodities using Trase data showed that, per dollar, cattle products imported to the EU carried a much higher risk of deforestation than cocoa, palm, or soy – with leather higher risk than beef.

Even consumer brands acknowledge the link between leather and deforestation. Following investigations by NGOs, major fashion and automotive companies have made public commitments to eliminate deforestation from their supply chains. Multiple brands, from BMW to H&M, have signed onto the Deforestation-Free Call to Action for Leather, which recognises the influence that leather consumption in Europe and other northern markets has on the deforestation

and conversion of natural ecosystems associated with cattle ranching. Yet industry lobby groups continue to deny that such a connection exists.

The link between leather and deforestation has also been recognised by governments outside the EU. Lawmakers have proposed to cover leather and/or hides in their legislation regulating the imports of forest risk commodities – the US FOREST Act and Schedule 17 of the UK Environment Act respectively.

False Claim 2: Academic research has concluded that leather is not a driver of deforestation

The leather lobby has repeatedly cited a 2024 study by the Sant'Anna Institute of Management at the University of Pisa as evidence that leather does not drive deforestation. This industry-commissioned study, which has not been published in a peer-reviewed journal, has a range of methodological flaws discussed in more detail in Annex A.1 of this document.

Other academic research has drawn clear links between leather and deforestation. Perrine *et al* (2024) analysed embedded deforestation in leather and rubber and estimated that the EU demand for hides is responsible for the loss of up to 31,000 ha of forests annually.

Two studies published in *Forests*, a peer-reviewed journal on forestry and forest ecology, focused on the ways in which the Italian leather sector influences deforestation in Brazil. Mammadova *et al* (2020) concluded that:

> *…despite the largely claimed statement by the Italian tanneries, Italy does import from deforestation frontier states, whether it is in the form of direct flows from BLA [Brazilian Legal Amazon] states to Italy or through re-exports from the southern and south-eastern states. Thus, the Italian leather trade with Brazil possesses the risk of Amazonian deforestation, unless the proper traceability and due diligence systems are in place to claim the opposite.*

A 2022 follow up study by Mammadova *et al* analysed the complex ways in which regulation in consumer markets and international consumption place pressures on producer markets that in turn drive environmental destruction. The leather trade between Italy and Brazil was mentioned to illustrate these dynamics.

It is relevant to note that assessments of the carbon footprint of leather production include the environmental impacts of cattle production, including deforestation.[1] This suggests it is appropriate to link leather to environmental damage that takes place at the farm level.

[1] See: F Brugnoli, K Sena, L Zugno. et al. (2025) 'A global study on the Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) of the modern cow leather industry' Discov Sustain 6, 80 available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-025-00798-6 ; and L Vandepaar, (2025) 'The Life Cycle Assessment of Leather' Carbonfact (website), available at: https://www.carbonfact.com/blog/knowledge/leather-carbon-impact

False Claim 3: Leather is a waste product of meat production

Leather is not a waste product, just as plastic is not simply waste from oil refining. Both are profitable commodities that influence demand and drive environmental damage.

Leather is a lucrative global industry, with significant value added downstream. Europe imports €1.3 billion worth of bovine leather and hides annually, with €263 million of this coming from Brazil.[2] A 2020 report by COTANCE notes European leather processing generates €125 billion in turnover.

With so much value added downstream, the leather industry clearly has the capacity to invest in ensuring that the raw materials it depends upon are deforestation-free. Framing leather as waste enables the industry to deflect responsibility for upstream environmental impacts, including deforestation. This misrepresentation shifts the burden of responsibility to the meat sector, despite the leather industry's financial dependence on the same supply chain.

False Claim 4: The demand for leather has no influence on the supply of cattle hides

Claiming that leather demand does not influence cattle hide supply, and therefore deforestation, ignores the economic realities of the sector. Brazilian leather exports generated US$1.26 billion in revenue in 2024, money that supports the continued operation and expansion of the cattle industry.

In Brazil, experts say that the hide represents around three to five per cent of the total value of a cow for a slaughterhouse. Although this appears small, when slaughterhouse margins are tight, the added revenue from hides can impact significantly on profitability. Slaughterhouse profitability is dependent on the margin between prices for live cattle and sale prices for beef, hides and other cattle products. This margin has, at points in the past, been extremely tight and fluctuates based on cyclical changes in the price of live cattle and various pressures on the price of beef. For example, analysts have predicted a squeeze on slaughterhouse profits in 2025 due to cattle prices rising faster than beef prices.

