# Minutes of HRWG Meeting 19 – 20 January 2017 Cargill, Singapore

### Attendance:

Name	Organisation	Status
Co-Chairs:-		
Madeleine Brasser (MB)	Oxfam Novib	Co-Chair
Alexandra Experton (AE)	Cargill	Co-Chair
Members (Present physically):-		
Alwi Hafiz (AH)	GVL	Alternative Member
Jesicca Furmanski (JF)	WWF	Substantive Member
Carolyn Lim (CL)	Musim Mas	Alternative Member
Sim Chuan Eng (SCE)	KLK	Substantive Member
Melizel Asuncion (MA)	Verite	Substantive Member
Yau Woon Lee (YWL)	Neste	Substantive Member
Loo Siew Wai (LSW)	Wilmar	Substantive Member
Perpetua George (PG)	Wilmar	Substantive Member
Tulio Brito Dias (TD)	Agropalma	Substantive Member
Chris Wangkay (CW)	Oxfam Indonesia	Substantive Member
		Substantive Member
Called in:-		Substantive Member
Lukita Wardhani (LW)	Goodhope	Alternative Member
Lim Sian Choo (SC)	Bumitama	
Lanash Thanda (LT)	SEPA	
Noor Izlin Andriana (NI)	Sime Darby	
Sabarinah Marzuki (SM)	Sime Darby	
Marcus Colchester (MC)	FPP	
Observer:-		
Yueyue Wang	Mars Chocolate	

Secretariat:	
Kamini Visvananthan (KV)	
Wathshalah Naidu (WN)	

No.	Description	Main Discussion Points	Action Items	Progress Updates	
19 Feb	9 February 2017 (Thursday)				
1.	Welcome and brief introduction	Meeting started with introduction of members.			
2.	Updates on (HR relevant) issues by Secretariat	<ul> <li>Membership of the HRWG: Balanced Membership in the HRWG         <ul> <li>new membership from LATAM (Tulio from Agropalma) and Social NGO in Indonesia (Oxfam Indonesia – Chris Wangkai): both of which were present for the meeting this time around.</li> <li>current composition:-                 <ul></ul></li></ul></li></ul>	KV to draft a letter that can be sent to the BoG to request for		

Representation from banks are also necessary.	representation from the
	FMCG to the HRWG <b>or</b>
Composition of Sub-groups:-	see if there is an easier
- FPIC : 6 members	way to obtain such
- Social Auditing: 10 members	membership from the
- Labour: 17 members	FMCG
- Gender: 8 members	
- Protection Guidelines of Human Rights Defenders and Whistle-	
blowers: 5 members	
• Website has been updated – the HRWG site – has more description	
on the WG and membership table. Have also uploaded the FPIC	
guidelines (Spanish and English version). The French version going	
through final review.	
FPIC Guidelines for Spanish and English are now online. French will	
be up soon.	
RSPO Sustainability College now has a free FPIC Course available in	
both Bahasa Indonesia and Englishcheck it out at	
http://sustainability-college.rspo.org/	
<ul> <li>Have the Chalk and Talk video</li> <li>17 module course</li> </ul>	
- 17 module course	
Sustainability Priorities Survey Report and M&E Workshop Report	
<ul> <li>Both the reports were sent to all HRWG members earlier this week.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>The Monitoring and Impacts Department are seeking to build on</li> </ul>	
these 2 outputs to further develop the Theory of Change and	
Indicators.	
<ul> <li>The Survey Report indicates the feedback of RSPO stakeholders</li> </ul>	
regarding prioritised sustainability changes in order to develop a	
theory of change for the RSPO	

<ul> <li>INA- NI- FPIC: In the process of forming a TF for the FPIC Indonesian version.</li> <li>To come up with the National Guide for conducting FPIC in Indonesia;</li> <li>Process of forming a task force</li> <li>Invites are being sent out.</li> <li>Target to come up with the guidelines by the end of 2017.</li> <li>Secretariat will be approaching some of you to sit on the TF and will contact some of you individually.</li> <li>Hope to get the support from the HRWG members</li> </ul> <b>Discussion on INA NI FPIC:</b> PG- The TF needs to be specific as to what it intends to do in the beginning itself to avoid complications later. <ul> <li>CB Workshop in Ipoh Malaysia (10<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> January 2017)</li> <li>Focused on Social issues</li> <li>Verite conducted a one-day training course</li> <li>FPP conducted a session introducing FPIC to the CBs</li> <li>MAPA conducted a session on Implementation on Minimum Wages in Malaysia.</li> </ul> <b>Discussion on CB Workshop and Capacity Building</b> More training plans to be discussed with Verite as the feedback from CB was very positive and have requested for more. The Group asked if growers can be included in the CB workshops too together with the CBs.	KV to review INA NI FPIC TOR to ensure that there are guidelines in place to address P&C review	
MB – while these trainings are under the TF on Labour we should also ensure that it is not just limited to labour but also to include women's rights, rights of indigenous people and other aspects of social auditing.	To highlight this to certification team	

