



Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil

Approved Minutes

Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil 8th General Assembly (GA8)

Date: 8 March 2012

Venue: Ballroom, Crown Plaza Mutiara Hotel, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Start time: 2.00 pm (Kuala Lumpur)

Chair: Jan-Kees Vis, President of RSPO

Attendance: 353 Ordinary Members (59% of total 599 eligible to vote)

RSPO Secretariat

Affiliate members and observers

- Agenda:**
1. Members' roll call
 2. Opening address and report by the RSPO President, Mr. Jan-Kees Vis
 3. To confirm minutes of the last General Assembly held on 11 November 2010
 4. To receive and adopt the Report and Audited Accounts of the RSPO Treasurer
 5. To discuss and adopt resolutions:
 - a) Appointment of Auditors
 - b) New vision and mission statements for the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil
 - c) To amend statutes on items related to the RSPO General Assembly and Extraordinary General Assembly
 - d) Proposal to amend statutes on items related to the RSPO General Assembly (Title-1)
 - e) Proposal to amend statutes on items related to the RSPO General Assembly (Title-2)
 - f) Protecting multistakeholder representation at the General Assembly
 - g) Direct voting for the President of RSPO by the membership & limitation to maximum of two terms of presidency
 - h) Enhancing the institutional governance of RSPO
 - i) Protecting multistakeholder decision-making in RSPO
 - j) Moratorium on RSPO certification
 - k) No RSPO support for offset-mechanisms
 - l) Creation of new category of ordinary membership for 'transnational companies and organisations'
 - m) Request for all RSPO ordinary members to submit time bound plans
 - n) Elimination in the use of Paraquat and adoption of integrated

weed management

6. To elect Executive Board members for the following categories:
 - a) Oil palm growers (Rest of the World and Smallholders) – 2 seats
 - b) Palm oil processors and Traders – 1 seat
 - c) Consumer Goods Manufacturers – 1 seat
 - d) Retailers – 1 seat
 - e) Banks and Investors – 1 seat
 - f) Environmental and Conservation NGOs – 1 seat
 - g) Social NGOs – 1 seat
7. Any other business

1. Members' roll call

The 8th Annual General Assembly of RSPO members was called to order at 2.00 pm on March 8, 2012 in Crown Mutiara Plaza Hotel, Kuala Lumpur, by The President of RSPO Mr. Jan Kees Vis who presided over the meeting after the minimum requirement of quorum of 50% of Ordinary Member attendance was reached.

2. Opening address and Report by the RSPO President

Jan Kees Vis (President and Chair) gave an overview of progress and challenges over the year:

Membership

- As of the previous week, membership numbered 699, which includes 599 ordinary members and 100 affiliate members.
- In 2011 the membership increased from 384 ordinary members to 549, at the end of 2011. An additional 50 ordinary members have registered, thus far, in 2012. This brings the total number of members in RSPO to 699 (599 ordinary members and 100 associate members) There is a split in the different membership categories. There are also changes within different constituencies. One member from Oil Palm Growers has left, and another has joined. One member from Environmental and Conservation NGOs has left, and there are two nominations for replacement. The processors and traders are now the largest category with 213 members followed by consumer goods manufacturers which had a big growth in 2011 with 205. The growers are 103.
- There are still issues on membership payment. Some memberships have been terminated and more information on that can be found on websites. The ones who are in arrears with payment have been listed, and the Secretariat is following up on that.

Composition of the RSPO Executive Board

The Executive Board will remain unchanged, with the exception of:

- GAPKI is stepping down from Oil Palm Growers with only one candidate nominated for replacement which is Edi Suhardi representing a caucus of Indonesian growers.

- Voting for the Executive Board seat will be done in the Environmental and Conservation NGOs group to vote between Conservation International (CI), Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil Foundation (ISPO) and Borneo Rhino Alliance (BORA).

Standing committee on Certification and Standards Trading, Traceability and Communications and Claims

- The latest information on the RSPO website with regards to certification of production states that there are 139 mills certified, 5.5 million tons of CPO from just over 1 million hectares.
- There is national interpretation for a range of countries and in process there still is Ecuador, Guatemala, Nigeria and the smallholder standards for PNG.
- Local indicators were developed for Daabon, Agropalma and for Ivory Coast.
- Supply and sales numbers for February were not yet up on the website this morning.
- Demand in the market is lagging behind the production, with market uptake being on average just above 50%.
- 156 companies have applied for trade and traceability supply chain certification and 305 facilities have been certified so far; a reviewed supply chain certification system document has been issued.
- The RSPO.org website is going to be revamped soon and then the RSPO.eu website will be merged into it.
- A 'How to start' web tool has been developed and launched in 5 languages.
- The global communication strategy has been finalized with our communications partner Hill & Knowlton, with specific communication strategies for Europe, India and China.
- The communication guidelines have been reviewed and approved by the EB prior to RT9 in November last year and are now on the website.
- 38 licenses for the trademark were issued and there are several products in the market already carrying the RSPO trademark.

Challenges and future actions

- The market pool for certified sustainable palm oil needs to be increased. More companies need to turn their commitments into concrete demands in the market. We must push ahead with the execution of our global communications strategy.
- The 1st meeting of the Steering Group for the P&C review has taken place and now a task force will be created. The composition of the task force has been agreed and they will be invited to join two meetings which will happen during the year. The next RT is earlier than usual at the end of October or early November so there will be a month less for the P&C review than originally expected.
- Transparency with the Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil regulations needs to be managed to ensure that it is easy for the Indonesian growers to know once they have complied with one of the standards what they need to do in order to comply with the other standards.
- The investment in smallholder organizations needs to be followed through as it was always the intention of RSPO to use some of the royalty fees from the trade and certified sustainable palm

oil to invest in programs to help smallholder production get certified. This will continue, as well as investment in the dispute settlement facility which is now up and running to support people who are involved in land conflicts.

3. Confirmation of Minutes of the last General Assembly held on 11 November 2010

The President requested the General Assembly to confirm minutes page by page and to raise their hands for any comments. There were no comments or objections to the minutes.

Confirmation of GA7 Minutes	Approved
------------------------------------	-----------------

4. Report and Audited Account of RSPO Treasurer

Tim Stephenson (AAK, Treasurer) summarised the Treasurer's report:

Organisational structure development

- There is now a more professional internal financial function with an international accounting firm as auditors and tax advisers. This is close to a corporate structure which has a more permanent feel and the potential to accommodate expansion. The RSPO continues to strive for transparency in financial reporting, compliance with local laws and continuous improvement as well as a more professional approach. The secretariat is considering reinforcing its capability with appropriate recruitment.
- The RSPO organizational structure has changed a little. Since the last meeting the shareholding structure of the company has been simplified. Rather than shares being held by individuals on trust for the RSPO, the RSPO is itself now the 99% shareholder in RSPO Secretariat Sdn Bhd with 1% held on trust. The RSPO Indonesian liaison office known as RILO performs the same function on a smaller scale in Indonesia and it is currently being registered as a regional representative office.

Audited accounts for the year ending 30th June 2011

- Full audited accounts have been distributed to all members along with the GA8 agenda. For the first time the audit was carried out by the RSPO's new auditors Price Waterhouse Coopers.
- The surplus for the year was just over RM1 million. Income was up significantly on the previous year based on higher membership numbers and also significantly higher income from royalties from trading, being certificate trading, mass balance and segregated supply chain.
- Profit from RT8 in Jakarta was down compared to the previous year but this was a period of some turbulence in the Secretariat with a temporary Secretary-General. In the circumstances making a profit at all from RT8 was perfectly good.

- Costs were also up for a number of reasons: there were more and higher-paid employees in the Secretariat, communication costs were higher mainly due to contracting of a communications provider, and other costs were also up partly due to some old and unpaid subscriptions written off and partly due to exceptional consultancy and recruitment cost.
- Project expenses amounted to RM2.1 million with the biggest cost being the Greenhouse Gas Working Group and the Palm Oil Producers Support Initiatives. A full breakdown of the project cost incurred in the year area is included in the accounts.
- Overall there is a surplus before tax of RM1.1 million which is about right for maintaining reserves of 1 year's running cost as per the stated policy of the EB. Net assets equating to reserves rose to RM6.6 million during the year. Fixed assets are relatively small comprising mainly office equipment; subscriptions outstanding have increased in line with income and comprise about 4 months' worth of income.
- Deferred income comprises subscription relating to the period after 30th of June 2011. Other accruals were mainly related to projects. The biggest asset is cash which has risen to a healthy RM7.8 million.

Questions raised in November 2011 at RT9

- A terminology issue, in which the trading account in the income was referred to as donations. This is an error and will be changed in this year's accounts.
- Some concern was expressed at the relatively high level of bad debts in the year which amounted to about RM535,000. This amount included a number of old outstanding debts of businesses which have been merged to others or ceased to exist, and to some extent is a clear-out. However old and unpaid subscriptions still continue to be a concern and the Secretariat is tasked with vigorously chasing these debts.
- There was a request from Faizal Parish (Global Environmental Center) on a note to the accounts on the taxation liability requesting more detail which will be included in this year.
- RILO budget costs seem low for the current year but this is mainly due to accounting for RILO on a cash basis as funds are forwarded to Indonesia. It does not indicate a reduction in RILO activities.

Budget 2011/2012

- The EB budgeted for a significant rise in income from increased membership and income from trading. Costs are budgeted to increase the strength of the Secretariat further and fill gaps in the organizational structure.
- RM1.7 million was budgeted for communications outreach particularly relating to communication initiatives in developing markets.
- Project cost was budgeted for an increase to RM3.8 million including a number of different projects and continuation of POPSI and Greenhouse Gas Projects, project for smallholders and some dispute settlement facilities in conjunction with OXFAM, P&C review and a project to leverage the UN's REDD program and several others.

- According to the unaudited management accounts for 31st December the surplus before taxation for the previous 6 months is RM3 million, about RM2.7 million ahead of budget.
- Income is 1 million ahead and trading income at 1 dollar per tonne is now the main source of income for the RSPO. Income looks to be heading towards at least RM10 million for the year as a whole.
- There is a surplus of RM600,000 on RT9; operating costs of RM1 million are below budget with little of the planned communications expenditure on outreach having yet been incurred. Project costs are also below budget.
- According to the balance sheet at 31st December the surplus in the previous 6 months has increased net assets to RM8.7 million. Net assets and liabilities have increased in proportion to income and expenses.
- Outstanding subscriptions are up more significantly with some issues needing to be resolved.
- Cash has increased to RM10.6 million.
- The establishment of a separate fund to facilitate certification for smallholders, which was proposed by the EB in November, will be further discussed at the EB meeting tomorrow. The surplus of RM3 million for the first six months of the financial year does not yet reflect that proposal.
- Secretariat resources, both quality and quantity, will be increased to match the increase in the size of the organization. There will be a higher priority for financial planning linked to strategic and operational planning on completion of compliance reviews in particular relating to Malaysian taxation, the RILO structure, internal controls and project management.

The Chair then asked if there were any questions or comments for the Treasurer from the floor. The following questions were raised:

Mr. Faizal Parish (Global Environmental Center): On the tax liability, in addition to having a note in the future account it would be useful to have some feedback of how tax liabilities are being reduced. Also, it would be useful if the budget could be circulated before future GAs.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) agreed that it was a good suggestion to send out the budget with the invitation to the GA.

Tim Stephenson (Treasurer): With respect to the tax issue, Price Waterhouse Coopers are now our advisers on taxation and we are seeking to minimize the amount of taxation we have to pay. Our situation is that for now we are registered as a taxable body within Malaysia but according to our advisers the taxation liability relates to income which does not derive from members which is a relatively small part of the whole income of the RSPO and even that income is offset-able with a proportion of expenses relating to it. Given all those points our taxation liability is not enormous but we constantly try and keep it to a minimum. We would rather spend our money on objectives rather than taxes.

Mr. Chandran (Platinum Energy): Another question on the tax, page 15. I notice that the tax effect of income not subjected to tax is 2.15 million whereas the subscription income for last year was 3.975 million; if subscription income is not taxable then I can't see the offset being aligned. If you look at Notes to the Taxation no. 8, income not subject to tax is shown as 2.149 whereas the actual subscription income was 3.9 and can you just explain that please?