For slaughterhouses on low profit margins, exports of hides to the EU can make the difference between a profitable and an unprofitable operation. A 2023 study modelled the potential impact of changes in EU leather demand on slaughterhouses of varying profitability and found that the loss of hide sales could tip a marginal slaughterhouse into unprofitability. Selling hides also ensures that slaughterhouses do not need to pay the costs of their disposal.

Several of the world's largest meatpackers also operate vertically, processing hides in their own tanneries and exporting these products to their own leather manufacturers abroad, thus further profiting from the added value of the manufacturing and sales of leather.

[2] EUROSTAT, EU 27 imports of leather HS Codes 4010, 4104 and 4017 from Brazil and non-EU countries, 2022-24 average. Excludes codes covering only non-bovine leather.

The sale of hides to Europe clearly benefits slaughter operations in Brazil, including in the Amazon region, reducing the cost of their operations and providing an additional revenue stream. By requiring hides to be deforestation-free, the EU has already catalysed change, as evidenced by news reports of deforestation-free leather now being exported from Brazil.

False Claim 5: Non-EU supply chains will not set up costly cattle traceability systems just for a residue of meat production

The hardest part of the leather supply chain to trace is what happens before the slaughterhouse. This part of the supply chain is shared with beef, so initiatives that aim to improve traceability in the beef sector will equally benefit leather. Although the EU accounts for only a small share of Brazilian beef exports, these exports were still worth around €491 million in 2024, which is a significant market to lose and justifies traceability investments.

Indeed, the EUDR is incentivising producers to make these investments, suggesting that regulation of leather and beef is sufficient to drive traceability in key countries that supply the Italian tanning sector. Annex A.2 of this document details the wide range of cattle traceability systems already in development in Brazil. Analysts have pointed to the EUDR as a driver of improved traceability in Brazil. Leather traceability from slaughterhouse onwards is much simpler, and a number of companies have this traceability in place.

Data also suggests that the market already rewards transparency. According to the Brazilian Beef Exporters Association, the average price of Brazilian beef exports is eight per cent lower than that of Uruguay, where cattle are traced individually. Uruguay's traceability system, geared towards EU standards, shows that regulatory alignment can be economically advantageous.

Even COTANCE concedes that traceability is critical, since the origin of hides directly affects leather quality. The group notes that the tanning sector "pays particular attention to the upstream dynamics" of the supply chain and aims to collect detailed information on animal rearing, transport, and slaughter. However, it also admits that such data remain difficult to obtain "in the absence of a regulatory obligation." The EUDR now provides precisely that obligation – offering the framework the industry itself has identified as necessary for improving traceability.

False Claim 6: Leather hides should be excluded from the EUDR because other cattle products are excluded

COTANCE has argued that the fact that dairy, gelatin, collagen and pet food are not covered under the EUDR is an argument to exclude leather from the law. The commodities covered by the EUDR were selected based in part on a detailed feasibility study considering the traded volume of the commodity, past and projected deforestation rates in the countries/regions of origin, the EU share of global demand. Based on this analysis, 12 commodities were assessed in detail, with seven ultimately covered under the law.

Dairy products, pet food and collagen did not meet the criteria to be even among the 12 products initially considered. Were the EU to increase its imports of dairy, collagen or other cattle products

from high-risk countries, it would be more appropriate to add these commodities to Annex I of the EUDR than to remove leather.

Annex A.1: Weaknesses in University of Pisa Study

The study Socio-economic and environmental analysis of the effects of Regulation 2023/1115/EU on the European leather sector, authored by researchers from the Sant'Anna Institute of Management at the University of Pisa, has been held out by the leather industry as conclusive evidence that leather does not drive deforestation and that leather should be excluded from the EUDR.

However, the findings of this study should be taken with caution, for several reasons.

Industry commissioned: the study was commissioned by UNIC (the industry body representing Italian tanneries) and COTANCE. It was not published in a peer-reviewed journal. The University of Oxford Catalogue of Bias sets out some of the common mechanisms through which industry sponsorship skews the results of studies. Several of these are apparent in this study – including a biased selection of research questions, interview subjects and impact assessment scenarios.

