

## Minutes of Meeting 10<sup>th</sup> Standard Standing Committee (SSC) Meeting

**Date:** 17<sup>th</sup> July 2020

**Time:** Part 1: 09.00 -12.00 (KL time); Part 2: 14.00 – 17.00 (KL time)

**Venue:** Join Zoom Meeting

### ATTENDANCE

Name		Organisation	Constituency
<b><u>Present:</u></b>			
1. Olivier Tichit (Co-Chair)	OT	Musim Mas	Processor and Trader
2. Lee Kuan Yee (Co-Chair)	LKY	MPOA	Growers
3. Lim Sian Choo	LSC	Bumitama	Growers
4. Audrey Lee	AL	OLAM	Growers
5. Ian Orrell	IO	New Britain Palm Oil Limited	Smallholders (SHSC)
6. Jenny Walther-Thoss	JWT	WWF-Germany	ENGO
<b><u>Absent with apologies:</u></b>			
7. Anne Rosenbarger	AR	NN Investment Partners	Finance Institution
8. Koji Sato	KS	KAO Corporation	CGM
9. Paula de Hartog	PH	Rainforest Alliance	SNGO
10. Faryda Linderman	FL	NNI Partners	Finance Institution
<b><u>RSPO Secretariat</u></b>			
11. Julia Majail	JM	RSPO Secretariat	
12. Amir Afham	AA	RSPO Secretariat	
13. Kamini Visvanathan	KV	RSPO Secretariat	
14. Dede Herland	DH	RSPO Secretariat	
15. Tiur Rumondang	TR	RSPO Secretariat	
16. Javin Tan	JT	RSPO Secretariat	
17. Oi Soo Chin	OSC	RSPO Secretariat	
18. Fei Fei	FF	RSPO Secretariat	
19. Wan Muqtadir	WM	RSPO Secretariat	

### AGENDA

Time	Item	Agenda	PIC
0900 - 1200	1.0	Opening 1.1 RSPO Antitrust Law 1.2 RSPO consensus-based decision making 1.3 Acceptance of Agenda	Co-Chairs
	2.0	Confirmation 9 <sup>th</sup> Minutes of Meeting on 15 <sup>th</sup> May 2020 2.1 Meeting arising from the MoM - see action trackers	Co-Chairs/JM
	3.0	SSC Terms of Reference (Revised version) 3.1 Final Draft 3.2 Members to sign code of conduct	JM
	4.0	Budget and Program for FY21 (updates)	JM
	5.0	Jurisdictional Approach for Certification (progress updates)	JT

	6.0	Shared Responsibility (updates)	OSC
	7.0	New Planting Procedures (updates)	WM
	8.0	Resolution GHG 6e GA16 on peat inventory (updates)	AA
	9.0	Supply Chain Standard in China (updates)	
<b>BREAKTIME</b>			
1400 - 1700	10.0	RSPO Standard Development SOP (for approval)	JM
	11.0	National Interpretation (for approval) 6.1 MYNI – insertion of Ind 3.4.1 (for decision/approval)	JM
	12.0	Interim Pathway for Medium Grower to get Certified (for approval)	JM
	13.0	NDTF, NDJSG and HCSA NDTF - Request for Time Extension NDJSG - Updates on SSC letter to NDJSG Co-Chairs RSPO Position on Adoption of HCSA into P&C 2018	AA/JT
	14.0	Strategy for Social Standard Development	KV
	15.0	Decent Living Wage	KV
	16.0	HGU Indonesia/ Letter from INA NI to RSPO	TR
	17.0	Any other business	
<b>END</b>			