Tim Stephenson (Treasurer): I think that is a net number actually. I can't provide an immediate answer but I am happy to deal with it separately.[See further explanatory comment below]

Mr. Chandran (Platinum Energy): I just want to know because it does happen with other associations. Some of the subscription incomes may not be taken as for tax offset. The nature of the subscription income is the issue here. This is something I think we need to pursue with PWC because in my view as Faizal has said all our subscription income should not be taxable.

Tim Stephenson (Treasurer): That is my understanding as well and in addition to that, income from the roundtable meeting where a large proportion of the income is derived from members would also not be taxable. Anything deriving from members should not be taxable and the only taxable elements are of those that do not derive from members, for instance some trading income.

The Chair then asked if there were any further questions or comments from the floor. As there were no questions, he asked if there were any objections to the audited accounts. As there were no objections, the report was approved.

Approval of audited accounts	Approved
-------------------------------------	-----------------

5. Resolutions

There were fourteen resolutions to vote on in this GA. The Chair explained that as no ballot papers had been received for this purpose, voting for the first resolution would be done by a show of hands. The voting result and discussion is as follows:

Resolution 6a – Appointment of auditors

As there were no comments from the floor, the resolution was put to the vote without discussions

Appointment of Auditors	Adopted	
To confirm the appointment of PriceWaterhouseCoopers as the auditors of the RSPO for the financial year ending 30 June 2012.	For	332
	Against:	0
	Abstain:	2

Resolution 6b – New vision and mission statements for the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil

The Chair explained that this was a resolution that was submitted by the EB because it represented the outcome of a strategy retreat that RSPO organized in July last year. The Chair called for a vote on the resolution and noted that the number of votes had now increased from 334 to 350.

New vision and mission statements for the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil	Adopted	
Vision statement: “RSPO will transform markets to make sustainable palm oil the norm” Mission statement: “To advance the production procurement finance and use of sustainable palm oil products to develop, implement, verify, assure and periodically review credible global standards for the entire supply chain of sustainable palm oil to monitor and evaluate the economic, environmental and social impacts of the uptake of sustainable palm oil in the markets and to engage and commit all stakeholders throughout the supply chain including governments and consumers.”	For:	320
	Against:	29
	Abstain:	0

1 vote was spoilt.

Resolution 6c - To amend statutes on items related to the RSPO General Assembly and Extraordinary General Assembly

The Chair explained that there were a number of resolutions with suggestions to change the requirements for a quorum at the GA in a number of different ways which showed that there was no

unanimity in the EB on how to best do that. In November last year the quorum was not met which incurred considerable expense and considerable trouble for members to come again to Kuala Lumpur to spend a day with RSPO. As membership growth continues the GA needs to be organized in such a way that the RSPO can continue to function. It is essential that there is a GA that can actually meet and that there are enough members in the room to be able to take legally valid decisions. There are a number of different resolutions on how to change this statute in relation to the quorum, but a large number of RSPO members supported the resolution to reduce the quorum to 80 members with no weighting of different constituency in the quorum requirements. This number can always be reached and doesn't exclude anybody from attending so the multi-stakeholder nature of the GA is assured because everybody is free to come to the GA as a voting member.

Mr. Chew Jit Seng (Genting Plantations): While the idea behind this is good and we want to ensure that there is enough quorum for the GA, if we look at the clause which is added there at the bottom it says that if a quorum referred to the above is not present within one hour etc. and then if it is adjourned to another future date not less than seven days at such adjourned GA if the quorum is still not present then the members present shall constitute the quorum. There is some concern about this because what happens if it does not actually reflect the others, RSPO's multi-stakeholder participation and principles of RSPO in terms of decision-making.

Jan Kees Vis (Chair): Everybody has the right to be present at the GA and it has always been the case that all constituencies have always been present at all the GAs that the RSPO has organized so far. The point is if for whatever reason there is no quorum present as what happened in November, we would have serious problems because we can't agree on the financial policies, we can't agree on the budget, we can't re-elect board members, and there was no provision in the old statutes what to do in case RSPO did not reach a quorum and so we have added that proposal in the second time around and this is in line with Swiss law under which RSPO operates. Actually you don't need a quantified quorum requirement in your statutes. Those members that are interested in the functioning of the association will come to the GA, and those are therefore the ones that will have the rights to supervise the actions of the board.

Mr. Chew Jit Seng (Genting Plantations): We understand that very well but the concern is also about whether we are actually looking for expediency in terms of convening the GA or the EGM rather than credibility of RSPO. Those are issues that have been discussed and some of us think the credibility issue is a bigger concern than the expediency.

Jan Kees Vis (Chair): All I can say is if there are items on the agenda that are of interest to you then you should attend the GA and you have the right to do so and make your voice heard.

Mr. Faizal Parish (Global Environmental Center): There was significant discussion on this by the EB prior to this proposal and our perspective which I think is shared by some others, is that we are looking for a simple system which is easy to implement, easy to operate. We like most of the other groups in RSPO want or value RSPO as a multi-stakeholder forum and the history of the organization has shown that all stakeholder groups do turn up at GA meetings. Our only concern is that we don't want it to be a mandatory requirement for everyone to show up in which case there would be the option of certain groups boycotting and blocking consensus, blocking agreement, blocking a meeting from carrying on. The quorum should not be something which is the cause of failure of RSPO's business. We have to keep the organization going, and to use technicalities such as quorum as something to prevent the positive discussion and the way forward is not the right way. The way to bring concerns to RSPO is to voice them through resolution and discussion at the GA and not as a way later to use the quorum as an issue to stop

the GA from happening. This is why we feel a simple figure like 80 is an achievable figure and I am sure all the stakeholder groups will make the effort to be present in that case.

Jan Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker and agreed that to mandate in the quorum presence per constituency would introduce the possibility for any constituency to boycott the GA and cripple the association.

Mr. Frank Davauder (Asia): I don't find the number of 80 very ambitious and I think you should look at what has been in the last five years and take the average of that and take that 90% and raise your quorum every year. If you want to be a successful organization you have to involve your members.

Jan Kees Vis (Chair): As an association you have to go through all kinds of legal proceedings to change the quorum every year. So we have taken the point of view of those who submitted these resolutions that since the principal task of the GA is to supervise the board that we pick a multiple of the number of board seats as the quorum. 80 may not seem ambitious but there are much larger associations that have quorum requirements that are far lower than this. We looked for a reasonable minimum, expecting to always have more than double the number of voices and votes in the room.

Mr. Frank Davauder (Asia): With that maybe you should look at how you organize the GA. Maybe you have to do video conferencing so that you draw more people so that we don't have to travel half the world.

Jan Kees Vis (Chair): There are certain legal issues to teleconferencing in GA so legally that is not possible but normally of course we have the GA after the Roundtable conference so everybody is already in the place when we have the GA.

Speaker from the floor: Then have it after either the Bali conference or the Price Outlook Conference. A lot of the people in the industry are here anyway.

Jan Kees Vis (Chair): I don't agree with that comment as the participation in Roundtable conferences has been impressive. There have been conferences with 800-1000 participants.

The Chair called for a vote on the resolution.

To amend statutes on items related to the RSPO General Assembly and the Extraordinary General Assembly	Adopted	
Reduce the quorum to 80 members with no weighting of different constituency in the quorum requirements.	For	263
	Against:	85
	Abstain:	2

Resolution 6d: Proposal to amend statutes on items related to the RSPO General Assembly (Title-1)

Jan Kees Vis (Chair) explained that the resolution was proposed by Unilever and Sawit Watch and it is an attempt to reflect the multi-stakeholder aspect and the nature of RSPO in the simplest way possible. A vote for this resolution would mean that statutes would be amended to require at least one member of each sector present at the RSPO GA and if a sector decides not to come because they are not interested in the agenda then the meeting is still valid. However, it would add perhaps to the concern that some have about the multi-stakeholder nature in an unweighted quorum of 80.

Olivier (SIPEF): I have two questions. First I do not really understand the language on the vote for section B. It says the statute here will be amended to state that the failure to have a membership sector unrepresented would deem the assembly incorrect. I am not sure maybe my English is not good enough but I have the impression that it is not sensible. Second, I would like to clarify what is the sector, is it the growers sector, is it the Malaysian Growers sector, the Indonesian Growers sector or the smallholder sector?

Jan Kees Vis (Chair) agreed that the speaker was correct: There is a double negative in here that shouldn't be there. B should read, "the statute will be amended to state that the failure to have a membership sector represented a failure to have a membership sector represented would deem the assembly in court." A sector, we have seven membership sectors so the growers are one sector, processors and traders are one sector but you are right it should be a representative under B.

Gert Vandersmissen (Vice-President IV): Just a clarification on the sector, so if you say it is growers that means if one representing the rest of the world is there and none of the Indonesians and Malaysians are, we still have a quorum?

Jan Kees Vis (Chair): Yes that is how it is currently in the statutes.

Gert Vandersmissen (Vice-President IV): OK because we want to avoid that for example if we are as a minority people are not there but we can still represent the growers so that is growers is one of the three representatives.

Jan Kees Vis (Chair): Because you have four seats on the board.

Gert Vandersmissen (Vice-President IV): OK. If one of the four is there, it's ok.

Mr. Simon Lord (NBPOL): So how are you going to get round the double negative? Are you changing this resolution and is that acceptable? I thought what we said is that if the resolution is put before or it must be taken as read we have in the past struck out resolutions where there have been issues because we had a double negative in it. Because it actually isn't giving what you want it to do. I am just wondering how we handle that.

Jan Kees Vis (Chair): Well it is a grammatical mistake. I think we are allowed to improve on mistakes in grammar.

Mr. Faizal Parish (Global Environmental Center): I just note on the last paragraph of the resolution on page 2 of 2. It says a vote against this resolution will mean quorum requirements will be indicated as indicated by the RSPO statute. It cannot be that if we vote against this that we are reversing the first vote and going back to the RSPO statutes. So that should also be struck out.

Jan Kees Vis (Chair): We have no resolution that suggests changes to the statutes in relation to the quorum. So depending on which one is adopted we need to change the statutes accordingly. Resolution 6c and d are not mutually exclusive. They can both be adopted.

Mr. Faizal Parish (Global Environmental Center): But 6c does not have such a statement. It would be better to say that quorum requirement would not be changed by this resolution; it may be changed by other resolutions. It is just that the current wording implies that voting against 6d will negate the position on 6c.

Jan Kees Vis (Chair): The last paragraph could have been deleted as well; if the resolution is not carried then nothing changes so it doesn't mean much.

The Chair called for a vote on the resolution.

Proposal to amend statutes on items related to the RSPO General Assembly (Title-1)	Rejected	
To require the presence of all constituencies in a quorum required for General Assembly and Extraordinary General Assembly. Proposed by Unilever and Sawit Watch	For	130
	Against:	211
	Abstain:	6

There were 3 spoilt votes for this resolution.

Resolution 6e: Proposal to amend statutes on items related to the RSPO General Assembly (Title-2)

Jan Kees Vis (Chair) gave the background to the resolution: This proposal asks you to choose between two options for multi-stakeholder requirements in the quorum. Option 1 is to add a requirement to the quorum that at least two members per constituency have to be present. Option 2 uses a formula which weighs the number of members per constituency that have to be present on the basis of the number of members in that constituency. So if we have a quorum of 80 then we should look at the question in that case in view of the number of retailers, the number of social NGOs that we have, how many retailers, how many social NGOs should be present in order to meet the quorum? Unilever and Sawit Watch have written this resolution in an attempt to show how complicated life would become if we were to use a formula that weighs the presence per constituency because I would imagine that for a smaller constituency like banks and social NGOs we would need half a member or maybe even less but the point is it is complicated enough to count the number of votes in the room, the number of proxies that people carry etc, etc. If you move towards a weighted presence then you make life more complicated than it already is and secondly if you don't have at the same time the right to waive the presence in a GA you have to endure the possibility to veto GA by not showing up.

Dato' Mamat: This resolution looks a bit odd because there is no avenue for 'against'. You've got to be 'for' and you've got to choose either Option 1 or Option 2. So this is a resolution you cannot vote against;

it is a 'for' and either 1 or 2. That is like an election where there is only that candidate and you cannot go against. I don't know maybe there is some logic behind it. Can the Secretariat explain?

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair): If you are not in favor of either you can abstain from voting.

