

Minutes of HRWG Meeting**14th June 2017****Lansdun Theatre****RIBA**

Attendance:

Name	Organisation	Status
Co-Chairs:- Madeleine Brassier (MB) Alexandra Experton (AE) Members:- Daryll Delgado (DD) Jessica Furmanski (JF) Wang Yue Yue (WYY) Amy Truelsen (AT) Loo Siew Wai (LSW) Carolyn Lim (CL) Rachel Cowburn (RC) Yan Peng (YP) Tulio Dias Observers: Ida Suryati (IS) Secretariat: Kamini Visvananthan (KV)	Oxfam Novib Cargill	Co-Chair Co-Chair

No.	Description	Main Discussion Points	Action Items	Progress Updates
14th June 2017 (Wednesday)				
1.	Welcome and brief introduction	MB to started with the welcome Quick Introduction of everyone		

		<p>MB...share if everyone is active in RSPO</p> <p>Discussion on the P&C: We need to determine what the status of the work that we do here will be in the P&C</p> <p>Quick Note on P&C...we need to see in terms of points of contention, we need to see what are we trying to achieve and can we try and achieve it.</p> <p>We will share some other processes as well...like impacts and outcomes and the ToC.</p>		
2.	Updates	<p><u>Labour Task Force:</u> DD provided an introduction on the Labour Task Force:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We had the kickoff meeting in march - First quarter was focused on the P&C Review. - To provide a background, the LTF is a task force that has a lifespan of 2 years. So, after the time has lapsed we will review the status and decide what to do next moving forward. - For the Labour Task Force input into the P&C, what was submitted was the list of priorities. - Besides the P&C, we have also started talking to organisations (Unicef, CGF) to see if we can integrate our calendars. - Also spoken to Maria Hostal from Fair Hire Initiative on tackling Ethical Recruitment. - We are also putting together a list of potential trainings from other training providers and/or resources. - The next meeting should be after the next P&C Task Force Meeting and during that meeting, we should be able to come up with a “preliminary menu” of Capacity Building Activities <p>MB we need to discuss the relationship and how can we collaborate and how do we keep the HRWG keeps the each other overlap.</p>		