Should be noted that information on upcoming trainings will be posted on the website.
P&C Review Task Force is in the Process of being formed. The target
is to complete the review by end 2017 (next GA). The BoG will adopt
the ToR next Monday.
LIVING WAGE:
A discussion on the implementation of Living Wage v Minimum wage was discussed:
Q: Does the Minimum Wage actually allow for a decent lifestyle in both
these countries?
Methodologies in calculating Living Wages:-
Global Living Wage Coalition: A Shared Approach to estimating
Living Wages
Asia Floor Wage
Q: Can we use the already existing methodologies in place to calculate the
Living Wage in Malaysia & Indonesia?
Secretariat Suggests:-
Propose that the RSPO adopts a methodology towards living wages
for the palm oil plantation industry;
Conduct a study to evaluate what is a decent living wage in the
<ul> <li>sector;</li> <li>Include these findings and methodology in the upcoming review of</li> </ul>
the P&C.
Discussion on Living Wage:
i) PG – we need to adopt a pragmatic view. As the growers might
not agree to developing a methodology to determine living

		I		1
			wage. Having this discuss at TF level will not get an answer and	
			you won't get a decision at that level.	
		ii)	SCE – might not be practical.	
		iii)	AE – Agree with Mr Sin. First thing to do would be to tackle the	
			issue of complying with minimum wage. it might be useful just	
			to have some guidelines on how to determine living wages	
			rather than expecting them to institute a system to determine	
			and implement. Perhaps we can come up with a guidance to	
			guide on how the implementers can calculate the living wages to	
			assist them in coming to that. This also can be used as a	
			checklist for auditors to check against.	
		iv)	PG – expectations need to be clear. That we are coming up with	
			a methodology. I don't think we would be able to agree on a	
			wage structure across the board like the one that Asia Floor	
			Wage has done.	
		v)	CL – When we talk about minimum wage itself, sometimes, in	
			certain parts of Indonesia, even achieving minimum wage itself	
			is a challenge. So perhaps instead of looking at raising the	
			minimum wage to a living wage, perhaps what we can look at is	
			what can we do to actually meet the minimum wage.	
		vi)	AE – Recommendation should be based on a methodology	
		,	rather than a number.	
		vii)	LSC – must be mindful on the countries' own law and	
		,	regulations as well as the appetite of the country for it.	
3.	Progress Report	i)	Updates from MB	
	on Sub Groups	,	•	
		HRWG 201	14 – 2016	
		• Fo	cus on FPIC, labour, social auditing; various researches, agenda	
			tting	
			gional focus – Indonesia and Malaysia. LATAM. Should also	
			nsider Africa.	
			14 – attention to HRs issues, esp labour	
L		I		

<ul> <li>After RT 14 – increased numbers of members.</li> <li>Trends or transformation of HRWG         <ul> <li>From couple of NGOs doing research and training development</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>From couple of NGOs doing research and training development</li> </ul>	
to bring to RSPO/HRWG. Need to be more multi-stakeholder	
inclusive.	
<ul> <li>Develop a more comprehensive TOR or TORs for the work we</li> </ul>	
do.	
- And financed by RSPO rather than individual member.	
Discussion:	
<ul> <li>PG – in terms of budget from the Secretariat. It will be good if</li> </ul>	
the HRWG decides on the budget so the Secretariat can allocate.	
- Alex/Madeline – today's discussion will include discussion on	
budget.	
Cont of briefing.	
- To more widely support HRWG endorsed activities	
- From policy development to implementation	
- From compliance to purpose driven. Compliance with P&C	
based but should be higher level of compliance that is purpose	
driven.	
Discussion:	
- Tulio – the accreditation body has the responsibility. The	
assessment must be objective. The purpose is the responsibility	
of the company.	
<ul> <li>Madeline – purpose of the P&amp;C needs to be clear for the</li> </ul>	
companies as well as the intent for the auditor	
- Tulio – there is a limitation in the way the P&C was written. And	
the CB seem to focus on documentation review. Tend to	
avoid/minimise 'talking' with people. Essential to improve the	
social part. Eg: there needs to be a woman on the auditing team	
so they are also able to talk to women workers.	

