

MINUTES OF MEETING

JURISDICTIONAL WORKING GROUP MEETING #23 (VIRTUAL)

Date: 1 November 2024 (Friday) 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm (MYT)

| | |
|---|--|
| <u>Attendance:</u> <u>Members and alternates</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sander van den Ende (SIPEF)* 2. Chin Kai Xiang (Bunge) 3. Silvia Irawan (Kaleka)* 4. Max Donysius (WWF Malaysia) 5. Alfred Yee (LKSS) 6. Lee Kuan Chun (P&G) 7. Melissa Thomas (CI) 8. Steni Bernadinus (Kaleka) 9. Daniel Liew (RSPO) | <u>Absent with Apologies</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quentin Meunier (Olam) 2. Tom Lomax (FPP) 3. Eza Nurain Abdullah (Sime Darby) 4. Aprilianto Nugroho (Sinarmas) 5. Jon Hixson (YUM) 6. Maria Amparo (CISPS) 7. Marcus Colchester (FPP) 8. Lim Sian Choo (Bumitama) 9. Rob Nicholls (Musim Mas) 10. Paul Wolvekamp (Bothends) 11. Rauf Prasodjo (Unilever) 12. Tri Padukan Purba (Rainforest Alliance) |
|---|--|

*Co-chairs of JWG

Agenda

| Item | Time (MYT) | Duration (minutes) | Agenda |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|---|
| 1 – Admin matters | 1600 – 1605 | 5 | 1.1 – Opening and welcome |
| | 1605 – 1610 | 5 | 1.2 – RSPO Antitrust Guidelines, Conflict of Interest Declaration and Chatham House Rules 1.3 – Acceptance of Minutes – JWG Meeting #22 – Apr 24 |
| 2 – Updates and discussion | 1610 – 1640 | 30 | 2.1 – Projects updates by the Secretariat |
| | 1640 – 1700 | 20 | 2.2 – JA pilot updates |
| | 1700 – 1710 | 10 | 2.3 – Other updates |
| | 1710 – 1730 | 20 | 2.4 – Brainstorming – JWG 2025 work plan |
| 3 - Closing | 1730 - 1750 | 20 | 3.1 – Any other business |

Minutes of Meeting:

| Item | Description | Action / Remark |
|------|--|-----------------|
| 1.1 | <p>Opening</p> <p>The meeting started at 4:05 pm Malaysian time.</p> | |
| 1.2 | <p>RSPO Antitrust Guidelines, Conflict of Interests Declaration and Chatham House Rules</p> <p>There was no question regarding the guidelines and the rules. And no conflict was declared.</p> | |
| 1.3 | <p>Acceptance of minutes – JWG Meeting #22 – Apr 2024</p> <p>Minutes of the JWG Meeting #22 was adopted by members.</p> | |
| 2.1 | <p>Project updates by the Secretariat <u>Jurisdictional RSPO membership category</u> The Secretariat provided updates on the Jurisdictional Entity (JE) membership category.</p> <p>The proposal for the JE membership category was adopted by the General Assembly (GA) in November 2023. Since then, the JA unit, in collaboration with the Membership and Legal Teams within the RSPO Secretariat, has been working together to review the RSPO Statutes and identify the necessary adjustments to accommodate the new category. The legal review of the RSPO Statutes to accommodate the new category was completed in June 2024. The revised document was then shared to the three JA pilots and JWG members in July 2024. The revised RSPO Statutes was endorsed by the Board of Governors (BoG) in September 2024.</p> <p>A resolution, GA21-2C will be submitted during the GA in November 2024 for members to adopt the revised Statutes. GA21-2C is specifically on the revisions made in the RSPO Statutes. The outcome of the members' voting for this resolution does not reverse the decision in the 2023 GA to create the JE membership category. The only changes made was to the RSPO Statutes to add on the new category called Jurisdictional Members that does not have voting rights and membership fees, with no changes made to the Code of Conduct and Membership Rules.</p> <p>The first draft of the membership application SOP for Jurisdictional Members is ready for consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>The JWG members raised a question about what would happen if the members voted against this resolution and the statutes cannot be amended. The Secretariat explained that if this occurs, the Membership Team and JA unit will need to identify the specific aspects of the Statutes that members have concerns with and revise the wording accordingly. The only impact for this would be a delay when the pilot is ready. However, it</p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>would be possible to have an extraordinary GA to pass the resolution if it is not adopted at the GA in November 2024.</p> <p>The JWG members wondered whether any of the pilots are closer to becoming members. The Secretariat explained that Sabah has made the commitment to achieve Step 2 by 2025 and target to start the application process by 2026. Seruyan is also working within a similar timeframe.</p> <p>Members raised a question that the voting is regarding the content of the Statutes, not the revision of the Statutes themselves, as the resolution to revise the Statutes to include the new membership category was passed last year? The Secretariat clarified that the Statutes was revised by adding a new membership category in the Statutes and the responsibilities and entitlement of the Jurisdictional Members. This resolution is to ask members to adopt the changes that have been made in the Statutes to accommodate the new Jurisdictional Members category.