Skewed research questions: the first part of the study aims to "detect and establish whether there are, and if so, to what extent, relationships, causes and effects between the leather sector and deforestation." To do this, the researchers pose three research questions:

1. Is there a connection between cattle raising and deforestation?
2. If yes, what are the outputs of cattle raising? Are raw hides the primary aim of cattle raising or are they by-products?
3. Is there a direct connection between the leather sector (bovine raw hides demand) and the deforestation phenomenon?

Question 2 appears designed to yield the result desired by the leather sector, and is irrelevant to the main question. A more useful question would be: does the sale of hides influence the size of the cattle industry? An answer to this question would help show whether there is a causal link between hides and deforestation for cattle ranching.

Reliance on a straw man – 'direct connection' or 'direct link': the study repeatedly claims there is no "direct link" between leather and deforestation. It dismisses evidence of linkages between leather and deforestation by arguing those linkages are not "direct." However, it does not explain why it is important for a link to be direct rather than indirect. We suggest the more relevant question is whether leather exports to the EU influence or incentivise deforestation (and therefore whether the inclusion of leather in the EUDR's scope is likely to reduce deforestation), not whether the link is direct or indirect.

Weaknesses in the literature review: the literature review infers that when a study focuses on the environmental impacts of the meat industry and does not mention leather, the authors are indirectly stating that leather is not a problem. The paper points to the fact that some studies only

make recommendations to major meatpackers, ignoring the fact that most major meatpackers also sell hides and produce leather. An example is this paragraph from page 25:

> Klingler et al. (2018) highlighted the importance of developing new systems for monitoring cattle supply chains in remote areas of the Amazon since the current agreements are ineffective. However, while discussing this aspect, the authors indicated that the latter agreements include high-profile commitments by major meatpacking companies operating across the Amazon basin to stop purchasing cattle from properties linked to illegal deforestation or other social or environmental standards. **Thus, they indirectly suggest that meat production, and not the raw hides production, is the main output of cattle raising activities**. (emphasis in the original)

Similarly, the authors claim that the majority of literature they reviewed supports the classification of hides as by-products of cattle. This finding leads to their conclusion that leather is not a direct driver of deforestation. However, many of the studies they considered appear to merely use the term 'by-product' in passing. Some of those studies use the term 'by-product' but also argue that leather is a driver of deforestation, while others do not consider this question at all.

Biased and limited interview sample: interviews are a major source of evidence for the study. The executive summary claims that "the majority of interviewees support the position that there is not a relationship between leather and deforestation." However, 14 of 28 interviewees work in the leather industry, which raises questions about bias and conflicts of interest. With the exception of a small number of academic interviewees, most interviewees are experts on either leather or deforestation/biodiversity, not both.

Unrealistic assumptions: The study concludes there will be negative environmental impacts from including leather in the EUDR. This is based on the comparison of a baseline scenario (current export flows), to two alternative, post-EUDR scenarios. Both alternative scenarios assume the complete end of exports of leather hides from Brazil to Europe. This biased selection of scenarios ignores the most realistic scenario – that some or all leather exports to the EU from Brazil will continue by using traceability systems already in place or in development. The study assumes no reduction in cattle ranching in Brazil or the US and rather that all material that cannot be exported to the EU would be diverted to another market, and that those markets will not in turn impose any new sustainability requirements.

Given the weaknesses in this study, the undersigned organisations do not consider that it provides a realistic or helpful analysis of questions on whether leather should be covered by the EUDR.

Annex A.2: Traceability in the cattle sector in Brazil

Although Brazil's federal government only announced a national cattle traceability plan in October 2024 – spurred in part by the EUDR – discussions and concrete steps toward cattle traceability have been ongoing in the country for over 15 years.

Some states are already leading the way. The southern state of Santa Catarina implemented full cattle traceability as early as 2009 and has since tracked over 4.6 million animals. Its identification system allows for the complete traceability of cattle movement, making it possible to identify the municipality and property of origin, the place of birth and the slaughter location of each animal.

In São Paulo, a key state in Brazil's meat supply chain that receives cattle from across the country, authorities have recently committed to implementing traceability across the state's herds. As the country's largest meat point of export, São Paulo's decision marks an important step in scaling traceability nationally.

