



## COMPLAINTS PANEL MINUTES OF MEETING for Website

Date: 26 March 2025 @ 3.00pm - 4.25pm

Meeting : via Zoom

MEMBERS OF THE COMPLAINTS PANEL	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Henry Barlow (Chair - CCP)</li><li>2. Lim Sian Choo ( Co Chair)</li><li>3. Michelle Desilets</li><li>4. Marieke Leegwater</li><li>5. Lanash Thanda</li><li>6. Robert Kruger</li><li>7. Florentine van den Eerenbeemt</li><li>8. Priya Gopalan</li><li>9. Carl Dagenhart</li><li>10. Kartika Dewi</li><li>11. Irene Aycinena Abascal</li><li>12. Miguel Tejada Iraizoz</li><li>13. Henky Satrio Wibowo</li><li>14. Juliarta Bramansa Ottay</li></ol>
GENERAL AGENDA	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Opening Remarks by Chairperson</li><li>2. RSPO Antitrust Guidelines</li><li>3. Declaration of Conflict of Interest</li><li>4. To confirm and adopt the minutes of <b>26 February 2025</b> CP Meeting</li><li>5. New Allegations</li><li>6. Complaints Case Statistics</li><li>7. Complaints Panel Meeting Dates<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>7.1 Dates for CP Monthly Meetings</li><li>7.2 Dates for CP Physical Meetings</li><li>7.3 Expansion of the Complaints Panel</li></ol></li><li>8. Post Complaints Monitoring</li></ol>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Dispute Settlement Facility (DSF)</li> <li>10. Commitment of Financial Institutions.</li> <li>11. 1st Internal Voluntary Review of the Complaints and Appeals Procedures</li> <li>12. ASC-CP Joint Meeting</li> <li>13. Complaints for deliberation</li> </ul>
	<b>Group 1 - COMPLAINTS FOR DELIBERATION</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PT. Sari Dumai Sejati (a subsidiary of AAA Oils and Fats Pte Ltd (APICAL Group) vs Mr. Hidayat Rasyid</li> <li>2. Poligrow Colombia S.A.S. vs Inversiones Chirajara S.A.S.</li> <li>3. NATURACEITES S. A. vs Requested for Confidentiality</li> <li>4. Palmas del Espino S.A. vs Requested for Confidentiality</li> <li>5. PT Harapan Sawit Lestari (a subsidiary of Cargill Incorporated) vs Mr Martarinus</li> <li>6. Compañía Palma Tica S.A. (a subsidiary of Compañía Industrial Aceitera Coto Cincuenta y Cuatro S.A.) vs Requested for Confidentiality</li> <li>7. INDUSTRIAS OLEOPALMA SA DE CV. (a subsidiary of Oleoquímica Mexicana SA de CV) vs Requested for Confidentiality</li> <li>8. OLEOFLORES S.A.S vs Requested for Confidentiality</li> </ul>
	<b>Group 2 - COMPLAINTS FOR DELIBERATION</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PT Citra Sawit Cemerlang (a subsidiary of Genting Plantations Berhad) vs Requested for Confidentiality</li> <li>2. PT Mitra Karya Sentosa (a subsidiary of First Resources Limited) vs Requested for Confidentiality</li> <li>3. PT Guntung Idamannusa (subsidiary of Musim Mas Holdings Pte. Ltd) vs Mr. S. Samsul Hadi (Kepala Desa Pelanduk)</li> </ul>
	<b>Group 3 - COMPLAINTS FOR DELIBERATION</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PT. Kartika Prima Cipta (PT. KPC) - subsidiary of Golden Agri Resources (GAR) vs Forest Peoples Programme &amp; TuK Indonesia</li> <li>2. Golden Agri Resources (GAR) vs Forest Peoples Programme &amp; Elk Hills Foundation</li> <li>3. First Resources Limited vs Requested for Confidentiality</li> </ul>



	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>4. Energy &amp; Palma S.A. (a subsidiary of HOLDING LA FABRIL S.A) vs Requested for Confidentiality</li><li>5. PT. Bumi Pratama Khatulistiwa ( subsidiary of Wilmar International Limited) vs Requested for Confidentiality</li><li>6. Energy &amp; Palma S.A. ( subsidiary of La Fabril Group) vs Requested for Confidentiality</li></ol>
--	--

#### DETAILS OF THE AGENDA:

No.	Agenda
1.	<b>Opening Remarks from Chairperson</b>  Opening speech by CCP.
2.	<b>RSPO Antitrust Guidelines</b>  RSPO Antitrust Guidelines were read to the CP.
3.	<b>Declaration of “No Conflict of Interest”</b>  A CP member declared a Conflict of Interest.
4.	<b>To confirm and adopt the minutes of 26 February 2025 during the Complaints Panel Meeting</b>  Minutes of 26 February 2025 adopted unanimously.