Mr. Chew Jit Seng (Genting Plantations)Chew Jit Seng (Genting Plantations): I am not an expert in the votes and in the voting processes but normally as we understand it the resolutions would need to have a clear 'yes' vote and a clear 'no' vote and also an abstention. So if you say that if you are voting for 'no', you go for abstention, actually there is an overlap in the option. Every resolution should have 'yes' votes, 'no' votes and abstention, so that you have 3 choices. At the moment we only have 'yes' votes and abstention but we don't have 'no' votes – abstention doesn't mean that you vote against it - it just means that you are not voting, you don't have an option, you don't have an opinion on it but in this case there is no room for people to vote against this but only to either vote 'for' or to abstain.

Tim Stephenson (Treasurer): Isn't it true that that this resolution really goes back to the previous one. If the previous one is voted down and that we don't need individuals to be present from each category then this one becomes moot, but if the previous one is carried then that means you definitely need at least one person from each category to be present and then with this resolution it just becomes a question of whether you need it to be just two or you need a full proportion. So I think it needs to be taken together and then it allows or follows some logic.

Mr Simon Lord (NBPOL): I have to agree with both Chew Jit Seng and Dato' Mamat. I think this leads to a bad start to start putting something like this together and I think it is wrong not to have a 'for' or 'against'. I think it should have been split into two resolutions; that would make the process a little bit longer but you could do a 'for' or 'against'. Simply abstaining means that there would be a lower number voting 'against'; it will not affect the outcome and I think this is a bad move to put resolutions into this format and I really would not encourage it in the future.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker.

Dato' Mamat: I think in relation to resolution 6c that this requires mandatory in terms of absolute figure or percentage. In case I don't want it to be mandatory or compulsory I revert to the 1st one. It still can stand alone.

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA): Yes, I think I would have to agree generally with the idea that a resolution must be clearly stated and must be able to stand alone. I think if there was an intention that this resolution had to relate to any other resolution then that should have been made explicit within the resolution, which it is not, and I think not to allow an 'against' vote is actually denying the membership the opportunity to say something which it should be able to say.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) announced that according to the results of the voting for Resolution 6d the resolution was rejected, making Resolution 6e null and void. Unilever and Sawit Watch withdraw Resolution 6e and it will not be put to the vote.

Proposal to amend statutes on items related to the RSPO General Assembly (Title-2)	Withdrawn
<p>Choose between two options for multi-stakeholder requirements in the quorum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) At least two members per constituency have to be present ii) A formula which weighs the number of members per constituency that have to be present on the basis of the number of members in that constituency. <p>Proposed by Unilever and Sawit Watch</p>	<p>No vote</p>

Resolution 6f: Protecting multistakeholder representation at the General Assembly

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA) presented the resolution on behalf of the MPOA and Indonesian growers: The resolution has been prepared and is presented here at the GA in order to reaffirm the fact that the RSPO is a multi-stakeholder platform and we believe it should unambiguously remain so. However we think that the multi-stakeholder nature of RSPO is vulnerable and we think it is vulnerable because of the discussions such as the one that we just had about whether or not every stakeholder within the association should be allowed the opportunity to speak and that should become mandatory. We think that the bylaws and the statutes should guarantee that multi-stakeholder participation is always protected and we think this because every membership category has different interests and different concerns, and for that reason they must all, every category, be present at every GA. They must do this in order to protect and represent their own interest. The number of members from each category in a GA relative to members from any other category should also at least reflect the size of that category within the entire membership of the RSPO. We believe that the position of having only one member from any particular category will not be reflective of the size and stature of that category within the association as a whole. And we think the fairest way to represent whole membership of RSPO on a smaller scale is proportionate representation. Bearing that in mind, MPOA proposes that this GA accept that in order for a GA to be valid and legitimate, it must always have a representation from every member category and that reflects the true multi-stakeholder nature of RSPO and that any quorum of GA lower than 50% of the total membership which would represent a simple majority of the entire membership should proportionately represent the whole membership of RSPO by constituency, and the effect of this is every constituency may rest assured that they will always be fairly represented as a proportion of the GA and this therefore applies to the entire membership of the association as a whole.

Mr. Faizal Parish (Global Environmental Center): I think all of us support multi-stakeholder involvement but it is not clear to me from the wording of this resolution how this will be put into effect, how will the proportionate representation of members be done and is that effectively saying if one group has too many coming then they will be asked to leave, in order to get the proportions right. Can you just clarify how this would work operationally because it is not spelled out in the resolution.

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA): I think the calculation and the formula that would be used would be very much according to what would have been Option 2 had the previous resolution been tabled and I think that would actually represent the minimum level and were more represented within the GA from any particular category then anyone who has an interest in any item in the agenda should be able to attend the GA. So I think the RSPO should not and would not turn away any member who felt that they should be at the GA even if that was in excess of the minimum number that was set.

Speaker: That is not what it says at the moment. It says that each category is capped at a certain number of votes in relation to the number of members they have.

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA): I don't think it says "capped".

Speaker: "It must proportionately represent", that means capped if you have too many.

Mr. Zainuddin (Sime Darby): The way I interpret this resolution, it states that to arrive at a quorum we have to have say 80 members as given earlier, and that 80 is split into percentage of sectors' minimum for the quorum to be effective. The reason for this I would say is mainly to reach consensus because once you have got good representation from the different sectors then you will see that the consensus would be reached.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker and asked if Puvan had anything else to add.

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA): That is absolutely right. That is what it says. It says the quorum is capped.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair): Or it is actually the last sentence in bold that says you suggested the effect of this is all constituencies in RSPO will always be represented in proportion at the GA which is something else than the second bullet point of the actual resolution which is the minimum requirement as in the last sentence has a different meaning than the actual requirement.

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA): I concede that it is obviously in the same manner as the double negative in the previous resolution. Obviously the meaning in this case is a quorum.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) recommended that just as with the double negative that was pointed out, this error should be pointed out as well.

Mr. Simon Lord (NBPOL): I think we get very confused between consensus, multi-stakeholder and what the GA does which is vote. At the GA we don't reach consensus, we actually reach a majority decision of all our stakeholders, all those stakeholders who have been able to physically be present or be present through a third party or indeed through a postal proxy. What worries me is if you start to have proportional representation in any shape or form what happens is that the smallest single group can deny the voting rights of the majority by simply abstaining from entering the room. This is not a 'for' or 'against', not an abstention, each of which gives a clear signal to the RSPO and the EB as the way the body general which is to proceed. What we and the rest of the world are concerned about as a small group is that we could hold to ransom the entire GA should a resolution be put forward that we thought was detrimental to our particular category. By simply not turning up, you can use any formula that you want, but it will boil down to one or two people having to be physically present in that room, and we can prevent the majority reaching a decision and I think we should never ever get into a situation where we deny the democratic right of a volunteer organization to vote. Therefore we are very strongly against any proportional representation as a requirement for a GA.

Speaker from the floor: I was going to express the same concerns that this resolution opens the window for any group to hold the whole organization to ransom.

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA): I agree this is indeed a concern. I also agree and believe that there is a greater concern that the majority will outstrip the rights of the minority and that is as difficult for me to swallow as an institution like RSPO moving forward as the position that you have outlined, and in fact I think it is more likely that the majority will and have always had the tendency through the rule of democracy to trample on the rights of the minority and that is the problem that we are trying to overcome here because I do not believe that RSPO is a democracy. At every other level of RSPO we do not take votes; why then should we reserve the luxury of a vote on a quorum that does not necessarily represent the majority. And I think what we make clear in this resolution is if you maintain the 50% quorum we are very happy to not have proportionate representation. However once you reduce from the 50% number then you open yourself to who exactly is in the room, where the room is, whether they can get to that room, whether the forms had been sent out at the right time and they are in full knowledge of what is being discussed and if they are not then decisions will be passed that will affect them. And in that case your only response for them is to leave the association. Now is that how RSPO wishes to operate? That you say to the small people: "If you don't like it, leave"?

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair): We now need to look at the total governance structure in RSPO because I think what Puvan just said is only half of the truth. For instance we have agreed that we will not make changes to the P&C through resolutions in the GA. We have agreed in all Standing Committees although there is a resolution to change that, in all Standing Committees, in all working groups, in all task forces RSPO takes decision by consensus. And review of P&C should always go through the agreed RSPO multi-stakeholder model, the RSPO way of working and by doing that we ensure that there are no resolutions potentially entered into the GA that can trample the interest of the minority. We have decided that when we created the statutes to not reach a decision by consensus in the GA. The GA is the only body in RSPO where we do not work through a consensus but where we work through votes. For some cases you have to be able to reach a decision to protect the rights of all the constituencies by working through consensus in all other bodies in RSPO and that has worked so far; has worked I think for all constituencies and I see no reason to introduce the possibility that a minority hijacks the entire association by introducing a mandatory requirement per constituency. You have to look at the total governance model to see the value of the fact, that 1: there is a GA, 2: you don't need a big quorum in the GA, 3: you need to be able to take decisions in a GA.

Mr. Simon Lord (NBPOL): I am not aware of any minority group that has ever raised an issue with the RSPO, EB or indeed the working Groups that have organized the RT that they have not been able to attend for whatever reason. Secondly I agree with Jan Kees that it is about the overall governance structure and I think your words slightly are at odds with the next resolution where you say you want to remove the consensus model from some of our working groups. Having consensus with sustained objection ensures that the minority groups are not disenfranchised. Having a majority decision at the GA and ensuring that people can attend allows us to take a vote and move forward. I think that is the best way. I think to have a multi-stakeholder consensus when you have got 350 people in the room would be incredibly difficult, you would be here a lot longer than an afternoon and I don't think we can get very much work done. Looking at the overall governance certainly I applaud the move to protect the rights of minority groups. I think also there is a risk of a GA being hijacked by a majority group in exactly the same way, block voting by abstention, by vetoing a physical presence in the room and I think it is our duty as RSPO members and we as the EB to preserve and protect the statutes of the RSPO where we feel that they are still in good governance and I support the consensus model. I do not actually support proportional representation in any way including the Unilever proposal and I do support majority voting at the GA.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker.

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA): I do agree that having a consensus model in a GA is simply not practical and this resolution does not suggest that you should have a consensus model at the GA. What it suggests is that the people who are in the room at the GA must reflect the constitution of the association as a whole. Now in reference to yourself, the point that you have made and also what the President has indicated, no resolution should come to the GA unless it has gone through a consensus process and I am fairly sure that no resolution which is on this table today has gone through a consensus process. Therefore I do not think that the resolutions which are presented at the GA have had or enjoyed a governance process of – a consensus process which the President has mentioned before. Any party can bring up a resolution without going through any standing committee, working group or task force. Therefore anything that happens up to the point of the GA within RSPO has no bearing on what actually happens at the GA. So if there are measures that are in place to protect the consensus-building process in RSPO, I agree and that is all well and good but that does not stop anyone coming to a GA fresh and putting a resolution in without having taking advantage of those processes which means that the rights of the minority can be subjected to because they have not gone through the process of checks and balances that RSPO is supposed to have in place. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. Adam Harrison (WWF International): On that point I don't think you are correct because the resolution is a vote that the GA can't affect the P&C, the Code of Conduct or the certification systems and not any other issues but I think there will always be the opportunity for resolutions to be tabled on new issues on statements we want to make but not on changing the fundamental rules that we all live by so I think you are overstating the fact that the GA could push through major changes which substantially change the rules of the RSPO in that way.

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA): So you are saying the GA has no power.

Mr. Adam Harrison (WWF International): No, I am saying the GA has decided that it doesn't want the power to impose changes on the P&C, this is what GA, General Assembly 7 but I am saying you are overstating your concerns about what the GA can do.

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA): I have no response because I thought the GA was the highest decision-making body of RSPO but if we are curtailing that situation then fair enough.

Mr. Chew Jit Seng (Genting Plantations): I think we are discussing something which is actually very fundamental to RSPO and the GA as we all know all along is actually the power of the membership and having heard from Simon, we the growers are actually the minority if we look at the present membership. So anything can happen if not every sector or every category is represented in the GA and as explained by Puvan, anyone can actually put a resolution aiming to change something which is prior to GA7 which already has been accepted or agreed earlier and that is why that resolution was passed but then we did not really at the last GA, the previous GA or rather define what is actually a formally agreed process or include the acceptable methodologies. For RSPO all of us understand that the GA is actually a formally agreed process as well as all the decision-making that we have all been practicing in the working groups, in the committees, in the EB. These are all formally agreed processes and acceptable methodologies until and unless there is something that is clearly defined which is contrary to that, what are we talking about? In RSPO acceptable methodology is decision-making made at the GA, and the EB implements the decisions made by the GA and also the working groups will come up with whatever proposal for the endorsement of the EB and the GA. That is the understanding; unfortunately we did not clarify that enough but I am a bit confused because we have actually approved Resolution 6c earlier and the 80 minimum number required for quorum, and we rejected Resolution 6d and in Resolution 6d on page 2 it

says a vote against this resolution would mean that the quorum requirement for the RSPO GA or Extraordinary GA will be indicated by the RSPO statutes. Does this mean that we are actually back to more than 50% requirement for the quorum?