<ul> <li>Social auditing : RSPO short history</li> <li>2007 RSPO Verification systems developed, enabling certification against P&amp;C</li> <li>2009 RSPO Complaints Panel established, supported by mediation from DSF</li> <li>2013 Commitments on No deforestation, No peat, No exploitation of communities, labourers and smallholders. This is essential as it's not necessarily included in the P&amp;C but companies took it on themselves.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Human Rights violations</li> <li>Number of complaints and other signals such as – HRs violations on RSPO certified plantations; number of researches flagging HR violations <ul> <li>Auditors have not picked up these adverse social impacts.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Conclusion: <ul> <li>Auditors have not been able to pick up on negative impacts of palm oil industries in the field of human rights.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Sub-group social auditing: Why, What and How?</li> <li>Objective: Good and consistent social auditing practices through strengthened social auditing mechanisms, proper recruitment, and well trained social auditors.</li> <li>Areas of focus <ol> <li>Improvement of certification mechanisms: TF quality assurance</li> <li>Strengthening oversight of Secretariat – to determine and keep record of the auditors who have gone through the trainings Pep – used to deliver the lead auditor course. Perhaps there is no registrar.</li> <li>Training development for lead &amp; social auditors on land rights, gender equality, labour, etc</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

<ul> <li>4. P&amp;C indicators, guidance, auditor checklist – P&amp;C Review <ul> <li>There are already recommendations from the Verite, Rainforest alliance and Cifor research.</li> <li>This is an opportunity for the review to ensure it goes beyond indicators. The standards need to evolve.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Deliverables: <ul> <li>[1<sup>st</sup> priority] Improved P&amp;C and guidance – need to ensure in terms of timeline to prioritise this action.</li> <li>Eg: FFB WG plan to submit recommendations by June (BoG meeting)</li> <li>Improved (meaningful) application of inclusiveness (should be 2<sup>nd</sup> priority)</li> <li>Policy guidance</li> <li>Influence the selection of social auditors. Also ensure improved</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Note: Also to link this discussion on trainings for CB. Need to discuss with Salahudin. Secretariat need to ensure that this WG is not	
performance evaluation MA – we need to provide the criteria for the selection of the Social Auditors (protocols; scope; who they are interviewing/sampling, etc] Gender Equality	'toothless'. To ensure that the decisions of this WG is channelled to the right person/group in the Secretariat.	
<ul> <li>A research on gender aspects in palm oil production was commissioned by Oxfam and conducted by CIFOR. RSPO and its tools are gender blind. Can be harmful and not conducive to women in the production cycle. More casual contracts then permanent contract.</li> <li>Missing out on child care and maternity leaves</li> <li>Health &amp; safety issues</li> <li>Land right issues.</li> <li>Missing out on trainings</li> </ul>		
Deliverable: need to be more focused.		

	i) Policy guidance;	Discussions and
	ii) Equal remuneration;	recommendations to be
	iii) Child care & Maternity;	communicated to
	iv) Equal access to resources;	Assurance TF.
	v) Increased participation in decision making.	
	• Suggestion to establish a fund – to promote initiatives at the company	
	level – empowering women in the business. The pros and cons of this	
	will be discussed later in the year.	
	FPIC sub-group	
	MC:-	
	• Where FPIC is concerned, don't think the main problem is with the	
	P&C.	
	• Problem is with the implementation and that would be most of the	
	work. The problem is does everyone understand their role in	
	relation to FPIC? And are the NI are taking into account the national	
	realities to give advise.	
	Actions since November	
	Training:	
	• FPP has submitted proposals and budgets for training for companies	
	and communities in 2015. The same is to be revised and	
	resubmitted.	
	• Revision to include training for the CBs as well.	
	<ul> <li>Trainings will be coordinated with the Assurance TF.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Next steps: edit text, agree budget, contract and carry out.</li> </ul>	
	FPIC Guide and chalk and talk videos	
	• FPIC Guide (2015) currently available in English and Bahasa	
	Indonesia and Spanish.	
	• It has now been translated into French but is yet to be published	
	• The 17 FPIC training videos (on show at RT14) have not yet been	
	given final edit.	
L		

