

Summary of Eighth Technical SRWG Meeting

The eighth Shared Responsibility Working Group (SRWG) technical meeting (ninth teleconference meeting) was opened at 6PM (MYT), March 23, 2020 by the SRWG co-chair and was attended by the SRWG members, Secretariat staff and Technical Facilitators. The SRWG achieved 100% representation of all membership sectors during this meeting.

The objectives of the meeting included energising for Year 2 Implementation and to ensure the SRWG have a clear understanding on the status of various working documents and the Year 2 recommended workplan. The agenda of the meeting was presented to the SRWG. Updates from the Secretariat include the submission of ACOP, status of MyRSPO, upcoming RT Series, update on the COP26 Campaign and the RSPO reactive statement on the Greenpeace report.

The Technical Facilitators presented the Year 1 Review and Learning from the recent SRWG survey based on the M&E plan to hold ourselves accountable on the process of SRWG implementation and the outcomes of SRWG. There is high satisfaction with the Technical Facilitators. The areas for improvement include getting more time and effort to understand the technical topics. The SRWG is satisfied with the RSPO Secretariat however a few challenges were identified with recommendations given. There is room for improvement in terms of the SRWG interactions, and some expressed their frustration on the dominance of some discussions and felt that it is important to ensure everyone has the same goal in achieving SR and the role of the SRWG. Based on the review and survey, several recommendations were presented. Internal and external communications are essential for Year 2, and it was also recommended that the SRWG discussion should focus on the SR quality piece. To achieve common understanding, the SRWG should embrace group discussions to reduce domination of specific voices and the data driven decision making process. For the Year 2 workplan, the public consultation webinars and the membership survey are tentatively scheduled in June/ July 2021. To ensure a smooth transition for the SR Unit and SRWG, the Technical Facilitators briefed everyone on the current status of the key documents with the current draft of documents to be made available in the SRWG shared internal folder.

To energise the SRWG and encourage discussion on the SR of greater involvement, the SRWG were broken into groups to discuss potential initiatives and innovative approaches to mobilise collective action. Within the breakouts, the members shared views, identifying projects for further discussion, prioritisation and guidelines that might be needed. There were several pending points on the Implementation Manual, and the SRWG managed to come to a few decisions. Due to time constraints, some discussion will be revisited at a later time after the Secretariat had done an internal review to align with systems and work processes.

As it was the last call with the Technical Facilitators, the SRWG bid farewell to them, and thanked them for their hard work and support since the SRTF. The Technical Facilitators expressed their admiration for the SRWG's motivation and leadership, wished them a successful implementation of YR2 and they hope to meet again in the future.

The co-chair thanked everyone for attending the meeting and looks forward to seeing everyone next month. The meeting was closed at 8.00 PM (MYT).

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF RSPO
RSPO Shared Responsibility Working Group (SRWG) 7th Technical Meeting**

Date: February 23, 2021 (Tuesday)

Time: 6 PM to 8 PM (MYT)

Venue: Video Conference (RSPO ZOOM 6)

Attendance:

<p>Members and Alternates</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Girish Deshpande (GD, P&G) 2. Natasha Schwarzbach (NS, PepsiCo) 3. Ilka Peterson (IP, WWF International) 4. Harjinder Kler (HK, HUTAN) 5. Lim Sian Choo (LSC, Bumitama) 6. Lee Kuan Yee (LKY, KLK) 7. Mariama Diallo (MD, SIAT SA) 8. Joshua Lim (JL, Wilmar) 9. Julian Walker-Palin (JWP, RPOG) 10. Miho Yamazaki (MY, AEON) 11. James Whitehead (JW, FPP) 12. Catarina Vivalva (CV, BNP Paribas) <p>Absent with Apologies</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ian Orell (IO, Sime Darby/ NBPOL) 2. Ben Vreeburg (BV, Bunge) 3. Nursanna Marpaung (NM, HUKATAN) 	<p>Technical Facilitators</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aimee Russillo (AR, LiSeed Consulting) 2. Bilge Daldeniz (BD, Proforest) 3. Claire Reboah (CR, Proforest) <p>RSPO Secretariat</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inke van der Sluijs (IVDS) 2. Lilian Garcia Lledo (LGL) 3. Chung Yee Ling (CYL) <p>Absent with Apologies</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Imam Marzuq (IM) 2. Yen Hun Sung (HS)
---	---

No	Description	Action Points
1.0	<p><u>Welcome Note</u> The SRWG co-chair welcomed the SRWG members to the meeting. The SRWG members acknowledged the anti-trust statement prior to the meeting.</p> <p>The objectives of the meeting were presented to the SRWG members:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SRWG is energised for Year 2 Implementation 2. Clear understanding of where we are and path forward <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Status of various working documents o Workplan Year 2 <p>The agenda of the meeting include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome and updates since the last SRWG meeting 2. Year 1 Review and Learning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o M&E plan and survey results o What that means - recommendations Year 2 3. Year 2 Draft Workplan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Needs and key steps o Discussion 4. Mobilisation and Transformation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Breakouts 5. Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Status of key documents o Implementation Manual Update o Q&A 6. Wrap Up and Discussion 	
2.0	<p><u>RSPO Secretariat Updates</u> To ensure a smooth transition for the Secretariat’s SR Unit, the Technical Facilitators have been working closely with the Head of SR. Processes are ongoing in order to ensure the</p>	

