

MINUTES OF MEETING

45th SSC Meeting

Time: 1500 - 1700 (MYT)

Date: Tuesday, 20th August 2024

Venue: Zoom Meeting <https://zoom.us/j/98289486549> Meeting ID: 982 8948 6549 Passcode: 45@SSC

ATTENDEES

Name	Initial	Organisation	
1. Olivier Tichit (Co-Chair)	OT	Musim Mas	P & T – Substantive
2. Lim Sian Choo (Co-Chair)	LSC	Bumitama Group	Grower (INA) - Substantive
3. William Siow	WS	MPOA/IOI	Grower (MY) – Substantive
4. Lee Kian Wei	LKW	United Plantations	Grower (MY) – Alternate
5. Silvia Irawan	SI	Kaleka	SNGO – Substantive
6. Sander Van den Ende	SvE	SIPEF	Grower (RoW) – Substantive
7. Jenny Walther-Thoss	JWT	WWF Singapore	ENGO – Substantive
8. Anne Rosenbarger	AR	WRI	ENGO – Substantive
1. Leena Ghosh	LG	RSPO Secretariat	
2. Yen Hun Sung	HS	RSPO Secretariat	
3. Jasmine Ho Abdullah	JH	RSPO Secretariat	
4. Liyana Zulkipli	LZ	RSPO Secretariat	
<i>Absence with apology:</i>			
1. Librian Angraeni	LA	Musim Mas	P & T – Alternate
2. Guillaume Lacaze	GL	L’Oreal	Consumer Goods Manufacturer – Substantive
3. Brian Lariche	BL	Humana	SNGO – Substantive
4. Ian Orrell	IO	NBPOL	Grower (Smallholder) - Substantive

AGENDA

Time	Item	Agenda	PIC
1500 - 1505	1.0	Opening	Co-Chairs
	1.1	Acceptance of agenda	
	1.2	RSPO Antitrust Law	
	1.3	RSPO Consensus-Based Decision Making	
	1.4	RSPO Declaration of Conflict of Interest	
1505 - 1515	2.0	Meeting Dashboard	Co-Chairs
	2.1	Confirmation of the 44 th MoM on 25 th July 2024	
	2.2	Action Tracker	
	2.3	Progress Update WG/TF/SG under SSC	
1515 - 1545	3.0	For Update	HS
	3.1	Standards Revision	
		- Recommendations on the structure of the P&C - Stakeholder Consultation Feedback Analysis Framework Mockup - Any Other Issues	
1545 - 1550	4.0	Any Other Business	

	4.1	Physical meeting once a year	
	4.2	Presentation of new standards for each of P&C indicators to be updated and shared to all members here with thoughts of incorporation into P&C in the next review	
1550		END	

DISCUSSION:

No.	Description	Action Points (PIC)
1.0	Opening	
1.1	The Chairs welcomed everyone to the meeting and presented the agenda of the meeting.	
1.2	The RSPO Antitrust Law, Consensus-Based Decision Making, and Declaration of Conflict of Interest were read out to the Committee. No comments were received.	
2.0	Meeting Dashboard	
2.1	<u>Confirmation of the 44th MoM on 25th July 2024</u> The minutes of the meeting were adopted.	
2.2	<u>Action Trackers</u> Action tracker of the previous meeting was presented. No comments were received.	
2.3	<u>Progress Update WG/TF/SG under SSC</u> The progress update for the WG/TF/SG Committee was presented. The Committee raised a question whether the Human Rights Working Group (HRWG) meeting on 19 th August 2024 includes input collection on the current draft of P&C and ISH or if it was just an update? The Secretariat clarified that it was just an update on the standards revision process as there was insufficient time to have a consolidated feedback from the HRWG. The draft P&C was shared with the HRWG members, and they were encouraged to provide their inputs individually instead.	
3.0	For Update	
3.1	<u>Standards Revision</u> The Secretariat presented the recommendations on the structure of Principle and Criteria (P&C) and the Feedback Analysis Framework Mockup from the stakeholder consultation.	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Secretariat presented the framework for the Multi-Stakeholder Consultation Process. The Multi-Stakeholder Consultation Task Force (MSCTF) will be established to look at the feedback received during the stakeholder consultation period. There are three categories of feedback, general consensus, divided consensus and no consensus. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ General consensus: 80% or more of feedback received through the stakeholder consultations is aligned in a single direction ○ Divided consensus: Feedback received through the stakeholder consultations is broadly split in different directions. ○ No consensus: Feedback received through the stakeholder consultations indicates no trend or commonalities in direction. ● Based on the category of feedback, general consensus could be updated immediately while the divided consensus and no consensus will be sent to the Multi-Stakeholder Consultation Task Force to be deliberated and discussed for consensus. ● The latest draft of the revised P&C and ISH Standard will also be published for public comments in parallel with the Multi-Stakeholder Consultation Process. This will be done via the digital commenting platform, Konveio. ● The MSCTF will comprise a balanced representation between growers and supply chain members (including NGOs). The Task Force will be made up of representatives of the seven sectors of the RSPO ordinary membership and will have 28 members divided between them. Observers will also be appointed for each sector. ● The MSCTF also includes stakeholder representation from the Accreditation Body (ASI, 2 members) and accredited Certification Bodies (3 members). The Accreditation Body and Certification Bodies shall represent the assurance aspect of the revised Standards, particularly in providing their expert opinion on the clarity and auditability of the criteria and indicators. ● The MSCTF will be conducted in a hybrid mode, allowing participants to join both physically and virtually. Physical meetings will be held in the morning from 9.30am to 4.30pm (MYT) and virtual meetings will be held in the evening for those who are unable to attend the physical meeting. ● The call for Expression of Interest (EOI) for the MSCTF members will be announced today (20 August 2024). ● The Secretariat also highlighted updates on the structure of the P&C document, in particular with regards to the three columns, compliance requirements, informative guidance and compliance checklist. Based on the feedback received, it was found that while there is support for these columns, there is also a call for them to be looked at separately and for now to focus on the criteria and indicators. The Secretariat 	
--	---	--