5.

New allegation submitted

5.1

RSPO/2025/02/RR	PT. Sawit Mas Sejahtera (a subsidiary of Golden Agri-Resources Ltd)
Complainant	Requested for confidentiality
Complaint received	26 February 2025
Location	Sumatera Selatan, Indonesia
Allegations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>That the Respondent allegedly transferred the Complainant to a different department purportedly as punishment for providing information to the auditors during the Respondent’s audit period.</li><li>The Complainant alleges that he is made to work extra hours and his wages do not commensurate with his work load.</li></ul>

Discussion on 26 March 2025:-

- Initial Diagnosis in progress.

6.

Complaints Cases Statistics

Total cases in 2025

Month	Complaints received	Country	Open	Closed	Rejected	Withdrawn
January	1	Papua New Guinea	0	1	0	0
February	1	Indonesia	1	0	0	0

Total Active Cases by Country and Year (as of 24.03.2025)

Country	Active Cases
Indonesia	10

Year	Active Cases
2014	1

Colombia	2	2020	1
Ecuador	2	2021	1
Guatemala	1	2022	1
Peru	1	2023	3
Costa Rica	1	2024	10
Mexico	1	2025	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>

## 7. Complaints Panel

### 7.1 Dates for Complaints Panel monthly meetings

Discussion on 26 March 2025:-

1. CP meeting dates for the rest of 2025 have been scheduled.

### 7.2 Dates for Complaints Panel Physical Meetings

Discussion on 26 March 2025:-

1. The Secretariat will be issuing a doodle poll to the CP members proposing dates for the next CP quarterly meeting.

### 7.3 Expansion of Complaints Panel

Discussion on 26 March 2025:-

1. Pending submission of a Board paper for the endorsement of the selection process.

<b>8.</b>	<b>Post Complaint's Monitoring</b>
<b>8.1</b>	<b>FELDA Global Venture - (Article by The Wall Street Journal)</b>
	<p>Discussion on 26 March 2025:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pending receipt of a further document from the Respondent.</li> </ol>
<b>8.2</b>	<b>Extractora de la Gloria SAS</b>
	<p>Discussion on 26 March 2025:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pending outcome on the local judicial and administrative processes.</li> </ol>
<b>8.3</b>	<b>Golden Veroleum Liberia (GVL)</b>
	<p>Discussion on 26 March 2025:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The CP has endorsed the Briefing Note.</li> <li>2. Pending drafting, endorsement and issuance of a directive to the parties.</li> </ol>
<b>8.4</b>	<b>PT. Bumitama Gunajaya Agro (subsidiary of Bumitama Agri Ltd)</b>
	<p>Discussion on 26 March 2025:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The CP is deliberating on the closure of the PCM period as parties have achieved an amicable resolution.</li> </ol>
<b>8.5</b>	<b>Aceites Y Derivados Sociedad Anonima (ACEYDESA)</b>
	<p>Discussion on 26 March 2025:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The CP has reviewed the proposals submitted and has selected an independent verifier for the independent verification of the implementation of the CP's decision.</li> </ol>