Meanwhile, the northern state of Pará, home to Brazil's second-largest cattle herd (26 million animals), has announced an ambitious goal to fully trace its cattle by the end of 2026. The move is also underpinned by economic projections: increasing the share of traceable beef exports from four to 10 per cent could generate an estimated boost of US$115 million to US$230 million in additional revenues for Pará's cattle producers.

The new traceability system is intended to meet EU demands and China's upcoming requirement for fully traceable Brazilian cattle, with China now the largest importer of both beef and leather. While the system may not be fully operational until 2032, independent traceability, transparency, or monitoring initiatives have already been promoted by both public and private stakeholders. The Centre for the Brazilian Tanning Industry (CICB) has also published a guide to help tanneries prepare for the EUDR. These efforts are helping meatpackers and tanneries build transparent supply chains – demonstrating that full traceability of cattle, for both meat and leather, is not only possible but is already being achieved in key regions of Brazil.

The undersigned organisations do not endorse or vouch for the quality or effectiveness of the traceability tools and initiatives listed below. The summaries presented are based on the initiatives' own publicly available materials. Our intention is not to promote these tools, but rather to demonstrate that multiple efforts are currently underway to improve traceability in the sector, particularly in response to increasing demands from global markets.

Traceability and transparency initiatives

Brazilian Roundtable on Sustainable Livestock

A key example of cross-sector collaboration is the *Mesa Brasileira da Pecuária Sustentável* (Brazilian Roundtable on Sustainable Livestock). Drafted in 2023, a national traceability proposal emerged from the coordinated efforts of the livestock sector. The process was led by the Roundtable and supported by the Brazilian Coalition on Climate, Forests and Agriculture. Several organisations engaged in the traceability agenda, including the Brazilian Beef Exporters Association (ABIEC), Brazilian Association of Certifiers for Auditing and Traceability, Friends of

the Earth – Brazilian Amazon, Boi na Linha/Beef on Track – IMAFLORA, Brazilian Leather Association, Confederation of Agriculture and Livestock of Brazil, Indirect Supplier Working Group (GTFI), Proforest, Tropical Forest Alliance, The Nature Conservancy, and others.

The proposed system will integrate official databases from federal, state, and private entities. Verification will begin from the first movement of each animal, and implementation will follow a phased approach. As Roberto Perosa, Executive President of the Brazilian Beef Exporters Association, highlighted:

> *Mandatory individual traceability represents a decisive step for Brazilian agricultural defense, enabling rapid responses to health emergencies and strengthening the confidence of international markets. In addition to protecting the production chain against potential losses, this system modernizes the sector and will be essential for opening and maintaining new markets.*

TAC

Conduct Adjustment Agreements (TACs) signed between the Federal Prosecutor's Office and meatpackers operating in the Brazilian Legal Amazon since 2009 have played a central role in advancing traceability and supply chain monitoring in the country. These agreements established compliance mechanisms and criteria for signatory companies, positioning traceability as a key tool to ensure meat products are free from socio-environmental violations.

A key feature of the TACs is their zero-deforestation policy, which goes beyond the legal allowances of Brazil's Forest Code by prohibiting any deforestation. Traceability requirements under the TACs primarily focus on **direct suppliers**, although the agreements reference the need to monitor **indirect suppliers** as well.

According to *MoniTAC* – an independent platform that tracks the implementation of the TACs – 68 meatpacking plants in the Amazon region are currently subject to these commitments.

In March 2025, Pará state prosecutor Ricardo Negrini, representing the Federal Prosecutor's Office, discussed potential improvements to the agreements, including the incorporation of indirect suppliers into the terms signed between meatpackers and the Prosecutor's Office.

GTFI – The Brazilian Working Group on Indirect Suppliers of Cattle

Established in 2015, the GTFI (*Grupo de Trabalho dos Fornecedores Indiretos*) is coordinated by the National Wildlife Federation and Friends of the Earth – Brazilian Amazon. It brings together stakeholders from industry, civil society, and academia to address challenges related to the traceability of indirect cattle suppliers—a longstanding gap in supply chain oversight.

GTFI plays a central role in promoting solutions to monitor and control deforestation linked to indirect suppliers. One of its key contributions was the development of the **Visipec** tool, which integrates public data to flag properties linked to deforestation, environmental embargoes, overlaps with protected or traditionally occupied lands, and other socio-environmental risks. The

group aims to support the implementation of traceability mechanisms for indirect suppliers and improve transparency by communicating both challenges and progress.

