

## Minutes of Meeting:

### RSPO Communications & Claims Standing Committee (C&CSC)

**Date** : August 30, 2011

**Venue** : Shell building, London

**Starting Time** : 10.00am –4.00pm

#### Attendance list (in alphabetical order)

AAK	Catherine Hansen
Ahold	Hugo Byrnes
BM TRADA	Andy Green
Cargill	Caroline Sikking
GreenPalm	Simon Crimas
Hill & Knowlton	Tanno Massar
Hill & Knowlton	Giovanni Colombo
Hill & Knowlton	Pamela Bons
IOI	Yves Augrandjean
Neste Oil	Simo Hokanen
New Britain Oils	Adam Thomas
New Britain Palm Oil Limited	Simon Lord
Oxfam International	Sandra Seeboldt
Product Board MVO	Marieke Leegwater
Rabobank	Dr Olaf Brugman
Retailers' Palm Oil Group	Belinda Howell
RSPO Secretariat	Anne Gabriel
Shell	Michelle Morton
Shell	Andy Gent
Sime Darby	Puvan Selvanathan
Sime Darby	Juliane Eykelhoff
Unilever	Jan Kees Vis (Chair)
WWF	Adam Harrison

## Opening

- The Chair (Jan Kees Vis) opened the meeting and welcomed all participants.
- Briefing on anti-trust law guidelines.
- Introduction of members.
- Perused through components within minutes of last meeting.
- No comments or questions were raised.

## Discussion

1	Composition of Members of C&CSC by Chair:
	<p><b>Streamlining members:</b> <i>Jan Kees</i> advised committee to look into streamlining members for this committee - 2 members per constituent with alternates identified. Members within the stakeholder group should appoint who will be the 2 key representatives in the C&amp;CSC and who will be the alternates.</p>
	<p><b>Wider distribution list</b> - <i>Hugo Byrnes</i>: if other interested members can be included into a wider distribution list for minutes, plans, and other material updates. <i>Jan Kees</i>: minutes and emails can be distributed to a larger pool of people – but meetings should strictly comprise members.</p>
	<p><b>Number of members per constituent</b> - <i>Adam Thomas</i>: many important issues in the communications sphere and questioned whether 2 members from each constituent is adequate. <i>Jan Kees</i>: whoever represents each stakeholder group will have to be open to comments from other parties/companies in the constituent. The member representative selected should be capable enough to manage this.</p>
	<p><b>Role of alternates</b> - <i>Belinda Howell</i>: enquired about the role of alternates in the C&amp;C. <i>Jan Kees</i>: The alternates will only attend the meetings when the key member is unable to do so. They will also be copied on correspondences.</p>
	<p><b>Stakeholder representation</b> - <i>Adam Harrison</i>: current member list heavy on processors &amp; traders – to gauge whether this does need to be reflected in the composition to underscore the need for members to contribute and offer feedback before the meeting. <i>Jan Kees</i>: membership category is not carved in stone – but number of companies should dictate level of interest on the board. Manageable to do this within 30 people – if more people want to be kept informed, include them in the correspondence loop. Most critical is to ensure that whoever represents in the standing committee is willing to pass on and share the comments from those stakeholder groups i.e. points in the agenda to be shared with Secretariat.</p>
	<p><b>Engagement amongst constituents</b> - <i>Simon Lord</i>: Historically, the RSPO has not managed engagement with constituents all that well. Suggested that the Secretariat provides full list so that the member representative engages with the stakeholders. Also enquired about growers from ROW and from Malaysia and Indonesia. How will this be represented in the composition? <i>Marieke Leegwater</i>: important to align input from constituents before meetings so there can be a clear agenda set or decision making so that members can be fully prepared. <i>Adam Harrison</i>: suggested rotation basis for representatives within</p>

