

## Shared Responsibility Task Force Teleconference

### Minutes of Virtual Meeting

**Date: 30 July 2019, 6:00pm - 7:30pm MYT**

#### Attendance List

	Name	Membership	Organisation
1.	Gwendelynne	Grower Malaysia substantive (alternate)	Sime Darby
2.	Lee Kuan Yee	Grower Malaysia substantive	KLK
3.	Sian Choo Lim	Grower Indonesia substantive	Bumitama
4.	Alagendran	Grower Indonesia substantive	Sime Darby
5.	Nepomuk Wahl	Process & Traders substantive	Olenex
6.	Naoko Satuma	Retailers substantive	Aeon
7.	Natasha Schwarzbach	Consumer Goods Manufacturer	Pepsico
8.	Ghislaine Nadaud	Bankers & Investors substantive	ABNAMBRO
9.	JT Lee	Bankers & Investors substantive	Credit Suisse
10.	Jenny Walther-Thoss	ENGO substantive	WWF
11.	Aimee Russillo	Technical Facilitator	LiSeed Consulting
12.	Bilge Daldeniz	Technical Facilitator	Proforest
13.	Smita Jairam	Technical Facilitator	Proforest
14.	Oi Soo Chin	Impacts and Evaluation Director	RSPO

High participation with all member categories represented except Social NGOs (on annual leave). A summary of the online public consultation, workshops in Utrecht and Chicago was presented. Almost 50 individual responses were obtained. Due to the document directly affecting RSPO members from the supply chain categories, it is not surprising that region-wise the highest number of respondents were in Europe and sector-wise came from Supply Chain Actors. There were no respondents from Africa, and Growers were underrepresented in the responses. See ppt. As such, it was important to have the growers' voices in this discussion.

For each section of the draft document out in public consultation, the comments received were summarized and questions were posed for discussion in short blocks of time to gather input and facilitate decisions by the SRTF. Specific decisions were made by consensus, followed by the mandate for the technical facilitators to draft items on behalf of the SRTF. Further questions which were more straightforward were noted for follow up via written input.

The following sections were discussed in detail with the formed consensus.

#### **Comments on Scope**

The SRTF agreed with the scope of the Shared Responsibility is specific to Palm Oil activities, at minimum and not limited to. It was agreed to give the mandate to the technical facilitators to reword the specifications where site-level information is needed in the requirements, and how to recommend collective action and resourcing.

**Comments on Definition** The SRTF agreed with the proposed suggestions for simplifying wording and limiting text. It was reaffirmed that SR include requirements that reflect the core values of the P&C's and not just requirements focusing on driving uptake of CSPO.

**Comments on Shared Requirements** The SRTF reminded themselves that there is still no accountability to the other members like the P&C's and agreed Yes to retaining sustainability

leadership & policy requirements, to ensure they are measurable. The SRTF gave the mandate to the Technical Facilitators to draft text for a proposed next step to develop further guidelines.

**Comments: Execution via Phased Introduction, Continual Improvement, Prioritization**

There was agreement that a step-wise approach/continuous improvement within certain requirements might be good. This can be formulated for an immediate timeframe: first uptake, then promote, then increase percentage in the mass balance. The timeline for implementation of requirements must be clear and demonstrated with proven progress and ensure the uptake of CSPO must be prioritized. The timeline can be similar as to what is implemented for growers for certification.

The SRTF agreed to give the mandate to the Technical Facilitators to draft the step wise approach within requirements where appropriate. The SRTF also agreed to hold a review of the entire SR implementation after the first year of implementation.

**Comments on Claims & Labels**

The general agreement is that labels do not have to be on product, can be off-product but not mandatory. The SRTF supported splitting the requirement to make education and outreach separate and explicit.

**Comments: Volumes**

There was reaffirmation of the commitment for a timebound plans for CSPO for all members allowing for a progressive switch from credits to physical CSPO.

Growers agreed that credits should only be for smallholders but not from others, as these are essential for the market entry for smallholders. Supply chain representatives commented that credits are as sustainable as IP, SG, MB with no discrimination. There is broad consensus that smallholder credits and continued use of credits for those sourcing small amounts of PO products only are fine.

Following debate on steps within the TBPs it was argued that due to the trickle-down effect from Retailers and CGM's demand, P&T would not need the same strict timelines. The facilitator proposed a compromise to allow P&T an additional year per step to allow for the trickling down of demand to take effect.

The technical facilitators were given the mandate to draft the language accordingly on claims, labels and volumes.

**Comments: Implementation mechanisms**

There is agreement for ACOP to be enhanced to add in questionnaires about data which can be used to provide analytics. Growers suggested TBP on uptake of CSPO for P&T, Retailers and CGM should be included in the RSPO SCC Standard document and be audited. It is important to note that there are RSPO members who are not in the scope of SCCS. It was agreed that the SRTF P&T rep will help to determine which SR requirements could be integrated into the SCCS, as he is involved with the SCCS review Taskforce as well and was given the mandate to draft an initial proposed list, to be included by the technical facilitators in the next draft of the document

**Comments: Verification**

Affirmation to leverage and strengthen existing systems. Independent verification is recommended but mainly for volumes. The Timebound Plan and volumes could be verified via SCCS. However, need to consider those to whom the SCCS does not apply. Different tools for different SR requirements will be required.

**Comments: Incentives & Sanctions**

There was general consensus with the existing proposals. The Technical facilitators were given the mandate to draft language reflecting the input of the public consultation and SRTF.

**Closing: Homework & Next steps**The homework due August 2<sup>nd</sup>, consisted of review and agreement on the individual SR requirements in Excel, with definitions and systems. In addition, 10-12 pending questions - not addressed on the call. The draft narrative and excel would then be updated and circulated for another review August 7<sup>th</sup>.

The next steps are covered as per the slides: dates and actions and overall deadline of 22<sup>nd</sup> Aug – Oversight Committee call to submit to BoG.

The call was closed at 7:30pm MYT.