## DISCUSSION

No.	Description	Action Items
1.0	<p><b>Opening</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LKY welcomed and thanked everyone. This was supposed to be a physical meeting, but due to the COVID19 situation, this meeting has to be carried out virtually.</li> <li>She reminded members not to discuss matter related to business or that breach the Antitrust Law. All decision will be based on consensus.</li> </ul> <p><u>Acceptance of Agenda:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Co-Chairs proposed to re-arrange the agenda, whereby agenda that require decision will be discussed in the afternoon, and all updates to be presented in the morning session. This is in view that some members based in Europe can only join the meeting in the afternoon. Members accepted the changes.</li> </ul>	
2.0	<p><b>Confirmation Minutes of Meeting</b></p> <p>Correction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On HRWGSG, it is confirmed the group to be called as Human Rights and Social Compliance Working Group (HR&amp;SCWG) and not HR&amp;SC Sub-Group.</li> <li>On item 5.2, the sentence should be read as "...and can open to exploitation and raised a concern that they are not considered as worker".</li> <li>On item 5.3, to remove "For standard checking, it is clear that the age falls as child labour".</li> <li>To correct the title of the minute as the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting, not the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting.</li> </ul>	

	<p>The minutes of meeting is endorsed subject to changes to all items as commented. LSC proposed the minutes to be endorsed and seconded by AL.</p>	
<p>2.1</p>	<p><b>Action Trackers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion to put NI Gabon together with the rest of NI discussion; and for NDJSG to be on a separate agenda.</li> <li>• Action Trackers will be put online in the RSPO website. Therefore, it is suggested to put a full name of the acronyms used throughout in the minutes.</li> <li>• SSC requested that all WGs and TFs under the SSC will be required to share their Action Trackers for SSC to know the progress of each respective WGs and TFs.</li> </ul>	<p>Secretariat to request all WGs/TFs to provide their Action Trackers to SSC.</p>
<p>3.0</p>	<p><b>SSC Terms of Reference (Revised Version)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JM highlighted all the newly added items in the SSC ToR as follow: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pg. 3 Item 3.0 - In principle, all normative documents will require the endorsement of the BoG, whereas informative documents (including but not limited to guidance documents, tools, procedures, etc.) may be decided at the discretion of the SSC. Notwithstanding the above, the SSC shall have the discretion to decide whether any document shall be put forth to the BoG for endorsement and/or to recommend BoG to bring it to the General Assembly for adoption.</li> <li>○ Pg. 4 Item 4.0 - The individual representative from the SSC institution can appoint an Alternate from the same constituency to attend a Committee meeting. Alternates can only attend if the Substantive is not present. SC members shall try to attend all meetings in person and work with their alternate member as soon as they know they cannot attend a meeting, to ensure that their seat is represented. In either case, SC members should send their apologies to the SC Co-Chairs and advise if their alternate member will attend. This information shall also be provided to the Secretariat Lead.</li> <li>○ Pg. 5 Item 5.0 – on meeting documentation and timeline to share the documents.</li> <li>○ Pg.7 Item 6.0 - The RSPO Secretariat, upon consulting the Chair (or Co-Chairs), will make all the necessary arrangements to call for all meetings and ensure it meets the quorum to conduct a meeting. A quorum of more than half of the members who also represented by every member group is required for a meeting and the decisions are taken by consensus. Decision cannot be made until the represented groups are present.</li> <li>○ Pg. 7. Item 7.0 - The reasons (not exhaustive) for the SSC to consider the retirement of a member are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If the members are not following what is required by the RSPO Code of Conduct and Antitrust Guidelines for RSPO Members;</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>(1) JM to inform SSC members to nominate their respective alternate. Secretariat will also put the announcement via website.</p> <p>(2) To propose additional text that alternate should be permanent and not on ad-hoc basis.</p> <p>(3) SSC members to take note of the reasons for retirement of a member.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Persistent refusal to furnish information requested by the Committee. Information requested, if deemed beneficial to the objectives of the Committee, shall not be unreasonably withheld except for those that are commercially sensitive and/or prohibited by law for dissemination;</li> <li>▪ Voluntary retirement; and</li> <li>▪ Absence from three (3) consecutive meetings without justified reason (including Alternate members)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pg. 8, Item 8.0 - All members of the SSC are bound by the Antitrust Guidelines for RSPO Members.</li> <li>○ Pg.8, Item 8.0 - Transparency is very important to RSPO. Chatham House Rules is applied which means names should not be disclosed. All discussions and documents are only classified as confidential in exceptional circumstances. However, where information has been designated as confidential because of its sensitivity (for example concerning violations or alleged violations of RSPO Principles &amp; Criteria), WG members should respect the confidentiality issues and shall prevent the same from becoming public.</li> </ul>	
<p>4.0</p>	<p><b>Budget and Program for FY21 for Standard Programs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A total of RM1,895,949.00 was allocated for standard development activities for FY21. These are for activities under the following TOC key result areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Credible Certification, Verification &amp; Grievance</li> <li>○ Engagement of the Supporting Sector</li> <li>○ Innovation in Standards &amp; Benchmarks</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Do we ask the impacts or return of investment of our spending? SSC requested on the progress impact on the supports given to HCVRN.</li> <li>• Budget for audit improvement is parked under the Assurance Department.</li> </ul>	<p>Secretariat to provide the progress impact on supports given to HCVRN.</p>
<p>5.0</p>	<p><b>Jurisdictional Approach Working Group (JA WG)– updates</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JT presented the progress updates of the Jurisdictional Approach (JA) Working Group.</li> <li>• The JA Certification 2<sup>nd</sup> public consultation completed in June 2020, mostly done via online due to COVID19 pandemic. The WG is currently processing the inputs and aiming to table it at the GA 2020. The draft will be presented to SSC in the 2<sup>nd</sup> week of September.</li> <li>• Some key comments that need further deliberations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cost effective landscape and management unit level assessment</li> <li>○ Monitoring of jurisdictional performance</li> <li>○ Workplan versus RSPO membership time bound plan</li> <li>○ Appeal, grievance and complaint mechanism; and</li> <li>○ What indicators and at what levels – upward delegation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