<b>8.6</b>	<b>PT Perkebunan Nusantara V (PERSERO)</b>
	<p>Discussion on 26 March 2025:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Respondent provided the 2nd progress update on the ongoing legal proceedings by way of email on 3.03.2025.</li> <li>2. Pending further updates on the legal proceedings from the Respondent.</li> </ol>
<b>8.7</b>	<b>PT Inecda (a subsidiary of S&amp;G BIOFUEL PTE. LTD)</b>
	<p>Discussion on 26 March 2025:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Appeals Decision delivered to both parties on 11.03.2025.</li> <li>2. Decision of Complaints Panel dated 13.09.2024 is upheld, Complaints Panel's Decision on stay (as requested by Respondent) dated 23.10.2024 is lifted as of 11.03.2025.</li> <li>3. Parties to comply with Complaints Panel's directive as in the CP's Decision Letter dated 13.09.2024.</li> <li>4. Pending receipt of monthly progress report from parties.</li> </ol>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Dispute Settlement Facility (DSF)</b>
	<p>Discussion on 26 March 2025:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The DSF Advisers convened on 19.03.2025 to collate feedback for the Recommendations Report's (RSPO Grievance Mechanism) public comments.</li> </ol>
<b>10.</b>	<b>Commitments of Financial Institution(s)</b>
	<p>Discussion on 26 March 2025:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No further updates at this juncture.</li> </ol>
<b>11.</b>	<b>1st Internal Voluntary Review of the Complaints and Appeals Procedures</b>
	<p>Discussion on 26 March 2025:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Public comments period is ongoing and will end on 28.03.2025.</li> </ol>
<b>12.</b>	<b>ASC - CP JOINT MEETING</b>
	<p>Discussion on 26 March 2025:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ASC-CP meeting to proceed as scheduled on 15.04.2025.</li> </ol>



## COMPLAINTS FOR DELIBERATION:-

### GROUP 1

Complaint 1.1 PT. Sari Dumai Sejati ( a subsidiary of AAA Oil and Fats Pte Ltd (APICAL Group) vs Mr. Hidayat Rasyid	
Case Reference	RSPO/2023/12/RR
Date Filed	03 August 2023
Respondent	PT. Sari Dumai Sejati (a subsidiary of AAA Oils and Fats Pte Ltd (APICAL Group)
Membership Category	Processors and / or Traders
Country	Indonesia
Complainant	Mr. Hidayat Rasyid
Complaint Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Complainant is a representative of a community, and the Respondent is a Crude Palm Oil producer.</li><li>• Allegations are with regards to unsustainable operations at the Respondent's plant, causing severe air and noise pollution, disrupting and affecting the daily lives of the community.</li></ul>
Status	Decision delivered with period to appeal (60 WD)
Decision / Justification	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Appeals period has expired.</li><li>2. No Appeal was lodged.</li><li>3. This Complaint is now closed.</li></ol>

Complaint 1.2 Poligrow Colombia S.A.S. vs Inversiones Chirajara S.A.S.	
Case Reference	RSPO/2024/04/MAM
Date Filed	18 March 2024
Respondent	Poligrow Colombia S.A.S.
Membership Category	Oil Palm Grower
Country	Colombia





<b>Complainant</b>	Inversiones Chirajara S.A.S.
<b>Complaint Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Respondent infringed a private property to do a firebreak.</li> <li>• The Respondent destroyed part of the forest of the plot of land and affected the place where the Complainant's cattle were located.</li> <li>• The Respondent did not comply with a conciliation agreement signed between the parties.</li> </ul>
<b>Status</b>	Investigation / Deliberation
<b>Decision / Justification</b>	<b>1. Pending receipt of an update on the special audit request.</b>

<b>Complaint 1.3 NATURACEITES S. A. vs Requested for confidentiality</b>	
<b>Case Reference</b>	RSPO/2024/06/MAM
<b>Date Filed</b>	24 April 2024
<b>Respondent</b>	NATURACEITES S. A.
<b>Membership Category</b>	Oil Palm Grower
<b>Country</b>	Guatemala
<b>Complainant</b>	Requested for confidentiality
<b>Complaint Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Complainant alleges that the Respondent is affecting the compliance of the act on corporate due diligence obligations for the prevention of human right violations in the supply chain.</li> <li>• The Respondent has abused the human rights of the indigenous population since the Company has carried out an unlawful seizure of land and water.</li> <li>• The Respondent has not complied with labour law, because the Company has unjustifiably withheld the appropriate wage.</li> <li>• Occupational health and safety regulations are not respected by the Respondent.</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Complainant alleges that the improper disposal of waste made by the Respondent is affecting the environment of the area where the community lives.</li> </ul>
<b>Status</b>	Investigation / Deliberation
<b>Decision / Justification</b>	<b>1. Draft ToR for independent investigation submitted to the CP for perusal and comments.</b>

