

## MINUTES OF MEETING

### 54<sup>th</sup> SSC Meeting

**Time:** 1500 - 1700 (MYT)

**Date:** Thursday, 26<sup>th</sup> June 2025

**Venue:** Zoom Meeting <https://zoom.us/j/95523020807> Meeting ID: 955 2302 0807 Passcode: 54@SSC

### ATTENDEES

| Name                         | Initial | Organisation       | Representative Category                   |
|------------------------------|---------|--------------------|---|
| 1. Olivier Tichit (Co-Chair) | OT      | Musim Mas          | P & T – Substantive                       |
| 2. Andrew Aeria              | AA      | PEMANGKIN          | SNGO – Substantive                        |
| 3. Jenny Walther-Thoss       | JWT     | WWF Singapore      | ENGO – Substantive                        |
| 4. Guillaume Lacaze          | GL      | L’Oreal            | Consumer Goods Manufacturer – Substantive |
| 1. Yen Hun Sung              | HS      | RSPO Secretariat   |   |
| 2. Jasmine Ho Abdullah       | JH      | RSPO Secretariat   |   |
| 3. Akmal Arif Razali         | AAR     | RSPO Secretariat   |   |
| 4. Amrita Gunasekaran        | AG      | RSPO Secretariat   |   |
| <i>Absence with apology:</i> |         |                    |   |
| 1. Lim Sian Choo (Co-Chair)  | LSC     | Bumitama Group     | Grower (INA) - Substantive                |
| 2. Anne Rosenbarger          | AR      | WRI                | ENGO – Substantive                        |
| 3. Sander Van den Ende       | SvE     | SIPEF              | Grower (RoW) – Substantive                |
| 4. William Siow              | WS      | MPOA/IOI           | Grower (MY) – Substantive                 |
| 5. Lee Kian Wei              | LKW     | United Plantations | Grower (MY) – Alternate                   |
| 6. Suzan Cornelissen         | SC      | CNV                | SNGO – Substantive                        |
| 7. Brian Lariche             | BL      | Humana             | SNGO – Alternate                          |
| 8. Librian Angraeni          | LA      | Musim Mas          | P & T – Alternate                         |

### AGENDA

| Time        | Item  | Agenda  | PIC       |
|-------------|-------|---|-----------|
| 1500 - 1505 | 1.0   | <b>Opening</b>  | 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   | <b>Meeting Dashboard</b>  | Co-Chairs |
|             | 2.1   | Confirmation of the 53 <sup>rd</sup> MoM on 27 <sup>th</sup> May 2025   |           |
|             | 2.2   | Action Tracker  |           |
|             | 2.2.1 | List of Supplementary/Derivative Documents of P&C and ISH Standard 2024 |           |
|             | 2.3   | Progress Update WG/TF/SG under SSC                                      |           |
|             | 2.4   | Progress Update of National Interpretation                              |           |
| 1515 – 1530 | 3.0   | <b>For Endorsement</b>  |           |
|             | 3.1   | PNG&SI NITF Members Composition   | JH        |
|             | 3.2   | MY-ISH NITF Members Composition   | JH        |
| 1530 – 1550 | 4.0   | <b>For Discussion</b>   |           |
|             | 4.1   | SSC Members Participation in Standards Related TFs                      | HS        |

|             |            |   |    |
|-------------|------------|---|----|
| 1550 – 1605 | 5.0<br>5.1 | <b>For Update</b><br>Annexes of 2024 P&C and ISH Standard | HS |
| 1605 – 1610 | 6.0<br>6.1 | <b>Any Other Business</b><br>SSC Meeting in October       |    |
| 1610        |            | <b>END</b>  |    |