· · · ·		
	<ul> <li>Information about if FPIC training videos are being made available in</li> </ul>	
	Bahasa Indonesia, French and Spanish is lacking.	same will be done
	FPIC during New Plantings Procedure:	
	<ul> <li>As part of (delayed) follow up to Resolution 6h (2015) on</li> </ul>	
	establishing mandatory requirements for assessments	
	<ul> <li>FPP asked to draft guidance for mandatory requirements for FPIC at</li> </ul>	
	NPP for CBs to use in verification	
	<ul> <li>Draft text sent by FPP for comments in December and no comments</li> </ul>	
	came back and instead we were invited to provide training during	
	the CB workshop. - Was this shared with this WG?	
	- Was send to the WG yesterday.	
	- Alwi – perhaps we can provide feedback as well.	
	No edits (yet?) suggested. FPP asked to provide training on same in	
	January.	
	Questions remain about late NPPs.	
	FPIC in Jurisdictional Approaches (JA):	
	<ul> <li>Draft FPIC text for Sabah being drafted by Jannie Lasimbang (JOAS).</li> </ul>	KV has already sent out
	What is the procedure to this? Will it be open for public	the message. Awaiting a
	consultation/comments?	positive response from
	<ul> <li>How will this be developed for the other jurisdictions like Seruyan,</li> </ul>	the FPIC WG in Sabah
	SumSel and Ecuador? Would like to discuss the procedure for local	
	interpretation.	
	<ul> <li>PG: the Sabah FPIC text needs to draw more from RSPO's</li> </ul>	
	experiences. It needs to be more consistent with RSPO	
	·	
	<ul> <li>Group resolved that we should ask that the Sabah text is shared</li> </ul>	
	with this group	
	Trial implementation	
	<ul> <li>GVL has kindly offered to host trial implementation of FPIC Guide in</li> </ul>	
	Liberia	

[	
	Stalled by lack of budget for CSOs to engage in process and oversight
	<ul> <li>How shall we develop budget for the CSO engagement?</li> </ul>
	Alwi – confirm this will still happen. Need to find the right space
	where it should be done.
	New Questions:
	Smallholders
	Kamini has asked if a simple FPIC guide for smallholders should be
	developed. I see the value of this, but I have two caveats
	Great care is needed to continue to adhere to the proper RSPO
	definition of smallholders. Ie Family farms under 50 ha <i>'where the</i>
	family provides the majority of labour and the farm provides the
	principal source of income.' (RSPO P&C 2013). This caution needs to
	be extended to the smallholders WG too.
	<ul> <li>1. Many small land holdings planted with palm may belong to local</li> </ul>
	land owners but are actually worked by outside labour and, so, are
	not smallholders by RSPO definition.
	2. Need to distinguish palm farmers on their own land from farmers
	who have acquired land (and so who require FPIC).
	Need discussion about FPIC Guide for these real smallholders and
	probably an engagement with the smallholders WG to work out
	what is the real need and how many smallholders are the RSPO
	actually dealing with?
	Progress report on Whistle-blowers sub-group
	Context:
	Resolution 6e (2016) requires HRWG and RSPO Secretariat to
	develop text for protecting HRDs (human rights defenders,
	whistleblowers, complainants and community spokespersons)
	during Q1 2017 for decision by Board by May 2017. This can feed
	into the P&C Review if there is a need.
	<ul> <li>HRWG took this into its draft work plan in RT14 meeting (in</li> </ul>
	expectation of adoption of 6e at GA)

		1	
	e to pool their information and for the		
work to start in the new yea	ar.		
Materials shared:			
	nsive dossier of relevant materials from		
<b>.</b> ,	and rapporteurs from NGOs and		
Company Policies. Sent a re	ading list of the materials.		
	early ready to be shared. Our lawyers		
are looking at it to ensure t	hat they are Human Rights compliant.		
Drafting Text:			
FPP is also drafting text setting out	proposed minimum requirements for		
RSPO members and for RSPO secret	ariat to protect HRDs		
Need to agree process on h	low to move ahead		
Labour Task Force			
Objectives:			
-	otection standards and processes and		
- · · ·	implementation and compliance among		
members			
	program that addresses the current gaps		
	the implementation challenges faced by		
different stakeholders	the implementation chaneliges faced by		
	nt to get out of this WG is a shared		
-	e situation of the workers while bearing		
-	s need to earn. We need to find that		
balance.	sheed to earn. We need to find that		
Tasks & Timeline:			
Year 1:			
Period	Task		
1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> Q	Assessment of level of compliance;		
	labor standards and protocols		
	guidance document		