	a certain group versus a permanent committee? If the rep on board is not sharing the information, how should this be managed?
	<b>Key role of stakeholder representation in SC</b> - <i>Jan Kees</i> : SC members are not elected like EB members. Every stakeholder to decide who they want represented in the SC. In the case there is a conflict of interest, to decide on process to allow for changes/modifications to be made.
	<b>Service providers in SC</b> - <i>Adam Thomas</i> : asked if service providers should have the right to veto on areas that they have potential conflict of interests in. They bring great value for representation but may have to discuss extent of decision making/influence from them. <i>Jan Kees</i> : Decision making will be by consensus, as is the rule in RSPO. Service providers, not being RSPO Ordinary Members, should not be part of that consensus process. 3 types of service providers; UTZ, GreenPalm and certification body. They bring good knowledge on verification, supply chain options, etc. Technical advice from them is valuable. But service providers do not have to be involved in final decision making. <i>Adam Green</i> : confirmed that as representative of the certification body, they can input and represent other certifying bodies but not be involved in final decision making.
	<b>Cross fertilization from other SCs</b> - <i>Michelle Morton</i> : suggested someone from T&TSC to be involved in the C&C SC – to have some cross over within the groups/standing committees. <i>Jan Kees</i> : explained that there is a limitation with regards to resources from member representatives and time spent. To cross involve someone in T&T meetings to be in C&C meetings – to consider increased demand in commitment. Challenge is in formalizing the reference between the standing committees. However, this should be fine on a voluntary basis between Chairs of standing committees. <i>Simon Lord and Adam Thomas</i> : cross fertilization between the standing committees represented makes sense. <i>Marieke</i> : suggested to include a space in the membership for Standing Committee representation.

<b>2</b>	<b>Regional/Geographical representation of C&amp;C Standing Committee by Chair:</b>
	<b>Distinctive landscapes</b> - <i>Jan Kees</i> : 3 geographies need to be actively involved from very market landscape and from a demand perspective, sustainability etc. Requested suggestions on how to organize and coordinate this.
	<b>Role of H&amp;K and Secretariat</b> - <i>Jan Kees</i> : H&K will be the hub in Europe India and China while the Secretariat takes the lead in SEA.
	<b>Regional Clusters</b> - Regional group of interested parties should meet on a regular basis so that regional matters can be discussed and fed back into the main C&CSC meetings.
	<b>Linked back to the C&amp;CSC</b> - The regional groups will also have representative from various stakeholder groups – to be connected to the C&C through teleconferencing etc.

3.	Terms of Reference for C&CSC by Chair:
	<b>Role of Secretariat</b> - Discussed the contents of ToR in terms of the role of the Secretariat and C&CSC. To gradually transfer the executive responsibility to the dedicated support from the secretariat.
	<b>Role of C&amp;C</b> - should be focused on strategic development – actual execution should be responsibility of the Communications Director/Secretariat. Work program/plans should be approved by the C&C and EB with flexibility built into it to reallocate in terms of budget. Marketing plans and strategies will be approved by C&C which will come from H&K or Secretariat
	<b>Communications policies</b> – The C&CSC is not equipped to do this. The secretariat in KL and the grievance panel is responsible to deal with these sorts of issues – this line to be omitted from ToR.
	<b>Stakeholder engagements</b> - <i>Simo Hokanen</i> : what do you mean by engaging stakeholders? <i>Jan Kees</i> : if there is an opportunity for engagement, members will be approached to speak in the capacity of RSPO representation
	<b>Monitoring of performance</b> - <i>Adam Thomas</i> : Chair & Secretariat to ensure that minutes and updates are communicated appropriately. However, who and how does one monitor performance for those who have these responsibilities? Is that the role of C&C?? Who is responsible for the management of the service provider? <i>Puvan</i> : this group does not have the capacity to evaluate the service provider. <i>Marieke</i> : suggests that the Secretariat manage the service provider – to ensure lack of ambiguity
	<b>ToR edits</b> : <i>Puvan</i> : Can the EB overwrite what the C&CSC decides on? Section on responsibility & objectives and the role of the secretariat – to refer to Puvan’s comments in the documents which are yet to be circulated to the committee members as it came in just before the meeting.
	<b>C&amp;CSC member background</b> - <i>Adam Harrison</i> : should members of this C&C SC be communications experts or industry/content experts. <i>Jan Kees</i> : difficult to be prescriptive about who should be represented in the SCs. Difficult to talk about supply chain options without understanding the technical issues within this sector. In a transition phase, move to a secretariat that is more empowered to take charge and resourced to a doable basis – by that time different supply chain options would have been put in place. Too early to be restrictive.

