

MINUTES OF 1st Physical Meeting 2013 - Smallholder Working Group

Date : 15 & 16 July 2013
Time : 09:00am - 16:00pm
Venue : Hastinapura Meeting Room, IFC Office, Indonesia Stock Exchange Building, Jakarta

Attendance:

No	Name	Ini	Organisation	Notes
1	Herman Tandinata	HT	PT Musim Mas	
2	Petra Meekers – Co Leader	PM	NBPOL	
3	Marieke Leegwater – Co Leader	ML	Solidaridad	Meeting chairperson
4	Cahyo Nugroho	CN	Fauna & Flora International	
5	Adam Keatts	AK	Conservation International	
6	Dayang Norwana Awang Ali Bema	DN	WWF Malaysia	
7	Dani Rahadian	DR	WWF Indonesia	
8	Thithinai Pongpiriyakit	TP	GIZ-Thailand	
9	Mansuetus Alsy Hanu	MH	SPKS	
10	Narno	NN	Group Manager of AMANAH	
11	Triyanto Fitriyardi	TF	IFC	
12	Perpetua George	PG	Unilever	
13	Senniah Appalasaamy	SA	BSI	
14	Asrini Subrata	AS	Asian Agri	
15	Yunita Sidauruk	YS	PT Hindoli	Day 1
16	Sophia Gynch	SG	CIFOR	
17	Katrina Durham	KD	IDH	
18	Dr Balamurugan	BL	Consultant	
19	Maizura Ismail	MI	Consultant	
20	Dawn Robinson	DW	Proforest (UK)	Joining via Skype – D1
21	Anni Vouhelainen	AV	Proforest (UK)	Joining via Skype – D1
22	Simon Siburat	SS	WILMAR	Day 2
23	Alfat Agus Salim	AA	WILMAR	
24	Daniel Hazman	DH	IDH	Day 2
25	Joko Arif	JA	IDH	Day 2
26	Salahudin Yaacob	SY	RSPO	
27	Julia Majail	JM	RSPO	
28	Imam A. El Marzuq	IM	RSPO – RILO	
29	Desi Kusumadewi	DK	RSPO – RILO	
30	Dr Asril Darussamin	AD	RSPO – RILO	

No	Discussion	Action point	Action by
1	DAY 1 – 15 July 2013		
1.1	Introduction/Welcome and Planning		
1.1.1	ML welcome everyone. She open the session with a round of brief introduction from all meeting participants, and go through the agenda to confirm on the schedule of the two days meeting. JM informed that in the end of Monday meeting, there will be a dinner & break fasting session at Financial	Info	

	Club, Jakarta. Started from 5.30 pm. All participants are welcomed to join.	
1.1.2	<p>ML presented the update on State of Play of the SHWG, the key points are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcoming Petra Meekers (stepping in for Dr. Simon Lord) • The mission of Smallholder Working Group • Progress up to today <p>There are some consideration in regards to Workstream approach under SHWG, and it was evaluated during the Workstreams Spokeperson Meeting in April 2013.</p> <p>Conclusions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Workstream approach does not help to reach SHWG objectives b. In order to reach goals, SHWG need to focus resources (can not do all at once!), hence a workplan is needed c. Need more clarity on who does what <p>ML explained the current workplan priorities as follows :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Document Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Simplify without compromise ▪ Make documents more accessible and more user friendly ▪ Implement changes to P & C ▪ Review definitions 2. Organise and Facilitate SH FFB trade 3. Organise SH Support Fund 4. Get the library function going- facilitate exchange of knowledge 5. Impact Monitoring – Important, but we cannot do all at once 	Info
1.1.3	PM added an explanation that the objective of the two days meeting is an agreement on the approach to do document review and how to bring it into the next level, the target is to meet the SHWG objectives.	Info
1.1.4	Confirmation of the last Minutes of Meeting	Info
	<p>No comments from the participants.</p> <p>The last Minute of Meeting on 28th October 2012, at Singapore were finalized and confirmed.</p> <p>Proposer : PG (Unilever)</p> <p>Seconded by : DN (WWF Malaysia)</p>	
1.2	<i>Update Workplan/priorities SHWG – JM</i> <i>Please refer to Annex 1.</i>	
1.2.1	<p>Discussion & Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. DR conveyed his concern on the SH Membership Fee structure, especially for the category of SH group managing >2000 ha of Palm Oil SH will need to pay 2000 euro (equal with big companies). <p>SY explained that it is a valid concern, however at this point of time the Executive Board has approve the new structure and need to be implemented immediately. If in the</p>	