3rd Q	Labour implementation guidance
	document; recommendations to
	training curriculum, criteria to
	accredit labour auditors; expansion
	of the certification methodology
	and scope
4th Q	Roll our of initial round of training
	courses and capacity building
	activities
Year 2:	
Period	Task
1st-2nd Q	Continuation of training courses
	and capacity building activities
3rd Q	Development of standard
	procedures for investigation and
	response within the complaints and
	DSF processes
4th Q	Formulate recommendations on
	various issues, e.g., worker
	representation, alternative
	livelihoods, and robust monitoring
	and oversight of labor-related
	concerns (BoG specific)
	i
Proposed compos	sition:
Lead	Daryll Delgado (Verite)
Growers	Musim Mas
	Wilmar or FGV
	Agro Palma, or someone
	Agropalma can nominate
	*Thai producer/smallholders group

		Processors/Traders	Cargill, or someone they can	
			nominate	
		Consumer Goods Manufacturers	Mondelez	
			Unilever	
		Retailers	M&S	
		Banks/Investors	Rabo Bank	
			HSBC	
		Social NGOs	Chris Wangkay (Oxfam - Indonesia)	
			Dr. Lanash Thanda (BCI/SEPA -	
			Malaysia)	
			Quinn Kepes (Verite – Latin	
			America)	
			Sandhi Elok (OPPUK - Indonesia)	
		Others stakeholders	ASI	
			CBs that are known to be well-	
			performing	
			Academic and investigative	
			researchers	
			Amnesty International	
			FinnWatch	
		Update on the Task force on Labour		
		TOR – can be adopted already		
		AE: you have the backup from the W		
		that there will be no more process ne		
		Criteria for the selection of TF memb		
			eb) because we want to move fast and	
		identify specific dates and we will cal		
	1	1	Lunch	·
4.	Action plans	Next steps		
			enda with regards to some of the work	
		with the sub-group, in this afternoon	we will be focusing on starting to work	

		through the tasks within that plan. So now we will cover the budget and start the breakout on subgroups today.		
		<b>Budget</b> – Sub-group need to tell us how much you need. KV will then work it into a budget and submit in April. Would be good to have it based on activities and specifics.		
		MC's for FPIC needs to be updated.		
		Budget needs to come in by 2 <sup>nd</sup> week of March but the earlier the better.		
		Contract – RSPO will contract directly based on invoices presented. It does not go through the WG. Indemnity responsibility under RSPO.		
		Ballpark the figures you need.		
		FPIC Training. Budget needs to be determined if it would fall under HRWG or in the Assurance.	check to see where the funding will come from for the FPIC trainings.	
		Other training - This group could plan the activities but perhaps the Secretariat can determine where the funds will be parked.		
5.	Discussion on definition of "local group"	The P&C explicitly state 'local people' and it was explicitly used for indigenous people later in the P&C and that was accepted into the revised P&C. it was an umbrella theme.		
		In purposes of land acquisition & grievance, the protection that the RSPO provides is the same for indigenous people, local communities. So you can't define who local people are because you are defining three different groups.		
		KV: the call for this definition was brought up during our technical meeting and we noted that there was no definition for this. If there could be a		

description and/or definition, we can use this in future documentation in the	
RSPO.	
Tulio:	
Concern is every time we have a definition, the concern would be what is	
not included in the definition? It may be too much work to RSPO to try and	
develop a definition we cannot apply globally without forgetting any local	
people outside this definition.	
Appreciates MC's evaluation. We could put a list of eventules in the	
Appreciates MC's explanation. We could put a list of examples in the	
glossary but it would be an example and we shouldn't limit it.	
PG:	
In the indicators and guidance does discuss this. In principle 2 it is there and	
it is clear. As a WG we need to determine what is clear and what isn't	
because I too share the same concerns as Tulio.	
MC: over-defining is a risk. See in 7.5 & 7.6 they used local peoples and	
somehow we didn't pick it up.	
KV: If not a definition, would we consider a description?	
PG: Why do we need this?	
i o. why do we need this:	
KV: For future documentation, we have technical definitions for everything	
and hence this came up. But you are right it is difficult to define. How do you	
get a guidance of what local people is?	
PG: Right now, talking from a grower's perspective, I don't think we are	
drawing lines, so for principles 2 and 7.5 and 7.6 it is clear whoever has the	
right, they go throughout the process. Right now we are not drawing lines.	
The reason for not having confusion is not clear. At least there is no	
confusion now. I don't think we need to fix something that is not broken.	

