

Minutes of Meeting RSPO Communications & Claim Standing Committee

Date: 16 January 2019

Venue : Online Webex Call

Time: 9.30 a.m -11.30a.m. (GMT) / 10.30 a.m. - 12.30 p.m. (CET) / 5.30 p.m. - 7.30 p.m. (MYT)

Attendance List

Stakeholder Groups	Members	Organisations	Emails
Consumer Goods Manufacturer	Jan Kees Vis (JKV)	Unilever	jan-kees.vis@unilever.com
Processor / Trader	Eddy Esselink (EE)	MVO	esselink@mvo.nl
Service Provider	Judith Murdoch (JM)	Consultant	judith@murdochassociates.com
RSPO Secretariat	Inke van der Sluijs (IvS)	RSPO Secretariat	inke@rspo.org
RSPO Secretariat	Fay Richards (FR)	RSPO Secretariat	fay.richards@rspo.org
RSPO Secretariat	Kamal Seth (KS)	RSPO Secretariat	kamal.prakash@rspo.org
Service Provider	Andy Green (AG)	Exova BM Trada	andy.green@exova.com
Processor / Trader	Bob Norman (BN)	AAK	bob.norman@aak.com
Grower	Mark Wong (MW)	Sime Darby Plantations	mark.wong@simedarby.com
Service Provider	Paula den Hartog (PH)	UTZ	paula.denhartog@utz.org
Consumer Goods Manufacturer	Chris Sayner (CS)	CRODA	chris.sayner@croda.com
ENGO	Emma Keller (EK)	WWF	ekeller@wwf.org.uk

Service Provider	Ian Bretman (IB)	Consultant	ian.bretman@btopenworld.com
Consumer Goods Manufacturer	Geza Toth (GT)	Ferrero	geza.toth@ferrero.com
Industry Association	Jelmen Haaze (JH)	BASP	jelmen.haaze@basp.be

Absent with Apologies

Retailers	Belinda Howell (BH)	Consultant	belinda.howell@rpog.org
Processor / Trader	Marie Laviaille Piot (MLP)	Cargill	marie_laviaille-piot@cargill.com
Processor / Trader	Tim Stephenson (TS)	AAK	tim.stephenson@aak.com

Action Points

1. FR, AG, JM and CS to present the briefing paper on the simplification of rules for the RSPO Trademark.
2. FR to confirm details of the next meeting on April 10, 2019 (Wednesday), whether it would be a physical or online meeting and a proposed venue if it will be a physical meeting.

Minutes

JKV

- Anti-trust statement
- Approval of minutes
- Review action points

Last Committee Minutes Action

1. JKV mentioned that there is a missing action point, which is to get approval from the Board of Governors (BoG) on the admittance of new members into the Communications & Claims Standing Committee, namely Orangutan Land Trust and GAR. FR to double check on this.

2. PH mentioned that she was present in the last meeting, but this was not reflected in the previous minutes.
3. JM mentioned that there were no changes in the Rules on Market Communications & Claims Document, although the Communications & Claims Standing Committee has proposed amendments to be made in point six of the previous meeting. FR mentioned that the revised document had been sent out on Monday (14/01) and that JM should have received it.
4. EE highlighted that in point 1.1.2.6 in the previous meeting minutes, 'must resemble' should say 'most resemble'.