	<p>Head of SR has a good understanding of the relevant documents, background, workplan.</p> <p>Inke reminded the SRWG to submit their ACOP 2020 report through their MyRSPO portal. Yee Ling updated the members that the recent temporary disruption at MyRSPO has been restored, and members can now resume their ACOP 2020 submission.</p> <p>Inke mentioned that a RT Series will happen on the same day, and the topic will be a discussion on Sustainable Growth in Latin America through four interviews with key stakeholders in the region. The RT Series will be facilitated by the Secretariat's Technical Director, Francisco Naranjo, and all members are invited to join the session. She also provided a brief update on the COP26 Campaign in which SR will be a key message and the RSPO reactive statement on the Greenpeace report.</p>	
3.0	<p><u>Year 1 Review and Learning</u></p> <p>During the development process, the Technical Facilitator have reviewed the SRWG Members' priorities, meeting minutes and chats. The M&E plan has identified 2 strands: (i) SR Implementation (progress), and (ii) SRWG (process). To improve the process, the recommendations and lessons learned will be added to the recommendations for Year 2. The Secretariat has completed the initial review, as well as reviewing the results of the recent survey.</p> <p>The Technical Facilitator presented a rapid SWOT analysis on the SRWG. From the recent SRWG survey, there is a high level of satisfaction with the Technical Facilitators among the SRWG. The areas for improvement include getting more time and effort to understand the technical topics. Overall, the SRWG is satisfied with the RSPO Secretariat during the SRWG process but felt that some of the challenges include lack of communication on SR to the broader membership and the prolonged temporary pause in Aug - Oct 2020. There is room for improvement in terms of the SRWG interactions, and some expressed their frustration on the dominant discussion topic and individual drivers thereof and felt that it is important to ensure everyone has the same goal in achieving SR and everyone gets heard.</p>	

	<p>Internal and external communications are recommended for Year 2. It was also recommended that the SRWG discussion should focus on the SR quality piece. It was suggested that, in order to renew the common understanding, the SRWG should invest more time in groups to reduce domination of specific voices. More time and effort should be invested on the SR technical aspects, and the SRWG should embrace the data driven decision making process.</p>	
<p>4.0</p>	<p><u>Year 2 Draft Workplan</u> The public consultation webinars and the membership survey are tentatively scheduled in June/ July 2021, the schedule is subjected to change depending on the development of the working documents and coordination with other workstreams and events.</p>	
<p>5.0</p>	<p><u>Mobilisation and Transformation</u> The SR28 requirement (support) has provided some examples of services and support to RSPO that could be demonstrated. This includes participation in RSPO working groups and task forces, involvement in jurisdictional/ landscape approach, support to independent smallholders certified.</p> <p>The SR29 requirement (resourcing) requires all members commit resources to ensure effective implementation of SR. The level of resources to be determined in Year 1 of SR implementation, subject to member consultation and oversight. The Resourcing subgroup had discussion on the resources challenges and management last year. There was a clear messaging from the Secretariat that the SRWG will not be involved in discussion on the source or the funding as it is under the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee.</p> <p>Majority of the SRWG discussion last year revolved around the volumes and quantity elements. The co-chair commented that quality and transformation should not just be relegated to a resourcing section at the end of the document and only then referred to almost in passing. This is a central element of Shared Responsibility and needs to be given proper attention and prominence.</p>	<p>1. Due to time constraints, the discussion on the mechanism that would define and facilitate the projects, as well as any needed guidelines will happen at a later time.</p>

<p>To encourage discussion on greater involvement and collective action, mapping/ inventory of initiatives and innovative approaches, guidelines, prioritisation or specific mechanism, the SRWG were assigned to 4 breakout groups to brainstorm the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Examples of projects/ innovative approaches 2. What would the role of SRWG be? 3. Would there be guidelines on what types of projects or a mechanism to define and facilitate them? <p>The SRWG members asked about the handover process of the Technical Facilitators, indicating concerns regarding Secretariat capacity. The Technical Facilitator assured that a proper handover workplan is already in place and they are working closely with the Head of SR on the documents and process. The SR Unit plans to expand recruiting an SR Manager and SR Executive in the future. The SR Unit will also be responsible for the rewriting prior to the public consultation in 2021.</p> <p>Group 1 emphasised on the importance of SR communication across all membership sectors. The group commented that the message on uptake and requirements should be clear to all members, and to educate them how they can support smallholders and understand the real situation on the ground, as well as challenges and opportunities to drive transformation.</p> <p>Group 2 acknowledged the importance of data in setting targets. The requirements are different across membership sectors, and they recognised the need for communication and basic understanding. Thus, they suggest communication to be tailored in order to create better awareness and understanding. The group also mentioned looking at synergy to bring funds and connecting with other work streams such as jurisdictional approach and smallholders.</p> <p>Group 3 mentioned about looking at big volume uptakers who are not delivering their consumption. They suggest understanding the barriers to help these players drive their uptake, as well as pushing towards certification. For members that are not delivering, they</p>	
---	--