		MB: is the guidance clear enough?	
		<ul><li>MC: look at page 23 of the FPIC guide which has a page on this. Page 39 also has a discussion on user's rights. This should be enough. WG would state that this is sufficient. It is dependent on community by community. We cant define it. Comes down to mapping.</li><li>Decision: Not to limit the interpretation to a specific definition. Leave it open as it is currently. This could be defined more broadly and inclusively.</li></ul>	
		open us te is currently. This could be defined more broadly and inclusively.	
6.	Breakout Session Notes of meetings FPIC: Annex1 Social Audit: Anne Labour: Annex 3 Gender: Annex 4	s of Sub-groups will be annexed:-	
7.	FGV Presentation on Labour Issues in Malaysia By Azam Ishak & Puan Norida	<ul> <li>Objective: to share their initiatives with us and see how we could feed into this collaboration.</li> <li>Had a labour issue workshop. Gathered key industrial players, stakeholders including the government officials to participate.</li> <li>Have identified 3 Main Labour Issues in Malaysia and the Action Points in tackling these issues. The issues are:-prohibition of fees charged on foreign workers by contractors and labour suppliers;</li> <li>witholding passports by employers;</li> <li>prohibition of children at work.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>Discussion:</li> <li>Why FGV is here is to see if we can collaborate with them as the work they are doing here are similar to all in the industry.</li> </ul>	

		<ul> <li>Mel: we would like to include and reference your findings into</li> </ul>
		the review for resolutions. We would like the whole RSPO to
		look into this and see how we can move forward. Verite would
		also like to be part of the workshop as we can contribute to it.
		<ul> <li>Systematic way of engaging with the government. The MOHR</li> </ul>
		informed that there will be a long term legal review.
		<ul> <li>We will be in touch with them moving forward.</li> </ul>
8.	Agropalma's	Presentation focuses on Brazil.
	presentation on	Issues in PO sector:
	Human Rights	i) Degrading working conditions
	situation in	ii) Gender
	LATAM (Brazil)	- Culture – patriarchal ideology
		- Environment
		<ul> <li>Maternity – discrimination against hiring women</li> </ul>
		iii) Child labour
		iv) Slave labour
		<ul> <li>not just reducing capacity or forced labour. Also include degrading</li> </ul>
		conditions.
		<ul> <li>Also includes long working hours (modern slavery)</li> </ul>
		v) Migrant workers – esp undocumented
		Root causes
		ii) Lack of knowledge and management capacity
		iii) Lack of financial capacities, esp amongst smallholders
		iv) Lack training
		Big players
		i) Conflict between a company and indigenous company
		- Land dispute
		ii) State labour audits often carry out with big companies but not
		small companies
	•	

<u>г</u>	
	Brazil established an Association of Growers. The labour situation was
	deemed to be good initially. They then revised that after further
	consideration.
	<ul> <li>Started partnership with ILO consultants. Made a diagnosis – and</li> </ul>
	created indicators. The Association monitors members.
	<ul> <li>Supply chain – still revealed child labour/slave labour.</li> </ul>
	- Worked with ILO and other NGOs (incl Solidaridad)
	For Smallholders – they formed consortium.
	Gender issues:
	<ul> <li>Difficult to deal with gender issues. Perhaps best to start to address</li> </ul>
	in the company first and then be better able to guide the supply
	chain.
	- More balanced in middle level – 35% women.
	<ul> <li>First woman was promoted to senior management – in charge of</li> </ul>
	new planting; replanting; fertilization – team of 300 pax.
	<ul> <li>Trial quota – developed a team women harvesting (often women</li> </ul>
	involved in loose fruit collection – labour cost too high – productive
	too low.)
	This trial (100 women) used the same equipment as men but more
	in small holders.
	Perhaps long term – consider developing new tools or shorter trees.
	Also trying with machinery drivers.
	<ul> <li>Remuneration – for harvesting? Collective agreement – slightly</li> </ul>
	higher than minimum wage.
	- On average: women are 25-30% less productive than men. But for
	Agropalma there is already shortage of workers. So lower
	production is not a huge problem – otherwise the women will return
	to loose fruit harvesting.
	<ul> <li>Sexual harassment – human resources have special measures but</li> </ul>
	extremely sexist culture.
	<ul> <li>Company has an equality policy – equality in terms of wages.</li> </ul>
	- Facilities are not conducive for women.