	<p>recommended that the best way forward is for the structure of the P&C to consist of the principle, criteria and indicators. The compliance requirement and informative guidance will be added later as an addendum to the P&C. These columns will be finalized at a later date once the criteria and indicators are finalised. The compliance checklist will be moved to be an addendum to the certification system document. This document will be finalised in line with the compliance requirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Secretariat will now undertake the process of putting back the things that have been moved to the compliance requirement into the indicators as part of the drafting guidelines. A lot of the details in the indicators were moved to the compliance requirements and this has led to confusion for some of the members. As the compliance requirement is now an addendum, those details will be brought back to the indicator to ensure that there is no weakening of standards from the 2018 P&C or Draft 3. The format will remain the same as the 2018 P&C version. ● The Secretariat updated that the Social NGO caucus has provided feedback on some of the proposed changes. Most of the proposed changes can be addressed, but there is one topic which is Principle 4, particularly on FPIC on existing plantations, that the Secretariat is not able to address as the ideological divergence between the Social NGO and Growers caucus is too wide. The issue has to be dealt with between the two constituencies. This could potentially impact the current timeline. The Secretariat recommended for this to be discussed at the Multi-Stakeholder Consultation Process but the Social NGO indicated that it is too short notice. ● The Social NGO caucus also raised that they do not have the same number of representatives as the growers in the current process. There was a suggestion to have a specific process that involves growers and Social NGOs with an equal representation to discuss the FPIC topic and achieve consensus. Once both groups have reached consensus, this then can be brought to the rest of the stakeholder groups for agreement. <p>The Committee commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How will the consensus for the feedback be determined, given that a quantitative threshold of 80% is used? Does this mean that the submission reflects the views of a group, and how is this measured? Additionally, how can we ensure that the significant input that falls within the 20% is not overlooked, especially since some groups may have more members than others? ● The Secretariat clarified that the approach is a mixture of both qualitative and quantitative elements. The quantitative aspect involves 	
--	---	--

the scale and distribution of feedback, including the origin of comments—specifically, the region and sector they represent. The qualitative analysis focuses on assessing the comments themselves, which contributes to determining the general consensus, divided consensus and no consensus, based on the level of weightage of the various representatives.

- The Committee expressed concern on the timeline regarding the additional process on the specialised topic for FPIC between growers and Social NGOs. How confident is the Secretariat that this is the only issue that requires a separate attention, and are there any other elements that might also require a special process? The Secretariat clarified that this is based on the feedback received. FPIC is an issue that needs to be specifically looked at while other aspects can be tackled through the Multi-Stakeholder Consultation Process.
- The Committee supports the idea of organising separate meetings, with an emphasis that there is a balanced representation between growers and Social NGO in the meeting, and how it will be facilitated so that both sides of opinions are heard.
- The Committee raised a question on whether there was a consensus in the previous Task Force to remove FPIC? It was clarified that the FPIC element was actually not removed. The current draft shows that the criteria have now been split to existing plantations and new plantations. The Committee agreed with having a good, facilitated meeting, and to be clear on how things are written.
- The Social NGO caucus raised a concern that the time is very tight, and it is difficult for them to attend the Multi-Stakeholder Consultation Task Force. It is a rush to get this done when there is a crucial principle that will not be discussed from their perspective. The Social NGO agreed to have a facilitated meeting, but the timing is too rushed. They suggested having the meeting before the MSCTF meeting instead. The Secretariat noted that it is a short notice, but this is done according to the timeline proposed to have the revised standards endorsed at the GA this year.
- The Committee raised a question on how members for the MSCTF are selected and when this will be done. The Secretariat explained that the call for EOI will be announced today. If the SSC agrees, the Secretariat will proceed to announce the EOI on the RSPO website, e-blast, and email to various caucuses today. The Committee agrees that this is the best approach to accommodate everyone’s request at this moment as the time is a constraint.
- The Committee raised a question on who will decide the composition if there are more volunteers than the seats available. Would it go back to the respective caucus to decide, or it falls on the Board of Governors (BoG)? This should be decided by the Board member representing the