4.	Supply chain challenges for biofuels by Michelle Morton:
	<p><b>The role and need for the RSPO:</b> was discussed - exchange volume a critical area. <i>Simo Hokanen:</i> ISCC system; certification for feedstock and storage point; These 2 are matched in the system – multiple different kind of feedstock – flexibility; New certification standards are coming into the markets – creating competition. Need to distinguish between regulatory claims and product/consumer claims – if this is not changed, it would make RSPO irrelevant.</p>
	<p><b>Comments during the presentation:-</b></p>
	<p><i>Adam Harrison:</i> supply chain certification of linking claim to physical production/supply – can use the existing system by Germany to check and verify the data.</p>
	<p><i>Jan Kees;</i> no issue with the bottom rule either – which includes RSPO mass balance specification. At the final molecule, there may not be a single amount of CSPO.</p>
	<p><i>Marieke:</i> the claim should specify that it concerns RSPO mass balance.</p>
	<p><i>Michelle Morton:</i> most using mass balance instead of segregated mechanism.</p>
	<p><i>Puvan:</i> can we /RSPO accept the fact EU decision to accept the mass balance.</p>
	<p><i>Simo:</i> to anticipate strong competition for the RSPO. Suggested verifying “<i>RSPO Certified Mass Balance</i>” claim. Disparity between the EU claim and the RSPO guidelines – may create integrity issues.</p>
	<p><i>Jan Kees:</i> the EU has accepted the Mass Balance as GHG emissions claim – the system has to ensure that the claim is only made once along the fuel system. Volume in can only be claimed once in the system –this does not affect the RSPO integrity – it’s up to EU to decide on this - to be possibly considered in the review of our trademark.</p>
	<p><i>Michelle:</i> do we look at solutions? RSPO is much better criteria as it is all encompassing and covers more spheres.</p>
	<p><i>Simo:</i> a complicated system should have been in place a year ago. Different between European member states. Numerous ways of applying the legislation. Every aspect of sustainability across the supply chain needs to be reported. Heavy task in calculating carbon emissions. Not good for the industry to have a number of certifications in place – different reporting for various standards creates complications. How strong do we want to build RSPO?</p>
	<p><i>Jan Kees:</i> there are 2 key issues; proportionate allocation on non-sustainability report – T&amp;T to look into the Mass balance and what stage the certification is required – final blend – some assurance that the blend is what it claims to be.</p>
	<p><i>Marieke:</i> to protect brand integrity for the RSPO – to decide at which stage the claim is made.</p>
	<p><i>Michelle:</i> no claims made at the retail downstream side for the gas sector. Is the</p>

	government claim a public claim? Does RSPO need to be verified? Restricting the market or losing the market value?
	<i>Adam Thomas:</i> as long as credibility in the system, there should be enough credibility in that supply chain to take it through.

<b>5.</b>	<b><i>Global Communications Outreach for Europe (Strategy &amp; Tactical Plan):</i></b>
	Presentation by Hill & Knowlton team. Comments from C&CSC members:
	<i>Adam Thomas:</i> give significant contribution to date, how much of the cost spent is a one off cost given the significant investment. <i>H&amp;K:</i> a significant portion – especially with the helpdesk – EURO4K-5K per month.
	<i>Olaf:</i> asked if the conditions raised by H&K needs to be fulfilled for the success of their recommended communications plans. <i>H&amp;K:</i> says it will greatly help. Better to make these decisions earlier on rather than later.
	<i>Adam Thomas:</i> asked H&K how they cost the campaigns without some of the fundamentals in place. <i>H&amp;K:</i> based on broad strokes.
	<i>Catherine Hansen:</i> enquired about why the plan does not address why manufacturers are not using the trademark. Also commented that Situation Analysis in H&K's proposal seems to miss the real communications objective which is to ultimately increase (and ideally accelerate) the uptake of CSPO. It seems top heavy on the Media & NGOs, when there is a need to start really targeting CSPO users - manufacturers and brand owners. The analysis seems to miss a key metric - not just that we make it easier for users of CSPO to access information on the SCCS & TM, but to ensure this translates to them actually starting to buy CSPO, regardless of whether they choose to adopt the TM. I also would not consider 'lack of consumer awareness' to be a key issue at this stage. To that end I would question the audience prioritization.
	<i>Adam Thomas:</i> enquired about why the media is positioned as a key audience rather than an influencer. And about why manufacturing stakeholder group not listed as key target audience.
	<i>Simon Lord:</i> commented that with the NGOs, they are more concerned about how the RSPO works and its certification process. How is this being addressed in the plan? Social issue are going to come to the fore with the millennium goals – more and more important.
	<i>Sandra:</i> to include social issues into the plan. NGOs are attacking RSPO not because they don't understand but because they don't see the results – to find best practices and success stories to be shared with other stakeholder groups.