**DISCUSSION:**

| No.        | Description  | Action Points (PIC) |
|------------|--|---------------------|
| <b>1.0</b> | <b>Opening</b>   |                     |
| 1.1        | The Chairs welcomed everyone to the meeting and presented the agenda of the meeting. The agenda was approved.  |                     |
| 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.  |                     |
| <b>2.0</b> | <b>Meeting Dashboard</b>   |                     |
| 2.1        | <b><u>Confirmation of the 53<sup>rd</sup> MoM on 27<sup>th</sup> May 2025</u></b><br>The minutes of the meeting were adopted.  |                     |
| 2.2        | <b><u>Action Trackers</u></b><br>The action tracker of the previous meeting was presented. No other comments were received.  |                     |
| 2.2.1      | <b><u>List of Supplementary/Derivative Documents of P&amp;C and ISH Standard 2024</u></b><br>The Secretariat presented the list of supplementary/derivation documents of P&C and ISH Standard 2024. No comments were received.   |                     |
| 2.3        | <b><u>Progress Update WG/TF/SG under SSC</u></b><br>The progress update for the WG/TF/SG Committee was presented.<br><br>The Committee raised a question regarding how land use change is being incorporated into the PalmGHG Calculator and what is the current status of this discussion. The Secretariat explained that they are currently awaiting the release of a key document from the GHG Protocol, which is expected to provide guidance on how to account for land use change. Although a draft version of the document has been released, the forests section has been postponed and is not yet available. The GHG Protocol had initially indicated that they would share an early draft with the Secretariat. However, due to changes in their internal timelines, the Secretariat has not yet received this draft. Alignment with the GHG Protocol is essential, and therefore, until the full document is available and their approach is clearly outlined, the Secretariat is |                     |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>unable to proceed with this.</p> <p>The Committee commented that all the stakeholders are also currently awaiting the release of the GHG Protocol's land use change guidance document. The delay has been due to internal disagreements among the experts involved in drafting the guidance. There is reportedly a split among the contributing experts. One group is advocating for a methodology that is 100% accurate and technically precise while another group believes the guidance must also be practical and user-friendly for companies. As of now, the two sides have not reached a compromise. Given the complexity of land use and biomass emissions from a scientific and methodological standpoint, developing a framework that is both scientifically sound and operationally feasible is a significant challenge. If the final guidance is overly focused on scientific precision without considering usability, companies may not be able to apply it. The Committee hoped that the GHG Protocol will be able to reach a workable compromise that maintains scientific integrity while also enabling practical implementation.</p> <p>One of the Committee members inquired whether the Secretariat is actively supporting all the Working Groups and Task Forces by participating in person rather than online. The concern raised was that the discussions appear to go in circles or become unfocused in many cases.</p> <p>This challenge reflects a broader issue of internal governance. While the Secretariat supports the Working Groups and Task Forces, it is ultimately up to the members to make decisions and set the direction. The role of the Secretariat is to facilitate the process, not to dictate outcomes. If the Secretariat were to impose a particular format or direction, it might be interpreted as exerting undue influence, especially if members feel they are being pushed in a direction they do not support.</p> <p>The Secretariat also explained that the approach depends on the specific Working Group or Task Force. If a group requests an in-person meeting, the Secretariat does facilitate it, provided that the budget allows. However, some groups are comfortable continuing with virtual meetings, and in such cases, that format is maintained. Each Working Group and Task Force also has designated co-chairs, and the structure and cadence of meetings are determined collaboratively with the co-chairs, based on the needs and preferences of the group.</p> <p>The Committee highlighted that the facilitation remains a challenge and suggested that this aspect needs to be further reviewed. The Secretariat acknowledged the concern and added that budget constraints are a significant</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

|            |  |  |
|------------|--|--|
|            | <p>factor. With the upcoming budget year expected to be tight, there will be a need to carefully manage expenses. While this does not mean that all meetings should be conducted virtually, there must be clear prioritization regarding when and where physical meetings are necessary.</p> <p>One Committee member commented that this issue also reflects a broader matter of governance. Members must take responsibility for managing their own processes effectively. Often, even with physical facilitation, progress is limited if members are unwilling to make decisions, choose to revisit previous discussions, or delay consensus. The strength of RSPO lies in its multi-stakeholder membership, but this also requires members to take ownership of the process. It would not be appropriate for the Secretariat to dictate direction or outcomes. Maintaining a balance between facilitation and member-driven governance is essential.</p>  |  |
| 2.4        | <p><b><u>Progress Update of National Interpretations of the 2024 P&amp;C and ISH Standard</u></b></p> <p>The progress update for National Interpretations (NI) of the 2024 P&amp;C and ISH Standard was presented. The latest addition was from Nigeria and they are in the process of forming their NITF. The NI process for Guatemala is currently on hold and the Secretariat is in conversation with them about continuing the process.</p> <p>The Committee asked what the concerns of the NI Guatemala were. The Secretariat explained that Guatemala, through GREDEPALMA, initially expressed interest in developing a National Interpretation. However, following that expression of interest, several issues were raised that they would like to clarify with the Secretariat before moving forward. These issues may not be directly related to the NI process itself, but more on whether it is worthwhile for them to proceed with the development of an NI. The stakeholders in Guatemala would like to first address other concerns that may be specific to the national context or regional dynamics.</p> |  |
| <b>3.0</b> | <b>For Endorsement</b>   |  |
| 3.1        | <p><b><u>PNG&amp;SI National Interpretation Task Force Members Composition</u></b></p> <p>The Secretariat presented the decision paper on the Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands (PNG&amp;SI) National Interpretation Task Force (NITF) Members Composition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands NITF has initiated the process to begin the National Interpretation for the 2024 RSPO Principles and Criteria (P&amp;C) on 3 February 2025. However, the PNG&amp;SI NITF could not achieve this, in particular for the supply chain actors including processors and traders and consumer goods manufacturers.</li> </ul>  |  |