</p> <p>Members highlighted that it is important to make sure everyone understands that the revision of the Statutes to support the new jurisdictional membership, as outlined in the resolution, was passed last year. If this version is not approved this year, it will need to be revised based on the feedback, leading to another revision. The delay is not due to a refusal to change the Statutes, but rather about making changes that the GA will support.</p> <p>Members suggested that for logistical purposes, since the resolution was presented by a JWG member last year, it would be helpful to have a representative speak on this resolution again to avoid any confusion. The Secretariat agreed with this and will appoint someone to speak on this resolution.</p> <p><u>JA RaCP field testing</u></p> <p>The Secretariat provided updates on the JA RaCP field testing. The study was conducted in 2023 and has since been concluded. The JWG members decided during the Bali workshop to conduct a field testing on the two recommended approaches at both Sabah and Seruyan.</p> <p>The call for interests for the field test of the jurisdictional RaCP recommended methods was published on the RSPO website in July 2024. After the closure of the tender period, only a single tender was received from PT Hijau Daun who is the same consultant who conducted the JA RaCP study in 2023.</p> <p>The Secretariat had deliberated internally with the JA-BHCV subgroup as well as the Sabah and Seruyan pilots over the suitability of locations, availability of data and cost considerations. The Secretariat was considering having the pilot test at only one location due to some concerns with the limitation of budget. However, both Sabah and Seruyan have strongly suggested having the test conducted at both locations. Therefore,</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>a decision was made to conduct the field test of both recommended approaches in Sabah and Seruyan, as originally intended in the ToR.</p> <p>The scope of the proposed field test would begin with the disclosure of non-compliant land clearing, LUCA and liability calculation and to conclude with the concept note submission. The project is expected to take 6 months. The timeline is shown below and is targeted to end by June 2025.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nov-Dec24: Contracting process and preparation by consultants • Jan-Mar25: Site selection and data availability analysis • Apr-May25: Implementation report (NCLC, FLC, remediation area, images and shapefiles used and proposal for new documents, datasets, procedures for JA RaCP, where applicable) • May-Jun25: Analysis report on the implementability and improvement suggestions for both recommended approaches of JA RaCP <p>Members raised a question whether the outcome of this field test is the concept note on how the jurisdiction can implement the compensation policy. The Secretariat explained that the scope will only cover up to the concept note level. The subsequent process which involves the compensation panel will not be part of this field test. It will stop at the preparation of the concept note and will not undergo a review by the compensation panel. The number of liabilities will be outlined in the report, concept note, and the proposal for the jurisdiction to compensate.</p> <p>Members expressed concerns about the timeline and whether it could be expedited. The timeline for site selection can be accelerated, as both Sabah and Seruyan already have an idea of which sites to focus on. It is important to speed things up and find ways to accelerate the process as there is already a bit of delay.</p> <p>Members raised a question whether the RSPO Secretariat will reach out to JASPO to discuss the site selection. The Secretariat stated that it will most likely be the consultant reaching out, but the Secretariat will still be involved and facilitate the connection.</p> <p>Members highlighted that it is important to ensure good coordination with the pilots and maximize engagement with the political aspects to explore negotiated outcomes. The focus should not only be on calculating liability but also on finding creative ways to channel efforts toward compensation methods that are feasible for these jurisdictions. Secretariat agreed with this and explained that the field test is designed to evaluate whether the two recommended approaches are workable and practical when applied on the ground. Hopefully, the field test will help identify any improvements that can be incorporated into the recommendations.</p> <p>Members also asked about the level of engagement of RSPO members in the pilot areas for this field test, emphasizing the need for collaboration with members.