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair): The quorum requirement is always in the RSPO statutes. That is a statement of fact. It does not introduce anything new. The contents of the statutes are what are being affected potentially by some of the resolutions that we are talking about. There are some things that if you have to say them it can't be true but you have to say I have authority then it can't be true. The same is true for multi-stakeholder organization, if you have to protect the interest of the smaller constituencies in your statutes than you are not a proper multi-stakeholder organization. Any resolution that would be entered into the GA that would smash the interest of either the smallholder producers or the social NGOs or the multinationals for that matter would be self-destructive for the RSPO because clearly those constituencies would leave. So when it is about the governance, it is about the fact that we are a multi-stakeholder platform and that we work together. We have never felt the need to put this multi-stakeholder nature in a quorum requirement and in the eight years that the RSPO has existed, because there was never a need to do it. Introducing it introduces the possibility to veto any decision in RSPO. That risk is bigger than the risk that Puvan imagined that someone will enter a resolution that will smash the interest of one of the constituencies.

Ms. Irene Fernandez: First, we should not make our life more complicated and this process will do that. If there is fear that members will not be present then each stakeholder must ensure that they are at the GA. It is their responsibility to be at the GA because they are part of that assembly and I don't think by putting things into the statutes would now ensure that kind of involvement. Second, we need to enhance the processes for participation where decision-making would take place and that is a different aspect altogether and therefore this question of proportionate representation is not really welcoming to a very democratic and lively process that we want to build in the RSPO.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker and reminded the assembly that there was a need to move on as there were still eight more resolutions, thereby calling for a vote on the resolution. He also reminded that this was Resolution 6f but that everyone does throw away the ballot they had for Resolution 6e.

Protecting multistakeholder representation at the General Assembly	Rejected	
To mandate proportionate representation by weightage in a quorum requirement for General Assembly. Proposed by MPOA	For:	101
	Against:	239
	Abstain:	6

4 votes were spoilt.

Resolution 6g: Direct voting for the President of RSPO by the membership & limitation to maximum of two terms of presidency

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA) presented the background for the resolution: The office of the President of RSPO confers significant powers onto the individual and in exercising these powers the President has

a significant impact upon RSPO which is binding upon its entire membership. For this reason MPOA believes that it is logical that the President as a single position rather than the EB as a whole should be elected by the GA and by the membership as a whole. The reason we believe this is because the current practice of appointing the President from within the EB is based on the notion that the EB is a fair representation of the entire membership. However, GA7 adopted a resolution to review the existing structure of the EB; indeed the entire governance structure of RSPO, and on the basis of this we can conclude that GA7 confirms that the current EB itself is imbalanced and does not properly reflect the views of the entire membership. Obviously an imbalanced EB cannot deliver a balanced President. Based on this the current constitutional provision that the EB chooses the President certainly cannot deliver this President which would be acceptable to the entire membership or the interest of the entire membership, and consequently it would also be authorized by or accountable to the entire membership. Additionally MPOA believes that to ensure that the RSPO periodically benefits from new thinking that any President is always driven by a sense of urgency to deliver results during his or her elected term and it is proposed that the presidency be limited for this reason to a maximum of two consecutive terms by any individual or constituency. The proposal is therefore to amend all the relevant articles in the RSPO bylaws and statutes to require that the President of RSPO is elected directly by the GA from among those individuals that are already nominated to the EB by the respective membership categories. And to amend the relevant bylaws and statutes so that the President will now be serving a limited two consecutive terms and to add whatever articles as necessary in order to ensure that this is reflected in other parts of the constitution. We have also asked that this resolution come into effect immediately. However we realize that in the case of this GA this is not possible; therefore upon consultation with the Secretariat and with our legal advisers we believe that there would be a slightly different procedure in this case which would allow us a three-month period for candidates to come forward after this GA and put themselves forward for presidency should this resolution pass, and that process is detailed somewhat in the note to this resolution.

Mr. Adam Harrison (WWF International): I have to question, I don't actually recognize your description of the overbearing, over-powerful President that is forcing decisions on people precisely because the RSPO works by consensus in all the major decisions that affect us. As is said earlier the rules apply whether it is through the Code of Conduct, whether it is through the P&C or the certification system and that precisely means that any individual, a minority or majority can stand up to any power that is there. It is difficult to see how the presentation of this resolution around this issue of balance and power; it doesn't ring true to me. I also think the complexity of trying to vote for a President in the GA from candidates that are up is going to be difficult. I am uncertain as to whether they are or aren't life candidates, eligible candidates; if you look at our difficulties dealing with the proxy voting here, if we are also doing that with the presidential candidate I think it is going to become a real burden of complexity that we won't be able to get through.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair): The current procedure is that GA elects EB members. When we first started in 2004 obviously all 16 EB members were elected at one time. After 3 years this procedure was changed so that half of the EB seat is up for election every year. So the term of an EB election is two years to ensure some continuity in the EB so that it is not possible that both EB members in one constituency have to step down at the same time. In the current statutes it is said that the 16 EB members elect the President from their midst. The reason this governance structure was chosen is that the chair of the team like the EB has to be able to rely on the support of the other members in the board and the only way to do that is to elect the President from within the EB by the EB. Electing the President directly from the GA could enable an attempt to put someone in the chair who cannot count on the support of the rest of his team. The chair has to be accepted by others in the board. However the fact that Unilever has had the chair since the beginning is not a good sign and it would be good if someone else actually took over. But

since 2004 in eight years only twice was there a counter candidate from within board. You need a considerable amount of time, and preferably some understanding of all the things that are happening in RSPO from standards and certification, trading facility, communications and claims etc. otherwise you spend even more time in order to be up to speed on what happens. I am in favor of some rotation in the chair of RSPO because it is not good for the organization if one person becomes the figurehead of that organization. So I'm sorry that MPOA has put these two things in the same resolution. Election by the GA is a very bad idea in terms of governance and the rotation of the presidency. I would have preferred two separate resolutions.

Speaker from the floor: Just a point of clarification similar to what Olivier brought up before: 'constituencies' in this language corresponds to categories and sectors just quite a volume for this.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker.

Mr. Faizal Parish (Global Environmental Center): Can you just clarify on this GA7 resolution which asks to review the structure of the EB as quoted here because it is imbalanced. I am a bit confused how an EB with two representatives of each constituency was ruled to be imbalanced. I understand that a review has been done and that the outcome of that review was an adjustment of the vision but not something about – I am not clear if that could be clarified because my understanding is that a fundamental basis of this resolution that earlier resolution maybe our understanding is not the same as what the earlier resolution and what is the nature of that imbalance in the board.

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA): You are correct the only outcome of the review is the resolution that we have passed before which was the new vision and mission. However the previous resolution itself which is noted as point 5 on the first page of the resolution says that we are reviewing the existing structure of the RSPO EB to reflect a better balance etc. The RSPO EB has not undergone any change since the time of passing this resolution either in terms of structure or in terms of operations.

Mr. Adam Harrison (WWF International): Again I beg to differ; there was the offer to cap the other Indonesian place and they of course would withdraw their membership so their offer was withdrawn with that. There is also the resolution being placed on the new category of member and the place of the EB, the multinational vertically integrated company. I would beg to differ that there is nothing that came out of that review and the vision and mission.

Mr. Chandran (Platinum Managing): My concern is the practicality of it. Puvan how would one know prior to a GA who will be in the EB and how would we put this in the agenda and also we will have to have in the agenda who are the members standing for the President if we go through this process. So the practicality of it, how are we going to implement this because only at the GA you will be electing the new representatives to the board because of the rotational system? You know that needs to be sorted out.

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA): Yes you are right. There are in fact two or three ways in which candidates would have to put their names forward and together with their manifesto and resume, whatever it has to be, and they would also have to declare whether they would be interested in the presidency were they elected to the EB. However we think the mechanism is separate to the principle. The principle is what this resolution is calling for which is there is direct voting and there is a limitation of term and there is a process on how this will work and that process is something that will have to be determined with the Secretariat on what would be the most practicable process. So we have to separate the principle from the method.

Tim Killeen (Conservation International): I would also like to take issue with Puvan in-capsulation of our strategic retreat in respect of the balance of the EB. We also agreed that we recruit a representative of the Asian smallholder as a compliment to FELDA. I think that is very much about balance and there was also a great deal of discussion on the role of the Secretariat, EB and the consensus that we need to make the Secretariat more executive in its capacity and for a new EB to play as it's occurred simultaneously becoming a steering committee rather than an EB. Those were also reached by consensus; everybody in the room agreed.

Mr. Chew Jit Seng (Genting Plantations): RSPO has not really implemented the resolution under the previous GA as was just discussed but when you explained earlier about the rotation of the presidency, if you remember I think at one of the previous GAs there was a proposal for rotation of presidency and unfortunately if I remember correctly it was rejected. So I am not sure how we can really relook at what the team has just mentioned about re-balancing the EB as well as looking at the rotation of the presidency.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker.

Speaker from the floor: Is this resolution not a result that the board hasn't been able to appoint a Vice President who could succeed the President. There are enough trade bodies Novita and Foster there is every two years there is a President coming from within so if the board would have organized this, we wouldn't have this resolution now.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair): You are absolutely right but that is not the content of this resolution.

Speaker from the floor: This is the result.

The Chair then called for the vote.

Direct voting for the President of RSPO by the membership & limitation to maximum of two terms of presidency	Rejected	
Amend all the relevant articles in the RSPO bylaws and statutes to require that the President of RSPO is elected directly by the General Assembly from among those individuals that are already nominated to the Executive Board by the respective membership categories, and also so that the President will now be serving a limited two consecutive terms and to add whatever articles as necessary in order to ensure that this is reflected in other parts of the constitution. Proposed by MPOA	For:	95
	Against:	248
	Abstain:	4

3 votes were spoilt.

Mr. Simon Lord (NBPOL): Regardless of the outcome of the vote on 6g, I think what you are hearing once more from stakeholders within the RSPO is that we need as an EB to look again quite seriously at our own structure so I would urge the EB at its meeting certainly tomorrow and the next meeting to consider once more the concerns of stakeholders that it is not a balanced board and I think we do need to seriously consider this as it keeps coming up time and time again.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker.

Resolution 6h: Enhancing the institutional governance of RSPO

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA) presented the background for the resolution: We believe there is a continuing ambiguity in the roles and the responsibilities of the EB and the Secretary-General relative to each other and the management of the RSPO within the current RSPO bylaws and statutes. We believe that this makes it difficult to determine where accountability lies for actions, supervision and checks and balances on behalf of and to the membership and we think that it is necessary that this ambiguity be removed. We need clarity on who is responsible for what and how it is that they play their complementary parts and we believe that this if clarified will make for smoother and more accountable management of RSPO. To this end we believe that the statutes and bylaws should be amended and to remove any and all ambiguity in the constitutional governance and management of RSPO by clearly prescribing the roles and responsibilities of all governing and managing bodies in the RSPO and to clearly separate the executive and non-executive functions in accordance with best institutional governance and practice. We have proposed as an example a governance structure which is illustrated in the diagram which accompanies the resolution and we believe that the GA as the highest body should be informed by a non-executive board which would be equivalent to a Board of Directors that there would then be committees set up which are the Standing Committee, and this Standing Committee would be the interface between the non-executive board and the RSPO Secretariat who will become the sole executive arm of the RSPO.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker and pointed out that there is even a diagram so that everyone can understand what the resolution is all about.

Hidde: There are a lot of good points in this resolution; however I regret not having been invited to comment on the draft as that would have been good. A lot of the content of this resolution resonate the earlier retreat that we had last year on improving exactly this point. A lot of benefits that you mentioned are all already agreed to. Therefore I don't see the need for this resolution and it might have been worded in a way that I would have supported if in future we would share drafts and resolutions and invite each other to improve and add to resolutions like this.