1. RSPO Global & Regional Update

- 1.1. IvS mentioned that Dan Stechay (the RSPO's US representative) has assumed the role of Interim O&E Director, in light of Stefano's departure from RSPO.
- 1.2. IvS shared the current number of RSPO members and its breakdown according to countries (as of 15/1/2019) and the highlights of the happenings at RSPO; 'Every Palm Matters' social media campaign in Malaysia and Singapore, the RT16 in Malaysia and the adoption of the 2018 RSPO Principles & Criteria (P&C).
- 1.3. In Europe, there was an increase of 520 members. There is an upcoming meeting together with WWF in Poland on February 2011, and another joint stakeholder meeting, together with EPOA in the Netherlands on June 14 as part of a series of events to replace EURT - for which there is no budget allo
- 1.4. Some of the highlights on the European side for RSPO; Ashwin Selvaraj spoke at the European Palm Oil Conference (EPOC) 2018, Francisca Morgante has now helmed the position of EU Market Development Manager and is based in Bologna (Italy), and the socialisation of the new P&C for the media in Brussels.
- 1.5. In India, there are now 47 members from 35 members in the previous year and the India-Sustainable Palm Oil Coalition (I-SPOC) was launched in September 2018. Kamal (RSPO's India Representative) had also initiated the "End Consumer Study for Palm Oil" in cooperation with WWF-India and is in the process of setting up of a National Interpretation (NI) Working Group for India.
- 1.6. RSPO members in Indonesia grew from 84 to 101. Although one grower member have resigned, there was an increase in the number of certified mills. Additionally, community outreach works done by staff in Indonesian office are ready to be rolled out in Malaysia and Africa, in partnership with the Sabah Environmental Protection Association (SEPA) and Sustainable Development Institute, respectively.
- 1.7. In Latin America, a growth of from 100 to 123 members was recorded. In Ecuador, there is a new Sustainable Palm Oil Committee that will work to promote CSPO and the implementation of the Jurisdictional Approach (JA) to RSPO certification in the country. The 7th RSPO Latin American Conference was

held in Cali, Colombia and the first product with the RSPO trademark use in the region are now available in stores across Ecuador.

- 1.8. As for North America, an impressive growth of 125 members was recorded, the US now being the country with the largest number (12%) of RSPO members. Cameron Plese joined the North American Office as the O&E Assistant Manager in September 2018. The North American Sustainable Palm Oil Network (NASPON) met in December 2018 and have established 3 working groups.
- 1.9. In China, the number of members rose to 83 from 67 and the RSPO China Representative position is now vacant, as Yun Jiang has resigned.
- 1.10. The Annual Communication of Progress (ACOP) reporting will open, starting from March 11.

JKV: With regards to GA15, what was the voting results like on the resolution to pass the new P&C?

lvS : I do not have the numbers now but they were adopted with great majority.

JKV: Good developments on the number of members and outreach activities, but activities relating to impact assessment are lacking. Also, impact assessment is not represented in the new governance structure.

lvS : The 2018 Impact report is out and available on the RSPO website.

2. Reorganisation of RSPO Standing Committees

- 2.1. IB mentioned that the exercise was meant to help the BoG to be more aligned with the Standing Committees
- 2.2. The reorganisation process has been slow due to it being put on hold during the second half of 2018, but the aim is to pick it up again and have a clear proposal to be presented at the BoG meeting in March 2019.
- 2.3. This issue that needs to be solved is how to keep some dedicated work within assurance around different stakeholder constituencies.
- 2.4. At the moment, the current setup is such that the Standards & Certification Standing Committee is looking at growers while the Trade & Traceability Standing Committee is looking at downstream palm oil actors. This is out of line with the way the Theory of Change (ToC), the RSPO strategy and its KPIs are being developed, to enable the development of a high standard and a quality assurance around the standard.
- 2.5. The Communications & Claims Standing Committee is doing important work on the RSPO Trademark usage and claims made by processors and thus, this needs to be protected and be rightfully placed in the new structure.
- 2.6. There is a gap in the Market Development Committee, whereby stakeholders need to conduct activities in their respective regions to drive the uptake of CSPO.

IB : The new structure is not set in stone and your feedback are welcome in order to see how things can still be maneuvered around.

EE : We have a consolidated feedback from existing committees but they have not seemed to be incorporated in the current table?

IB : The current table is still a work in progress and all the comments have been taken into account. The writing in blue are the comments that are made by individual committees. From the comments, it seems that the proposal does not seem to be resolving the issue and this was one of the three points that I have highlighted. My challenge is to work on the details of this, how do we fine-tune this structure. I also need to put something out to explain how it may work at the board-level and how it ties up with the current activity level. I need more people to engage with this, especially to work on the Terms of Reference and the framework of these new committees, based on your previous experiences.