<b>Complaint 1.4 Palmas del Espino S.A. vs Requested for confidentiality</b>	
<b>Case Reference</b>	RSPO/2024/09/MAM
<b>Date Filed</b>	27 May 2024
<b>Respondent</b>	Palmas del Espino S.A.
<b>Membership Category</b>	Oil Palm Grower
<b>Country</b>	Peru
<b>Complainant</b>	Requested for confidentiality
<b>Complaint Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Complainant alleges that the Respondent has acquired FFB using restrictive competition practices, which affects smallholders.</li> <li>The Respondent has omitted the RSPO antitrust guidelines.</li> </ul>
<b>Status</b>	Investigation / Deliberation
<b>Decision / Justification</b>	<b>1. Pending receipt of an update on the special audit request.</b>

Complaint 1.5 PT Harapan Sawit Lestari (a subsidiary of Cargill Incorporated) vs Mr Martarinus - Indonesia	
Case Reference	RSPO/2024/12/HN
Date Filed	04 September 2024
Respondent	PT Harapan Sawit Lestari (a subsidiary of Cargill Incorporated)
Membership Category	Oil Palm Grower
Country	Indonesia
Complainant	Mr Martarinus
Complaint Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Complainant alleges that he informed the Respondent, prior to his termination, of his expectation that all wages to which he was entitled would be included in the final payment compensation calculation, to which the Respondent agreed.</li> <li>The Complainant alleges that the “final payment compensation” (as phrased in a written mutual agreement dated 19 October 2023) paid by the Respondent was not in accordance with the wages paid during his employment.</li> </ul>
Status	Decision delivered with period to appeal (60 WD)
Decision / Justification	<b>1. Pending expiry of the Appeals period.</b>

Complaint 1.6 Compañía Palma Tica S.A. (a subsidiary of Compañía Industrial Aceitera Coto Cincuenta y Cuatro S.A.) vs Requested for confidentiality	
Case Reference	RSPO/2024/13/MAM
Date Filed	11 September 2024
Respondent	Compañía Palma Tica S.A. (a subsidiary of Compañía Industrial Aceitera Coto Cincuenta y Cuatro S.A.)
Membership Category	Oil Palm Grower



<b>Country</b>	Costa Rica
<b>Complainant</b>	Requested for confidentiality
<b>Complaint Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Complainant alleges that the Respondent breached the obligations to the RSPO by ignoring the High Conservation Values (HCVs) that were identified during the New Planting Procedure (NPP) in 2013, when clearing land in a protected area to plant oil palm crops.</li><li>• It is alleged that this situation affected forest conservation, as an area that should have been protected according to Costa Rican law was deforested;</li><li>• The Complainant alleges that the area where the alleged deforestation took place has now been abandoned but the damage has not been remedied by the Respondent;and</li><li>• The Complainant alleges that the said act of deforestation not only violates the RSPO sustainability principles, but also has a significant negative impact on local biodiversity and the communities that depend on this ecosystem.</li></ul>
<b>Status</b>	Investigation / Deliberation
<b>Decision / Justification</b>	<b>1. The Briefing Note is in progress.</b>

<b>Complaint 1.7 INDUSTRIAS OLEOPALMA SA DE CV. (a subsidiary of Oleoquímica Mexicana SA de CV) vs Requested for confidentiality</b>	
<b>Case Reference</b>	RSPO/2024/17/MAM
<b>Date Filed</b>	29 November 2024
<b>Respondent</b>	INDUSTRIAS OLEOPALMA SA DE CV. (a subsidiary of Oleoquímica Mexicana SA de CV)
<b>Membership Category</b>	Oil Palm Grower
<b>Country</b>	México
<b>Complainant</b>	Requested for confidentiality
<b>Complaint Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Complainant alleges that the Respondent has unjustifiably dismissed workers, deceiving them into resigning with the promise that they will be rehired;</li><li>• It is alleged that the Respondent did not pay the dismissed workers the full amount of compensation for early termination of contract, breaching Mexican</li></ul>

	<p>federal labour law;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Respondent bribed the authorities to obtain the parcel certificate from the National Agrarian Registry (RAN) required by Mexican Law;</li> <li>• It is alleged that the Respondent has falsified information regarding land ownership in order to use it as evidence to avoid the imposition of non-conformities during audits;</li> <li>• The Complainant alleges that he was dismissed for reporting these practices to senior management; and,</li> <li>• The Complainant alleges that crude oil palm is stored in tanks that do not receive any maintenance. Therefore, the Mexican legislation regulating this matter is not being complied with.</li> </ul>
<b>Status</b>	Investigation / Deliberation
<b>Decision / Justification</b>	<p><b>1. The Secretariat has received a formal response from the Respondent and is reviewing the same.</b></p>