- Furthermore, there are also representatives from the government sector who have taken the seats of the NGOs in the NITF as they manage the smallholders in PNG and claim that they will be able to bring valuable contributions. These individuals possess significant knowledge of the palm oil industry in the country, as well as the key issues surrounding it. Given their expertise, it was recommended that they be included as substantive members of the NITF. This approach is consistent with the precedent set during the previous NI process in 2019, when government representatives were permitted to join the NITF and actively contributed as substantive members.
- The Secretariat has sent out several announcements to encourage more participation but were not able to get more members. The initiating members also reached out to interested members however were not successful.
- As the NITF is considered to have not fulfilled the requirements according to the RSPO SOP for Standard Setting and Review (2020), the NITF is required to seek endorsement from the SSC on the proposed composition of the NITF, as the requirement under the SOP was to ensure balanced representation. Therefore, the RSPO Secretariat is presenting this decision paper for SSC's endorsement.
- The current members composition for PNG&SI NITF is as follows:
  - Growers – 4
  - NGOs (including the government) – 4
  - Supply Chain Actors (including consumer goods manufacturers and processors and traders) - 2

The Committee commented:

- The Committee expressed concern over the proposal of government representatives to take up seats under the NGO category within the NITF as substantive members. The Committee is not in favour of this arrangement, as it could result in undue influence from the government side, thereby affecting the multi-stakeholder balance of the NITF. If government participation is deemed necessary, representatives should be invited in the capacity of technical members or observers, to provide input and expertise without holding decision-making power. The Secretariat explained that according to the NITF, government participation is considered critically important due to the complex and often sensitive nature of national issues in Papua New Guinea. In this specific case, the PNG&SI NITF believed that having strong government support was essential for the success and credibility of the NI process. The Secretariat had proposed to include the government individuals to be technical experts/observers but they insisted on including them as substantive members of the NITF. Therefore, the Secretariat decided to