<p>6.0</p>	<p><b>Shared Responsibility Working Group (SRWG)– updates</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SRWG is seeking endorsement for new member, Miko Yamazaki from EAON.</li> <li>• The first phase of SRWG work will be on (a) development of verifiers for the Shared Responsibility Requirements; and (b) development of Draft 1 of Shared Responsibility Implementation Manual</li> <li>• SRWG will seek BoG decision by end August to take position on credits into account.</li> <li>• The consultant of the SRWG is currently working on benchmarking of potential equivalent reporting mechanisms. This will be done via selection of first 5 reporting mechanisms/standards. The Draft 1 of benchmarking framework based on Shared Responsibility requirement.</li> <li>• Communication plan is being prepared with the objective to ensure members and stakeholders are aware of the Shared Responsibility requirements and understand the organisation’s role in the fulfilment of the requirements and understand how they are able to successfully achieve the requirements.</li> </ul>	
<p>7.0</p>	<p><b>New Planting Procedures (NPP) – updates</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WM presented an update to the SSC on the progress of the NPP revision thus far.</li> <li>• Public consultation carried out in early 2020 and received 327 comments.</li> <li>• The RSPO NPP Revision Subgroup has been formed and expected to work within the next 2 months leveraging on the draft document that have incorporated the comments/inputs received during the public consultation.</li> <li>• NPP is a procedure where member is required to adhere to and not a guidance (informative). This is not a guidance document. In 2010, BoG has decided that this is a procedure where member need to comply (normative).</li> <li>• To note that HCSA is currently revising their Annex document i.e. ICLUP document. Hence, RSPO to word clearly on to its version in view of the revision by HCSA (on its toolkit) so to appropriately harmonised it with the RSPO New Planting Procedure.</li> </ul>	
<p>8.0</p>	<p><b>Resolution GHG 6e GA16 on peat inventory – updates</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AA briefed the Committee regarding the status of the resolution that requiring RSPO members (Growers and Processors) to declare their landholding which contain peat via submission of shape files and maps. The resolution has made it compulsory for members to submit the info covering plantation areas of certified and non-certified.</li> <li>• The status of submission to-date is 132 members (113 Growers and 19 Processors &amp; Traders). This number is based on data of certified plantation areas. The response rate of submission to-date is 61%.</li> <li>• Secretariat has sent reminders to all non-submitters via emails and supports from all RSPO regional offices. The closing dates of responding to the request is 24<sup>th</sup> July 2020.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of non-submitters will be compiled and shared with the Assurance Department and will be distributed to all CBs.</li> <li>LKY offered to extend the reminder for Malaysian MPOA members on this matter.</li> <li>SSC recommended the Peatland WG to take note about the situation in Indonesia regarding the regulation not allowing sharing of shape files, as this could be one of the reasons of non-submission.</li> </ul>	
9.0	<p><b>Development of Supply Chain Certification Standard (SCCS) in China – updates</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fei Fei updated SSC on the development of RSPO's activity in China under the O&amp;E program.</li> <li>There is no sustainable palm oil supply chain standard for China at the moment. The RSPO SCCS will be translated to Mandarin and will lobby for adoption of the RSPO standard in China. This will require engagement with the government and industry players in China.</li> <li>China only recognised national standard. Development of standard is under the China Standard Technical Committee.</li> <li>This strategy is an opportunity for RSPO to penetrate the local market industry in China.</li> <li>SSC will be updated on progress of this program.</li> </ul>	
10.0	<p><b>RSPO Standard Development SOP (for approval)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JM presented the revised version of the RSPO Standard Development SOP highlighting key changes made on to the document.</li> <li>All normative document needs to go through Standard Standing Committee for approval before it goes to BoG for endorsement. BoG may decide to bring it to GA or otherwise SSC can provide the recommendation to BoG.</li> </ul> <p><u>Decision by the SSC:</u></p> <p>SSC approved the RSPO Standard Operation SOP subject to the following addition to the document:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To add on definition of 'non-substantive changes'</li> <li>Time line of NI shall be completed in the 3rd anniversary of P&amp;C, while request to develop NI at least at the 2nd anniversary of P&amp;C. This point will be added to the point 9 of the SOP. This will not disband the NI TF should there still be any pending elements that the NI still need to work on.</li> </ol> <p>SSC will endorse this document via online subject to acceptance of the text to be provided by the Secretariat.</p>	<p>Secretariat to share with SSC the additional text to be added on to the SOP document.</p>
11.0	<p><b>National Interpretation: MYNI</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JM presented the letter from MYNI on criteria for the Social Sensitive Areas.</li> <li>SSC is pleased to note that the indicators on the Social Sensitive Areas is clear. Secretariat to include a comment to the MYNI TF</li> </ul>	