<b>Complaint 1.8 OLEOFLORES S.A.S vs Requested for confidentiality</b>	
<b>Case Reference</b>	RSPO/2024/18/HN
<b>Date Filed</b>	28 November 2024
<b>Respondent</b>	OLEOFLORES S.A.S
<b>Membership Category</b>	Oil Palm Grower
<b>Country</b>	Colombia
<b>Complainant</b>	Requested for confidentiality
<b>Complaint Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Complainant alleges that the Respondent owns and operates oil palm plantations on conflicted and contested rural lands in Montes de Maria.</li> <li>• The Complainant alleges that the Respondent has diminished legal, customary and user rights in the region of Montes de María, without the FPIC of local communities.</li> <li>• The Complainant alleges that the Respondent failed to fulfil its commitments to ensure transparency in providing the necessary information to interested parties.</li> <li>• The Complainant alleges that the Respondent failed to fulfil its commitments to use peaceful dispute resolution mechanisms, not to instigate violence, to protect Human Rights Defenders and to prevent reprisals against them.</li> <li>• The Complainant alleges that the Respondent conducted non-compliant land clearing, which resulted in the damage of High Conservation Value (HCV) areas and freshwater ecosystems in the region.</li> </ul>

<b>Status</b>	Investigation / Deliberation
<b>Decision / Justification</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Following the Respondent's submission of its formal response to the allegations, both Parties were given another opportunity to respond on the matter of the Complaint. The Complainant and the Respondent provided their responses on 6 March 2025 and 14 March 2025, respectively. Each response was furnished to the other party for their perusal.</li> <li>2. The Complaints Panel directed for an independent investigation to be conducted by an independent investigator and for the Secretariat to proceed with the preparation of the Terms of Reference for the said investigation.</li> </ol>

## GROUP 2

<b>Complaint 2.1 PT Citra Sawit Cemerlang (a subsidiary of Genting Plantations Berhad) vs Requested for confidentiality</b>	
<b>Case Reference</b>	RSPO/2024/03/LSL
<b>Date Filed</b>	04 March 2024
<b>Respondent</b>	PT Citra Sawit Cemerlang (a subsidiary of Genting Plantations Berhad)
<b>Membership Category</b>	Oil Palm Grower
<b>Country</b>	Indonesia
<b>Complainant</b>	Requested for confidentiality
<b>Complaint Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allegations revolve around land issues where the Complainant(s) were evicted by the Respondent from their agricultural land.</li> <li>• There are elements of intimidation by the Respondent and local authorities in the process of resolving the disagreements on the aforementioned land dispute.</li> <li>• The Respondent destroyed the irrigation built by the government.</li> </ul>
<b>Status</b>	Investigation/Deliberation - DSF mediation process
<b>Decision / Justification</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DSF Mediation in progress.</li> </ol>

### Complaint 2.2 PT Mitra Karya Sentosa (a subsidiary of First Resources Limited) vs Requested for confidentiality

Case Reference	RSPO/2024/10/RH
Date Filed	10 July 2024
Respondent	PT Mitra Karya Sentosa (a subsidiary of First Resources Limited)
Membership Category	Oil Palm Grower
Country	Indonesia
Complainant	Requested for confidentiality
Complaint Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Respondent conducted land clearing, planting, and construction of a concession boundary road beyond the boundaries set out under its plantation business license (IUP) and/or right-to-cultivate land title (HGU).</li> </ul>
Status	Investigation/Deliberation
Decision / Justification	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Pending expiry of Appeals period on 04.06.2025.</b></li> </ol>

### Complaint 2.3 PT Guntung Idamannusa (subsidiary of Musim Mas Holdings Pte. Ltd) vs Mr. S. Samsul Hadi (Kepala Desa Pelanduk)