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>raise the matter to the SSC for further guidance and a final decision on the proposed composition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee commented that while the government involvement in the context of PNG is important, putting them under the NGO grouping could be an issue. Oil Palm Industry Corporation (OPIC) is technically a semi-government body jointly financed by both the government and smallholders/growers. Historically, PNG has operated under a trilateral structure involving the industry, the government, and OPIC, and this arrangement has long been central to how the sector is managed and governed. Given this historical and structural context, the Committee expressed understanding as to why the inclusion of such representatives in the NITF is important. The current RSPO framework does not have a category to include them as substantive members, but their presence in the NITF is essential. Including OPIC under the NGO constituency could work, but the Oil Palm Ministry may not.</li> <li>• The Committee acknowledged the significant role that the government plays in the palm oil industry in PNG. However, they could participate as technical experts or observers instead, providing input without holding decision-making authority. Allowing government representatives to sit in the NITF as substantive members could set a precedent for other countries, who may similarly argue that their governments play a critical role in the palm oil sector and should therefore also be given substantive representation. The Secretariat agreed that this suggestion aligns more closely with the current SOP that encourages the inclusion of technical experts, researchers, and government representatives as technical observers.</li> <li>• One Committee member commented that the government representative may feel that they are unable to contribute effectively if they were not participating as substantive members.</li> <li>• The Committee raised a question on how the government was included in the previous NITF. The Secretariat clarified that during the 2019 PNG&amp;SI NITF, the TF was established prior to the implementation of the current SOP. At that time, there was no formal requirement for balanced and proportional representation across stakeholder sectors, which allowed the TF greater flexibility to structure its composition with appropriate authorisation. Therefore, the government was classified under its own separate category. However, under the current SOP, there is now a clear requirement to maintain proportional representation among the three key stakeholder categories: growers, supply chain actors, and NGOs and a separate "government" category is no longer permitted. As a result, the PNG&amp;SI NITF proposed a 4-4-4 structure—four representatives each from growers, supply chain, and NGOs, and assigning governments under the NGO category. The NITF is</li> </ul> |  |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>currently unable to secure sufficient representation from the supply chain category, particularly from consumer goods manufacturers and retailers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee proposed a possible solution by reducing the overall composition of the NITF to a 3-3-3 structure, with three representatives each from the grower, supply chain, and NGO sectors. NBPOL currently holds two substantive seats in the grower category which means one of the representatives will take up an alternate seat. Given that OPIC has a hybrid structure—partially government and partially industry-funded, it could appropriately be placed under the NGO category. Meanwhile, the Oil Palm Ministry could participate in the process in the capacity of a technical advisor, without holding voting rights.</li> <li>• One of the Committee members is still not convinced on putting OPIC as substantive member under the NGO category. It was suggested on the possibility of engaging with two of the alternate NGO nominees to explore whether they would be willing to take on substantive roles. If this adjustment were possible, OPIC could then be reassigned as an alternate member rather than a substantive one. This could be a pragmatic solution while maintaining compliance with RSPO's SOPs. This solution could work but OPIC may not agree to accept a non-substantive role as they have traditionally held a central role in discussions between government, industry, and smallholders, due to its unique, balanced structure in PNG.</li> <li>• The Committee raised a question about whether OPIC represents indigenous communities in PNG. It was clarified that OPIC solely represents oil palm farmers and does not speak on behalf of indigenous communities. However, the land in PNG is customarily owned and held communally rather than by the state. This structure distinguishes PNG from countries like Malaysia and Indonesia, where land tenure issues often involve state ownership. In PNG, communities cannot be forcibly removed from their land under normal circumstances. Efforts were made previously to identify and involve NGOs, but those attempts were largely unsuccessful.</li> <li>• The Committee agreed to a 3-3-3 membership structure, keeping OPIC as one of the substantive members in the NGO category and the Oil Palm Ministry as a technical expert/government observer, and one of the NBPOL representatives to take up an alternate Grower seat.</li> <li>• The Committee raised another issue whether the Secretariat provides support in person for this NITF. The Secretariat clarified that they were not requested to provide physical support for the process but were asked to provide virtual support, which they are currently delivering as required.</li> </ul> |  |
|--|--|--|

|     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| 3.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee asked whether a decision needed to be made during the current meeting. The Secretariat responded that this is a decision paper, and ideally, a decision should be made. However, since there is no quorum, a formal decision cannot be finalized at this time. If the members present can reach a consensus, the decision can then be circulated via email to the full Committee for formal endorsement.</li> <li>• The Secretariat will summarise the discussion and provisional decision in the revised decision paper. The Committee has agreed that the PNG&amp;SI NITF will have a 3-3-3 membership structure with 3 Grower representatives, 3 NGO representatives (including OPIC) and 3 Supply chain actors, of which two seats are currently filled, and a dispensation has been granted for the third. The Oil Palm Ministry would participate as a technical expert/government representative, without voting rights. The revised decision paper will be shared via email to the SSC members who are not present and they will be given a week to provide comment and endorsement via email.</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>The SSC has endorsed the decision paper subject to the changes below:<br/>To change the composition structure to 3-3-3, instead of 4-4-4 to ensure balanced representation. To achieve this, the SSC requested the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Oil Palm Ministry as an invited government representative.</li> <li>• One of the NBPOL representatives to take up an alternate Grower seat instead as there are currently two substantive representatives from NBPOL as growers.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>MY-ISH NITF Members Composition</u></b></p> <p>The Secretariat presented the decision paper on the MY-ISH NITF Members Composition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Malaysia NITF has initiated the process to begin the National Interpretation for the RSPO Independent Smallholder (ISH) Standard on 7 March 2025. However, the NITF was not able to achieve this, in particular for the supply chain actors including processors and traders and consumer goods manufacturers and social NGOs.</li> <li>• As the NITF is considered to have not fulfilled the requirements according to the RSPO SOP for Standard Setting and Review (2020), the NITF is required to seek endorsement from the SSC on the proposed composition of the NITF to ensure balanced representation. Therefore, the RSPO Secretariat is presenting this decision paper for SSC's endorsement.</li> <li>• The current members composition for MY-ISH NITF is as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Growers - 2</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>1. Amend the decision paper accordingly</p> <p>2. Seek approval from SSC members via email</p> <p><b>Action by:</b><br/><b>Secretariat</b></p> |
|-----|--|---|