	<p>recommending them to link these indicators to the discussion regarding the local food security standard.</p> <p><u>Decision by the SSC:</u></p> <p>SSC approved the request made by MYNI to insert the additional Guidance to Indicator 3.4.1 for MYNI 2019.</p>	<p>Secretariat to inform the decision to MYNI TF.</p>
<p>12.0</p>	<p><b>Interim Pathway for Medium Grower to get Certified</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Medium Grower Task Force (MGTF) was established to oversee the classification of oil palm producers and lead the development of a certification system and/or certification standard for medium-sized growers. One of its objectives is <i>“to develop an interim definition for medium sized growers and an interim process for medium sized growers who produce FFB but lack a mill to get certified under the RSPO Group Certification System”</i>.</li> <li>• MGTF is in view that an interim pathway for this producer is necessary while the TF carrying out the research study to develop a profiling system in order to understand this group of producers.</li> <li>• An interim pathway for the medium grower to get RSPO certified therefore is developed by the MGTF and now presented to SSC for approval. The TF also has come up with an interim definition for medium grower.</li> <li>• The Group Certification System will not be applicable to ISH under the RISS.</li> <li>• The SSC raised concerns on:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the threshold (500 ha) – what about those having more than 500 ha but has no mill? What happen to those growers having 2000 ha without mill?</li> <li>○ core problem more on to find the threshold/ methodology for small grower to be certified i.e. using RISS or P&amp;C 2018 or new standard?</li> <li>○ discussion on credits need to be discussed carefully due to its sensitivity.</li> <li>○ do we need this interim pathway now? can we wait till the outcome from the study and come up with full proposal instead? the outcome from the study will provide basis for decision.</li> <li>○ considering the current Covid19 pandemic, not many producers (from this category) anticipated going for certification.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Decision by the SSC:</u></p> <p>MGTF to focus and complete the study (Profiling System for Palm Oil Producers, by Sept 2020) and come up with firmer position and answer the question whether we really need an interim solution.</p>	<p>JM will convey the view of SSC to MGTF to hold the interim pathway.</p>
<p>13.0</p>	<p><b>NDTF, NDJSG and HCSA</b></p>	
<p>13.1</p>	<p><b>NDTF - Request for Time Extension</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NDTF active period has ended on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2020, but it has 2 (two) more on-going assignments, i.e. (1) Gap Analysis RSPO&amp;HCSA and HCS Implementation Guidelines, which is</li> </ul>	