JM : My concern is how to get the right kind of people to be involved and how do you do it on a regular basis to make it effective.

IB : Noted. On the issue of impact assessment that JKV brought up, the current document only details out the allocation of existing responsibilities and Terms of Reference into the new structure. Impact assessment is missing at the moment but one of the reasons why the BoG is interested in the new structure is because the ToC is guiding the strategy, the workplan and the KPI of the BoG. Some of the detail in the BoG committee working on those themes will be impact assessment. It will run across every committee and this will be a more logical structure. I also need to highlight the areas of the existing structure that are unchanged.

JKV: What are the next steps in the process?

IB : The first step would be for me to take account the discussions in this meeting in more detail. Also, to elaborate more on the new structure in identifying which areas of the current structure that need to be retained and how we can develop the BoG-level structure that the BoG is looking for. This would then be shared with the Governance Steering Group and Committee Chairs. The whole process may take up around 10-14 days.

JKV: If one of the problems that needs to be solved is a better connection between the BoG and the Standing Committees, then an alternative solution would be to retain the current structure of the Standing Committees. That being said, the current Smallholder Task Force should be made into a Standing Committee. One BoG member should also be selected as the Co-Chair of each Standing Committee and the reporting relationship should also be formalised through the RSPO Secretariat, from the Standing Committees to the BoG. On the concerns about the separation of Standards & Certification (Assurance) Standing

Committee, the P&C certification and the process around it will have a different set of stakeholders compared to the supply chain certification, which are currently in the Trade & Traceability Standing Committee. Reflecting on the Terms of Reference for the Standard & Certification and the Trade & Traceability Standing Committees, there are two aspects; standard on one hand while the other is about the whole process involved in developing, maintaining, explaining, assurance and the complaints aspect of the standard.

IB : The BoG needs to be working more actively in Standing Committees and this is not entirely a popular proposal amongst members of the BoG. Last year, there was a proliferation of Standing Committees and a clear process about how these Committees and Task Forces report to the BoG. Basically, the structure was missing as to how the Task Forces and Working Groups feeding into the Standing Committees, who comes to the BoG with recommendation so that the latter could solve an issue in a fairly rapid manner. As it is, very few issues get elevated to the BoG and thus we need to look into how we can ensure continuity.

JKV: What do the members of the Communications & Claims Standing Committee think about renaming it to the Market Development Standing Committee? Do we see any particular risks in the proposed name change?

AG : The name change seems to fit perfectly as most of the work done by the Communications & Claim Standing Committee revolves around market development. The regional update by IvS confirms this as we looked at how we are doing market development work in select regions. Nevertheless, there will also be a problem such that there will be discussions about the RSPO Trademark use which would have impacts on the Standard and Assurance. Broadly speaking, I think we should go with the name change and focus more on market development.

EE : While some of the work that we do fits the market development description, but there are also work that is beyond that of market development, especially those around the trading models and its inclusiveness. Are we working along the right and appropriate lines, not only from the perspective of communications & claims but also that of supply chain? There is currently an overflow of the Trade & Traceability Standing Committee work and the proposed structure sees a greater split up of the Trade & Traceability Standing Committee. There is the market development side where you look at how to get more people to buy more RSPO-certified materials, but you also have the verification side on the supply chain models that now sits in the proposed Assurance Standing Committee. Personally, I think that although the bulk of the Communications & Claims Standing Committee work fits the bill of the proposed Market Development Standing Committee, there should also be more responsibilities parked under the proposed Standing Committee.

JKV: I agree with EE and there has always been a correlation between the works of the Communications & Claims and the Trade & Traceability Standing Committees, as

mentioned. What mechanism do we have, as RSPO, to work on the market development? I personally think the regional Roundtables are a key tool to achieve this.

JM : The way the group works at the moment, we need a lot of input for decisions to be made. I agree with JKV that regional Roundtables and exhibitions are key to achieve development in the market. There was also a point made about combining technical committees as well as analysing uptake data and ACOP. If we start pulling out and understanding the data from ACOP, that would already be a huge input to the group members to ease the decision-making process. "Market Development" can just be the name of the group, but my concern is just that there will need to be a lot of input to the group to get an outcome.