- NGOs - 2 (Only Environmental NGOs)
- Supply Chain Actors – 1

The Committee highlighted:

- The Committee suggested that it might be beneficial for the ISH NITF meetings to take place with the larger P&C NI meetings as this may encourage participation from stakeholders who are already present for the NI discussions. For example, if the P&C NITF meets today, the ISH NITF could potentially meet on the following day. The Secretariat explained that scheduling is generally left to the NITF themselves. There is an overlap of the WWF membership who participates in both the P&C and ISH NITF, who initially indicated that the two NITF would attempt to coordinate their meeting schedules. However, the Secretariat is uncertain whether that coordination has taken place.
- The Committee suggested that the Secretariat take a more proactive role in proposing and facilitating consecutive scheduling of NITF meetings, rather than leaving it entirely to the NITFs. The Secretariat takes note of this and will coordinate with the P&C MY NITF and explore whether scheduling the meetings consecutively is feasible. However, the scheduling can only begin once the NITF is officially formed. This NITF has delayed commencing formal work, and no scheduling has been initiated yet. Once the group is formally established, the Secretariat will support efforts to align the meeting schedules.
- The Committee raised a question on how a group of only five or six individuals could provide sufficient diverse and knowledgeable input as this is not very efficient. The Secretariat responded that this NITF was initiated by WWF, with a primary focus on the Sabah landscape. The independent smallholder context in Malaysia, particularly in Sabah, is quite specific and localized, and this has led to a smaller group of interested and relevant participants, especially from the supply chain sector. They did not intend to form the NITF with such a small number of members. In fact, the call for participation and the recruitment period for this NITF were longer than others. WWF has made efforts to reach out to other potential stakeholders to join the NITF, and the Secretariat also sent out multiple e-blasts to all RSPO members, but the interest and response have remained limited. Therefore, some strategic direction or guidance to the NITF may help ensure that their work moves forward effectively.
- The Secretariat also explained that the primary motivation behind forming the NITF was also to discuss the definition of smallholders, which is a cross-cutting issue relevant to both the P&C and ISH Standards. They were also particularly interested in ensuring that the Sabah context is properly reflected in the interpretation of the

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>standard. Although the group is relatively small, they expressed a desire to propose specific changes, and these issues were considered sufficiently important to warrant the formation of a NITF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee has agreed that the 2-2-2 membership structure of the NITF should be the bare minimum required for balanced representation for all NITFs.</li> <li>• The Committee expressed concern that the initiative appears to be driven primarily by WWF's regional office as there had been no indication from the national WWF representatives involved in the Malaysia P&amp;C NITF that this initiative was being developed. If the intention is only to discuss the context of smallholders in Sabah, then this could potentially be addressed through a standalone meeting or consultation, rather than establishing a formal NITF. However, if the intention is to review the full P&amp;C for ISH, then the process must be consistent with other NI processes. The Secretariat clarified that the group does intend to review the full ISH Standard, but they have identified a few key issues they wish to focus on.</li> <li>• The Committee raised a concern about whether the current approach is effectively leading to the development of a Malaysia-wide ISH Standard, or if it is inadvertently becoming tailored specifically to the Sabah context. The NI should ensure that diverse perspectives from across the country are fully considered and should not be a regional context, with the final output intended to apply to the whole Malaysia.</li> <li>• The Secretariat responded that, although the initiative was originally driven by WWF with a focus on Sabah, the NITF does include members who bring broader national representation. For example, Wild Asia is one of the members in the NITF and has certified independent smallholder groups in Perak and Johor. These groups are also connected to IOI, which sources from them directly. While the intention was to address specific concerns related to Sabah, the overall composition of the NITF reflects a more balanced view and is positioned to bring a nationwide perspective to the discussions and outcomes of the ISH Standard.</li> <li>• The Committee emphasized that it is essential for the process to remain a national-level discussion, not a regional interpretation focused solely on Sabah. It would be acceptable to address Sabah-specific issues, provided that these are clearly identified and contextualized within the broader framework of the national standard.</li> <li>• The Committee recommended that the Secretariat inform the NITF that the process must retain a national focus, rather than a regional focus and request that the NITF provide a brief overview of their proposed workplan. This would allow the Committee to review and better</li> </ul> |  |
|--|--|--|