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>The Secretariat responded that the consultant plans to speak with the smallholders, large growers, and government representatives, which will require support from the pilots in Sabah and Seruyan to facilitate these connections. While there won't be much fieldwork involved, there will include interviews and calls with stakeholders, with fieldwork kept to a minimum.</p> <p><u>Jurisdictional HCV-HCS assessment tool</u></p> <p>The Secretariat provided updates on the progress for the Jurisdictional HCV-HCS assessment tool. This was also discussed within the JA-BHCV subgroup. The process flow of jurisdictional HCV-HCS assessment proposed by HCVN was agreed by the JA-BHCV subgroup in late February 2024.</p> <p>The final draft of the HCV-HCS Screening Manual for RSPO Jurisdictional Entities was received from HCVN on 15th July 2024 and was shared with JA-BHCV subgroup on 15th August 2024. The 5-module document covers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Introduction to jurisdictional HCV-HCS assessment ● Module 1 - Main screening manual ● Module 2 - Quality evaluation for screening ● Module 3 - Assessment planning ● Module 4 - Assessment protocol <p>The response from the subgroup to the draft is generally favorable, but there were several points raised by the subgroup:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Quality assurance is required before finalising HCV-HCS maps for use by jurisdictions ● Quality assurance process should be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Like an audit process i.e. pass/fail decision ○ Conducted by independent third party ○ Field work based (no longer looking at data, some people will have to be sent on the ground to look at those data) <p>HCVN proposed that the screening data should not result in a pass/fail decision. However, before finalizing the actual jurisdictional HCV/HCS map to be used by the jurisdiction, it should involve a pass/fail decision. Once the map has undergone quality checking, it must clearly indicate whether it is a good map, cannot be used, or requires further work. Quality-assured HCV-HCS maps could be different from the eventual conservation and development plans of jurisdictions. The gaps are to be addressed in the jurisdictional RaCP process.</p> <p>Basically, the scope of this tool is to provide a map that can be handed over to the jurisdiction for their use. However, the eventual spatial planning and the Go/No-Go zones defined by the jurisdiction may not be identical to what is proposed in the HCV-HCS map. The jurisdiction has the authority to make its own decisions for various reasons, such as developing areas identified as HCV-HCS or adding to their conservation map areas that are not included in the HCV-HCS map. The Secretariat would just like to</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|------------|--|--|
| | <p>highlight that the map may not be applied 100% when the jurisdiction conducts their planning and identifies No-Go zones. Any gaps that arise will be addressed through the jurisdictional RaCP process.</p> <p>The subgroup also pointed out the importance of data sharing transparency. The results collected for this exercise could be too technical for government agencies or smallholders, so efforts should be made to share the data transparently with all stakeholders. There should be a systematic data quality analysis, which is covered in one of the modules about the quality evaluation process. On top of that, there needs to be clearer information on the capacity of those implementing the HCVN assessment manual.</p> <p>The subgroup raised a concern regarding inconsistencies between the tool and the JA piloting framework. One of the issues identified was that the piloting framework refers to "indicative" jurisdictional HCV-HCS maps, while the assessment tool refers to "quality-assured" maps. It was suggested that once the tool is finalized and adopted, the piloting framework will need to be reviewed and adjusted to align with the tool and address these inconsistencies as a whole.</p> <p><u>Ecuador pilot Step1 self-assessment</u></p> <p>The Ecuador pilot Step1 assessment was submitted by CISPS, the multi-stakeholder board for the Ecuador pilot, supported by Conservation International Ecuador.</p> <p>The assessment was reviewed by two JWG members in September 2024. Both members have agreed that Ecuador has fulfilled all Step 1 Indicators. The Secretariat will proceed to submit to the Standard Standing Committee (SSC) for endorsement in November 2024 during RT2024. Upon SSC's endorsement, during the JA Breakout session, the Secretariat will have a simple ceremony to present to the Ecuador pilot representatives with a letter of acknowledgement.</p> <p>Members raised a question on the timeline and process. Is it already completed with only two reviewers? The Secretariat responded that Step 1 of the assessment has been completed and now requires SSC's endorsement. Once the SSC endorses it, Ecuador will be recognized as having achieved Step 1 and can then proceed to Step 2.</p> | |