	<p>future SHWG think that the current SH Membership structure need to be revised, it may come up with a new resolution to the EB.</p> <p>b. DR suggested to encourage better outreach and communication program for smallholder, using extention strategy to dispersed the information about RSPO JM highlighted the Smallholder Linking & Learning function to widen the information for and from Smallholders, and it is the role of SHWG itself to further extend the news and information to reach the SH on the ground. AD & DR commented, we need to encourage the involvement of national initiative (i.e INA SWG in Indonesia) to support the outreach program, it is important to improve the capacity of local NGOs since they are closely working with the SH on the ground.</p> <p>c. PG commented, part of the challenges of SHWG is that the group is tend to pick up the focus on specific issues, it is important to define the strategy and also to have a workplan in term of structuring the way to move forward, to ensure that the group will working properly (considering that the WS approach was discontinued).</p> <p>d. PM commented, there 2 questions to think about : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workplan for communication and outreach strategy • How to link the capacity into the communication strategy (capacity mapping of stakeholders) </p>	<p>Reactivation of INA SWG will be the starting point to support the outreach program of SHWG, especially in Indonesian context. INA SWG will prepare a draft of strategy wrt the outreach program in Indonesia</p> <p>SHWG will use result based approach to move forward instead of workstream approach</p>	<p>AD, DR, IM</p> <p>SHWG</p>
1.2.2	<p>There was a discussion if Smallholders should be a separate constituent within RSPO. It was agreed to move forward with the current composition and make the RSSF fully operational to support the smallholders towards certification.</p>	Info	
1.2.3	<p>With regards to the document review of Smallholders, RSPO will engage an independent facilitator to assist during the review stages.</p> <p>After careful search process the SHWG lead team considered Dr. Balamurugan best placed to do this job, with assistance of Dr. Simon Lord. Dr. Balamurugan was invited to attend this meeting to prepare for the work.</p>	Info	
<p>1.3 Presentation on Simplified HCV Study by Conservation International - AK Please refer to Annex 2.</p>			
1.3.1	<p>Discussion & Comments</p> <p>a. SY highlighted about discussion point 1 , is more relevant to forestry practices, might not be fit into palm oil production. PG, need a clear definition and understanding</p>	<p>Will find the way to rephrase the associated item</p>	<p>AK</p>

on how to manage the HCV especially for those HCV founded in smallholder plantation.

- b. **DR** commented, ask for clarification if the simplified HCV is dedicated for the existing smallholder plantation under group certification (to address 5.2) or will be dedicated to the prospective smallholders as well.
What is the cut off date for Independent Smallholder certification ?
- c. **SY** explained that there are no double standard in RSPO, existing plantation need to comply with P 5.2 , new plantation will need to comply with P 7. In particular for P 7.3, at this point of time the HCV assessment need to be done by approved HCV assessor.
The next question, whether for Smallholders the approved HCV assessor can use the simplified one? Or they can use the conventional HCV assessment procedure ?
- d. **PG** commented, to assist the group to focus on the document review process, it is important to separate the issues of HCV management within smallholders plantation with the compensation mechanism that have been developed
AS commented, RSPO should not set the standard for SH to be harder than companies, otherwise lot of SH will not be able to comply with the RSPO standards
ML explained 'lowering the bar for SH' may be difficult considering the debate in the European market pertaining to the recently revised P&C, where the many people think that the revised version is not stringent enough, therefore they are in view to develop additional demands or a new mechanism so called RSPO +.
- e. **SA** commented, prospective members is those smallholders that already been assessed, but has yet join with the smallholder group.
PG commented, she is in view that the meeting should be trying to solve the issue of inclusivity within the tool, and suggest put the note of the compensation mechanism, otherwise the discussion will become to broad
AD commented, under the standard it has been disclosed that not all smallholders can join the group, there are certain requirements to be fulfilled,
It is important to set some alternatives (in term of technical aspect) for the smallholders, to accommodate them within the system (without compromising the standards)

DR commented, the checklist should also accommodate the individual prospective members of smallholder group, so that the smallholder will understand how to utilize the tools

The issue will be park under parking lot, to be discuss further

- f. **BL** enquired, what is the challenges in terms of identification and management of HCV found within smallholder plantation during the certification process, he assume that based on that challenges SHWG has decide to simplify the HCV standard for smallholders **AK** explained, referring to the experiences from Thailand independent SH and presentation by Daniel May in the last SHWG meeting, the main challenges are :
- The SH require a lot of hands on support
 - Need to provide a lot of expertise to conduct the HCV assessment exercise for smallholders

DR shared the experience from WWF project, with regards to the HCV identification there is no serious challenges for existing plantation, however the most challenging will be on those new smallholder plantation. It was also associated with externalities and ecosensitive market.