|            |   |   |
|------------|---|---|
|            | <p>understand the intended direction of the work and ensure it aligns with national-level expectations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee has agreed with the proposed composition, but with a condition that the ISH MY NITF include in their Terms of Reference (ToR) a clear statement that the resulting NI must reflect a national context, not a regional one. The Secretariat will proceed with a provisional decision and circulate it via email to all SSC members for a formal decision with a week's deadline.</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>The SSC has endorsed the decision paper with a condition that the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the MY-ISH NITF shall specifically state that the National Interpretation Task Force shall focus on the national context of all independent smallholders in Malaysia, to ensure that the NI is applicable at a country-level and not a regional-level. Dispensation has been provided for the vacant supply chain actor; and going forward, the SSC stipulates that a 2-2-2 composition structure is the bare minimum for any NITF.</p>   | <p>1. Include in the NITF's ToR the proposed condition</p> <p>2. Seek approval from SSC members via email</p> <p><b>Action by:</b><br/><b>Secretariat</b></p> |
| <b>4.0</b> | <b>For Discussion</b>   |   |
| <b>4.1</b> | <p><b><u>SSC Members Participation in Standards Related TFs</u></b></p> <p>The Secretariat presented a brief recap of the participation of SSC Members in Standards Related Task Forces as requested during the last SSC Meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As discussed at the last two SSC meetings in April and May 2025, the SOP for Standard Setting and Review and the ToR for Supply Chain Certification Standard Review Task Force have restrictions regarding the participation of SSC members in these Working Groups and Task Forces.</li> <li>The Secretariat proposed three options for consideration in the previous meeting, but the SSC has requested the Secretariat to further refine the options to address some other scenarios that came out in the discussion. The refined options are shown below:</li> </ul> <div style="background-color: #fff9e6; padding: 10px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p><b>Options for Consideration</b></p> <p><b><u>Option 1:</u></b> SSC members will need to resign from SSC if they wish to take part in any standards development processes as mentioned above.</p> <p><b><u>Option 2:</u></b> SSC members may nominate different individuals from their own organisations to participate in either SSC or TF.</p> <p><b><u>Option 3:</u></b> In the event an SSC member chooses to participate in a TF, they must recuse themselves from any related discussions during SSC proceedings to avoid any conflict of interest.</p> <p><b><u>Option 4:</u></b> In the event an SSC member chooses to participate in a TF, they should step down from the SSC temporarily.</p> <p><b><u>Option 5:</u></b> An SSC member can participate in a TF as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) An <b>observer</b> - they retain the right to participate in the decision making process at the SSC</li> <li>b) As <b>substantive member</b> - they must recuse themselves from decision-making at the SSC.</li> </ul> </div> |   |