		<p>AE: Based in our last meeting, where there are issues which overlap, they would fall back to everyone.</p> <p>Suggest a quarterly update for the Task force for everyone in the HRWG of the LTF so they know that we are doing</p> <p>DD: To include the co-leads of the HRWG to the LTF work and correspondences.</p> <p>Process decision: AE and MB will figure out the best way to ensure communication within the group and process. Concern is a lot is going on and not many responses getting back.</p> <p>Q: Does the LTF get input from other sub-groups? Yes, whenever it is relevant. The only difference is that it is time bound, and we have specific deliverable.</p> <p>Overview: Yes its in the 1st TF meeting. How are our activities are parallel with the P&C review.</p> <p>We know what they are. We want to have them endorsed anyway</p> <p>AE & MB will organise the method of communications. The most effective way is that you need to give the group the anticipated time for feedback.</p> <p><u>Gender Equality & Social Auditing:</u> Research was commissioned on the quality of social auditing in the RSPO system. It was done by Rainforest Alliance and Verite</p>	<p>KV to share LTF TOR with HRWG</p> <p>MB & AE have been included into LTF mailing list</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Oxfam has combined it into hands-on recommendation for RSPO Goes in very well for RSPO P&C MB wants a meeting between the ATF and sub-group on social auditing to go on ATF So far, the focus has been on the P&C review. The indicators are getting clearer</p> <p>RC: What is the work that is being done looking at auditing...isn't that all the work that Verite did?</p> <p>DD: Right after we did the work we shared it but nothing happened. But we have referred to the document a lot and in our engagement with them. At the same time we put in the report, we were doing training activities...those trainings were on how to audit against labour standards.</p> <p>In the meantime, there was a parallel development calling for the improvement of the quality of assessment. Its bigger than the social auditing. All we have been doing is to use that report. There is an official recommendation. It has been followed up Jan looks at the auditability. Needs to be followed up quickly.</p> <p>DD: Social auditing can make a decision on evaluation, like to monitor how it is used?</p> <p>MB: As lead of this group I will make it a priority to act on this. KV to make connection with JVD.</p> <p>To look at the document and see what the communications are. Align and see where they are, the steps are and get on the same page.</p> <p>DD: what we did, we looked using at the standards and see what they want,</p>	<p>KV has sent email introducing Jan Van Driel & MB to initiate discussions</p> <p>KV has sent email introducing Jan Van Driel & MB</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>We looked at the system. Who are these auditors, are they qualified? Most of the time, they don't have a social auditor.</p> <p>Tulio: CB presentation a few years ago in 2015 about the challenges of social auditing...these improvement should not be so difficult because the challenges presented are small and the list is non-availability,..</p> <p>MB: if you can send the overview, I will send the set of recommendation so that you have the relevant document...that the Social auditing group are referring to.</p> <p>Study...they should look at the study that was commissioned by the Verite/Oxfam as well as a reference.</p> <p>Human Rights Defenders ("HRD"):-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process of the policy was for the protection for HRD. - There were major concerns...we recognise that this is a critical thing. - Concerns were around the ability of RSPO including whether it had the requisite resources to uphold the system proposed in the daft by FPP as well as the legal implication specifically taking on the protection of taking on the HRD and the extent proposed. - After the feedback from the HRWG, we discussed how does the policy tie into the complaints procedure and how would it help in improving the current system. - A gap analysis was conducted by FPP in relation to the draft and the revamped complaints procedure. - We now are seeking a legal review on the resolution and the draft to determine the legal implications on RSPO and its members. <p>Discussion:-</p>		
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We need to be careful when it comes to drafting this policy. When RSPO makes a promise, people will rely on that promise. As such, it is a big risk if we promise too much. - This is a complete new territory. It might have severe consequences and affect our credibility. - We need to keep the above in mind and be careful about this in terms of what we are able to deliver. <p>AE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We should ask ourselves, what is the outcome that we are trying to achieve? What are the standards that we want to be held accountable against, the ways to achieve this, the systems that are available. - We shouldn't set ourselves up to fail. <p>RC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there other accreditation systems that have adopted a policy such as this? - What are the risks? Or examples of this system being implemented? If we have those references, then we can see where we can tie this up. <p>The review should not only be a review into the legal aspects, it should also benchmark the policy to labour and social standards....parameters should also be discussed and the specification of the resolution itself.</p> <p>-It is important for us to quickly come up with the text and determine the outcome as well as whether we have the expertise to do it.</p> <p>Q: do we refer it to the draft text to the P&C? PG: This discussion is not for the P&C. It is in relation to a resolution which was passed during the last GA. We should be concerned with putting up something tight which addresses all concerns.</p> <p>TD:</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>What we need is clear guidance on how to uphold the rights of these parties.</p> <p>At point (iii) of the resolution calls for graduated actions. The norms relate to the P&C. it is a heavy implication that is ensuring protection. Suggest that principle 6.13 includes non-intimidation.</p> <p>-Suggestion: look at SAI8000 as a reference</p> <p>Gender:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We need to look at all the modules with a gender lense and this needs to be applied in connection with all the sub-groups. - There is a lack of gender sensitivity at the moment <p>RC: We should be share best practices. Economic empowerment with this large group contributing to this sector. Women are invisible so we don't know what the contribution is Lets bring training to this group. It can go into the criteria and indicator</p>		
3.	P&C Review updates	<p>AE</p> <p>1st P&C Review was done in KL</p> <p>First of its kind in our approach</p> <p>We didn't delve into the text</p> <p>Looked at the process and outcomes</p> <p>2 main points:</p> <p>Looking at a stepwise approach</p> <p>Benchmark between P&C and Rainforest Alliance's system</p> <p>Approach to a standard with a continual process.</p> <p>Benchmarking against standards like POIG, SAN</p> <p>The need to include smallholders in the process</p>		

