

MINUTES OF MEETING **10th RSPO JWG MEETING (VIRTUAL)**

Date: 1 June 2021 (Tuesday) 8pm(MYT) to 10pm(MYT)

<p><u>Attendance:</u></p> <p><u>Members and Alternates</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Glyn Davies (WWFMY, GD – Co-chair) 2. Sander van den Ende (NBPOL, SE – Co-chair) 3. Balu Perumal (MNS, BP) 4. Chin Kai Xiang (Bunge, CKX) 5. John Watts (INOBU, JW) 6. Lim Sian Choo (BAL, LSC) 7. Lee Kuan Chun (P&G, LKC) 8. Audrey Lee Mei Fong (OLAM, ALMF) 9. Marcus Colchester (FPP, MC) 10. Paul Wolvekamp (BothEnds, PW) 11. Rauf Prasodjo (UNILEVER, RP) 12. Rob Nicholls (RN, MM) 13. Jon Hixson (YUM’s Brand, JH) <p><u>Absent with Apologies</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alagendran Maniam (SDP, AM) 2. Maria Amparo Alban (ACDC, MAA) 3. Tom Lomax (FPP, TL) 4. Putra Agung (RA, PA) 5. Wahyu Wigati (GAR, WW) 6. Imam Marzuq (RSPO Secretariat, IM) 	<p><u>RSPO Secretariat</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dillon Sarim (DS) 2. Javin Tan (JT) 3. Julia Majail (JM) 4. Amir Afham (AA)
--	---

Agenda

Time (MYT)	Item #	Agenda	PIC
8.00pm - 8.10pm	1.0	Opening (Welcoming) 1.1 RSPO Antitrust Guidelines 1.2 RSPO consensus-based decision making 1.3 Agree the Agenda	Co chair (Glyn)
8.10pm - 8.15pm	2.0	Updates from RSPO Secretariat 2.1 JWG Resource Team from Secretariat 2.2 SSC decision	RSPO Secretariat
8.15pm - 8.45pm	3.0	Updating: RSPO JA Piloting Framework	Co chair (Glyn)
8.45pm - 9.30pm	4.0	Discussion: JWG work plan	ALL
9.30pm - 9.35pm	5.0	AOB	

Minutes of Meeting:

No	Description	Action
1.0	<p>Opening remarks</p> <p>GD welcomed the JWG members to the 9th JWG meeting. It has been almost a year since the members last met. GD welcomed Paul Wolvekamp (PW) who is taking over from Michael Rice (MR) from BothENDS, representing Social NGO.</p> <p>ALMF expressed her appreciation to JM and JT for taking the task to continue with the development of the RSPO JA framework with JWG voluntarily during the transition of RSPO into its new structure.</p> <p>The two objectives of the 10th JWG meeting is to finalise the JA document for final Standard Standing Committee (SSC) endorsement before rolling it out; and the workplan of the JWG moving forward.</p> <p>GD read out the RSPO Antitrust Guidelines and consensus-based decision making for conducting WG meetings to all members of JWG. RP inquired clarification and clarity on if voting is to be in-placed if there is no consensus-made and if the similar process at SSC level. The Secretariat clarified that consensus-based decision making is a process practised across all RSPO supporting bodies (WG and SSC), of which if no consensus is achieved, the matter will be escalated to higher level for decision.</p>	
2.0	<p>Updates from the RSPO Secretariat</p> <p>The Secretariat introduced the interim Secretariat Resource Group, made up of JT, JM, AA and IM, in supporting the JWG. The Secretariat updated the members on SSC requests received in #16 SSC meeting in March 2021.</p> <p>In summary, the JA document is accepted by SSC for endorsement subject to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title of the document will be changed to “JA Pilot Framework”; 2. Addition of a cover note specifying the use of the document limited to pilot testing only; 3. Addition of an annex specifying the gaps of the current document required to be acknowledged as a certification system document; and 4. No further public consultation is required for this document for the purpose of pilot testing. <p>In addition to this, the SSC accepted the activities/timelines prepared by the secretariat to guide the works required moving forward, but acknowledged it would be subject to change based on future circumstances. The three pilot test sites would be allowed to proceed.</p> <p>GD inquired on the status of the hiring of a dedicated JA Secretariat staff, which will strengthen the RSPO Secretariat support to the JWG. The Secretariat confirmed that a dedicated JA Secretariat Staff will be hired.</p> <p>PW inquired that with the JA framework roll-out as a piloting framework, the RSPO is potentially accepting more pilots? If yes, what would be the mechanism? The co-chair responded that any new pilot is welcome based on the endorsed JA Framework. The JA Framework is to serve as the guidance document for all pilots (existing and potential new) going into the guided direction based on the framework.</p>	