Case Reference	RSPO/2024/14/RH
Date Filed	16 October 2024
Respondent	PT Guntung Idamannusa (subsidiary of Musim Mas Holdings Pte. Ltd)
Membership Category	Oil Palm Grower
Country	Indonesia
Complainant	Mr. S. Samsul Hadi (Kepala Desa Pelanduk)
Complaint Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Respondent's Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) program is not concrete and sustainable for the surrounding community;</li> <li>The Respondent has conducted replanting/cutting down of oil palm trees on a plantation, resulting in the emergence of insect pests damaging the</li> </ul>

	<p>community's coconut plantation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Respondent only provided pesticides twice and did not take responsibility for the community's coconut plantation damage; and</li> <li>• The community's pesticide proposal through the Village Head was not urgently responded to by the Respondent, which caused the surrounding community to suffer great losses.</li> </ul>
<b>Status</b>	Investigation/Deliberation - (Bilateral Engagement process)
<b>Decision / Justification</b>	<p><b>1. The Bilateral Engagement period has expired. The matter has been referred back to the CP and the CP has directed the Secretariat to request a special audit.</b></p>

### GROUP 3

Complaint 3.1 PT. Kartika Prima Cipta (GAR) vs Forest Peoples Programme & TuK	
<b>Case Reference</b>	PreCAP/2014/03/IR
<b>Date Filed</b>	13 October 2014
<b>Respondent</b>	PT. Kartika Prima Cipta (PT.KPC) - Golden Agri Resources (GAR)
<b>Membership Category</b>	Oil Palm Grower
<b>Country</b>	Indonesia
<b>Complainant</b>	Forest Peoples Programme (FPP) and (Transformasi untuk Keadilan) TuK Indonesia
<b>Complaint Description</b>	<p><b><u>Points raised:-</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PT KPC is in persistent violation of the RSPO P&amp;C pertaining HCV assessment, the recognition of customary land rights and free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC). Lack of FPIC of the local Dayak and Malay people in the process of land take over.</li> <li>• Land takeover was done without land tenure study and participatory mapping.</li> <li>• Late HCV assessment which was done by IPB, final consultation was in May 2014.</li> <li>• Dissatisfaction by smallholders and resentment because of reduced post facto set aside for HCV rather than getting plasma scheme (20%).</li> <li>• Set aside land as HCS area that made no provision for customary land uses and tenure and local people livelihood.</li> <li>• GAR as the parent company of all 18 subsidiaries listed in acting in violation of the New Planting Procedure (NPP) by submitting information which is known as false. No HGU in 16 of 18 NPP.</li> <li>• The assessors which have endorsed GAR's HCV assessment, ESIA's and social engagement actions, are in violation of their responsibility to provide impartial assessment of company compliance with RSPO P&amp;C.</li> </ul>





<b>Status</b>	Decision delivered with period to appeal (60 WD)
<b>Decision / Justification</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pending expiry of Appeals period.</li> <li>2. The Secretariat received the 2nd PCM Progress Report from the Respondent on 07.03.2025.</li> <li>3. The Secretariat has received the HCV documents of the 18 subsidiaries on 26.03.2025, and the same has been furnished to the relevant department within the Secretariat for further assessment.</li> </ol>

<b>Complaint 3.2 Golden Agri Resources (GAR) vs Forest Peoples Programme &amp; Elk Hills Foundation</b>	
<b>Case Reference</b>	RSPO/2020/04/IR
<b>Date Filed</b>	2 March 2020
<b>Respondent</b>	Golden Agri Resource (GAR)
<b>Membership Category</b>	Oil Palm Grower
<b>Country</b>	Indonesia
<b>Complainant</b>	Forest Peoples Programme & Elk Hills Foundation
<b>Complaint Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Respondent, through its subsidiaries located in Central Kalimantan, operate its plantations with permits which never had the force of law;</li> <li>• The Respondent, through its employees have been involved in the payment of bribes to provincial officials in Central Kalimantan.</li> </ul>
<b>Status</b>	Decision delivered with period to appeal (60 WD)
<b>Decision / Justification</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pending expiry of the Appeals period.</li> </ol>

