

## Minutes of Meeting:

### **RSPO Communications & Claims Standing Committee**

**Date** : July 12, 2011  
**Venue** : Grange St Paul's London  
**Starting Time** : 10.00 am – 3.00pm

#### **Attendance list (in alphabetical order)**

AAK	Catherine Hansen
Ahold	Hugo Byrnes
BM TRADA	Andy Green
GreenPalm	Bob Norman
Hill & Knowlton	Tanno Massar
Hill & Knowlton	Giovanni Colombo
IOI	Yves Augrandjean
IOI	Patrick Cobussen
New Britain Oils	Adam Thomas
New Britain Palm Oil Limited	Simon Lord
Retail Palm Oil Group	Belinda Howell
Product Board MVO	Marieke Leegwater
Rabobank	Dr Olaf Brugman
RSPO Secretariat	Anne Gabriel
Shell	Michelle Morton
Sime Darby	Puvan Selvanathan
Sime Darby	Nienke Pek
Unilever	Jan Kees Vis
Wilmar	Jeremy Goon
WWF	Carrie Svingen

## Opening

- The Chair (Jan Kees Vis) opened the meeting and welcomed all participants.

## Discussion

1	<b>Global Communications Plan on Europe by Giovanni Colombo</b>
1.1	<b>Membership helpdesk:</b> Suggestion that all C&C members are regularly updated on incoming questions and responses for the more 'critical' and 'negative' line of questions to ensure consistency on specific subject matters across RSPO members
1.2	<b>Media engagement:</b> Point raised about engagement with Financial Times is key due to misconceptions – to keep this in mind for future communications strategy. H&K explained that Sec Gen was supposed to meet with the FT correspondent, but cancelled due to prior engagements.
1.3	<b>Stakeholder engagements:</b> Comment raised about the need to engage with orgs like Forest Footprint Disclosure and that they should not be in the priority list of stakeholders due to prevailing credibility issues
1.4	<b>Food labeling:</b> Discussion on awareness and sentiments amongst retailers and manufacturers over labeling of type of vegetable oil and quantity used
1.5	<b>Bio fuels:</b> Comments on closing of the gap between RED and RSPO standards and to be feedback into the P&C review. Competing standards are creating market confusion
1.6	<b>RT9:</b> there was a suggestion that next roundtable meeting should consider a slot for competing standards; ISCC; RSPO+; ISPO
1.7	<b>Issues management &amp; risk matrix:</b> Simon Lord requested that H&K importantly develop this for each market and stakeholder groups including issues faced
1.8	<b>Carbon off setting:</b> Jan Kees commented that there was a need to clarify the parallel between GreenPalm and the EU emissions trading scheme towards a positive uptake. Belinda Howell commented that it was better if positioned as voluntary carbon off setting. Comment also came in about allowing manufacturers and derivatives players to be more involved in this
1.9	<b>Strategic Mapping:</b> Puvan Selvanathan asked clarification if the communications directions imply that RSPO is the solution to all problems. He required this be identified/mapped out and substantiated. The strategy should unveil what it is RSPO is not saying that has established some of the existing misconceptions in EU. Michelle Morton commented that there can be an improvement on the RSPO if we can get more exposure on GHGs related aspects.
1.10	<b>Collaboration with other Multi Stakeholder Initiatives:</b> Michelle Morton commented that much value can come from synergies with other roundtables as well i.e. vegetable

	<i>oil conference with the soy bean; timber conference with the FSC</i>
1.11	<b>Outreach to supply chain players:</b> <i>Patrick Cobussen enquired if outreach to players throughout the supply chain is in the Europe plan i.e. participation in food conferences/platforms. Andy Green commented that in the UK, they are having discussions with people within the right target market pertaining to certification process &amp; uptake.</i>
1.12	<b>Launch of trademark:</b> <i>comment about trademark launched without much buzz and interest. Suggested that H&amp;K leads this process in terms of developing the plan and map for the next stage as part of the trademark plan.</i>

<b>2</b>	<b><i>Global Communications Plan for India &amp; China by Tanno Massar</i></b>
2.1	<b>RSPO Advisory Board in India:</b> <i>question from Carrie on how this advisory board would work in line with the existing Coalition in India. Tanno to revert with specific direction and information on this</i>
2.2	<b>Score Card by WWF:</b> <i>Carrie confirmed that this will not cover Indian and Chinese companies as CSPO in these markets is still at a very preliminary stage. However, the Scorecard package will include narrative sections on the highlights of the market.</i>
2.3	<b>Pricing issue in India:</b> <i>Puvan asked that if pricing is indeed the most important issue in India, should we not be focusing all our resources towards this issue instead of generic awareness building exercise in India. Stakeholder mapping process should help identify &amp; clarify this matter. Tanno of H&amp;K to revert with a strategy on this.</i>
2.4	<b>Stakeholders in China:</b> <i>question raised on why CFNA is not listed in the stakeholder mapping for China. Tanno to ensure that this is well reflected.</i>
2.5	<b>Derivatives:</b> <i>comment from Caroline Hansen that personal care &amp; household segments critical in India &amp; China. Tanno to have this reflected in the plan</i>