|            |  |   |
|------------|--|---|
|            | <p>The Committee commented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee pointed out that during the previous meeting, there was an Option 6, which allowed members of the SSC to join the TFs or WGs without restriction. This was based on the understanding that there were sufficient checks and balances within the process as a standing committee and there would be no need for specific conditions governing the participation of SSC members in TFs or WGs. This option is currently missing from the documentation and recommended that it be added to accurately reflect the minutes and decisions from the last meeting.</li> <li>• The Committee reiterated that, as agreed in the previous meeting, the approach should allow for maximum flexibility in TF participation. They emphasized that conflict of interest concerns should be addressed through transparency, rather than restriction. If an SSC member participates in a TF and later raises an objection during SSC deliberations, it should be clearly recorded and acknowledged that the objection came from someone involved in the TF. This level of transparency ensures that potential conflicts are managed openly and on a case-by-case basis.</li> <li>• The Committee has agreed that this discussion be postponed to the next meeting when more members are present for a fuller and more representative discussion.</li> <li>• The Secretariat takes note of this and will include Option 6 accordingly and present this at the next SSC meeting for discussion.</li> </ul> | <p>Amend the options and discuss in the next SSC Meeting<br/><b>Action by:</b><br/><b>Secretariat</b></p> |
| <b>5.0</b> | <b>For Update</b>  |   |
| <b>5.1</b> | <p><b><u>Annexes of 2024 P&amp;C and ISH Standard</u></b></p> <p>The Secretariat provided an update on the annexes of the 2024 RSPO P&amp;C and ISH Standard.</p> <div style="background-color: #fff9e6; padding: 10px;"> <p><b>For Update</b></p> <p>The Secretariat is preparing to release and circulate Version 4-1 of P&amp;C 2024 and V2-1 of ISH Standard 2024, which incorporates the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 6 procedural updates (based on the Decision Paper approved by the SSC in May 2025)</li> <li>- Guidance: Annex 5 of P&amp;C 2024 and Annex 3 of ISH Standard (based on the structure agreed by the SSC in March 2025)</li> <li>- Annex 2 of P&amp;C 2024 - Key international laws and conventions applicable to the production of palm oil</li> <li>- Updated Change Log of P&amp;C 2024 and ISH 2024, with explanatory notes on the above changes</li> </ul> <p>The following changes are still pending - future update to Version 4-2 and V2-2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Annex 4 - Approved HRDD Methodology - drafted by HRDD Subgroup, pending discussion and approval by the HRWG. Expected end-July</li> <li>- Any other procedural updates for clarity that have been discussed but not yet approved by the SSC through a decision paper</li> </ul> </div>  |   |

|            |   |  |
|------------|---|--|
| <b>6.0</b> | <b>Any Other Business</b>   |  |
| <b>6.1</b> | <p><b><u>SSC Meeting in October</u></b></p> <p>The Secretariat informed the Committee that the SSC Meeting originally scheduled for 28 October 2025 will most likely focus on endorsing National Interpretations so that they can be submitted to the Board of Governors (BoG) for approval. As the BoG meeting is scheduled on 6 November, all materials must be submitted at least two weeks in advance to meet internal timelines. This creates a tight and unworkable timeline, particularly if the SSC does not reach quorum during the 28 October meeting, which would require decisions to be made via email circulation, adding at least another week to the process.</p> <p>Therefore, the Secretariat proposed to reschedule the SSC meeting to one week earlier, in order to allow sufficient time for approval and preparation of materials to the BoG for endorsement. The Secretariat will send out a doodle poll with suggested dates for the SSC Meeting in October.</p>  | <p>Send a doodle poll for the SSC meeting in October</p> <p><b>Action by:</b><br/><b>Secretariat</b></p> |
| <b>6.2</b> | <p><b><u>MYNI Task Force's Request</u></b></p> <p>There was a discussion from the MYNI TF on the issue of native customary rights and how they are currently addressed within the P&amp;C as well as what constitutes sufficient evidence for compliance. This is particularly in the context of Malaysia, though similar challenges may exist in other jurisdictions as well. The MYNI TF has suggested that this issue may warrant the establishment of a dedicated Task Force or Working Group. The purpose of this group would be to examine how native customary rights and alternative land tenure arrangements can be clearly respected in a way that facilitates compliance with the P&amp;C and helps resolve disputes or issues that may arise.</p> <p>The MYNI has requested that this matter be brought to the SSC for consideration, and the Secretariat has taken this as an action point from the MYNI discussion. The Secretariat has reached out to the MYNI and the member who initially raised the issue to request additional details, which would help in framing the matter more clearly for SSC review. While the specifics are still being developed, the Secretariat is raising this to the SSC so the Committee is aware of the concern and can anticipate a formal proposal in due course.</p> <p>The Committee agreed that more detailed information is required before the SSC can support or discuss the formal creation of a Working Group. It would be beneficial for the MYNI to prepare a brief write-up or draft ToR outlining the rationale and scope for a potential Task Force or Working Group. This would provide context for the SSC and support a more informed discussion. This issue may have relevance beyond Malaysia, and a broader or regional approach could be more cost-effective and impactful.</p> | <p>Request for a detailed write up</p>   |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>The Secretariat will bring this back to the MYNI TF and request further clarification and background, including a possible write-up or draft ToR. The Secretariat will then report back to the SSC for further discussion.</p> | <p>on the issue from MYNI<br/><b>Action by:</b><br/><b>Secretariat</b></p> |
|--|---|--|

**MEETING ENDED AT 1628 MYT**