9.	Other matters	<ul> <li>Grievance mechanisms – sexual harassment (yes); not necessarily other forms of gender related discrimination (no for wage discrimination). There is a policy and code of conduct – all forms of discrimination (including GBD) is prohibited. But no grievance channel.</li> <li>i) Developing the HR Policy</li> <li>Pep and Alex volunteered</li> <li>ii) To consider developing guidelines on ethical and fair recruitment practices</li> <li>Recruitment agencies</li> <li>iii) MB; There are many tools available online to help with the</li> </ul>	
		development of this and we should use this to aid our preparation.	
20.01.2	2017		
10	Action Plan Moving Forward	<ul> <li>Overarching Plan</li> <li>Policy development</li> <li>HR Defenders and Whistle Blowers Policy</li> <li>Human Rights Policy for companies</li> <li>Initial draft to be shared with Labour and Gender sub-groups.</li> <li>Note: Policy need to reflect on the ground realities</li> <li>First draft – 1<sup>st</sup> week of April</li> </ul> <b>Gender Equality</b> <ul> <li>Recommendations to the P&amp;C review process</li> <li>Aim to complete by 3<sup>rd</sup> week of March</li> <li>Input into existing policy development initiatives to ensure gender related principles and standards are incorporated</li> <li>Engage in the process of developing the HR Policy; FPIC; labour guidelines</li> <li>Develop gender specific guidelines for the ACOP</li> <li>To engage/collaborate with labour</li> </ul>	

<ul> <li>Establish a fund to support gender related initiatives at the community level</li> <li>To engage with the RSPO Smallholder Development Fund team</li> <li>Incorporating gender component into specific trainings</li> <li>FPIC</li> <li>Labour</li> <li>Certification</li> <li>Assurance</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Social Auditing <ul> <li>Recommendations for the P &amp; C review and head the overall HRWG submission for the P&amp;C Review task force</li> <li>Policy guidance for: <ul> <li>Training</li> <li>Auditors selection</li> <li>Making social auditing more inclusive</li> <li>Workshops for conducting meaningful social auditing</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li></ul>
Labour         • Assessment of level of compliance, labour standards and protocol guidance document         • Labour implementation guidance documents. Training curriculum, criteria for accreditation, labour auditors, expansion of certification methodology and scope:         • Roll out initial trainings         • Standard procedures for complaints and DSF procedures         • Continuation of training courses and capacity building         • Formulate recommendations on various issues:         • Worker rep         • Alternative livelihood         • Robust mentoring         • Oversight on labour related concerns

	<ul> <li>FPIC</li> <li>Training materials (collaboration with gender and labour) Note: would not necessarily involve smallholder</li> <li>Training</li> <li>Guidance on implementation of FPIC process - challenges</li> <li>Africa trial (GVL)</li> <li>P &amp; C review</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Tasks for Secretariat:</li> <li>Share updates and timeline for the review of the P &amp; C</li> <li>Tentative 3<sup>rd</sup> week of March for all recommendations to come in.</li> <li>To ensure that the whole HRWG will indicate approval of the recommendations before the same is submitted to the TF.</li> <li>Ensure summary of HRWG workplan is posted on the website</li> <li>Indicate names of the person's responsible for the implementation specific tasks</li> <li>Indicate timeline for completion of each tasks.</li> </ul>	
11. Next meeting	Physical meeting – 14 June 2017 in London	

## Annex 1:- FPIC

Present:

Marcus (sub-group chair) Alwi Hafiz Lim Sian Choo Lukita Wardhani

## 1. FPIC Training

We agree to modify the TORs as follows.

- i. We explain the advantages of having initially separated training days for communities and NGOs and Companies, in order give people a context where they feel confident to ask questions and not feel shy of exposing their lack of knowledge. It is likewise key to then have joint training and exchange sessions in order to give all parties the chance to then share views and explore issues of confusion or contention together. The aim is always to end up with a shared understanding of an adequate FPIC process. This process worked very well in the 2007-2008 trainings.
- ii. It is important to also involve CBs and Government officials as in many contexts companies need local government to understand the RSPO requirements.
- iii. Trainers from local CSOs should also be engaged as facilitators.

It is agreed that companies pay their own costs of attendance.

Action: MC to redraft proposal and budget accordingly.

2. Training videos

Kamini is asked to give us feedback on the uptake of videos. How much are they being used? It is agreed the videos should be made available in Spanish, French and Bahasa Indonesia.

3. FPIC in NPPs

Sub-group members to provide feedback on FPP's draft mandatory requirements for assessments asap and any comments can be passed to Assurance Task Force.

NPP was conceived for new acquisitions where companies are in a phased development of land so not all FPIC process is completed at the time of FPIC. It was agreed that there are a variety of scenarios where NPP is done later in the project cycle.

- Late planting on company's own land bank long after land acquisition.
- Acquisition of unplanted land from other company
- · Acquisition of 50% planted land from other company

More thought needs to be given to this in the NPP text.