JKV: Do you think the task of analysing the ACOP data should be delegated to the RSPO Secretariat?

JM : It would have to be due to the sheer amount of ACOP submissions. It is also quite a task to get through it and understand the issues that members are facing. For example, an ACOP submission by a company that no longer claim RSPO Credits should be challenged. This is just one of the issues that needs to be picked up when going through the ACOP data.

IB : The feedback is very helpful in highlighting the work that needs to be done in the development on the new structure. The BoG committees need to look at the issues and assess if the strategic goals are achieved, and if not, what needs to be done differently? What does it mean in terms of providing directions to the Secretariat and the allocation of resources? It would not be effective if all these process are not linked up. The ACOP data needs to be analysed by the Secretariat and the analysis need to be filtered into a report to a group who can decide on the action items and give assurance to the BoG that the action items discussed will be followed up accordingly. If there are exceptions that needs to be addressed, this should also be reported to the BoG and there should be a process in dealing with these circumstances. All of these is quite vague and that there is a load of work that is loaded on people, without a clear understanding of what the objective is. I want to make sure that we set these levels of responsibilities, but the BoG Committees and high-level advisory committees should always look at the bigger picture and not delve into these problems in great detail. I could develop some thoughts on this, but all I need is the critiques to enable me to understand better what will be best for RSPO.

PH : Based on the document, there seems to be a lot of overlaps in terms of work in each of the proposed Standing Committees. Can we come up with a matrix to ensure that there is no overlap in the tasks?

JKV: If there are questions that need to be addressed, the BoG should direct the questions to the relevant Standing Committee, either those in the old and new structures rather than to allow more Standing Committees, Task Forces and Working Groups to be formed.

3. Confirmed Changes to RSPO Communications & Claims Document

- 3.1. FR presented the newly revised RSPO Rules on Market Communications & Claims Document.
- 3.2. If there are no comments, FR said that the next step is to translate the document and have it published on the RSPO website.

EE : Will there be any communications on this (e.g. on the eGazette)?

FR : It will be socialised via the eGazette, but I do take note that there needs to be more proactive communication on this.

4. Proposed Change to RSPO Trademark Rules

- 4.1. AG mentioned that the recent “no palm oil” stance made by British frozen food retailer Iceland, has reignited the debate on palm oil among consumers in the UK.
- 4.2. As a result, some UK manufacturers now want to make it clear to their consumers, at the point of sale, that they only procure CSPO.
- 4.3. The use of RSPO TM with tags is confusing, e.g. the “Mixed” tag tells the consumers that while the products contain a certain amount of CSPO, there could also be the use of unsustainable palm oil. This could get consumers to abandon palm oil, altogether.
- 4.4. AG pointed out that it is also ironic how a claim of “Mass Balance” could actually have 99% of CSPO while that of “Segregated” could only have 96% of CSPO.
- 4.5. The use of trademarks without tags, have been done by other schemes that run mass balance schemes (e.g. Rainforest Alliance, Fair Trade and UTZ) so for RSPO to do so, is not out of the norm.
- 4.6. AG also highlighted that the RSPO Trademark has zero recognition in the UK market, based on a study that was conducted.
- 4.7. There is an opportunity to increase the use and awareness of the RSPO Trademark but there will need to be adjustments, especially on the tags accompanying the RSPO Trademark.
- 4.8. Moving forwards, the proposed changes will first need to be approved by the Communications & Claims Standing Committee, then out for public consultation before it can be approved by the BoG.
- 4.9. In summary, the use of RSPO Trademark should be simplified to just plain and RSPO Credits Trademark. If not, allow the use of the word sustainable on the ingredients, although this is feared to be seen as misleading by consumers.