Tim Stephenson: Just looking at the diagram I think it is a little inconsistent with your aim. Expression of support for making the Secretariat the principal executive body of the RSPO, it's been shifted down to the bottom of the page instead of up and it attributes greater power to the Standing Committees. I think that is not necessarily the best way to move forward that we need to have a Secretariat that is professional executive takes control of the institution and identifies options and then the Standing Committee provides strategic advice and resolves problematic issues in conjunction with the EB. So I am not sure it is the direction that we all agree. We need to move forward as per our strategy retreat.

Speaker from the floor: I support what Tim has said and I am very surprised that if nothing grant was deciding during a retreat that is barely a surprise but definitely this is devoting a lot of power to the Standing Committee and taking away a lot from the EB and the Secretariat. It is not practical. It doesn't bring much, it doesn't support a practical or a strong RSPO and I am concerned with what we can see currently how some of the Standing Committee works where geographically they are made up of people from only one part of the world; the other part of the world here or in Europe we can see the inconsistencies as to what the goals are or how do you implement or you can formulate what would be good new regulations or new ways of working for the RSPO and therefore I think it is not preferable to have the Standing Committee having so much power and taking it away from the EB.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker.

Mr. Chandran (Platinum Energy): When you look at how we made a great deal of progress over the last one year to strengthen our Secretariat we do have a very good team in the Secretariat but I am rather hesitant to say at this juncture that we should be giving executive powers to the Secretariat because I just don't think we have enough strength as Tim has pointed out; we need to strengthen it further in order to make an Executive Secretariat. Now once that role is taken over by the Secretariat then of course the EB can become a non-executive board but I don't think the timing is right. This is something which could - as Simon has said a strategic retreat to discuss this as a time plan we should draw up and take it from there. That is my observation.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker.

Mr. Simon Lord (NBPOL): The area which also puzzles me from the diagram is the exact role of the Standing Committee and that the arrow from the RSPO Secretariat goes to one of the Standing Committee and not the EB but in the text it talks about the Secretary-General accountable to the board, so there is a difference there which I think is a very significant one if you are proposing to put a Standing Committee in between the executive or non-executive board and the Secretariat. The other thing is that because this is linked to the next resolution 6i which is proposing to give voting capability to the Standing Committee then decisions would be taken by the Standing Committee by vote and then again this would change the nature and given the previous comment about the dispersed nature or regional nature of some of the Standing Committee then we would be creating a new level which has a voting mechanism rather than a consensus which is in the current arrangement in the EB. It is introducing an unknown or a significantly changed arrangement to the current one. I fully support what is proposed about giving more power to the Secretariat giving that function but a relatively new team has come into the Secretariat and that needs to be looked at and I fully support that - that be given but still there may need to be a transitional overseeing role by the EB.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) I think you have expressed the concerns that Simon had said that comment and in our strategy retreat we have agreed as an EB that over time we need to become non-executive and that executive powers need to be moved to the Secretariat but you need to consider quite a number of things for that to work, like for instance what is the relationship going to be then between the GA and the Secretariat? And you need to consider for instance the regional representation; you are considering for the board to create RSPO in Latin America, to create one in Africa, one in China, one in India. That needs to become part of your management structure as well so the whole governance structure and management structure of RSPO needs to be reviewed in order for you to do that, and although the gist of his proposal is absolutely right the timing is poor. The fact that MPOA acted in isolation without consulting any other constituency is a missed opportunity the timing most of all is wrong.

The Chair then called for the vote.

Enhancing the institutional governance of RSPO	Rejected	
Amend all statutes and bylaws and remove any and all ambiguity in the constitutional governance and management of RSPO by clearly prescribing the roles and responsibilities of all governing and managing bodies in the RSPO and to clearly	For:	97
	Against:	246

separate the executive and non-executive functions in accordance with best institutional governance and practice. Proposed by MPOA	Abstain:	4
---	----------	---

3 votes were spoilt.

Resolution 6i: Protecting multistakeholder decision-making in RSPO

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA) presented the background for the resolution: MPOA thinks the reasons for this resolution are valid and of concern and we hope that the governing and executive organs of the RSPO takes note of this concern to ensure that multi-stakeholder decision-making is more consciously placed on future deliberations on governance at RSPO. However we have decided to withdraw this resolution at this point and to allow the sentiment of this resolution to inform continuing discussions at the RSPO governing bodies.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) affirmed that Resolution 6i was withdrawn.

Protecting multistakeholder decision-making in RSPO	Withdrawn
Ensure that multi-stakeholder decision-making is more consciously placed on future deliberations on governance at RSPO. Proposed by MPOA	No vote

Resolution 6j: Moratorium on RSPO certification

Dato' Mamat (MPOA) presented the background for the resolution: There is currently enough certified certifiable palm oil produced to fulfill the requirement for those markets. However the uptake has not matched the arable supply. Last year only 52% was taken up and that is 35% had certification and only 70% had physical uptake. Furthermore there is no differentiated market access for CSPO so it is being traded in a normal market, which dilutes the value of palm oil that is produced responsibly and sustainably by implementing the RSPO criteria. This situation discourages existing RSPO growers from expanding their certified areas and new entrants from investing in RSPO certification and it is difficult to encourage smallholders to adopt RSPO because there is no point in producing more CSPO if there is no demand for it and the market does not value CSPO as compared to the regular non-certified palm oil. Therefore MPOA proposes the resolution to agree on a moratorium on RSPO certification until such time that the supply and demand for the CSPO is in balance in the market and that this period of moratorium be exempted from the time-bound plans of the companies concerned, and the moratorium refers particularly to the new areas and the new entrants. We just stay at our present supply position.

Mr. Amir Faizal (Royal Dutch Shell): I actually checked this resolution with our legal advisers in London as well as in Malaysia and they are of the opinion that it is in breach of the competition law in the EU as well as in the US and this also contravenes the Competition Act 2010 in Malaysia and so because of that I request that we actually revoke this resolution but if not then I am legally required by my company to excuse myself from Resolution 6j and I will come back in for Resolution 6k.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair): Under Swiss law this resolution is acceptable.

Mr. Amir Faizal (Royal Dutch Shell): I understand that there are differences in legal opinion so I am required by the company to actually leave this hall and I actually request that it is minuted that I Amir Faizal from Royal Dutch Shell excuse myself from this resolution and I will be back for Resolution 6k.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) confirmed that he understood, and thanked the speaker.

Mr. Amir Faizal (Royal Dutch Shell) left the room for Resolution 6j.

Olivier (SIPEF): Indeed the demand for physical sustainable palm oil is currently quite disappointing in comparison with the efforts that the growers have made. I personally think, and it's also the view from a few growers including from the rest of the world, that stopping and having a moratorium will not support uptake and I think we should be the growers now at this time when actually the prices are good, we are strong, there is greater momentum for certification and it is rather timely for us to lead from the front and to continue certifying and supporting efforts of other growers to join and to certify that palm oil and to improve their practices. Therefore I do not think that moratorium would support the RSPO, or the progress of oil palm production towards sustainability.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker.

Ms. Suraya Ismail (Emery): I have a point for clarification: what is CSPO and does it also include CSPKO because we are aware there is a shortage of CSPKO and if there is a moratorium being put in place then it might affect our business going forward.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair): A moratorium on certification would clearly put an end to the growth in the volume of available CSPO and CSPKO.

IMSF: I am from the Independent Manufacturer of Specialty Fats and we sell quite a fair quantity to Europe and our buyers really want to buy RSPO Fully Segregated Processed Oil from us. That is a downstream product and when we approached one big supplier we realize is RSPO, they told us yes it is RSPO CPO we realize that the oil is mass balanced. So we can't use that. Another big supplier said we are potential competitors so they wouldn't sell to us. So even though you say there is a lot of RSCPO around if you look carefully some of it is not compatible. If it cannot be used we have to look into this and we cannot simply agree to this, it is very dangerous because you are shutting out and preventing us from promoting the processing of RSPO oil and to give to our buyers especially in Europe. So we would appreciate it that the producers, when they say RSPO, should go for fully segregated because most of our buyers now are looking for fully segregated processed downstream products. Also our request is that to make it transparent and easier for us to procure the oil maybe we should classify the RSPO CPO, to supply us in quantity in terms of region and also categories whether it is fully segregated, or whether it is mass balanced or IP. I hope that we can proceed and if there is a severe shortage as the lady says in the supply of fully segregated CSPKO how can we stop the certification.

Mr. Chew Jit Seng (Genting Plantations): The present production level and the availability of the CSPO and CSPKO, looking at the numbers, that has always been the biggest concern for the growers because in the spirit of RSPO we produce, and the use part is not matching the requirement and that is the main concern. So this resolution actually calls for some re-balancing, it's not calling for a moratorium on the entire certification.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) pointed out that the resolution does indeed call for a moratorium, and advised Chew Jit Seng to read the text of the resolution.

Mr. Chew Jit Seng (Genting Plantations): As explained by Dato' Mamat that is for those new players who have not come in, those who have not started certification so that the existing volume of CSPO is taken up. But going back to what Faizal said about going against competition law it is good that Swiss law allows this kind of thing because as you know in the petroleum industry that Faizal comes from Shell, there has always been this cartel in managing the trade so what are we really talking about. So this is actually the reality of the trade situation in the world today.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker.

Sin (KLK): As a producer we go into certification and after getting it we don't get anyone wanting to come and pay us a premium, encouraging us to go forward. So here you are talking about a moratorium but you may not see the reason. I have many units; when we say moratorium on RSPO certification it does not imply that I put a stop and not prepare anything. I think most of our units are doing the preparation at the same time; we are quite ready to go into certification if there is an uptake demand for this type of CSPO. However, if there is no uptake, I rush into expediting into certification in many business units and at the end of it, the moment I get into certification, I get my certificate and the time moves on, in nine months I need to go into annual surveillance audit. I subject myself to another round of certification audit and yet another round and I expose myself in a public announcement to say I am in certification and many of us are putting ourselves, exposing ourselves for public eyes there. So what sort of incentive is given to those people who really prepare going into certification? For my case here I think it makes sense that we slow down until such a time when there is an incentive for us to move forward. Otherwise we just put a stop temporarily. It does not imply that we are not preparing ourselves to that level of standard to be in compliance with the P&C of our RSPO certification.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker.

Hidde: Just a question for clarification because this is a resolution being brought from an association of members MPOA; can I ask the representative of MPOA to clarify on the process within MPOA, how this resolution reflects the consensus of members within MPOA. Also, are there any views on how MPOA members would act should this resolution be voted down today in this hall?

Dato' Mamat (MPOA): The moratorium is for new and additional certification. The existing ones are supposed to carry on because I think you can see in another roundtable they are doing that manner. The amount produced voluntarily according to the market requirement is being modeled on the other roundtable because they are much more sensible in that way and in terms of the reaction of the MPOA, we are putting the proposal and let's see how people see it in terms of the production of RSPO-certified oil. We keep on producing and nobody is buying, that is not a thing that we do in a normal way.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) pointed out that Dato' Mamat did not answer the question, and asked Haider to repeat the question.

Hidde: The main part of my question is to clarify on the process within MPOA on how this resolution reflects the consensus of members of MPOA.

Dato' Mamat (MPOA): We had a discussion on this resolution; all members of MPOA who are RSPO members came to that meeting and we discussed this and it was agreed, and we put it to our Council and it was agreed.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker.

Mr. Simon Lord (NBPOL): I have a great deal of sympathy with this resolution; as a grower we also would like to see more premiums being paid and more uptake of sustainable palm oil. It is a shame MPOA did not consult the rest of the growers in the RSPO, and that is something to take note of next time. Although I am in sympathy with it I don't agree with it. I think time-bound plans and locking in time-bound plans for those that procure sustainable palm oil is the way forward, Having a moratorium which removes what is basically our time-bound plan for oil producers, which removes the ability to get certified, sends a signal right the way up the supply chain that time-bound plans are not a useful instrument. We operate a fully segregated supply chain; it hurts us as much as it hurts everybody else but we didn't do RSPO simply because we would get a premium. We did it because we try to differentiate ourselves as being a responsible producer.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker.