SY commented, an analogy to explain the inclusivity issues of smallholders “football player not allowed to score a goal when in offside position, despite of what is the quality of the player and where did he coming from, because rules is rules”

TF commented, suggest the group to focus the discussion on the standard for the eligible smallholders, instead of broaden the discussion to the larger context.

Send the comments through email to AK AD

- g. **AD** highlighted on HCV 4 (riparian zone), need to put more attention on the method of pesticide and fertilizer application along the riparian area/river banks
- h. **PG** raised her concern in terms of practicality of the simplified HCV document :
- What is the expectation in terms of the knowledge of HCV for the group manager
 - Do we need to allocate some of the questionnaire items to be addressed by the smallholder itself, rather than put everything under the responsibility of Group Manager
- AK** explained, it was something that has been considered significantly in the process. Who should be conducting the survey ? If the responsibility is fall under group manager, the next question was, what is the capacity of

Group Manager to perform HCV assessment exercise ?

That is why, bringing in the relevant expertise become very important, to determine an appropriate management method for the HCV in the smallholder area.

Another point that need to be considered is how far the Group Manager can access & manage their member.

AD explained, during the audit process, both Group Manager (GM) and smallholders will be assessed, it is crucial to have a GM with appropriate capacity, since the GM will required to understand most of the aspect of certification (P&C,standard,etc)

DR commented, one way to support the outreach program is through Training on Trainers (extention agent), the more we train the more we reach smallholders.

- i. **ML** raised a point of discussion, should the document applied to Independent SH only, or will also applied to Scheme SH ? considering that there are more capacity and resources with the Scheme SH

AK commented, in technical the simplified HCV guidance is applicable for both independent and scheme. However, during the development process, the subject in mind is Independent SH, with a low capacity resources on the ground.

PM commented, the material that we discussed is methodology to assess HCV, so it will help either for Group Manager (Independent) and Scheme Manager.

PG commented, the document is a structure for Group Certification but it also a tools for any other parties to potentially use if they want to.

DN commented, the simplified HCV guidance is a tool, all other supporting activities will need to be established to make it efficient.

PG commented, SHWG will need to escalate the HCV issues for SH to HCV Working Group or HCV network to get more comprehensive views and solutions.

- j. **ML** wrapped up the discussion, some conclusion points :
- the document presented by AK is ontrack, further developed towards Simplified HCV guidance for SH
 - to escalate the discussion on HCV to higher level (BHCV WG / RN)
 - think further on how the tools will meet the requirement of the Scheme SH context
 - need to discuss further on how to deal with those SH who has done the

conversion of HCV area into Palm Oil plantation (develop compensation track)

- k. **SY** explained about the process of how to move forward with the document :
 - a. the initial draft has been presented by AK in front of SHWG
 - b. AK will take all the comments come up during the process
 - c. after the compilation process, it will become SHWG document
 - d. then SHWG should push the document to BHCV WG for the briefing
 - e. if BHCV WG agree with the proposed document, then it will be go to EB for approval

1.4 Briefing on the current RSPO P&C revision - SY

Please refer to Annex 3.

1.4.1 Discussion & Comments

- a. **AS** asked clarification on GHG calculator, more than one tools currently available to calculate GHG emission (developed by other certification scheme), which tools that supposed to be used by companies to calculate their emission
- b. **ML** asked about the impact of the recent P&C revision to the SH
SY, the guidance for Independent & Scheme Smallholders will need to be revised to address the changes into account, most of the discussion will be done through NIWG
- c. **PM**, asked confirmation about the tools to calculate Carbon Stocks
SY, currently RSPO is establishing a Working Group to look into this, so called C 5.6 & 7.8 WG. Also going to be established a Legal FFB WG.