| 2.2 | <p>JA Pilots Updates</p> <p><u>Sabah</u></p> <p>The Secretariat presented updates on the Sabah JA pilot. The JE for the Sabah pilot, JASPO Sdn Bhd, has been legally established. Since May 2024, the Secretariat has been working with the Sabah pilot to review the Step 2 assessment format. A draft of the Step 2 assessment format has been shared, and the Secretariat has collaborated with the Sabah pilot in May, July, and September, conducting three workshops with support from the RSPO Secretariat to develop a work plan for achieving Step 2 and ensure mutual understanding.</p> | |

| | | |
|------------|--|--|
| | <p>The Sabah pilot has identified the person in charge, departments, and entities for various matters. Working groups have been formed to work on matters such as labour, FPIC, conservation of climate/environment, and nature. Sabah has established several working groups such as smallholder working groups, monitoring and evaluation working group, legal and administrative matters working group, and land rights working group. The Sabah pilot is committed to achieving 100% jurisdictional certification readiness by 2025, with the first sub-jurisdictional certification expected by 2028. By 2030, RSPO certification will be made mandatory in Sabah.</p> <p><u>Seruyan</u></p> <p>The Secretariat also presented updates on the Seruyan JA pilot, which aims to legally establish a JE by the end of 2024. In October 2024, the first workshop was conducted with technical support from RSPO to identify the persons in charge and develop a work plan for achieving Step 2. Ongoing projects include district-wide HCV-HCS mapping and the certification of smallholders under the Group Certification program. The issue of FPIC is also being addressed as part of the process and is already incorporated into existing regulations. The pilot is committed to completing the Step 2 indicators by 2025.</p> <p><u>Ecuador</u></p> <p>The Ecuador JA pilot's Step 1 assessment has been reviewed by the JWG, and the indicators have been achieved. The drafting and review of the ministerial decrees for setting up a JE are targeted for submission to the President's Office in December. The RSPO Secretariat is part of the working group for this process. The pilot is also working on establishing a trust fund for the JE's operations and engaging with North American buyers to support the Ecuador pilot.</p> | |
| 2.3 | <p>Other updates</p> <p><u>JA Breakout session – RT2024</u></p> <p>The title of the JA breakout session at RT2024 is “Investing in the Potential of Jurisdictional Approaches”. This session will focus on the business case for jurisdictional membership and explore how to motivate investment in a jurisdictional approach. It will present pathways for key actors to invest in jurisdictional/landscape infrastructure as part of efforts to create a greener sector. Speakers will include representatives from Conservation International Ecuador, Sawit Kinabalu Sabah, SIPEF Papua New Guinea, and the Governor of Edo State, Nigeria. The session will discuss the benefits and motivations for starting a jurisdictional/landscape initiative in their respective regions.</p> <p><u>JA side event – RT 2024</u></p> <p>The Secretariat is also co-organizing an event with UNDP at RT2024, with support from JASPO, to have a mini workshop with the pilots and interested parties. This event is by invitation only and will focus on learning and sharing experiences from all three pilots, as well as networking with interested stakeholders.</p> | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p><u>Engagement with East Kutai</u></p> <p>There has been interest in a jurisdictional initiative based in East Kutai, Kalimantan, supported by the USAID-Segar team. The Secretariat has had several engagements with them, including participating in focus group discussions with local stakeholders and the USAID-Segar team to socialize the JA concept. However, there are some challenges, particularly as the head of the district government is not yet fully convinced of the JA approach. The current focus is more on engaging with both the government and the private sector. The funding for the USAID-Segar team project will end in September 2025, which limits the time available. Despite these challenges, the Secretariat is fully committed to supporting them and will monitor the progress. They are also in the process of identifying another NGO to take over the initiative.