JM : To add to what AG said, there is an increasing number of labels appearing on products that support the “No Palm Oil” promotion, in the UK. Paterson’s, a company that

manufactures oatcakes, have a full panel on their packaging to say that they are proud that the product does not contain palm oil and is orangutan-friendly. When compared to Mark & Spencer's (M&S') oatcakes, the general view of the consumers is such that the M&S didn't come off as using CSPO because it made no comments or reference on it. Online grocery store, Ocado, have also started to listed a whole range of products that are free from palm oil. This confirms that there is a consumer trend to move away from palm oil, in the UK.

JKV: Does M&S have the RSPO Trademark on their oatcakes?

JM : No, M&S has chosen not to use the RSPO Trademark, which is a shame since they have dedicated a lot of effort to source CSPO and are an active member of the RSPO.

EK : Based on conversation with a few companies recently, it was made known to me that palm oil has become only second only to plastics, in terms of consumer requests to companies to have them removed. This is something that we need to avoid.

CS : As a result of Iceland's campaign controversy, there is a lot of demand for RSPO to do something about the growing "no palm oil" sentiment among consumers and the change in the trademark would be a positive response to the issue. In CRODA's recent 2018 sustainability report, the incorrect approach replacing palm oil with alternatives was mentioned in great detail.

JKV: The problem with the change is that the distinction between products containing segregated palm oil and those containing mass balance palm oil, would be lost. Hence, there would be no incentive for companies to move gradually from mass balance to segregated palm oil.

AG : That is true from a labelling point of view, but one can argue that nobody is labelling at the moment so there is not much of an incentive for companies to move from mass balance to segregated palm oil, anyway. Therefore, it is not so much of a big issue compared to having retailers wanting manufacturing companies to remove the use of palm oil, altogether.

CS : I feel strongly that the change would greatly promote the RSPO Trademark as there a lot of products containing mass balance derivatives in the market now.

EK : For Rainforest Alliance and other schemes that have used this simplified labelling approach, is there any research that looks into the risk of simplified labelling on the incentivisation for companies to move towards segregated from mass balance palm oil.

PH : Rainforest Alliance does have separate logos for products containing segregated and mass balance palm oil. For mass balance logos, Rainforest Alliance also ask companies

to accompany them with an explanatory statement about mass balance and UTZ have the same for products using mass balance cocoa. Hence, the presentation by AG was not accurate to say that Rainforest Alliance have been using a simplified approach in their labelling (i.e. without tags).

AG : Apologies for that. In the case of Fairtrade however, it seems that they have been very successful in gaining widespread acceptance among consumers without having tags on their labellings. I have not seen any research to see if people would understand the mass balance element behind the Fairtrade products or not.

JKV: There has been an investment over time in the recognition of the Fairtrade Trademark by the general public. The difference between the RSPO Trademark with that of Fairtrade, UTZ and Rainforest Alliance is that while the former is typically applicable to only one single ingredient, the rest normally applies to the whole product. This is an important distinction to make in the marketing of the RSPO Trademark. Also, there is a room for improvement for the RSPO in terms its investment in its communications campaign in the UK market in the recognition of the RSPO Trademark. However, the question remains, how many versions of the Trademark do we still want to support and maintain? It is interesting to note that AG mentioned that the “use of the Trademark without tags would be slightly less misleading”, was this an intentional use of words?

PH : Rainforest Alliance has the specific rules for the claims on ingredients, e.g. if cocoa is the core ingredient of a product, how much of that cocoa is certified?

AG : I don't think the proposed idea is, in any way, misleading. However, the use of the word 'sustainable' in the ingredients of a product label (without the use of the RSPO Trademark) can be misleading. On the point made on the labelling being applicable to a specific ingredient or the whole product, I personally think it is irrelevant because if the basic thought process of the general public is “palm oil kills orangutans”, the assumption will be that “all product that contains palm oil kills orangutans”. What we are trying to say with our Trademark is that “these products do not kill orangutans”, regardless of how much palm oil is used in the product. From the point of view of the consumers, they would need to be able to defend the use of palm oil in the products that they purchase. If we collectively take mass balance as CSPO, then it should only say CSPO on the Trademark.