	<p>Some key gaps and point of clarification raised by a JWG member on: 1) the audit rules (especially if a single member breaking the rules); 2) lesson learned on the most feasible scale for JA implementation; 3) the practicality for JE holding multiple group certification; and 4) the awareness and understanding of wider stakeholders group or community on the complex idea of Jurisdictional Approach.</p> <p>GD responded that gaps raised have been heavily discussed and the current framework was built upon the experiences from Sabah, Seruyan and Ecuador. There is no immediate step or plan in building and documenting the example; however, there are still opportunities to further elaborate the points raised in future as we are building towards a more comprehensive certification system. Comprehensive consultation conducted (2 rounds of 60-day or more) on the existing framework.</p> <p>PW further inquired if the JWG has considered the indicators to show the progress and/or success of the pilots? GD responded that the monitoring elements are as per outlined in the document as system- and landscape-performance indicators.</p> <p>JW inquired if it would be wiser to consider launching the framework only after most of the identified gaps are developed. GD then responded that the current framework is still very relevant to be launched to provide guidance for the existing pilot to continue working on building its JA initiative. SE further added that the launch of the framework is to provide some official guidance to existing pilots that are recognised by the RSPO. The framework (document) should continue to evolve based on the rich experiences drawn from existing pilots.</p> <p>MC supported the launching of the framework, even though it is not definitive yet, as it will reach wider players (especially non-RSPO members) and to consider new (potential) pilots. In addition, acknowledging that there is still a long way before the actual details are needed for implementation.</p> <p>MC also responded to the previous question raised as to the mechanism (who) would approve the new pilot. It is outlined in the document (page 16) that it is the BoG that approves the new pilot.</p> <p>JW further added that the framework is needed to be launched, however, also noted that there are some important clarities needed by the companies before they decide to participate (i.e. the incentive mechanism).</p>	
<p>3.0</p>	<p>Updating: RSPO JA Piloting Framework document</p> <p>The JWG members then proceed with finalising the document as requested by SSC. The JWG members collectively agreed to keep the texts simple for a preamble stating the document as a piloting framework with an additional Annex listing the existing gap of the framework.</p> <p>It is noted that Annex 2 will need to have a paragraph providing a summary of the types of gaps identified (process, institutional etc). Both co-chairs and secretariat are to finalise the document for JWG members approval via email before seeking SSC final endorsement.</p> <p>MC raised that the last three listed gaps can be complicated. It will need to be referred to BHCVWG on the matter. JWG members agreed and the involvement of other RSPO supporting bodies or even wider stakeholders in filling the gap.</p>	<p>The Secretariat to finalise the document with assistance from co-chairs by the end of June and share it with JWG members for final approval.</p> <p>Upon JWG members' approval, the Secretariat shall proceed with getting SSC endorsement before launching.</p>

<p>4.0</p>	<p>Discussion: JWG Work Plan</p> <p>The Secretariat presented a quick review of the work plan tabled to SSC to the JWG members, noting that it is a work plan developed by the Secretariat and is meant for reference. SSC also acknowledged that the work plan is to be further improved by JWG.</p> <p>There were concerns raised on the proposed timeline within the work plan and there should be a more aligned list of activities as outlined in Annex 2 of the document.</p> <p>There were discussions around the challenges in ensuring the development of rules around HCV/HCS mapping (landscape versus management unit) is completed for implementation, as the requirements of the mapping are within Step 2 of the JA framework. It is noted that the existing document does provide a line for interim measure, however, it needs to be clear that any mapping of indicative areas are meant to identify no-go areas, of which it does not mean those not listed as ‘no-go’ areas are directly recognised as ‘go’ areas. There is still a need to conduct finer-scale assessment, ensuring there are others (i.e. social and community livelihoods) elements are captured.</p> <p>GD further added the Sabah level mapping captured HCV 1 to (partly) HCV 4, where other social values are to be captured at a much finer scale of assessment. LKC fully agreed and noted that the JWG will need to provide more clarity around what is indicative and what other assessments needed to complete the full assessment.</p> <p>JWG members also noted that RSPO Secretariat and relevant supporting bodies’ capacity and resources are crucial in determining the speed of relevant development to fulfill the gaps.</p> <p>The Secretariat proposed that perhaps some prioritisation can be done on the list of the identified gaps to determine the resource needs and if there is a limitation, the group can further discuss the alternative. LSC proposed that some pairing of the gaps can be done too as they are interlinked. CKX proposed that the jurisdictional-level remediation and compensation work be prioritised. LKC also highlighted that the time needed for any development that required endorsement will also need to be factored (different levels of endorsement (SSC, BoG or GA)).</p> <p>AL proposed that the Secretariat work internally (or with relevant supporting bodies) on the potential timeline and process for the list of gaps identified. The proposed timeline and work plan then be brought to the JWG for further deliberation. This is because the Secretariat is in better understanding of the internal processes for such development.</p>	<p>The Secretariat to work internally on the proposed work plan and timeline for the next JWG meeting.</p> <p>JWG members are to provide comments and feedback to the Secretariat on the work plan with proposed prioritisation of the listed gaps (via email).</p>
<p>5.0</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>All members agreed to the quarterly WG meeting. The co-chairs inquired and obtained confirmation from the Secretariat that the hiring of a dedicated JA person has been initiated.</p> <p>JW raised and the co-chairs agreed that the work plan should also look at facilitating learning sessions with all pilots.</p> <p>The meeting adjourned at 10.pm (MYT).</p>	