<b>6.</b>	<b><i>Global Communications Outreach for China &amp; India (Strategy &amp; Tactical Plan):</i></b>
	Presentation by Hill & Knowlton team. Comments from C&CSC members:
	<i>Yves:</i> asked about results that can be expected for the shorter term. If we can skip one country due to budget limitation, would it be India or China?
	<i>Adam Thomas:</i> Indian market is rather similar to Chinese market - price driven; government buy in very critical. Why is government engagement in India a low priority compared to China? <i>H&amp;K:</i> difference between India and China – In India the federal and state government structures are very complex with different machineries. Unless there is a strong business case/model, no point in reaching out to government as yet.
	<i>Sandra:</i> social issues should be part of the analysis – NGOs only mentioned WWF – others should be incorporated. Part on the risks is not comprehensive enough – better risk assessment.
	<i>Adam Harrison:</i> asked why H&K is advocating the idea of RSPO representation in India and China when that is the key reason why they have been appointed in those markets. It seems like there is high level of reliance and dependence on WWF in India and China – a separate identity needs to be established clearly in those markets with the stakeholders i.e. Government etc. Also enquired on why Wilmar is not mentioned more actively in India and China. <i>H&amp;K:</i> aware of the rationale behind their engagement but still reinforces the value in having a local RSPO rep augmented by a task force of people.
	<i>Puvan:</i> In India & China, is stakeholder mapping critical given it has already been identified that government and pricing are big issues – no time bound plan on when these issues will be resolved. If it is 3 years, there might be no premium then – in 3 years' time there may be no price issues, what would be worthwhile doing now then? Will it change anything so that we can decide if we need to replace our resources? H&K has been asking for a business plan, the important questions needs to be discussed and fed back into them.
	<i>Simon Lord:</i> Defining market share on how to distinguish between one standard and the other. Need to rethink what needs to be done – RSPO has always been the only player – but no longer. Communications strategy needs to be reinforced for these two markets – Malaysia & Indonesia. Should look at our standards and how can we maintain credibility.
	<i>Sandra:</i> Presence of national standards – by creating demand in other markets, we are also ensuring the future of the RSPO. Enquired after the plans in Indonesia. <i>Anne Gabriel:</i> explained that there is a communications strategy and plan for both Indonesia and Malaysia run out of the Secretariat. And that in Indonesia, a public relations firm has been running an advocacy exercise. An analysis of activities and results in these markets will be shared by the Secretariat with the C&C.
	<i>Adam Harrison:</i> explained that production of CSPO is not a concern. 12 million metric

	tonnes will be available by 2015. The issue is creating the demand for the CSPO. Communications strategy should address this aspect.
	<i>Hugo</i> : the role of the US in the whole campaign – what about North America. Largest company in the RSPO is an American company. What is our outreach there? As a vision of 100% CSPO by 2015 – 100% of what exactly? <i>Jan Kees</i> : limited resources allow us to prioritize on specific key markets.
	<i>Jan Kees</i> : The key take out from the presentation is that in order for a communications campaign to be effective, we don't only need long term milestones – but also interim. For all 3 markets – for palm oil as well as for derivatives. For Europe, it may end in 2020 – different development rates for palm oil and derivatives. For India and China, stakeholder mapping needs to be done so there is clarity. Acknowledge that a local representation for RSPO is key – at this point in time, that should be led by H&K. Identify member companies on the ground – may recruit ambassadors. Creating legal entities in all these markets to have physical presence is too difficult for RSPO – so to utilise a body/member company to represent us will be a better start.
	<i>Simo</i> : an important thing between RSPO and the other systems is the wider issues – a good mechanism should be put in place to handle the grievance cases and how to bring forward the RSPO transparently.
	<i>Jan Kees</i> : credibility has 2 issues - content of the standards & the way we manage the standards through the multi stakeholder initiative. Active grievances focus more on social issues – in European market, supply chain communications is still a big issue. Hopefully, the two imminent platforms will address this.
	<i>Jan Kees</i> : if there is no potential or future in China, the CFNA paper etc. will not be developed. With China, it is largely policy driven – not very clear in terms of what we can do in terms of influencing policy makers as yet – Consumer Goods Forum will be key and to ensure enough representation in China – need to do stakeholder mapping. In India, if you want to engage with the government, business case is critical – making stakeholder mapping more important. Working on India & China will help achieve demand/uptake side. Communicate the volume of available CSPO in terms of timeline.
	<i>Simon Lord</i> : 10% to 100% market transformation; H&K has put in place most of the requirements and expectations; But the RSPO has not put the fundamental business plans together – haven't spent enough time on this.
	<i>Jan Kees</i> : The EB has to go back to the outcome of Port Dickson to develop a strategic plan, and use that for revenue model, trademark relevance etc.