</p> <p>A couple of months ago, the government of East Kutai Timur discussed with the Seruyan government, seeking guidance on how to pursue jurisdictional approaches, such as the capacity-building process, and to learn from Seruyan's experiences. This is part of their journey to adopt this approach. There are ongoing discussions about whether they should engage in further discussions with the Seruyan government. The initiative is strongly supported by the Indonesian RSPO Secretariat. However, the main challenge is the limited time, as the USAID-Segar team's project period ends in September 2025. Given the complexity and duration of the process, there is still a long way to go, and the initiative lacks direct support from companies.</p> <p>Indonesia Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO) is also starting work on the jurisdictional approach and has developed a piloting framework, which is part of the collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture. However, there is currently a challenge due to the new regime and changes within the ministry, making it difficult to make progress over the past two weeks since the new minister came in. More engagement is needed to address this situation. The plan is to have discussions with GAPKI and the government of Ketapang, who are willing to test the jurisdictional approach in that area. While there are positive signals from the government, especially from ISPO, to start considering this approach, it may be limited this year. However, there may be an opportunity to begin piloting with RSPO next year.</p> <p>Is there any risk on this initiative? The momentum created by the EUDR and the challenges Indonesia aims to tackle could lead to surprisingly successful and positive outcomes. RSPO needs to be aware of the cut-off date, as it may differ from the RSPO HCS cut-off date, especially considering that many members have made NDPE commitments dating back to 2015. Overall, this effort is seen as positive, with the EUDR conversation serving as a catalyst. Once it becomes more official, it will require greater involvement from the RSPO Secretariat. More updates will be provided as the progress continues.</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>From the RSPO side, this can be an opportunity to engage, and as the ISPO JA moves forward, it could serve as a stepping stone for accelerating RSPO JA in jurisdictions that also wish to move into RSPO JA certification. Such collaboration, similar to the previous joint audits, could help accelerate both efforts, but it would require high-level engagement. This may be something for the RSPO Secretariat to strategize and explore further possibilities. The Secretariat agreed, noting that once more information is available regarding ISPO's push, this should be escalated to the Board of Governors (BoG) level.</p> <p>The new regime will require the RSPO Secretariat to step in, particularly in starting the development of two key areas, not only JA but also the broader concept of certification linked to mandatory certification, similar to ISPO. There are ongoing discussions within the government, particularly addressing the challenges posed by the EUDR. One of their requirements, such as geolocation for farmers which is exactly part of the needs of current certification bodies, including both RSPO and ISPO, which are already quite engaged in this area. If this moves to a landscape level, it will directly involve the government's role, and RSPO can initiate a dialogue on this.</p> <p>This development has broader implications than just JA. There is also the question of when ISPO will become mandatory, with deadlines being repeatedly delayed, which ties into this larger discussion. It's important to continue monitoring this situation closely.</p> <p>JWG 2025 work plan</p> <p>2.4 The Secretariat presented a brief workplan for JWG in 2025.</p> <p>There were 7 items identified in the RSPO JA Piloting Framework as gaps to be addressed before jurisdictional certification is possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New RSPO Membership category for Jurisdictional Entity • New PalmTrace identifier number that shows both a Jurisdiction and a Grower therein • Audit rules and action for non-compliance by single actors within a jurisdiction • ACOP reporting at the jurisdictional level • Verification SOPs/mechanisms/checklists Step 1 and Step 2 progress • Jurisdictional or landscape level indicative HCV and HCS mapping • Jurisdictional level remediation and compensation <p>Of the 7 gaps, four are being addressed and near completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership category for JE • Pilot progress assessment • Jurisdictional RaCO • Jurisdictional HCV-HCS assessment | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>In anticipation of the first jurisdictional certification in 2026, the main focus of 2025 work plan should be on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audit