	<p>suggest explaining and communicating the works of other membership sectors, and how the non-achievers are costing the supply chain. The group also shared that the finance sector can push end users towards compliance.</p> <p>Instead of creating new systems, Group 4 agreed there is a need to leverage the existing systems. They suggest RSPO to do more on communication with their existing platforms, for instance providing guideline documents for each sector member.</p> <p>Due to time constraints, all groups did not have a chance to discuss what the mechanism would look like or any needed guidance. The SRWG will resume the discussion on this at a later time.</p>	
<p>6.0</p>	<p>Next Steps</p> <p>To ensure a smooth transition for the SR Unit and SRWG, the Technical Facilitators briefed everyone on the current status of the key documents. The latest version of the documents will be uploaded in the shared Dropbox by the end of March 2021.</p> <p>The Technical Facilitator had analysed the SRWG response on the Implementation Manual v0.15. There are a few pending points, but overall there is a broad agreement with the new Implementation Manual draft. Some edits will be needed mostly for clarity.</p> <p>There are new sections (objectives and grievances) in the Implementation Manual, and the Secretariat is currently reviewing the sections, and will update during the SRWG meeting in April 2021. The Head of SR will share the draft to the SRWG prior to the April meeting.</p> <p>After several discussion on the Implementation Manual's pending points, the SRWG agreed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New acquisitions (1.2.6) to reduce from 3 to 2 years for SR Implementation 2. To present Declaration of Support (3.4.1) to the public consultation 3. Sanctions' timeline (3.6.1) to be 3 years for new members <p>The Secretariat is currently working on a guidance document with regards to the SR policy at MyRSPO, and the Head of SR will share the guidance document when it is ready.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Technical Facilitators will upload the latest version of the documents in the shared Dropbox by the end of March 2021. 2. The Head of SR will share the draft of the Implementation Manual objectives and grievances to the SRWG prior to the SRWG meeting in April 2021. 3. The Head of SR will share the guidance document with regards to the SR policy at MyRSPO when the document is available. 4. The SRWG will revisit the discussion on the timeframe of closing non-conformance (uptake). 5. The SRWG will review the verifiers template and provide their comments by April 9, 2021. The Secretariat will then collate, analyse and update the SRWG during the next SRWG call in April. 6. The Secretariat is currently reviewing the Implementation Manual and will circulate by the week of April 12. 7. The SRWG will vote for the next SRWG meeting dates in the Doodle poll (either April 20 or 22). 8.

	<p>The P&T felt that the CAR resulting from TBP goals cannot realistically be closed within 1 - 3 months. They added that contracts are slightly longer than the timeframe, and they are mostly annually and not monthly. They explained that it will be a one-year discussion to enter a long-term contract with the CGM. A Grower representative suggested selling short to meet the target. A CGM representative clarified that contracts as mentioned by the P&T usually take one year for discussion. The Grower provided an alternative suggestion, to submit a time bound action plan in order to close out the non-conformance within the timeframe, and perhaps corrective action can be put in a plan. They felt that the timeframe is equivalent to what the growers are having now. If the member did not meet the timeframe to close the non-conformance, a strong justification should be provided. Due to time constraints, the SRWG will revisit this pending point and discuss at a later time.</p> <p>The Secretariat's Assurance Unit has reviewed the verifiers. The Head of SR has checked that the verifiers do not exceed requirements and use 'verifiable' language, specifically for the verifiers that will be checked during SCC audits.</p> <p>Next Steps</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The SRWG to review the verifiers template and provide comments by April 9, 2021. The Secretariat will then collate, analyse and update the SRWG during the next SRWG call in April. 2. The Secretariat is currently reviewing the Implementation Manual and will circulate by the week of April 12. 3. SRWG to vote the next SRWG meeting dates in the Doodle poll (either April 20 or 22). 	
7.0	<p><u>Wrap Up and Goodbyes from the Technical Facilitators</u></p> <p>This is the last call with the Technical Facilitators, and the SRWG bid farewell to the Technical Facilitators. They thanked them for their enthusiasm and hard work for the past two years as facilitators since the SRTF. The Technical Facilitators expressed their admiration for the motivation and leadership from the SRWG, wished the SRWG well for their Year 2 and they hope to meet again in the future.</p>	
8.0	<p><u>Closing Remarks</u></p> <p>The co-chair thanked everyone for attending the meeting and look forward to seeing everyone again next month.</p>	