7.	<b>KPIs &amp; Budget for global communications outreach by H&amp;K:</b>
	Presentation by Hill & Knowlton team. Comments from C&CSC members:
	<b>Underestimation of original fees:</b> H&K explained that the original estimated and contracted amount of EURO230K was due to gross underestimation of man-hours required on their part to deliver the services required. They also explained that the RSPO is a different structure from most organizations due to our multi stakeholder dynamics, which adds to the complexity of the business and work to be executed.
	<b>On performance review:</b> <i>Adam Thomas &amp; Simon Lord:</i> What happens if the agency does not achieve the deliverables? A lot of fees asked for. It is contracted – so there should be repercussions and ramifications. Who does the review? Is it the secretariat and is it in the ToR? <i>Puvan:</i> why wouldn't H&K be able to achieve the deliverables? Outcome is not stated above? Between now and end of April, there should be tacit understanding that if we conduct all these deliverables, we should have come some way in transforming the market. Are these activities drawn up to transform the market or are there arbitrary activities? Is this an effective communications strategy? We don't know our business plan – what is our priority?? Which are we doing first and why? Which country is a priority? <i>Jan Kees:</i> the communications strategy is based on the situation analysis developed and shared. These deliverables will follow from normal circumstances. Agreed in July to increase the fee to EURO390K. Requests everyone to make a meaningful effort with this budget in the 3 markets identified.
	<b>Since last presentation:</b> <i>Simon Lord:</i> the last presentation we requested H&K to justify the EURO390K; deliverables and KPIs identified. Our decision now is to decide based on what has been requested and decision made on this. <i>Adam Harrison:</i> best way of moving forward is stakeholder mapping. H&K's achievement to date has been describing what is there already. Could we have managed this ourselves without the H&K support? As individual members of the RSPO don't seem to pull the weight of getting things done through outsourcing rather than do it ourselves. We need to agree whether we can do internally or with contracted service providers.
	<b>European outreach –</b> <i>Adam Harrison:</i> in Europe why is the focus on media – if we are not focusing on NGOs or government, what is our media relations going to be about? Shouldn't the budget be formulated to then focus on NGO or government or supply chain engagement? <i>Jan Kees:</i> if there is a need in the European market for supply chain education – several ways of doing this i.e. training etc.
	<b>On budget options -</b> <i>Jan Kees:</i> Option B was decided upon in the last meeting – will start in July this year till June 2012. To clearly identify what is required to be included in the

	<p>budget. <i>Puvan</i>: RT9 is a critical component and should be part of this budget. Too many ifs in the plan by H&amp;K Develop the business plan first even if Darrel has to pull something together. If we speak to Godrej and Wilmar in India and China we will be able to gauge the responses and answers for India &amp; China and on whether H&amp;K should be commissioned and paid for a stakeholder mapping in these markets. Expressed sustained objection over spending money without knowing why we are spending money.</p>
	<p><b>Campaign should start running:</b> <i>Marieke</i>: if the goal is transform the market – one has to build knowledge and do something. With the competing schemes, it may not be sensible to stop investment at this point in time. <i>Adam Thomas</i>: budget has been allocated. Sympathise with that Puvan is saying. The programs are clearly developed. Yes there is a need for a business plan. So it is not wasted money. There is a bigger risk in doing nothing rather than doing something.</p>
	<p><b>On development of business plan by EB</b> - <i>Jan Kees</i>: with the current issues with GAPKI and MSPO, the next 4 months is a bad period to come up with strategic directions. Priority should be in a better understanding of which audience is key in India &amp; China and why. <i>Caroline Sikking</i>: the business plan is not up to the C&amp;C. This may not happen before the end of the year. Need to prioritise on what needs to be achieved.</p>
	<p><b>Final decision based on budget options</b> – <i>Jan Kees</i>: EB has endorsed budget of EURO390K – most C&amp;C members are agreeable to this. There is a need to come up with a business plan and milestones. Will not organize and invest in another retreat for EB to come together for a business plan. <i>Puvan</i>: expressed a sustained objection on the general direction of the communications prioritizing. Suggested to go with a 4 month plan with H&amp;K till they get their act together. Focus on RT9 – Europe – skip India and China. H&amp;K should speak to Wilmar and Godrej as the first step in the stakeholder mapping to determine if such mapping is necessary at all. If a mapping is warranted, then it is to 'plug gaps' in anything Wilmar and Godrej do not know about China and India markets, respectively. However, if Wilmar and Godrej are able to provide sufficient information about the landscape, issues &amp; priorities in India and China, then the stakeholder mapping becomes unnecessary moving straight into strategy execution. H&amp;K to develop an effective communications strategy – contingent of the EB to meet up and discuss this – and get Sec General to draw up an agenda. <i>Simon Lord</i>: expressed a middle ground stating that final decision will be on Option B budget. Key initiatives in Europe will continue with a clear map developed by H&amp;K which will include RT9 and key stakeholder engagement. Meanwhile audits with key RSPO member support (Wilmar and Godrej) will take place for India and China, prior to any execution of stakeholder mapping in these markets. EB will start working on a business plan from October. This will then be reflected into the H&amp;K communications outreach globally. All attending</p>