	<p>expected to complete by 30<sup>th</sup> August 2020; and (2) HCSA Reviewer Template Review, expected to complete by 16<sup>th</sup> Sept 2020. The extension is needed due to the gap analysis RSPO &amp; HCSA which show multiple gaps that need further discussion.</p> <p><u>Decision by the SSC:</u></p> <p>SSC agreed to allow time extension for another 6 (six) month until 31<sup>st</sup> Dec 2020.</p>	
<p>13.2</p>	<p><b>NDJSG - Updates on SSC letter to NDJSG Co-Chairs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A letter from the Co-Chairs of SSC has been sent to the Co-Chairs of NDJSG on 20<sup>th</sup> April 2020, with due date to respond by 31<sup>st</sup> July 2020. However, no submission of final workplan received to-date.</li> </ul>	<p>Secretariat will send a reminder to NDJSG.</p>
<p>13.3</p>	<p><b>RSPO Position on Adoption of HCSA into P&amp;C 2018</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P&amp;C 2018 adopted HCSA Toolkits under indicator Criteria 7.12 to demonstrate contribution RSPO to halting deforestation. Indicator 7.12.2 (b) explained the application HCSA toolkit.</li> <li>• The HCS Approach Toolkit, Version 2.0 May 2017 contains 7 modules, listing all requirements to fulfil the 3 phases (Identification, HCS forest patch analysis, and HCS-HCV protection) of the toolkit. Within the toolkit Version, there is stated in relevant session of the toolkit (modules in-development):             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Module 2. Social Requirements: “A broader set of social requirements for the HCS Approach is being developed, initially with a focus on oil palm. A draft (working draft) of the Social Requirements for Conserving High Carbon Stock Forests in Oil Palm Development is included in Section B of this module. (page 4 Module 2, HCSA Toolkit, Version 2.0 May 2017).”</li> <li>○ Module 5. High Carbon Stock Forest Patch Analysis: ‘Note: This module is a beta version undergoing some final technical clarifications. (page 3 Module 5, HCSA Toolkit, Version 2.0 May 2017).’</li> <li>○ Module 6 &amp; 7: Developing issues &amp; quality assurance</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Early this year, HCSA has published two new documents:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Updated Module 2. The Social Requirements of the HCSA (Module 2 Version 2.0 February 2020) – serving as updated requirements for the working draft as stated within May 2017 version as stated above); and</li> <li>ii. Implementation Guide for the Social Requirements of the High Carbon Stock Approach, Guidance for the HCS Approach, Version 1.1 February 2020. This Implementation Guide for the SRs provides practical instructions for companies on how to go about fulfilling the updated Module 2. social requirements.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• This has raised concerns/issues/confusion that stem from the adoption of the HCSA toolkit.</li> </ul>	