Mr. Faizal Parish (Global Environmental Center): I also fully support the view that there should be more uptake of sustainable palm oil but I don't think a moratorium is the way to gain that. It is more important to push the buyers and there is a separate resolution to encourage all the retailers and buyers to have time-bound plans to push the uptake, and that is the right signal. If we send the signal of stopping the supply, of having a moratorium, that will be totally misinterpreted in the rest of the world through press or whatever that there is a failure and no one wants to produce sustainable palm oil. So I would strongly encourage that the focus is on getting the buyers and the retailers to increase the amount of their taking and not to send a wrong signal to the market. If individual businesses are facing problems then presumably that individual business or the country association can take the decision themselves to slow down the application for certification. This would not need a resolution at the GA.

Mr. Chandran (Platinum Energy): My concern is that I realize now that some of the resolutions that have been put forward are really against the Code of Conduct and we operate on an antitrust law basis and it is time that whatever resolution is put forward to the GA here has got to be vetted now that we have legal advisors in place like it is done in a lot of international organizations. One that comes to mind and I have been involved in is the NIOIP in America. So you need to now have the legal advisors in place; we need to vet some of these resolutions because there is no point debating at the GA when you put forward something which is against the Code of Conduct. I think that needs to be addressed by the board at the next meeting.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker and moved to take a vote on the resolution. Royal Dutch Shell left the room and did not take part in the voting for this resolution.

Moratorium on RSPO certification	Rejected	
Agree on a moratorium on RSPO certification until such time that the supply and demand for the CSPO is in balance in the market and that this period of moratorium be exempted from the time-bound plans of the companies concerned, and the moratorium	For:	44
	Against:	296

refers particularly to the new areas and the new entrants. Proposed by MPOA	Abstain	6
--	---------	---

3 votes were spoilt.

Resolution 6k: No RSPO support for offset mechanisms

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA) presented the background for the resolution: The existence of offset mechanisms as channels can and do contribute to the issues highlighted by this resolution and we hope that RSPO would focus effort on removing these channels as soon as practicable. However we do recognize that current offset mechanisms are important channels for those responsible companies who legitimately support the growth of CSPO and use offset mechanisms as a stepping stone towards uptake of physical oil when it is available to them. On the basis of this MPOA is withdrawing this resolution.

No RSPO support for offset mechanisms	Withdrawn
To focus effort on removing offset mechanisms. Proposed by MPOA	No vote

Resolution 6l: Creation of new category of ordinary membership for ‘transnational companies and organisations’

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA) presented the background for the resolution: We are introducing Resolution 6l for the second time because we had in fact discussed this in KK last November; we the Group submitting here including MPOA, MUSIMAT, HSBC and CIAT propose the creation of a new category of Ordinary Membership for Transnational Companies and organizations. The reason for this new category is we believe that there are more and more members of the association whose business interests and business activities with palm oil straddle different categories in the supply chain and we think that this new category will be reflective of RSPO as an institution moving forward. We think that this new category will be exemplary to how it is that the industry wishes to project itself as an integrated global industry with integrated and global companies whose values system straddle everything from estates to the shelf. We think that the T&C category will also allow for RSPO and specifically members within RSPO in this category to always take the global view and not to be constrained by their limitations of specific categories, and in particular companies that have interests in different geographic territories will be able to look at both sides of the argument between Asia and Europe for example and similarly countries that have interests both in the producing and the supply chain that have got to deal with the consumer side whether it is a B2B consumer or whether it is an end consumer will also be able to balance both of these positions and bring them to the table in a very informed manner as we go forward with RSPO discussions. So we hope that this resolution would be supported.

Speaker from the floor: Question for clarification Puvan. In point 1 of the notes of this resolution it says A entity so I want to make sure it doesn't mean A or B but it says "and" one and the other. So it is both more than one part of the value chain and at least three geographical regions so to be able to be recognized in this category you have to apply with both criteria and not the one or the other.

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA): It is “and”.

Speaker from the floor: So you have to apply with both criteria?

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA): Yes you have to apply with both.

Tim Stephenson: I understand what Puvan has said and I have some sympathy for those views. My concern would be to understand how many members would qualify in this particular category and how many have indicated that they would like to join. It would be not necessary to create a new area for just two or three members. That doesn't seem to gel but if there are significant numbers then maybe it would.

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA): For the benefit of everyone else not on the EB, we did conduct an exercise to see how popular this particular category may be and granted it was done from the growers' side in the first instance we polled members who have vertically integrated interest. On the members' side alone we found that there would be at least 10 potential companies who would be able to qualify for the category, and were the category to be created would think about moving into it primarily by consolidating the number of memberships that they currently have different parts in the supply chain. For example Sime Darby's would of course be a classic. We have memberships in three different categories and we may look at consolidating all of this into one because it would represent our interests more accurately.

Mr. Adam Harrison (WWF International): Can I ask the proposer of this resolution what restrictions they currently feel they are under in terms of pursuing their best interest industry and transformation of the industry and what restrictions you are seeking to lift with this move?

Puvan J. Selvanathan (MPOA): If I may speak for all the proposers, I think the restrictions that the current members feel are not limitations in that you do have the option of populating different membership categories in different ways. However that is not representative of the heart and soul of the company. The companies that are subscribing to RSPO are committing on a broad-based RSPO philosophy and as an operating principal actually expect their entire supply chain and value chain to be represented through RSPO. We think the current set-up of RSPO does not allow for a company which has all of these different facets to exist in a single place and we think this is a category that will become exemplary of RSPO as more and more people move outside their distinct boundaries. So we think that this is currently a category for a small number of players but as a category for the future we would hope that we would see more people moving into it.

Mr. Chandran (Platinum Energy): Can I also clarify one of the positions, there was a request from the bio-energy sector to become a member of the RSPO on the board, a seat on the board for example this was put forward a couple of years back because they felt that it was a growing sector and they ought to be represented. But this is one opportunity by creation of such a sector where many of the players involved in the bio-diesel or bio-fuel or bio-energy industry will have a voice through this creation of these new transnational companies.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker and moved to take a vote on the resolution.

Creation of new category of ordinary membership for ‘transnational companies and organisations’	Rejected	
Create a new category for members of the association whose business interests and business activities with palm oil straddle different categories in the supply chain. Proposed by MPOA, VISIMAS, HSBC and SIAT	For:	132
	Against:	208
	Abstain	1

9 votes were spoilt.

Resolution 6m: Request for all RSPO ordinary members to submit time bound plans

Mr. Adam Harrison (WWF International) presented the background to the resolution: This resolution speaks very much to the discussion we just had on Resolution 6j about the moratorium and the imbalance between supply and demand. As the organization that published the scorecard we are also very concerned about the lack of uptake but this resolution also speaks precisely about some of the comments from the floor saying that actually it is the Code of Conduct and specifically the time-bound plan and which is the tool we have already in front of us that can best put pressure on the rest of the supply chain. The tool exists, the enforcement has not always been up to scratch within the RSPO and this resolution is aimed at bringing it up to scratch. So the proposal is that all RSPO ordinary members who are in the trade of palm oil: growers, traders and processors, consumer goods manufacturers, retailers be required to submit to the Secretariat of the RSPO a time-bound plan and appropriate to their own category be it to produce, to trade, to process, purchase and use 100% CSPO asking them or requiring them to submit that by GA9. Immediately in response to that, the second part of the resolution is that members of those category that haven't submitted the time-bound plan by the GA will be listed on the RSPO website as non-compliant with this resolution and with the Code of Conduct. The third part is to ask the RSPO through a due process to develop, by GA9, clear guidance on what expectation it has for the other ordinary members of the RSPO, specifically the financial institutions and the NGOs, both social and the environment, in order for them who also signed the Code of Conduct to understand what the RSPO is expecting from them. And the fourth part is also to request the RSPO through due process and by GA9 to define what is a sufficiently challenging time-bound plan and that is the wording within the Code of Conduct, and to present both 3 and 4 for approval of the GA to be included in the Code of Conduct.

Mr. Faizal Parish (Global Environmental Center): Just to pre-empt or avoid any confusion on paragraph 1 of what is called for in the resolution, at the last meeting in Sabah there was some confusion on the wording. The request is for the members to submit a time-bound plan prior to GA9, not that they are required to be 100% and purchase 100% certified oil prior to GA9. The order in that paragraph is ambiguous so just to seek clarification that indeed it requests us to submit the time-bound plan by the next GA, not to be 100%.

Mr. Adam Harrison (WWF International) agreed with the speaker and affirmed the statement.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair): Adam have the NGOs developed some thoughts on what it is that they can put in place in terms of a time-bound plan?

Mr. Adam Harrison (WWF International): So far there has only really been sort of a qualitative level rather than a quantitative one. So it is thinking about actions, it is thinking about promotion of RSPO and promotion of CSPO so the thinking hasn't been done in any detail.

As there were no further questions, the Chair moved to call for a vote on the resolution.

Request for all RSPO ordinary members to submit time bound plans	Adopted	
<p>All RSPO ordinary members who are in the trade of palm oil are required to submit to the Secretariat of the RSPO by GA9 a time-bound plan appropriate to their own category to process, purchase and use 100% CSPO. Those who fail to do so will be listed on the RSPO website as non-compliant. By GA9 the RSPO will develop through due process clear guidance on its expectations of other ordinary members, define what is a sufficiently challenging time-bound plan, and to present the latter two for approval of the GA to be included in the Code of Conduct.</p> <p>Proposed by Ecological Society of London, Conservation International and Flora & Fauna International</p>	For:	239
	Against:	92
	Abstain	18

1 vote was spoilt.

Mr. Simon Lord (NBPOL): I have something to add to Adam. I don't think it is good enough Adam that it is just qualitative. When you put a proposal like this and you are actually asked the question, "What are you going to do about it?" and you are talking about qualitative, time-bound plans for all the producers is a key performance indicator, we have been hauled over the coals repeatedly for not delivering, for not having a robust or challenging enough plan and I think there should be an indication to all the NGOs in the room and also those who are not involved in the production of palm oil that you should set yourselves some key performance indicators which are measurable, the number of sub-committees that you are involved in, the number of organizations that you have actually approached. It should be quantifiable; it is not good enough just to be qualitative.

Mr. Adam Harrison (WWF International): I absolutely agree and that is precisely why we want the rest of RSPO as a whole and through the membership in RSPO to challenge us precisely in those ways so that we do understand in the same way that we have challenged you over the years to continuously move forward. I think it is right that you should be challenging us as well. You would be on the task force would you?

The Chair thanked Mr. Simon for the advice and then moved to the final resolution.

Resolution 6n: Elimination in the use of Paraquat and adoption of integrated weed management

Ms. Irene Fernandez presented the background to the resolution: This resolution is in relation to something that I have been continuously raising in the RSPO and I would like to raise it again because it is an issue that is very much of concern that brings about harm to communities. Since 2006 there have been assurances that the use of highly hazardous pesticides, in particular Paraquat, will come to an end.

There was discussion of plans or studies related to integrated weed management being put in place but unfortunately that has not happened to date and we see the continuous use of pesticide that is bringing increased harm, in many cases irreversible health conditions to workers and to communities. In particular this has affected women who are sprayers in many of the plantations and today is very specifically being International Women's Day I think it is also important for us to recognize that the rights of these communities and workers need to be addressed very urgently. Therefore Pesticide Action Network Asia-Pacific would like to state this resolution to now implement the elimination of all combinations of Paraquat in the production of palm oil, and the rapid adoption of integrated weed management. To achieve this goal we propose the following activities and targets:

- a) The RSPO in cooperation with growers and NGOs shall implement the elimination of the use and purchase of all formulations of Paraquat, and elimination of existing stocks of Paraquat, within a year.
- b) In the process RSPO shall prevent all risk to and ensure the independent health monitoring of workers or surrounding communities exposed to Paraquat.
- c) RSPO shall ensure that no Paraquat is improperly stored or disposed of.
- d) The RSPO and certification bodies should adequately and regularly monitor the elimination of Paraquat, taking into account the volume used, the manner of use and the storage and disposal of remaining stocks.
- e) RSPO, growers, NGOs and other stakeholders shall share information, experience and expertise among themselves towards a rapid adoption of integrated weed management.

Though we recognize there will be a review of the P&C as the notes state, we think that it is really urgent and this issue has been postponed for too long so we are then putting forward this resolution.

Mr. Simon Lord (NBPOL): As a grower, Paraquat is the most effective contact herbicide we have at our disposal. There is no viable alternative yet in the market and I think I have been a considerable block to the PAM and Tenaganita in terms of ensuring that producers continue to be able to have access to this chemical and to use it. However five years ago when we met with the Criteria Working Group, we made a commitment to the NGOs that we would endeavor to remove or replace Paraquat, and as an EB we committed to that, as a Criteria Working Group we committed to that. To my shame we have not done it and our RSPO evaluation of integrated weed management did not result in any concrete advice. To this end we feel as the new breed of palm oil we must honour our commitment made to the Criteria Working Group and we will cease the use of Paraquat from May 2012.