Calculation of GHG emission shall be based on RSPO Palm GHG Calculator, OR equivalent tools, company will need to provide the proof that the tools being used is equivalent to RSPO Palm GHG Calculator

1.5 Presentation on "RSPO Smallholder certification models in Honduras" – DW & AV

Please refer to Annex 4.

1.5.1 Discussion & Comments

- a. Clarification of group certification & the definition of smallholder in Honduras
SY, PM, ML, DR, AV

DR & AV to made reference to Group Certification document (new version), and use the P&C document as main reference for standard to be used

1.6	Document Review – PM Please refer to Annex 5.	
1.6.1	Discussion & Comments	
	<p>a. Discussion on the recent revision of Group Certification document, especially on the item of scheme SH without mill</p> <p>b. PG, the biggest difference between the current scheme and independent smallholder guidance is that under the group certification there is a lot of requirements on how the group manager should cascade the information down. If, we can incorporate the requirements within the group certification standard, she suggest to have one standard for smallholders. SA, think that the differences of requirement between scheme and independent are needed, considering the nature of each category DR, the basic differences between SC & ISH guidance is in principle 4, agrochemical waste disposal management. Scheme SH has mill to support them on how to manage, meanwhile the ISH resources were limited. PM, upon reaching the agreement on the guidance document (either going to have a single document or leave it into 2 separated doc), the next crucial action is to find the direction on how to review the guidance. SY, will be a good suggestion to have one generic document with a clear definition of all smallholder category, the CB will be using NI, for countries without NI may refer to one document.</p>	<p>The new Group Certification document allow scheme smallholders without mill to be certified, similar to the independent SH</p> <p>The group has agreed to move forward towards a single Generic Guidance for Smallholders</p> <p>The document to work forward :</p> <p>a. 1 Generic Guidance for Smallholders b. 1 Generic Group Certification c. Documents under National Interpretation will be vary, the cascade document will depend on the national conditions/status</p>
1.7	Wrap Up of Day 1	
2 DAY 2 – 16 July 2013		
2.1	<p>ML explained the agenda for the second day meeting, include some modification from the initial schedule.</p> <p>PG, suggest to initiate the discussion on the structure going forward for the Working Group before moving to the document review, given that the Workstream approach was discontinued.</p> <p>PM, the first priority is to start with a new framework for the BHCV with regards to the Generic standard, the technical review team will prepare a draft for the new framework, the first draft will be circulated to the SHWG members in the end of August, the idea was to have review process through email before RT11, by RT11 we hope to have a draft of framework in place (include suggestion on indicators).</p>	Info

2.2 Way of Working SHWG

- a. The WG will work based on the priorities/target and approved workplan
- b. Formed 2 subcommittee for Simplified HCV & Generic Guidance
- c. Composition of Simplified HCV subcommittee :
 - Perpetua George (Unilever)
 - Dani Rahadian (WWF Indonesia)
 - Dayang Norwana (WWF Malaysia)
 - WILMAR
 - Asril Darussamin (RSPO – RILO)
 - Triyanto Fitriyardi (IFC)
 - Herman Tandinata (Musim Mas)
 - Asrini Subrata (Asian Agri)
 - RSPO HCV Manager
- d. Composition of Smallholder Generic Guidance subcommittee :
 - Perpetua George (Unilever)
 - Triyanto Fitriyardi (IFC)
 - Herman Tandinata (Musim Mas)
 - Senniah Appalasamy (BSI)
 - WILMAR
 - Asrini Subrata (Asian Agri)
 - Dani Rahadian (WWF Indonesia)
- e. Timeframe for HCV Simplified Guidance
 - July – 1 August : Comment from wider SHWG members (via email)
 - 10 August : Send to BHCV WG
 - 24 Aug – 2nd week Sept : Inputs from BHCV sub committee
 - 4th week Sept : finalized doc
- f. Timeframe for SH Generic Guidance
 - 15/16 July : 1st Meeting
 - 31st Aug : Draft outline
 - 3rd week Sept (21/5) : Input from WG
 - 1st week Oct : subcommittee physical meeting
 - End October : input from WG (2)
 - End Jan : 3rd draft of document
 - End Feb : Final Draft
- g. 2nd SHWG Meeting : 10 November 2013
- h. Smallholders Linking & Learning Workshop : 11 November 2013

2.3 Presentation on the “Challenges of doing plasma Certification” by Wilmar - SS

Please refer to Annex 6.