PH : The conversation should move away from “what is in the product or not” to “coming up with a labelling which say that the product contributes to the production of CSPO”. Along the same line, the RSPO Credits are also contributing to the solution of ending unsustainable practices in the oil palm cultivation.

JKV: Taking away the distinction between mass balance and segregated and effectively, any incentive for companies to move towards segregated palm oil, what is WWF's view on that?

EK : I don't necessarily see this move as a major risk.

JM : One of the benefits of segregated palm oil, that is really coming to the forefront, is that its traceability enables consumers to track the group of mills where the palm oil was sourced from and the details of its audits. Traceability is something that is slowly picking up in the industry and the communication on the product could be something that should be focused on to educate consumers on the advantage of using products that contain segregated palm oil. The use of the "Segregated" tag does allow a level of traceability to a group (roughly 150) of mills because at the moment, when people talk about traceability in the market, outside of the RSPO Trademark, they are talking about a universe (possibly a thousand) of mills. I think that this should be a message to be communicated out, outside of the RSPO Trademark discussion.

BN: The use of the Trademark would need to have an excellent narrative on what it means for the product to carry the the Trademark, to counter any criticisms, not necessarily by the public, but mostly from NGOs. I think the idea to use a simplified Trademark that tells consumers that the product supports CSPO production is good, but I echo PH in saying that this should also apply to products manufactured by companies that uses RSPO Credits.

KS : Taking India for example, where there is little to no Trademark use by companies and where there is little awareness about good and bad palm oil, the use of a single Trademark would be ideal to make it simpler for consumers to make a decision. In a landscape where consumers are pretty neutral on the "no palm oil" sentiment, it is more for consumers to say that they know that the products that they purchase is sustainable.

MW: To echo what BN said, although the RSPO has different supply chain mechanisms, there needs to be a single Trademark that we are comfortable to be used that reflects what is being put in the products. The last thing we want is to have a Trademark which conveys a stronger message about how sustainable everything within the product is, compared to another Trademark. This would allow detractors to argue that a certain product is not truly sustainable because it has been mixed with palm oil from conventional sources. On top of that, the discussion has raised a much wider question around the recognition and the support of the Trademark, and answering this requires a more in-depth thinking than just trying to change the Trademark.

EE : There should also be possibility for companies to choose for themselves whether they want to put an extra tag on the plain Trademark.

JKV: I support that the proposal to use the Trademark without any tags for any supply chain model, but we should also retain the possibility to use the tags "segregated" or "certified", the latter for IP palm oil. Additionally, the use of the simplified Trademark should also be

extended to products that use RSPO Credits and is this something that MW is warning against?

MW: I think that there still needs to be some form of distinction for products that use the different supply chain mechanisms.

JKV: Are you saying that we should retain the current Trademark with tags?

MW: Yes.

JKV: We have to make a firm decision on this. As it is, the UK and French market are moving away from palm oil, and if the current tool that we have is not effective enough to prevent this from happening, then we need to make changes.

AG : We have been using the current Trademark for quite some time, yet the awareness of it amongst consumers is still very low. So, I do think that change is necessary because the status quo is not exactly working.

MW: The question remains as to whether the low use of the Trademark is because it is too complicated to use or is there not enough support and promotion of the current Trademark?

AG : I think it is a mix of both and the main issue now is that the “Mixed” tag introduces an element of doubt amongst consumers, prompting them to think why they should support products that still contain unsustainable or “bad” palm oil when they could just opt for products that contain no palm oil at all. The argument has become more simplistic and it needs now to be communicated on the frontline.

MW: If we take FSC for example, they still have the tags “Mixed” and “Segregated” but there is still a wider acceptance of the FSC label, compared to that of the RSPO.

AG : FSC’s mechanism for “Mixed” is different than ours such that they will not allow mixing with timber from unknown sources, so “Mixed” may imply that they use recycled or reclaimed wood.

BN : That’s a technical rebuttal but a consumer will not understand the technicalities of the mechanisms.