	<p><b>Decision by the SSC:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) SSC decided that the adoption of the HCSA toolkit and HCV-HCS manual by RSPO is intended for identification purposes only as described in indicator 7.12.2(b).</li> <li>(2) The SSC acknowledges that the HCSA SRs and ICLUP were a part of the HCSA toolkit during adoption by HCSA in draft form, however, note that some of the HCSA requirements may align, contradict, or go beyond the existing RSPO requirements. To ensure the integrity of HCSA toolkit implementation, practical measures and guidance developed respecting consultation with wider stakeholder groups are crucial. As such, it was decided that:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NDTF to finalize the gap analysis for identification of gaps and/or overlaps of relevant RSPO requirements (P&amp;C 2018 and NPP) with HCSA requirements.</li> <li>• NDTF to setup criteria, process and procedure for integration of any new HCSA requirements which are in-line or add value to existing RSPO requirements and processes. This procedure shall take into consideration the RSPO Standard-Setting SOP and ISEAL requirements.</li> </ul> </li> <li>(3) The SSC also acknowledged that HCV-HCS Assessment Manual, governed by HCVRN will incorporate new Social Requirements published by HCSA with immediate effect, where same level of consistency in implementation needed for RSPO members, hence SSC requested:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secretariat to seek clarification and discuss with HCVRN ALS on the steps to setup a separate review process of integrated assessments for RSPO members, pertaining to the new Social Requirements from HCSA.</li> <li>• Secretariat to communicate the introduction of the revised module 2 and SR implementation guidance and related transition process to RSPO members.</li> </ul> </li> <li>(4) Secretariat to discuss and develop a workplan with timelines specifying completion of the above action points number 2 &amp; 3.</li> </ol> <p>Once the above action points are completed, all future additional requirements by HCSA are required to undergo the review process as per the developed review procedure.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Secretariat to seek clarification and discuss with HCVRN ALS on the steps to set up a separate review process of integrated assessments for RSPO members, pertaining to the new Social Requirements from HCSA.</li> <li>(2) Secretariat to communicate the introduction of the revised module 2 and SR implementation guidance and related transition process to RSPO members.</li> <li>(3) Secretariat to discuss and develop a work plan with timelines specifying completion of the action points.</li> <li>(4) Secretariat to facilitate NDTF discussion to setup criteria, process and procedure for integration of any new HCSA requirements which are in-line or add value to existing RSPO requirements and processes.</li> </ol>
<p>14.0</p>	<p><b>Strategy for Social Standard Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KV updated the SSC on one of the main outcomes from the recent HR&amp;SCWG meeting to move towards developing a strategy. This is a proposal for the entire HRSCWG strategy. The strategy is still in draft form, but the structure has generally been agreed upon by the WG.</li> <li>• The purpose to develop a strategy are:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To outline the vision and purpose of the group;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To align the work of the group to the revision of the P&amp;C in 2023;</li> <li>○ To outline clear goals, objectives, and tactics to achieve them;</li> <li>○ To clarify the roles of HRSCWG in the RSPO structure and its relationship with the other bodies; and</li> <li>○ To drive the HRSCWG in achieving the goal set out within a determined time frame.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To achieve the strategy, the WG will work through the formation of sub-groups comprising the following:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ FPIC Sub-Group (existing)</li> <li>○ Social Auditing Sub-Group (existing)</li> <li>○ Gender Sub-Group (existing)</li> <li>○ Labour Sub-Group (to be re-activated)</li> <li>○ HRD Sub-Group (Existing)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● The suggestion to reactivate the Labour Sub-Group (LSG) is to create a more permanent structure within to address labour challenges for the RSPO. LSG is proposed to remain under the HRSCWG to align the vision of realizing the rights of the plantation workers in the RSPO. While it is so, it will have a link to the other standing committee such as the ASC and SHSC.</li> </ul> <p><u>Decision by the SSC:</u></p> <p>SSC affirmed the idea to continuously improve the implementation of the standard. The SSC suggested the approval to be made once the full strategy is completed. SSC also requested that the ToR for the Labour Sub-Group to be shared to the Committee.</p> <p>SSC also suggested for HRSCWG to consider consolidating the sub-groups in view of the challenges in getting members to join in each of the sub-groups. It was also proposed for the HRSCWG to ensure guidances developed to be followed through to support the application on the ground.</p> <p>SSC also agreeable that an update be given to ASC so to sync the understanding on the direction of the WG.</p>	<p>Secretariat to share the TOR of the Labour SG.</p>
<p>15.0</p>	<p><b>Decent Living Wage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● KV updated that the consultation with the Social NGOs as well as the HRSCWG has been done. There was a consensus that the proposed way forward is the way to go given the current condition.</li> <li>● The idea to form a DLW Taskforce was well received and suggestion on the composition of the TF prioritizes technical expertise.</li> <li>● Also presented was the revised strategy of DLW taking into account the inputs/comments received during the consultations with Social NGO and the HRSCWG.</li> <li>● ToR of the DLWTF will be developed and shared with SSC.</li> </ul>	