Mr. Chew Jit Seng (Genting Plantations): I think the choice of using Paraquat or not is up to the individual company on a voluntary basis because as explained it is still a very useful agrochemical for the plantation industry and there are no viable or feasible economic alternatives. Also as a planter, as a researcher, as an advisor you know that there is also the location feasibility, the palm age feasibility of the use of Paraquat when you are at young age, when you are doing replanting, when you are doing land clearing and as Paraquat is classified as a highly toxic Class 1B agrochemical, there are already many restrictions put in place by the various governments. The majority of governments in the world today still allow the use of Paraquat but you have to comply with very stringent regulations for replication, use and storage. Also, according to the regulations you have to send your sprayers for annual medical surveillance which is being done, there is also a monthly assessment of sprayers, women sprayers and if they are pregnant or breast-feeding they are changed to other jobs. All these are actually in practice, so there are many steps we are taking. Chemicals cost money. We are actually endeavoring to comply with Principle 8 which is continuous improvement to reduce the use of agrochemicals as far as it is possible

but unfortunately Paraquat is still one of the agrochemicals still needed by the industry. So I think most of the industries are still using it but it is an option to individual companies whether they want to use it or not despite all the restrictions.

Mr. John Clendon (Univanich Palm Oil): In Thailand we are currently involved with our smallholders to get RSPO certification. As many of you know although Thailand is the third largest producer of palm oil in the world 80% of our producers, our small growers are smallholders. As part of the certification program training of smallholders to become certified we are concentrating very much on proper use of pesticides, handling and storage as we have mentioned. So whilst we understand and support the sentiments behind this resolution, the impact of it in Thailand would be that smallholders who are customarily using Paraquat because it is the cheapest and most effective herbicide will certainly be discouraged. For that reason I think most of them would be reluctant to support this resolution.

Speaker from the floor: I think there was maybe a small slip of the tongue from our colleague from MPOA. Paraquat is a class 2 not a class 1B, it is the WHO worldwide classification, so it's a class 2 which translates to moderately hazardous but that is beside the point. Indeed from the time being there is no alternative to it as Dr. Simon mentioned but as well as Dr. Simon has mentioned, the RSPO has failed all its members in a way by not bringing at least alternatives or recommendations on how we can reduce or eventually replace Paraquat in the plantation and definitely for smallholders as well. The problem of smallholders being of course how they handle the Paraquat, and the plantations on how we train, how we monitor and how we eventually reduce the use of Paraquat.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) thanked the speaker and commented that the RSPO has asked Ravi to put some of their reserves to alternative weed management strategy. Of the 36 companies that participated in the survey, half of them didn't use Paraquat so maybe there is an alternative for it but there is apparently no need for it according to some companies.

Speaker from the floor: I just wanted to share that IOI has already phased out Paraquat and I will ask the EB in the meeting that we have tomorrow in this particular field of the use of chemicals, safety and PPE are we doing enough as RSPO as a whole in sharing knowledge and resources to improve the working conditions of workers in the field.

Ms. Irene Fernandez: I think it is really very important that we address the issue of sustainability and the relationship with pesticide. That is the commitment that we are asking and I would like to thank Simon for bringing forward that issue. We can continue to say till the cows come home we do not have an alternative, but have we tried, how much have we tried and only when we say no to Paraquat would we really make an effort to ensure that there is something else in place. At the same time while we think of our profits have we ever thought about the communities that have suffered severely from poisoning by Paraquat which was banned in 2002 in Malaysia but because of the lobby from the growers it was repealed in 2005, and you know what the hazards are and it's very clear. It has been documented. We also cannot have double standards worldwide; in Europe it cannot be used but it can be used here and therefore in every field we must be consistent and not continue with double standards and that is why we are saying the issue of sustainability and the concept of sustainability must also be consistent in our practice.

Mr. Chandran (Platinum Energy): I have to endorse what Chew Jit Seng and others had said. I can well appreciate the sentiments behind this resolution but I think the responsible use of Paraquat is the key word here. It is a component of integrated weed management and it can support our Principle 3 and that is what it is all about. But I understand the sentiments behind it because if you take any chemical it is all

poisonous and we decided at the board meeting we are not going to look at an alternative of Paraquat but we are going to look at the whole spectrum of pesticides that we use on plantations. That was what the Cabby Study was all about but unfortunately we did not get the response that we expected but then since this year we are going to review the P&C may I appeal to the proposers leave this with the board and it should be part of the review exercise of the P&C and not really a forum for the GA to make a decision on this.

The Chair called for a vote on the resolution.

Elimination in the use of Paraquat and adoption of integrated weed management	Rejected	
Implement the elimination of all combinations of Paraquat in the production of palm oil, and ensure the rapid adoption of an integrated weed management. Proposed by PAN-AP	For:	106
	Against:	226
	Abstain	12

6 votes were spoilt.

Although the resolution was rejected, the Chair assured Ms. Irene that RSPO would make this part of the P&C review process.

6. Election of Executive Board

There were 8 seats to be elected with results as follow:

Constituent	Elected
Growers	
MPOA is retiring and standing for re-election. As there were no alternative nominations received, MPOA is re-elected by acclamation.	MPOA
GAPKI has resigned from being a member of RSPO. Edi Suhardi representing a caucus of Indonesian growers is the only candidate to take up the seat. Therefore Edi Suhardi is appointed by acclamation.	Edi Suhardi
Processors and Traders	IOI
IOI is retiring and standing for re-election. As there were no alternative nominations received, IOI is re-elected by acclamation.	
Consumer Goods Manufacturers	Unilever

Unilever is retiring and standing for re-election. As no alternative nominations have been received, Unilever is re-elected by acclamation.							
Retailers	Carrefour						
Carrefour is retiring and standing for re-election. As no alternative nominations have been received, Carrefour is re-elected by acclamation.							
Banks and Investors	HSBC						
HSBC is retiring and standing for re-election. As no alternative nominations have been received, HSBC is re-elected by acclamation.							
Environmental NGOs	CI						
<p>Conservation International (CI) is retiring and standing for re-election. Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil Foundation (ISPO) and Borneo Rhino Alliance (BORA) have both been nominated as candidates.</p> <p>The Chair requested the Environmental NGO category to vote.</p> <p>CI was re-elected for the Environmental NGOs seat. The Chair congratulated CI.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>CI:</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ISPO:</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BORA:</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </table>	CI:	12	ISPO:	0	BORA:	5
CI:	12						
ISPO:	0						
BORA:	5						
Social NGOs	Oxfam International						
Oxfam International is retiring and standing for re-election. As no alternative nominations have been received, Oxfam International is re-elected by acclamation.							

7. Any Other Business

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) asked if anyone had a question or observation for Any Other Business (AOB).

Mr. Peter: An observation: I have a feeling that some of the resolutions for today when worded just a little bit differently would have been supported. While they were not accepted today, I have this doubt over what would be the process to check which resolution would have a chance to come back next year with more support? What would be the best process to check that today? I am not sure what the best answer to that question is but it is a feeling I have that some of it would have a better chance.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) agreed with the speaker and reminded everyone that the P&C review has started and there will be a period of prior consultation. The first draft will be to the task force, public consultation will be in June and July and it is hoped to finish the process in time for the next GA which will be after RT10 which will be held in Singapore in the last week of October. So this means that the target is the week of October 29th running into November 1st and 2nd.

Mr. Faizal Parish (Global Environmental Center): Just a comment: There are clearly a number of resolutions which were put forward and were not supported. I think there are two things arising from that - that maybe in future we should be encouraging more consultation and multi-stakeholder involvement in the preparation and submission of resolutions to ensure that they have a broader range of support prior to coming to the GA, but I think not to make a hard and fast rule but encouragement. The second thing is there are some elements of the resolution that has been rejected which I would hope that the EB in its deliberation can look at. A number of issues raised by MPOA in relation to the governance and the rotation of the presidency and the representation on the EB I feel it would be healthy and good to be examined by the EB and there be feedback prior to the next GA sufficiently in advance so that if people want to re-submit or submit other resolutions they will get some feedback prior to that. I am noting that the next GA is only six months from now. There is not a lot of time but it would be useful to get that feedback and we need to somehow bring back the feeling more that this is a collective multi-stakeholder view and not one party or one sector does not have to be making a lot of interventions without getting the support from a broader group.

Tim Stephenson (Treasurer): I am sure everybody is on tenterhooks as to Chandran's question from earlier about income subject to tax. It is just the tax effect in that note, it is not the gross amount it is the tax effect so it is 26% of the total income that is not taxable on that particular note 8 - so it does look right from that perspective.

Jan-Kees Vis (Chair) agreed that gross and net are important distinctions.

Speaker from the floor: I support what Faizal just said. One point in particular which is in one of the resolutions that was not adopted is on the recording of the dissenting opinions within the standing committee or the working groups. At the moment I think there are certain discussions happening where the dissenting opinions are not being recorded, and those might be valuable to the RSPO so that they can be brought forward to the EB or at least share that at one point with the membership at large. It might be that these dissenting opinions are not adopted later on but at least I think it is important to record them properly.

Mr. Simon Lord (NBPOL): I endorse what has been said. That is absolutely right particularly in many of the resolutions put forward by the MPOA. The EB must look at some of these and take action on them. There are some really good ideas and we would be stupid not to look at them.

The Chair thanked the speaker and asked if there were any last remarks. As no further remarks were made, the Chair thanked all the attendees for being here again in large enough numbers to allow them to take legally valid decisions, and for their patience and constructive behaviour during the discussions.

Meeting was adjourned at 5.34 pm Kuala Lumpur time by the RSPO President, Mr. Jan-Kees Vis.

END OF GA8

Annex 1 - Attendance list**Ordinary Members Attendance and Proxy List****Banks and Investors**

1. 8

Consumer Goods Manufacturers

2. 116

Environmental NGOs

3. 16

Producers

4. 63

Processors and Traders

5. 110

Retailers

6. 32

Social NGOs

7. 8

Ordinary Members Attendance and Proxy List

Banks and Investors

1. ANZ Banking Group Limited
2. Citibank
3. Credit Suisse AG
4. Generation Investment Management
5. HSBC Bank Malaysia Berhad
6. International Finance Corporation (IFC)
7. Rabobank International
8. Standard Chartered Bank

Consumer Goods Manufacturers

9. Allied Bakeries
10. Alsacienne de Pâtes Ménagères (APM)
11. Arnott's Biscuits Ltd
12. Associated British Foods plc
13. August Storck KG
14. Australian Food and Grocery Council
15. Avon Products, Inc
16. Bahlsen GmbH & Co. KG
17. Bakkavor Limited
18. Barilla G. e R. F.lli Società per Azioni
19. Beiersdorf AG
20. Brandt Zwieback-Schokoladen GmbH & Co.KG
21. Brioche Pasquier Cerqueux
22. Burton's Foods Ltd
23. Casa Olearia Italiana Spa
24. Cereform Ltd
25. ConAgra Foods, Inc
26. Continental Bakeries BV
27. CO-OP Clean Co. Ltd.
28. CSM NV
29. DAUDRUY Van Cauwenberghe
30. De-Vau-Ge Cereals Holding GmbH
31. DP Supply BV
32. DSM Nutritional Products AG
33. Europe Snacks
34. Federatie Nederlandse Levensmiddelen Industrie - FNLI
35. Ferrero Trading Lux S.A.
36. Findus Group / YoungsSeafood Ltd
37. Frank Roberts & Sons Limited
38. Gebrueder Mueller Kerzenfabrik AG
39. Ginsters (A Division of Samworth Brothers Limited)
40. Goldenfry Foods Ltd
41. Goodman Fielder Ltd
42. Greencore Group plc
43. Griesson-de Beukelaer GmbH & Co. KG
44. Griffin's Foods Limited
45. H J Heinz Company Ltd
46. Haribo GmbH & Co KG
47. Henkel AG & Co. KGaA
48. Honeytop Speciality Foods
49. Hügli Holding AG
50. Intersnack Procurement B.V
51. Iwata Chemical Co.,Ltd
52. Johnson & Johnson
53. Justin's
54. Kao Corporation
55. Kellogg Company
56. Kerry Group
57. Klemme AG
58. KORONA SPOLKA AKCYJNA
59. Lamb Weston/Meijer VOF
60. Lantmännen ek för
61. Lindt & Sprüngli (International) AG
62. Lion Corporation
63. L'Oreal
64. Lotus Bakeries NV
65. Mars, Incorporated
66. Masson Group Company Limited
67. Mimasu Cleancare Corp.
68. Nairns OatCakes Ltd
69. Natra SA
70. Neste Oil Corporation
71. Nestle S.A.
72. Norlander Zeelandia AB
73. Nutreco International BV
74. Nutrition et Santé
75. NutriXo
76. Oriflame Cosmetics SA
77. P&G
78. Peerless Holdings Pty Ltd
79. Peeters Produkten BV
80. PEPSICO
81. Plusfood bv
82. Premier Foods Group Limited
83. PT Mikie Oleo Nabati Industri
84. PZ Cussons Plc
85. Raisio Group Plc.
86. Raps GmbH & Co. KG (4500016669)
87. Rhodia
88. Royal FrieslandCampina NV
89. sa Aigremont nv
90. Samworth Brothers
91. Santa Maria AB
92. Saraya Co Ltd
93. SAS Biscuits Poult