Currently covering the most important cattle ranching states in the Brazilian Amazon biome (Mato Grosso, Pará, and Rondônia), Visipec is currently best suited for tracking cattle between direct supplying ranches and the first tier of indirect supplying ranches. This aligns with the industry's commitment to adopt a continuous improvement approach to the monitoring and traceability of indirect suppliers.

In 2019, the Brazilian Tanneries Association and the National Union of Italian Tanneries, along with their respective certification arms, the Brazilian Leather Certification of Sustainability and the Quality Certification Institute for the Leather Sector a signed an agreement to incorporate land use change principles and criteria in their platforms and to use the cattle traceability tool Visipec in a pilot project with a group of tanneries that source leather from the Amazon to enhance supply chain governance for the leather sector (i.e. a set of Good Practices for how to expand monitoring to indirect suppliers in the Brazilian Amazon).

GTPS – Brazilian Roundtable on Sustainable Livestock
The GTPS Traceability Working Group, created in 2021, aims to build a shared understanding of traceability and monitoring challenges across the Brazilian cattle sector. It brings together diverse actors in the livestock value chain to promote dialogue and coordinate efforts around sustainable practices, including traceability systems that go beyond compliance and support long-term environmental goals.

GTRB – Working Group on Cattle Traceability in Mato Grosso
Launched in January 2022 and coordinated by the Mato Grosso Meat Institute, GTRB focuses on advancing social and environmental transparency in cattle movements within the state of Mato Grosso— home to Brazil's largest cattle herd. The group is working to develop and implement a state-level traceability system tailored to local conditions, aiming to improve the accountability of the beef production chain and support compliance with market and legal requirements.

SMGeo – by Niceplanet
SMGeo is a platform designed to **register, analyse, and monitor** both **direct and indirect suppliers** in the cattle supply chain. It supports socio-environmental due diligence and risk analysis, offering tools to help companies comply with legal and market-driven traceability requirements.

The platform has Minerva Foods as one of its clients. In 2023, the meatpacker announced it had sold its first shipment of fully traceable leather.

Agri Trace Animal by CNA (*Confederação da Agricultura e Pecuária do Brasil*)
Agri Trace Animal's initiative promotes **certification and traceability** of livestock products, aiming to add value to farmers' production and enhance **transparency across the supply chain**,

from farm to consumer. The programme supports producers in meeting domestic and international market expectations for verified, traceable meat.

Selo Verde – Pará State Institute for Environment and Sustainability
The Selo Verde platform is a result of a partnership between the Government of Pará and the Federal University of Minas Gerais. It supports the monitoring and evaluation of sustainable agriculture and combats illegal deforestation. It provides transparent data on agricultural production and environmental compliance for rural properties registered in Brazil's Rural Environmental Registry (CAR).

The platform integrates state and federal public databases and is updated daily. Its goal is to promote environmental and land regularization while offering a traceability tool that aligns with deforestation-free supply chain initiatives.

Boi na Linha, by Imaflora
Boi na Linha, also known as Beef on Track, aims to bring together cattle ranchers, slaughterhouses, supermarkets, investors, public sector actors, and civil society organisations on the same page. The goal is to promote best practices through monitoring, auditing, and reporting on processes and tools, thereby increasing transparency in the pursuit of a cattle supply chain free from deforestation, slave labour, and the invasion of public lands. The programme also contributes to the production and sharing of technical knowledge, with the aim of encouraging the development of policies and procedures for responsible cattle ranching.

COTI Initiative, by Niceplanet
The Certification of Origin and Traceability Implementation (COTI) is a landscape-level initiative designed to promote full traceability across the cattle supply chain in a collaborative manner. It brings together all key stakeholders—from rural producers and the processing industry to final consumer brands—into a unified system. COTI leverages blockchain technology to ensure traceability and uses third-party verification to track transactions from **birth farms to tanneries.**

The initiative is supported by the National Wildlife Federation, Imaflora, the Brazilian Beef Exporters Association, and ACRIPARA, the Livestock Ranchers Association of Pará State. Since the launch of the pilot phase in July 2023, 40 farms in Pará have joined the initiative. By the end of that year, more than 113,000 animals were being individually tracked and managed through the blockchain-based system.