Complaint 3.3 First Resources Limited vs Requested for confidentiality	
Case Reference	RSPO/2021/04/EN
Date Filed	8 March 2021
Respondent	First Resources Limited
Membership Category	Oil Palm Grower
Country	Indonesia
Complainant	Requested for confidentiality
Complaint Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Respondent allegedly has ownership, control and influence over a company called Fangiono Agro Plantation (FAP) Agri, a non-RSPO member who was not declared in the Respondent's RSPO Group Membership.</li> <li>• The Respondent also allegedly has ownership, control and influence of an Indonesian company, Ciliandry Anky Abadi (CAA) who is a subsidiary of a British Virgin Islands registered company by the name of Sima Capital. This company too was not declared to be a part of the Respondent's RSPO Group Membership.</li> <li>• The Respondent, via FAP or by FAP's 11 subsidiaries have violated the RSPO Principles and Criteria by deforestation, peatland degradation, using lands for plantation without FPIC, river pollution, and unilateral layoffs of workers.</li> <li>• The Respondent, via CAA, have violated the RSPO Principles and Criteria by deforestation, peatland degradation, using lands for plantation without FPIC, and river pollution.</li> <li>• The Respondent is violating its NDPE Commitments, the RSPO Principle and Criteria, the RSPO Code of Conduct, and RSPO membership rules.</li> <li>• The Complainants alleged that the Respondent has control and influence over a group of companies known as New Borneo Agri ("the Sulaidy companies"), a non-RSPO member who was not declared in Respondent's RSPO Group Membership.</li> </ul>
Status	Investigation / Deliberation
Decision / Justification	<p><b>1. The Secretariat is in the midst of preparing the Briefing Note for the CP's deliberation.</b></p>

Complaint 3.4 Energy & Palma S.A. ( subsidiary of HOLDING LA FABRIL S.A) vs Requested for confidentiality	
Case Reference	RSPO/2023/01/MAM
Date Filed	05 January 2023
Respondent	Energy & Palma S.A. (a subsidiary of HOLDING LA FABRIL S.A)
Membership Category	Oil Palm Grower
Country	Ecuador
Complainant	Requested for confidentiality
Complaint Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allegations made against the Respondent are in relation to the modification of property deeds to remove areas identified by the government as community lands and environmental protection zones.</li> <li>• Lawsuit against community owners to intimidate the local people.</li> <li>• Company's activities have a negative impact on the natural environment and lead to degradation and deforestation.</li> </ul>
Status	Investigation / Deliberation - Independent investigation
Decision / Justification	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Briefing Note is in progress.</li> </ol>

Complaint 3.5 PT. Bumi Pratama Khatulistiwa ( subsidiary of Wilmar International Limited) vs Requested for confidentiality	
Case Reference	RSPO/2022/17/LSL
Date Filed	26 December 2022
Respondent	PT. Bumi Pratama Khatulistiwa ( subsidiary of Wilmar International Limited)
Membership	Oil Palm Grower

<b>Category</b>	
<b>Country</b>	Indonesia
<b>Complainant</b>	Requested for confidentiality
<b>Complaint Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pertaining to labour related issues such as wages, no optimal health services and safety, (BPJS) is not registered, unilateral termination, the rights of the workers are not honoured, intimidation and expanded job scopes of workers (harvesters)</li> <li>• It is further alleged that the workers who have been working for a period of more than 5 years are not converted to permanent workers, instead their working days were reduced,</li> <li>• The Respondent is allegedly not transparent in determining Lembaga Kerjasama (LKS) bipartite and the amount of FFB delivered to the factory/mill.</li> </ul>
<b>Status</b>	Investigation / Deliberation
<b>Decision / Justification</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Secretariat has obtained clarification from the CB on the special audit report.</li> <li>2. The Secretariat will proceed with the drafting of the Briefing Note.</li> </ol>

Complaint 3.6 Energy & Palma S.A. ( subsidiary of La Fabril Group) vs Requested for confidentiality	
<b>Case Reference</b>	RSPO/2023/09/MAM
<b>Date Filed</b>	16 May 2023
<b>Respondent</b>	Energy & Palma S.A. ( subsidiary of La Fabril Group)
<b>Membership Category</b>	Oil Palm Grower
<b>Country</b>	Ecuador
<b>Complainant</b>	Requested for confidentiality
<b>Complaint Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decrease of the number of workers in a union due to actions of the Respondent.</li> <li>• Preventing the Union from conducting its activity.</li> <li>• Wrongful dismissal or termination of employment.</li> <li>• Bad working conditions.</li> <li>• No supply of work equipment ( such as tools).</li> </ul>



Status	Investigation / Deliberation
Decision / Justification	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The Secretariat is in the midst of preparing the Briefing Note for the CP's deliberation.</li></ol>