2.3.1 Discussion & Comments

- a. **ML**, ask clarification regarding KKPA using nucleus/company standard
SS, clarify the clause under INA-NI page 4

AD explaining the history of KKPA linked to the standard that need to be used. KKPA is a scheme system where the plantation is fully developed and managed by the nucleus estate, that is why the standard being used to this category is same with the nucleus company.

- b. **PM**, there are differences on the ground with regards to implementation, the National Interpretation combined with the experiences of ground practices will be take into consideration during the review of smallholder generic guidance
- c. **AA**, asking further clarification with regards to KKPA 100% managed by nucleus
AD, explaining about Generic and NI
PG, explaining the history of current SH NI and SH Generic
- d. **SY**, explaining queries from CB regarding the SH in Sabah. Also explaining certified FFB Trading through GreenPalm system.

2.4 Presentation on the FFB legalities issues - DR Please refer to Annex 7.

2.4.1 Discussion & Comments

- a. **ML**, ask clarification pertaining to the status of independent smallholder who has developed Palm Oil plantation within the National Park
DR, those smallholders were breaching the law and their activities were against the forestry regulation, therefore they are illegal
SY, explained on the alternatives to overcome the issue (3 possibilities) :
 1. The mill to have as system to ensure the supply base legal status in place
 2. Request buyer to start sourcing only CPO that are coming from legal area
 3. RSPO to tweak the supply chain system especially for mills that produce MB, to only use legal FFB as the non certified oil to be mixed with the certified one to produce MB CSPOwhat will happen to those illegal smallholders with regards to ISPO ?
DR, ISPO doesn't recognize minor indicator – all major, the main reference is national law, it is important to have strong law enforcement on the ground.
- b. **PG**, refer to the revised P&C – requirement 4.1.1 & 4.1.4,
Q : how to relate the issue with new P&C requirement

DR, in practical the growers may adopt internal control system concept from group certification system, since it was clearly govern the traceability of FFB source
PM, need to analyze the problem from a broader context not only the illegalities of FFB as it is
PG, ask clarification pertaining the internal control system

2.5 Wrap Up summary

PM

- a. Develop an approach with indicator without compromising the standard
- b. To be inclusive with the current standard might compromise the standard. Maybe look at a phased approach/stepwise entry model for independent smallholders as an option ?

Process

- a. Combine the two generic documents (generic scheme and independent smallholders)
- b. Review general definition of smallholders (1)
- c. Include the existing definitions and include other options (2)
- d. Review guidance and include possible indicators for scheme and independent (draft to be prepared by technical reviewer with help from Dr.Bala). During this meeting gather some inputs on some areas of concern raised by outcome of trials (3)
- e. Include changes to P&C 2013 (discuss which are applicable to smallholders and how to include)
 1. Smallholder general terms :
Farmers growing oil palm, sometimes along with subsistence production of other crops, where the family provides the majority of labour and the farm provides the principal source of income and where the planted area of oil palm is usually below 50 hectares in size)
 2. Existing definitions: schemed smallholders, independent smallholders and associated smallholders (to discuss). Add schemed smallholders and out growers without mill. Rest of the definitions to be addressed by national interpretation.

2.6 Presentation on Updates on RSPO Smallholders Support Fund (RSSF) - JM

Please refer to Annex 8.

2.6.1 Discussion & Comments

- a. **SS**, asking clarification regarding the RSSF Funding Request form
JM, explaining the details of RSSF form
- b. **AD**, if the Fund is available for Surveillance

audit ?

JM, it is available for the first ASA.

ML, the main audit cost + first annual surveillance is eligible for 100% grant financing, meanwhile for preparation cost 50%.

- c. **AS**, how many maximum applications could be submitted by a company/supporting agency for RSSF.
JM, currently there is no limitation
- d. **DR**, is the cost eligible to cover overhead cost for facilitator/supporting agency ? is it possible to apply only for surveillance audit (without main audit) ?
JM, to cover the overhead cost of the supporting organization is not yet the priority at this point of time. the smallholder group may apply for the surveillance only.
SY, once a group of SH being certified, they may sell 100% of their FFB production under GreenPalm and even for the next year volume as well. GreenPalm doesn't go by month.
- e. **AD**, what is the priority/criteria of accepting the project ?
JM, the priority is for the 'low hanging fruit'
- f. **TF**, how is the decision making process for the applications that have been submitted to RSPO ?
JM, the RSSF Fund Panel will meet 4 times within a year, depend on the applications that have been received. Explaining the timeframe of fund.