<p><u>Decision by the SSC:</u></p> <p>SSC agreed with the idea to form DLWTF. An announcement to invite member to join the group should be done to start forming of the TF.</p> <p>It is important to ensure there is balance representation in the TF and the invitation should mention that the TF is highly technical, hence, members joining are those who have the relevant technical knowledge on the subject. It is also important to mention in the communication that the TF will invite technical experts to be part of the TF.</p> <p>Data shall be handled carefully. A simple document summarizes how the data is collected and managed is needed.</p> <p>It is also important to ascertain where to park the DLWTF within the structure, either reporting directly to SSC or HRSCWG. The link between the DLWTF with NITF need to be clarified.</p>	<p>(1) Secretariat to prepare the TOR of DLWTF.</p> <p>(2) Secretariat to come up with a proposal where the TF will be parked.</p>
<p>16.0 <b>HGU Indonesia/ Letter from INA NI to RSPO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TR has had a discussion with the INA NI TF and also shared the report by AsM. The INA NI TF is in view that the recommendation made in the report has been addressed in the NI under the Criteria 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5.</li> <li>• The INA NI is in the opinion that the Government of Indonesia recognised the existence of customary land rights. As soon as the community obtained the customary land rights from the government of Indonesia through a certain legal process, the community can apply that rights to negotiate with the company about the land. The challenge is the community need to first obtain the customary land rights that is legally recognised by the government. It is in such situation (i.e. in the absence of the community’s customary land rights), company will request the community to give their consent in order for the company to obtain the HGU.</li> <li>• INA NI seek direction from SSC to report back to the BoG.</li> </ul> <p><u>Decision by the SSC:</u></p> <p>SSC is in view that based on the report, there is no credible alternative that can be used at scale. There is no alternative and it is difficult for the customary landowner to get the rights recognized and, in that way, would allow them for development.</p> <p>What is missing in the report is how company actually manage the land. SSC recognised it is a legal problem. To understand the problem, one need to understand the whole picture to understand the implication.</p> <p>SSC proposed to request the law firm (AsM) to do a bit more research on how plantation company operates on top of those rights? Suggest making a scenario i.e. Company A with 4 or 5 scenarios and describe how to build plantation on that. How do the company obtain their various licences to operate in that industrial plantation?</p>	

	<p>Moving forward, SSC recommended to continue the legal review looking at the process all the way to how it can be used to get to a business level.</p>	<p>TR will reach out to the legal company (AsM) about the estimate budget to continue legal review.</p>
<p>17.0</p>	<p><b>Any Other Business:</b>  a) SSC accepted the nomination for Miko as member to SRWG.   b) Next meeting will be on 13<sup>th</sup> August 2020 for three hours started at 1400 to accommodate those in Europe.</p>	

Meeting ended at 1730.