94. SAS Devineau
95. SENNA Nahrungsmittel GmbH & Co KG
96. SEPPIC SA
97. Seventh Generation, Inc
98. Shiseido Company Limited
99. Smilde Foods BV
100. Soapworks Ltd
101. Societe Industrielle De Bondues
102. St Hubert
103. Stratas Foods LLC
104. Taiyo Yushi Corp
105. The Hershey Company
106. The Jordans & Ryvita Company Ltd.
107. Tiger Tim Products Ltd
108. TOP Taste BV
109. Twincraft Soap
110. Unilever NV (VAT: NL004966466B77)
111. Unilever Supply Chain Company AG
112. United Biscuits (UK) Ltd
113. Ventura Foods, LLC
114. Verdener Keks- und Waffelfabrik Hans Freitag GmbH & Co. KG
115. Vereinigte Fettwarenindustrie GmbH
116. Vitacuire SAS
117. Walter Rau Lebensmittelwerke GmbH
118. Werner & Mertz GmbH
119. Wessanen Nederland Holding Bv
120. Westfälische Lebensmittelwerke, Lindemann GmbH & Co. KG
121. Wewalka GmbH Nfg. KG
122. WhiteWave Foods
123. Wilhelm Reuss GmbH & Co. KG Lebensmittelwerk
124. Yves Rocher

Environmental NGOs

125. Borneo Rhino Alliance (BORA)
126. Cheyenne Mountain Zoo
127. Conservation International
128. Fauna & Flora International
129. Global Environment Centre
130. National Wildlife Federation (USA)
131. Orang Utan Land Trust
132. Orang Utan Republic Foundation
133. PanEco
134. Sumatran Orangutan Society (SOS)
135. The Zoological Society of London
136. Wetlands International
137. WWF Indonesia
138. WWF International
139. WWF Switzerland

140. WWF-Malaysia

Producers

141. Achi Jaya Plantations Sdn Bhd
142. Agropalma S.A.
143. ANCUPA
144. Anglo Eastern Plantation PLC
145. Boustead Plantations Berhad
146. FEDEPALMA
147. FELDA
148. First Resources Limited
149. Genting Plantations Berhad
150. Golden Agri-Resources Ltd
151. Golden Veroleum (Liberia) Inc
152. Grupo Jaremar
153. Hap Seng Plantations Holdings Bhd
154. Herakles Farms Coöperatief, UA
155. IJM Plantations Berhad
156. Keresia Plantations Sdn Bhd
157. Kuala Lumpur Kepong Berhad
158. Kulim (Malaysia) Berhad
159. Louis Dreyfus Commodities Plantation
160. Malaysian Palm Oil Association
161. Mong Reththy Investment Cambodia Oil Palm Co., Ltd (MRICOP)
162. New Britain Palm Oil Ltd
163. Noble Plantations Pte Ltd
164. Olam International Limited
165. PalmElit SAS
166. PPB Oil Palms Berhad
167. PT Agro Bukit
168. PT Agro Indomas
169. PT Agrowiratama
170. PT Bakrie Sumatera Plantations TBK
171. PT Barumon Agro Sentosa
172. PT Berkat Sawit Sejati
173. PT Bumitama Gunajaya Agro
174. PT BW Plantation Tbk
175. PT Harapan Sawit Lestari
176. PT Inti Indosawit Subur
177. PT Ivo Mas Tunggal
178. PT Lubai Sawit Nusantara
179. PT Mentari Pratama
180. PT Musim Mas
181. PT Perkebunan Nusantara III
182. PT PP London Sumatra Indonesia Tbk
183. PT Proteksindo Utama Mulia
184. PT Salim Ivomas Pratama
185. PT Sampoerna Agro
186. PT Sawit Sumbermas Sarana
187. PT SMART Tbk
188. PT Swakarsa Sinarsentosa

- 189. PT Tri Bakti Sarimas
- 190. PT Unggul Lestari
- 191. PT Waringin Agro Jaya
- 192. R.E.A. Holdings Plc
- 193. Sabah Softwoods Berhad
- 194. SIAT SA
- 195. Sime Darby Plantation Sdn Bhd
- 196. SIPEF Group
- 197. Socfin Group
- 198. SPZ Enterprises (PNG) Pty Ltd
- 199. Tian Siang Holdings Sdn Bhd
- 200. Tradewinds Plantations Berhad
- 201. United Palm Oil Industry PCL (UPOIC)
- 202. United Plantations Bhd
- 203. Univanich Palm Oil PCL

Processors and Traders

- 204. AAA Oils & Fats Pte Ltd
- 205. Aarhus Karlshamn UK
- 206. AB Fortum Värme samägt med Stockholm stad
- 207. ADM
- 208. AI Energy Co. Ltd.
- 209. Alfred C Toepfer International GmbH
- 210. Ambrian Energy GmbH
- 211. Artistic Support Sdn Bhd
- 212. B.Grimm Green Power Limited
- 213. BASF Personal Care & Nutrition GmbH
- 214. Bio Oils energy S.L.
- 215. BP plc.
- 216. Britannia Food Ingredients
- 217. Bunge
- 218. C.I Acepalma S.A.
- 219. California Oils Corporation
- 220. Cardowan Creameries Ltd
- 221. Cargill, Incorporated
- 222. CELYS - Part of ALVA SAS Group
- 223. Companhia Refinadora da Amazônia
- 224. Cremer Oleo GmbH & Co. KG
- 225. Daabon Organic CI Tequendama SA
- 226. Danisco Enablers
- 227. E D & F Man Liquid Products Europe B.V.
- 228. Elburg Global
- 229. Emery Oleochemicals (M) Sdn Bhd
- 230. Eulip S.p.A
- 231. Evonik Goldschmidt GmbH
- 232. Felda Iffco Sdn Bhd
- 233. Florin AG
- 234. Fuji Oil Group
- 235. Future Prelude Sdn. Bhd.

- 236. Gardner Smith Pty Ltd
- 237. Givaudan SA
- 238. Global Agri-Trade Corporation
- 239. Godrej Industries Limited
- 240. Green & Natural Sdn Bhd
- 241. Green Earth Fuel LLC
- 242. Guangzhou Namchow Oil & Fat Co., Ltd
- 243. Henry Lamotte Oils GmbH
- 244. Huntsman Holland B.V
- 245. Inter-Continental Oils and Fats Pte Ltd (ICOF)
- 246. Intercontinental Specialty Fats Sdn Bhd
- 247. IOI Group
- 248. Itochu Corporation
- 249. Jin Wei (M) Sdn Bhd
- 250. J-Oil Mills, Inc.
- 251. Juchem Food Ingredients GmbH
- 252. Jules Brochenin SA France
- 253. Just Oil & Grain Pte Ltd
- 254. Kamani Oil Industries Pvt. Ltd
- 255. Keck Seng (Malaysia) Berhad
- 256. Koninklijke Zeelandia Groep b.v.
- 257. KTC (Edibles) Limited
- 258. Lam Soon (Thailand) Plc.
- 259. Lam Soon Edible Oils Sdn Bhd
- 260. Levo BV
- 261. Lipidos Santiga
- 262. Loiret & Haentjens SA
- 263. Marvesa Holding NV
- 264. Metcash Trading Ltd
- 265. Mewah Group
- 266. Mitsubishi Corporation
- 267. Mitsui & Co., Ltd
- 268. Molkerei Meggle Wasserburg GmbH & Co KG
- 269. Morakot Industries Public Company Limited
- 270. Natu'Oil Services Inc
- 271. New Biodiesel Co., Ltd
- 272. Nexsol (Malaysia) Sdn Bhd
- 273. Nidera Handelscompagnie B.V.
- 274. Nutriswiss AG
- 275. OLIO Spezial Speisefett Speiseöl GmbH
- 276. Oxiteno S.A. Indústria e Comércio
- 277. Pacific Inter-Link Sdn. Bhd.
- 278. Pacific Oleochemicals Sdn Bhd
- 279. Pacific Rim Plantations Services Pte Ltd
- 280. Palmaju Edible Oil Sdn. Bhd.

- 281. Palsgaard A/S
- 282. Patum Vegetable Oil Company Limited
- 283. Perdue Agribusiness Inc
- 284. Peter Greven GmbH & Co. KG
- 285. Platinum Energy Sdn Bhd
- 286. Pro Fair Trade AG
- 287. Product Board for Margerine, Fats and Oils (MVO)
- 288. PT Agro Jaya Perdana
- 289. PT Indokarya Internusa
- 290. PT Intibenua Perkasatama
- 291. PT Megasurya Mas
- 292. PT Wahana Citra Nabati
- 293. PT Wira Inno Mas
- 294. Refinadora Nacional de Aceites Y Grasas S.A. (REFINAL)
- 295. Rikevita (M) Sdn Bhd
- 296. Royal Dutch Shell
- 297. Silbury Marketing Ltd
- 298. Sime Darby Unimills BV
- 299. Southern Edible Oil Industries (M) Sdn Bhd
- 300. Soyuz Corporation
- 301. ST Refinery Sdn Bhd
- 302. Stephenson Group Ltd
- 303. Suksomboon Vegetable Oil Company Limited
- 304. T S Oil Industry Co., Ltd
- 305. Thai Oleochemicals Co., Ltd (TOL)
- 306. THIN OIL PRODUCTS LLC.
- 307. Tianjin Namchow Oil and Fat Co. Ltd
- 308. Vance Bioenergy Sdn Bhd
- 309. Volac International Ltd
- 310. Walter Rau Neusser Öl und Fett AG
- 311. Wilmar Europe Holdings BV
- 312. Wilmar International Ltd
- 313. Wouters NV

Retailers

- 314. Aldi South Group
- 315. Axfood AB
- 316. Boots UK Limited
- 317. C.I.V. Superunie B.A
- 318. Carrefour
- 319. Coles Supermarkets Pty Ltd
- 320. Compasss Group plc
- 321. Coop, Switzerland
- 322. Delhaize Group SA/NV
- 323. Dutch Food Retail Association (CBL)
- 324. Federation of Migros Cooperatives
- 325. Groupe CASINO
- 326. Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc.

- 327. IKEA Services AB (inv: IKEA Of Sweden AB)
- 328. J Sainsbury PLC
- 329. L'Occitane en Provence
- 330. Marks & Spencer PLC
- 331. McDonald's Corporation
- 332. Rema 1000 Denmark AS
- 333. REWE Group on behalf of REWE-Zentral-Aktiengesellschaft Köln
- 334. Royal Ahold NV
- 335. Scamark S.A
- 336. SODEXO
- 337. SOK Corporation
- 338. Tesco Stores Ltd
- 339. The Body Shop International
- 340. The Co-operative Group
- 341. Waitrose Ltd
- 342. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc
- 343. WM Morrison Supermarkets PLC
- 344. Woolworths (Proprietary) Limited
- 345. Woolworths Limited

Social NGOs

- 346. Both ENDS
- 347. Oxfam International
- 348. PAN AP - Pesticide Action Network Asia and the Pacific
- 349. Sawit Watch
- 350. Solidaridad
- 351. UTZ Certified
- 352. West Africa Fair Fruit
- 353. Yayasan SETARA Jambi