	<p>constituency. The Committee suggested including this in the announcement. Once the Secretariat receives the nominations, the Secretariat will share them with the BoG members. The SSC will be informed once the final decision has been made. The Committee also recommended sending the announcement to the BoG and informing them that they will be in charge of final decision making on who represents their constituencies. Steering Group (SG) members are not allowed to be in the MSCTF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The SSC Member representing Social NGO would like to be excluded from this decision as the meeting is too soon and the Social NGO members might not be able to attend if the FPIC issue is not discussed. The Social NGO caucus would like to have a series of meetings that includes subject matter experts. There might be a risk that there will be no representatives from the Social NGO should the meeting on 2 – 6 September be pushed forward. The Committee requested the Social NGO caucus to consult among themselves to see how this could be moved forward and will get back to the SSC in a day. ● The Committee raised a question on whether the additional discussion will take place at the same time as the MSCTF meeting or will the discussion happen before the MSCTF meeting? Will the discussion be with the same group of people? The Secretariat’s recommendation is to reach out to the Social NGO and growers directly, and the discussion will be based on Principle 4 in 2018 P&C. In terms of timing, it depends on whether the Social NGO members will be able to attend. The suggestion is for the discussion to take place in parallel with the MSCTF meeting on 2-6 September 2024. Alternatively, it can also be held a week after that, on 9-13 September. Next week will not be possible. If consensus cannot be reached after the discussion, the default is to go back to the 2018 P&C version as it was the last wording that received consensus from all stakeholders. ● The Committee highlighted whether there is a backup plan should there be no participation from the Social NGO in the MSCTF? What will the process be if there is not enough participation? Do the MSCTF still proceed? What is the process in the event consensus was not reached? Does it go to the SG? How might that affect the timeline? If consensus was not achieved, it will go to the SG as SG is responsible for content. If the SG cannot make the decision, it goes to the SSC and BoG. With regards to the participation from all sectors, the Task Force does not need to have full representation. It should be stated very clearly that the MSCTF can still proceed if there is no full composition. At least 1 representative per sector is sufficient. If the sector cannot bring forward any members, the sector has to put forward their position that 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include in the announcement that the BoG will decide on the representative if there are more volunteers than the allocated seats. 2. Send the announcement to the BoG <p>Action by: Secretariat</p>
--	--	---

	<p>they agree with the process to continue. The BoG members can represent the constituency if there is no representative.</p> <p>Decision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SSC agreed with the structure of the P&C, to have the compliance columns as an addendum to the standards. • The SSC agreed to have a separate session for FPIC discussion between growers and Social NGOs, in parallel with the Multi-Stakeholder Consultation Process. • The SSC Member representing Social NGO will reach out to the Social NGO caucus regarding the proposal of being involved in the MSCTF and the separate discussion on FPIC between SNGO and growers in the 1st week of September, and 2nd week of September in the event more time is needed. • The call for EOI for the MSCTF members will be announced today and the membership to the MSCTF will be determined by the BoG members. 	<p>Announce the call for EOI for MSCTF today Action by: Secretariat</p>
4.0	Any Other Business	
4.1	<p><u>Physical meeting once a year</u> The Committee suggested having a physical meeting once a year. There will be one physical meeting this year, during the sideline of the RT2024 on 9 November 2024. The Secretariat will send out the calendar invite soon.</p> <p>4.2 <u>Presentation of new standards for each of P&C indicators to be updated and shared to all members here with thoughts of incorporation into P&C in the next review</u> The Committee highlighted that it is very important that the SSC members are kept updated on the relevant happenings around the world and if there are any documents or issues that should be included in the next P&C review. This might be able to diffuse difficult discussion before the next P&C review. The Secretariat should conduct research and reach out to the various agencies and update the SSC on the latest highlights and key points as well as share it with the respective working groups. The Secretariat agreed with this and mentioned that the Government Affairs team within the Secretariat can look into this as they have been looking at the legislations and regulations. The Secretariat will provide an update to the SSC.</p> <p>4.3 <u>Collaboration between HCVN and RSPO</u> HCVN has proposed a MOU with RSPO to formalise the implementation of HCV-HCS assessment. The Secretariat is still discussing the details of the MOU with HCVN and will update the SSC in due course.</p>	<p>Send out invitation for SSC physical meeting on 9 November 2024 Action by: Secretariat</p>

MEETING ENDED AT 1637 MYT