		<p>PG: Key was that there wasn't content so we didn't go into it...we were talking about structures and what we need to do about that Feeling was that if we resolve the structure, then content would be better</p> <p>Some content was that there is a general feeling for improvement of labour and Human rights</p> <p>FPIC component needed to be simplified and/or 'peeled off' The requirement needed some work but not clear on the how.</p> <p>MB: Little time to present all the priorities yet we did Priority the social NGOs shared overlapped what we discussed here. FPIC and HRD, child labour, labour rights and small holders were listed to be included. Inclusion was a key word shared. Relevant to this group.</p> <p>Two lane option- Where u have specific standard for smallholders and growers...so then that brought the discussion on how its diluted.</p> <p>Nothing is decided. Structure felt important.</p> <p>Merticated system was discussed. It is relevant to social auditing/auditing...can you make everything auditable?</p> <p>DD: Discussion of aligning the P&C with commensurated effort.</p> <p>It makes it a bit complex as we review the text today.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>We need to be agile in reviewing this text.</p> <p>The outcomes will stay the same, it is a matter of how we are getting there.</p> <p>Be prepared for that.</p> <p>The process is heavily owned by the P&C Review TF which is represented by the categories.</p> <p>Here we are an advisory aspect so we need to be clear on what comes out of the work we do here.</p> <p>AE: we need to look at our roles here separate from the P&C TF. As far as this group is concerned, we need to agree on what is agreed.</p> <p>People here can defend the outcome here as much as we can but its dependant on the agreement on our various constituencies For the rest (growers/producers) this is a time for us to see if it is implementable/feasible instead of defending the interest of your constituency because that will be done there.</p> <p>Tulio: Strategy, I can take the position in the group, and I have influence with the Latam Representation. If you want to be progressive, it is important the support from others such as the supply chain members who are in this group/organisations, If they stay clear in a way to RSPO to achieve their own expectations, this is the way the convincing power increases.</p> <p>Strategy to be effective: It would be good if the consumer companies support in a very clear way the proposals from this Working Group.</p> <p>Are there Banks in this group?</p>	<p>MB has approached Rabo Bank on whether they</p>	<p>Jose den Toom of Rabo Bank has</p>
--	--	--	---------------------------------------

		<p>Trying to fix this. MB is proposing to have their input because we need it. MB is talking to Rabo Bank to see if they would like to continue being in this Working Group.</p> <p>PG: With the urgency with the banks, can we accept going to the banks to consult them specifically because that is easier to have them to say yes to than to join the WG</p> <p>DD: It's a matter of reaching out to them. Suggest reach out to them and ask them to lend their voice. <i>(The FITF are organising webinars...there will be a series surrounding Labour issues. Verite have been approached by the FITF to help provide these webinars)</i></p> <p>MB: who is in charge of this webinar.</p> <p>DD: I will put you in touch with that.</p> <p>In relation to the HRWG's recommendations to the P&C Review:- RW: We could clearly state in terms of social improvement, what do we want to see, and we support the position that the HRWG are providing. The strength of this group would be in alignment. We need to be what our red lines are.</p> <p>AT: Would it be helpful that we voice our support to our constituencies that this is our support.</p>	<p>would like to continue their membership in the HRWG</p>	<p>responded with interest to continue to be in HRWG</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>DD: I forgot to mention that we had a meeting with CGF. We were very clear of what we wanted...we wanted them to support us to tell their members what we are proposing.</p> <p>RW: We (Unilever) can drive it through because I am actively involved with the CGF so I can be the alignment factor. We need to show the connectivity and the support...so that we aren't setting two sets of</p>		
4.	Discussion of Text for P&C Review	<p>The last Draft for the input into the P&C Review (which was circulated for comments via email) was projected and the members who were present went through the draft principle by principle and discussed what would the final recommendation be. Where there is no consensus, the recommendation will be taken out.</p> <p>Where the group were unable to come up with the specific text to be recommended, comments were inserted to express the intent of the Working Group in the recommendations for change.</p> <p>The discussion then went into discussing and finalising the text to be provided to Proforest, the facilitator to the P&C review. The final text is as attached in the email which attaches these minutes.</p> <p>The finalised document will be sent to Proforest after it is cleaned up by KV</p>	KV to send cleaned up Recommendations	Cleaned up Recommendations were sent on 28 th June 2017
5.	Conclusion	<p>We had finished the meeting much later than projected and the group was unable to discuss the following which was included in the Agenda as the discussion for the P&C input had taken time:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Breakout discussions with Sub-groups - Plans moving forward - Discussion on next meeting 		