4. FPIC Jurisdictional Approaches

As stated in wider group, local FPIC interpretations for Sabah, Seruyan, South Sumatra and Ecuador need to be subject to comment process to ensure consistency with P&C. This needs to be communicated to those leading Jurisdictional Approaches.

5. Trialling on FPIC Guide in Liberia

Agreed to go ahead. MC to include budget for CSO participation.

6. FPIC Guide for Smallholders

For scheme smallholders the standard P&C and FPIC Guide apply. For independent smallholders, where they are on their own land FPIC is not really an issue. It is agreed that there are confusing local scenarios where farmers acquire land from neighbours or indigenous peoples or others through the local land markets or through informal or customary land allocations. These local contexts will be very varied and a generic guide cannot usefully provide guidance suited to all occasions. It will be important to encourage the INA-NI FPIC group to keep in mind such scenarios

# 7. Next steps

MC to write up work plan in new format and submit to HRWG.

8. Date of next meeting of sub-group To coincide with wider HRWG meeting

## **Annex 2: Social Auditing**

## 1. P&C review

- 1.1 draft 0 to be drafted by MB
- 1.2 draft 0 to be and circulated by MB in the sub-group on 31/1 and to leads of sub-groups
- 1.3. discuss first draft: skype/conference call on 8/2 entire subgroup

1.4 inputs received from all sub-groups by 28/2

1.5 draft 1 to be finalised and signed off by entire HRWG and sent to Standing Committee before the deadline as to be communicated by SC.

1.5 links and lobby established with labour group, FPIC group and gender group, QA WG, Secretariat, Carl Bek Nielsen and other board members (in particular Johan Verburg and Paul Wolvekamp); Pep to play essential role in lobby

2. Draft policy guidance with regards to meaningful social auditing and training

2.1 Draft 0 to be drafted by MB April , exact date to be set

2.2. Draft 0 to be discussed in sub-group mid April, exact date to be set

2.3 Draft 1 to be signed off by entire working group, May, exact date to be set

2.4 Policy guidance on meaningful social auditing to be sent to QA group, Secretariat,

#### Annex 3: Labour

### Sub-Group Workshop Results:- Identification of priority issues for the labour standards and protocols guidance

### Identification of Priority Issues:-

- OSH: confirm which standards to use domestic legal as minimum on pesticides, OSH plan, awareness (4.6 to 4.8)
- SEIA: 6.1, 7 (NPP)
- 6.3. Clarity about the grievance mechanism's principles and elements
- 6.5. Expound on decent living wage, adequate housing/ water, etc, monitoring access to food
- 6.6. Parallel means of independent and free association; CBA should apply to migrant workers as well
- 6.7. Include guidance about children in the workplace (can pull up from old Guidance for Independent Smallholders under Group Certification): UNICEF, FSC standards or guidance for reference
- 6.8 and 6.9: non-discrimination and sexual harassment & abuse, specifically related to grievance mechanism
- 6.12: Forced labor and trafficking: recruitment fee, document retention (reference FLP)
- 6.13: Human rights policy and mechanism: (c/o Pep and Alex)
- How do we address worker training and documentation? (Reference Verite standards)

### Strategy:

- Maintain the principles, strengthen the criteria and deepen/ expand the indicators
- Gap analysis between P&C, POIG and FLP standards (Note: Wilmar has done a preliminary study; should follow up)

\*The document should be ready by 2nd or 3rd week of March.

### **Annex 4: Gender Equality**

### 1. P&C review

- 1.1 draft 0 to be drafted by MB
- 1.2 draft 0 to be and circulated by MB in the sub-group on 31/1 and to leads of sub-groups
- 1.3. feedback on draft 0 from entire subgroup by 17/2 via email
- 1.4 revised draft from MB for circulation on 24-2; this draft can only revised if strong substantiated objections
- 1.5 draft 1 to be finalised and signed off by entire HRWG and sent to Standing Committee before the deadline as to be communicated by SC.
- 1.6 links and lobby established with labour group, FPIC group and gender group, QA WG, Secretariat, Carl Bek Nielsen and other board members (in particular Johan Verburg and Paul Wolvekamp); Pep to play essential role in lobby
- 1.7 development elements on gender equality for FPIC trainings and labor trainings: planning to be undertaken, MB to be in touch with Marcus and Mel
- 1.8 Max 3 elements on gender equality identified to be reported on in ACOP; elements to be in line with indicators, first brainstorm in April, date to be set