rules/certification system and treatment of non-compliance • Jurisdictional FPIC guidance • Other support mechanism: JA communication strategy and bridging financing opportunities with pilots. <p>Members emphasized the importance of leveraging the RSPO prisma system for the pilot progress assessment. As the prisma system is being developed and piloted, it is important that the ongoing efforts for JA integrate with the system. The pilot can avoid building its own data system and instead align with what prisma already offers. There should be a JA-specific prisma system to ensure all JA data, processes, and certifications are systematically integrated. Members suggested that now is the time to start preparing for this integration.</p> <p>The Secretariat agreed, noting that they are in communication with the prisma team to explore how to engage with them effectively. While the JA process remains dynamic, once the RaCP and HCV-HCS mapping are endorsed or procedures are established, the Secretariat can work more closely with the prisma team to identify the data to be collected. If certain data points are not yet captured in the current prisma management unit system, they will need to be incorporated. The Secretariat plans to collaborate more closely with the Prisma team next year.</p> <p>Members suggested capturing this as part of the 2025 workplan. If all goes well, certification will be based on the prisma system next year, and the JWG will work closely with the prisma team to review the datasets to ensure they are ready for application.</p> <p>Members raised a question on landscape-level indicator monitoring, asking if this is already ongoing and how it will be addressed, given its importance in establishing a baseline to assess impact. They asked whether this has been included in the current work and framework document, especially in terms of tracking whether the upwardly delegated functions are effectively preventing deforestation in the landscapes where the jurisdictional approach is supposed to be operational. This is important to ensuring that governments are aligned with the objectives of the jurisdictional approach. Monitoring these impacts is one of the key workstreams that justify the progression of members to the next step in the stepwise approach.</p> <p>The Secretariat explained that one of the landscape indicators in Step 2 includes having a system in place to monitor deforestation. This is an indicator that the pilot must fulfill, but it is the responsibility of the pilot to set up this system. Members emphasized that while it is the pilot's responsibility, it should not take too long to implement, as monitoring should be done early. To attribute impact to the intervention, a baseline is necessary for comparison. The Secretariat acknowledged this concern and confirmed that the pilot is aware of the importance of monitoring. It is part of the progress assessment, but it should not be overlooked.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | <p>The Secretariat clarified that while the system indicators are part of the progress assessment for Step 2, the review process is still unclear. Unlike Step 1, which mainly involves having a plan (which can be handled by members), Step 2 is more technical and involves reviewing maps, RaCP, and FPIC. Therefore, the review process cannot be done solely by the JWG or Secretariat. The Secretariat can handle system indicators, but the technical aspects, such as HCV and RaCP, require further discussion to determine who should be responsible for the review and how it should be conducted. This is an issue that still needs to be addressed.</p> | |
| 3.0 | <p>Any Other Business</p> <p><u>Sabah pilot proposal</u></p> <p>There is a request from JASPO Secretariat to seek support of the JWG to present this proposal to the RSPO BoG in seeking allocation of funds from RSPO. The idea is for the RSPO to link JASPO with its members who can support funding to JASPO. This request is in line with the GA resolution passed last year in Jakarta, which called on RSPO to allocate adequate budget and staffing resources to implement the jurisdictional approach. The proposal seeks funding of USD 470,000 from RSPO to advance the Sabah JA pilot to Step 2. The funding will help establish the JE and its governance for the Sabah JA pilot, develop an internal control system, pilot the certification model, and strengthen the operations of the JASPO Secretariat. Currently, WWF Malaysia has been supporting JASPO, but their funding is ending soon. As a result, this proposal has been put forward to request funding.