2.7 Briefing on Smallholder Programme by CIFOR - SG

2.7.1 Discussion & Comments

1. **SY**, ask confirmation in regards to whether CIFOR have conduct study for other scheme (ISCC, etc) ?
SG, haven't involved with the said study
2. **PM**, if CIFOR is open to discussion of particular topic the SHWG will be happy to collaborate

2.8 Presentation on IDH palm oil program in Indonesia - DH

Please refer to Annex 9.

2.8.1 Discussion & Comments

- a. **SS**, asking clarification of the assumption being used for the projection of yield
DH, the program using multitive assumption
- FFB production, from 10 to 12 tonnes/ha move to 20 tonnes/ha
 - OER was improved by 3% , by 20% to 23%

- Logistical side

b. **ML**, asking clarification with regards to the next plan/future cooperation with RSPO

DH, the focus of the program is not certification, it is about the agronomics :

- How to increase upwards
- How to increase quality
- How to make operation more efficient and effective
- How to deal with the different partnership
- Innovative financing mechanism from the banks

By doing the appropriate activities, it will meet with the RSPO P&C. RSSF may later come as a layer on top of the IDH program to support certification purpose.

c. **SY**, asking pertaining to the target of the program, will the program include people who doesn't need the fund ?

DH, the program was developed in the basis that everybody have something to put in, not only the producers and uptakers, but also the smallholder itself.

d. **AD**, clarification regarding the expansion of degraded land

DH, in practice there are possibilities to improve the production either by expansion or intensification, it is important to ensure if the expansion is happen in the legal land. The role of government will be very crucial.

e. **DR**, where is the programme sit on with regards to provide accesses (to information, agroinputs, finance, market) for the independent smallholders

DH, Farmer Development Centre will be the entity who responsible to provide accesses for smallholders (to information, agroinputs, finance, market, education,training)

f. **TF**, what is the form of the fund (loan or grant)? – financing by local banks with regards to collateral – what about the consideration of environment and social aspect ?

DH, the fund will be delivered as loan or grant depend on which mechanism being taken, the program try to create an enabling environment for the banks to channel the funds.

Financing by local banks – there are 3 primary issues that become the point of interest of banks :

- Cashflow

- Collateral
- Technical (replacement of the financing in particular)

E&S – establish the program with a good practices since the beginning, including FPIC process, to build up stakeholders interest

- g. **ML**, what about the relationship between IDH and ISPO?
DH, at the moment there are no formal partnership between IDH and ISPO, however it is possible to have it in the future

2.9 WRAP UP – SUMMARY

2.9.1 **ML** summarized all keypoints from the two days meeting :

1. SHWG reach conclusion on the main topic of the agenda and have define the next step with dedicated timeline
2. SHWG has agreed to incorporate the two SH guidance into a single Generic Guidance for Smallholders, and also to move forward with the Simplified HCV document
3. The important of outreach program to reach broader scope of smallholders
4. SHWG has reached an agreement on the next WG Meeting (10 November 2013) & Linking and Learning session (11 November 2013)
5. Thanks to all participants and IFC for hosting the meeting

2.10 Parking Lot

1. Smallholders Membership
2. SHWG – How to move forward
3. SHWG – Communication outreach
4. How to deal with stepwise entry level issues. eg: Cut off date for Independent Smallholders
5. /Compensation –Group Manager – Capacity issues

Meeting was adjourned at 4.08pm.

List of Annexes:

Annex 1 – Workplan/priorities SHWG by Julia Majail
 Annex 2 – Simplified HCV Study by Adam Keatts
 Annex 3 – Briefing on The Current RSPO P&C Revision by Salahudin Yaacob
 Annex 4 - RSPO Smallholder Certification Models in Honduras by Dawn Robinson & Anni Vouhelainen
 Annex 5 - Document Review by Petra Meekers
 Annex 6 - Challenges of Doing Plasma Certification by Simon Siburat
 Annex 7 - FFB Legallities Issues by Dani Rahardian
 Annex 8 - Updates on RSPO Smallholders Support Fund (RSSF) by Julia Majail
 Annex 9 - IDH Palm Oil Program in Indonesia by Daniel Hazman

Minutes taken by: Imam A. El Marzuq
 Checked by: Julia Majail, Marieke Leegwater and Petra Meekers