JKV: I think this would need to be put in the proposal, in the context of the UK market where the choice is “whether I want to purchase products that contain no palm oil or products that contain RSPO-certified palm oil” and to make that recognition as easy as possible. The proposal should also contain an element of the communications campaign in the UK market, because the simplification of the Trademark will not necessarily get companies on

board to start using it and if they do use it, they do not necessarily understand what it means. Do we have a volunteer to write this proposal paper? Could I ask Fay, Andy and Judith to come up with a draft proposal together?

AG : I am happy to be involved.

FR : I am happy to be involved, too.

CS : I would be happy to make any contribution that I can, as well. One last comment, where the evidence of palm oil derivatives is not clear to the consumer, especially when “palm” is not in the nomenclature of the derivatives, I feel that this change may enable the existing consumer goods companies to start using the Trademark. This is because the knowledge of palm oil amongst consumers will continue to grow and that they might start asking companies with regards to the sustainability of the palm derivatives that they use in their products.

JKV: In Unilever, the marketing department are more anxious to declare that a food product contains palm oil compared to a home and personal care product. For some reason, there is a difference in the interest of the issue when it relates to food and non-food products.

CS : Customers will eventually start questioning about palm oil derivatives in home and personal care products because as of now, there is still low awareness due to the absence of the word “palm” in their nomenclatures. Therefore, the use of the simplified Trademark could one day help companies to defend themselves when customers start questioning, although they do not feel that it is necessary to defend themselves now.

MW : JKV, do you think it is useful to engage more with the marketing and branding team of companies to better understand what their concerns might be or what might enable them to use the Trademark?

JKV: That is a good point, and perhaps if we were to make a proposal from the UK market perspective, we could have a conversation with them and ask them how they would respond to the change in making the Trademark rules simpler and whether this would make them more interested to use it. The proposal should be written based on the context that there is a growing shift towards no palm oil products in the consumer market and that companies who are currently using CSPO are hesitant to use the Trademark due to the complexities of its rules and consumers do not really understand it. It should also be mentioned that the downside of the proposed use of the simplified Trademark would be the loss of distinction between products that contain palm oil from different supply chain models. The proposal should then be circulated around at some point during the next or a separate meeting before its content is agreed upon and submitted to the BoG.

EE : Should the proposal also include the possibility for companies to still be able to include the tags, should they choose to do so?

JKV: With the use of tags, the intention is to make it clear that there is a distinction in the supply chain model used behind the claim. So, if you have one RSPO Trademark that can be put on products using palm oil from different supply chain models, it would undermine those with the “certified” or “segregated” tags. But I hear and I have the same thought as you, EE, just not sure what the best solution is for the matter.

EE : Well, we could just have that clause in the proposal and wait for the results of the public consultations to see if members would like to adopt it or not.

JKV: For now, I am more in favour of the simplification of the Trademark in order to give the consumer goods manufacturers and retailers the tool to prevent them from swaying to the “no palm oil” direction. If that is successful, then maybe there would be proposals then to reintroduce the tags into the market. We would pick up the discussion once the draft proposal is ready.

5. RSPO P&C Implementation Plan

- 5.1. Since the adoption of the new P&C 2018, press release was shared via the media, social media and website.
- 5.2. Hot topics factsheets, a short video of the new P&C and interviews with key stakeholders have also been developed.
- 5.3. A webinar for the media was also held, but there was a lukewarm reception for it.
- 5.4. Socialisation of the new P&C have also been planned and are to be implemented via:
 - 5.4.1. Roadshows in Southeast Asia, Latin America and Africa in February and March.
 - 5.4.2. NASPON Meeting
 - 5.4.3. Media event in Brussels and the Belgian Alliance for Sustainable Palm Oil (BASP)
 - 5.4.4. CB trainings

lvS : I am sure that all of us will also be highlighting the new P&C when speaking at events.

JKV: When does the new P&C come into effect?

lvS : They can already be in use but they will mandatory at the end of the year, on 15 November 2019 (i.e. a year after the adoption at the GA15).

6. AOB (Dates of Next meetings & Closing)

- 6.1. April 10, 2019 (Wednesday), ideally a physical meeting. FR to confirm exact location of meeting.