</p> <p>Members raised a question regarding the long-term financial sustainability of the JE supporting the Sabah JA pilot. They noted that WWF and other partners have been supporting the initiative since Sabah committed to implementing the JA, but questioned whether it is sustainable to have RSPO coordinate within its membership to provide funding for this important work. It is important to consider the whole financial viability of the JE in the long run. Members suggested that a more sustainable financial viability should be considered to ensure the continued operation of the JE without repeated funding requests.</p> <p>The Secretariat explained that financial viability is one of the indicators that must be fulfilled at Step 3. The pilot must demonstrate its financial sustainability at that stage. The current funding request is actually to support the pilot during its setup phase, before obtaining a jurisdictional certificate, which is understandable. However, the Secretariat agreed that the long-term financial viability of the pilot is an essential consideration, and this will need to be addressed as part of the Step 3 requirements.</p> <p>This fund is intended to kickstart the process, and there will eventually need to be a more sustainable financing mechanism for JE. The JASPO Secretariat has established a sub-working committee on sustainable financing.</p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Members recommended that the optics of the funding request could be improved if it were framed less as a direct request for funds and more as a collaborative effort. As local government involvement would strengthen the proposal, it would be good to have matching funding, for instance, if there were a funding contribution of \$200K from RSPO, the local government will match that amount as well. This would not only make the funding arrangement more equitable but also improve the optics.</p> <p>Members also emphasized the importance of approaching this from a more strategic and structural perspective. They suggested that, similar to the RSPO global smallholder support, a specific and strategically important framework needs to be developed for funding JA. This involves understanding how RSPO itself can play a role in financially supporting the development of jurisdictional certification. The role of government as a key stakeholder within the jurisdiction also plays an important role on how funding could be structured in a sustainable and strategic manner. While the optics of funding are important, the real challenge lies in ensuring long-term viability and sustainability. The RSPO needs to define how it can contribute to the financial support for JA, and this will require careful thought and consideration before it can be brought forward for discussion and approval.</p> <p>The Secretariat noted this and commented that when considering funding support, the focus should not be limited to just the Sabah pilot. It should be looked at from a bigger picture, considering how all JA pilots can be supported during the interim period before achieving financial viability.</p> <p>Members asked whether it is feasible and reasonable to engage the business world in supporting JA, specifically companies such as fertilizer producers, could be involved in a way that promotes collaboration with farmers in a group setting. This could potentially offer a sustainable financing model for a JE, as it is very difficult to be sustainable without support from NGOs or bankers.</p> <p>The RSPO Secretariat have started engaging internally with the Government Affairs team as well as the RSPO CEO about this matter. The Secretariat will incorporate the feedback shared by the members and keep the JWG updated on the progress of the discussions and the next steps moving forward.</p> <p><u>Kaleka updates</u></p> <p>Silvia Irawan from Kaleka has retired and this will be her last meeting in JWG. Steni Bernadinus will be replacing her in JWG.</p> <p>The RSPO Secretariat and JWG members expressed their appreciation for her excellent services and dedication over the years.</p> <p>The role of co-chair in the JWG is currently vacant.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p><u>Other AOBs</u></p> <p>Members asked whether there is a document on the impacts of the new standards for jurisdictional certification. The Secretariat responded that this has not started yet, as it is pending the results of the GA resolution. Members suggested for the Secretariat to review the differences between the previous fund and the existing funding mechanisms, and the implications these may have for jurisdictional certification. The Secretariat noted this and stated that the certification system document and standards are finalized, they will work on adapting those to the jurisdictional approach.</p> <p>Members have requested support from the JWG for the resolution put forward by Kaleka, WWF, and Sawit Kinabalu on the feasibility of implementing a mechanism to incentivize medium-sized and smallholders. This resolution will be presented during the upcoming GA.</p> <p>The meeting ended at 5:50 pm.</p> | |
|--|--|--|