	<p>members consented to this direction. <i>Olaf</i>: reinforced this suggesting that H&amp;K may start with the execution of the communications plan with a budget for the next 4 months, with the exception that the stakeholder mapping for India and China be carried out as suggested by Puvan. And then decide on the basis of a thorough review of specific results and where we stand with the stakeholder mapping on objectives, activities and budget for the coming period</p>
--	--

## Key Decisions & Action Points

<b>Subject matters &amp; focal points:</b>	
	<b>Member Composition of C&amp;C Standing Committee:</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core members to comprise 2 representatives per constituency.</li> <li>• Each constituent to come up with 2 names before the next meeting.</li> <li>• Secretariat to provide the full list of representatives in each stakeholder group.</li> <li>• If anyone wants to continue the representation, decide to do so or if more members volunteers, to agree who gets selected.</li> <li>• Names to be sent to Secretariat/AG.</li> <li>• Service providers to be included but requires confirmation – open invitation to UTZ; GreenPalm; CB; H&amp;K; Secretariat.</li> <li>• Final list will comprise key constituent representation; alternates; and those interested to be included into wider distribution list.</li> </ul>
	<b>Regional Clusters:</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members for clusters groups representing India; China; SEA; ROW to be established via email process coordinated by the Secretariat/Anne Gabriel.</li> <li>• Members to send recommendation to Secretariat/AG on member composition</li> </ul>
	<b>Terms of Reference:</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secretariat/Ag to input provided during the meeting.</li> <li>• C&amp;C recommends communications policies prepared and recommended by the secretariat – the strategy always left to be decided by the EB – in terms of policies, C&amp;C also makes recommendation – day to day business to endorse to be managed by the Secretariat – if there are issues, to be raised at group meetings – it removes approval process.</li> <li>• Also to incorporate comments from Puvan.</li> <li>• To add membership representation 2 members per constituent, and the expectations of the role.</li> <li>• To be included and refined and circulated for approval to the C&amp;C members.</li> </ul>

	<b>On Bio fuels:</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key issues discussed here will be by the T&amp;TSC for the proportionate and non-proportionate allocation. And thereafter worked into the communications rules.</li> </ul>
	<b>Global Communications Outreach:</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Endorsement of Budget Option B (EURO390K) beginning July 2011 to June 2012.</li> <li>Hill &amp; Knowlton to provide specific deliverables within the budget that covers RT9 and outreach in Europe.</li> <li>For India and China, immediate deliverable includes audits with Wilmar and Godrej to ascertain if a stakeholder mapping in India and China is indeed required.</li> <li>Meanwhile, EB will request Secretary General to draw up a framework for a business plan for RSPO, which when prepared will be reflected into the global communications strategy.</li> <li>H&amp;K to deliver results expected for now within stipulated budget without requesting for any increase for a one year period of time – it is a capped fee. South East Asian communications plan to be included into the next C&amp;CSC meeting.</li> </ul>

## All Other Business

<b>11.</b>	<b>Next C&amp;C Meeting:</b>
11.1	Monday, October 31st 2011.
11.2	Location will depend on final membership composition and who will host this.
11.3	Agenda and Presentation materials to be sent through to C&CSC members 2 weeks before meeting

Prepared by:

Anne Gabriel, Communications Director

RSPO Secretariat

Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

###