<b>3.</b>	<b><i>Communications Plan in Malaysia; Indonesia by Anne Gabriel</i></b>
3.1	<b>Communications loop:</b> <i>Puvan raised a comment about ensuring that messages on developments in grower markets should be strategically fed back into the European; India &amp; china outreach. Anne to ensure this is considered as part of the H&amp;K plan.</i>
3.2	<b>Palm Oil strategy in Malaysia &amp; Indonesia:</b> <i>Carrie mentioned that WWF has appointed Boston Consulting Group to develop strategies for the priority countries that they have identified in partnership with WWF: China, Indonesia, Malaysia and Indonesia markets. Anne Gabriel is already in touch with BCG and will ensure that the strategies are aligned to the in-market plans.</i>
3.3	<b>Ministry of Energy, Green Technology &amp; Water:</b> <i>Michelle Morton mentioned the need to include this ministry in engagements in Malaysia</i>
3.4	<b>Stakeholder Mapping &amp; Communications Plan in Malaysia:</b> <i>Anne Gabriel will be</i>

	<i>discussing this closely with Puvan S and Jeremy G.</i>
3.5	<b>West Africa:</b> <i>Simon Lord commented that producers in this market view RSPO as the way to move forward to work sustainably: a very positive thing; current road show in Africa with key players being organized. Anne Gabriel to get a directional brief from Simon Lord on this market to set some communications priorities.</i>
3.5	<b>South America:</b> <i>comment on successful roundtable meetings organized in this market; with many large expansion groups. Possible for the RSPO to work closely with them.</i>

<b>4.</b>	<b><i>Spokespersons Guidelines &amp; Mapping by Tanno Massar</i></b>
4.1	<b><i>Individual capacities &amp; RSPO spokesperson:</i></b> <i>Comment about the need to clearly identify prior to any engagements whether the opportunity is on behalf of RSPO or member organization's spokesperson's individual capacities.</i>

<b>5.</b>	<b><i>Budget revision for H&amp;K by Tanno Massar:</i></b>
5.1	<b><i>Increase in fee from Euro230K to Euro390K:</i></b> <i>Tanno briefed members over the need for increase in total annual retainer budget due to underestimation of capacity and man-hours required in delivering expected strategies and results.</i>
5.2	<b><i>Endorsement by the RSPO Secretariat:</i></b> <i>Puvan enquired if the increase in budget is endorsed by the Secretariat. Anne Gabriel replied that the Secretariat has endorsed the increase with the caveats that the plan is developed in detail for all 3 markets; no increase in fees thereafter for a period of a year until deliverables and performance have been reviewed; all fundamental deliverables should be delivered within the agreed retainer without asking for additional budget.</i>
5.3	<b><i>Details in the plan:</i></b> <i>Puvan commented that there was no difference between this presentation by H&amp;K compared to the first time they presented during the pitch. Belinda commented that the only additional item from that pitched was the Helpdesk, the need for which the panel had clearly stated and asked H&amp;K to include in their budget.</i>
5.4	<b><i>KPIs &amp; measurements:</i></b> <i>Simon reinforced that H&amp;K should work out measurements to gauge the success of the campaign in the markets they are engaged for.</i>
5.5	<b><i>Website &amp; other projects:</i></b> <i>Belinda asked if this budget increase affects other project deliveries i.e. the website. Anne clarified that the other project costs which were agreed towards in the last EB meeting in PD in March remain the same. The only revision is in the annual retainer arrangement.</i>
5.6	<b><i>Refinement of communications directions:</i></b> <i>Jan Kees commented after the tender process, H&amp;K and C&amp;C have underestimated cost of a campaign to cover many markets; EB retreat has also modified plans in line with refined vision. JKV mentioned that existing budget allocation allows for increase</i>
5.7	<b><i>Budget against Content:</i></b> <i>Adam Thomas commented that the budget can be approved against a solid scope/plan presented which is yet to be done.</i>

5.8	<b>Detailed strategy and tactical plan for all 3 markets including a stakeholder mapping process:</b> many C&C members reinforced the need for H&K to revert with a detailed plan as mentioned in order to approve the increase in fees so there is clarity on deliverables expected against budget/investment.
5.9	<b>Process of approval:</b> it was decided that the plan developed by H&K will have to be presented and discussed amongst the C&C first prior to recommendation to the EB in the next meeting. Anne & H&K to work together in ensuring this is the goal to be achieved.
5.10	<b>Information request:</b> Giovanni requested if a survey can be sent to all members to solicit info on individual markets & issues faced to generate the strategy and tactical plan. This was agreed to be carried out via email.

<b>6.</b>	<b>Trademark Marketing Plan by Tanno &amp; Application Update by Anne Gabriel</b>
6.1	<b>Consumer education:</b> Andy Green asked about plans towards consumer education as key issue with manufacturers is that not many of them have an immediate preference to include palm oil into their product labeling. H&K will need to spearhead the consumer outreach.
6.2	<b>Apprehension towards trademark application:</b> Adam Thomas commented that parties not willing to label palm oil on products as it may seem too complicated; and also that many people do not plan to adopt the trademark given the knowledge that there is a review in the pipeline. Comments also that many companies have applied for the trademark but not sure how many of them can understand the rules – complicated rules & guidelines. Comments also that information on the current website not very easily accessible.
6.3	<b>GreenPalm website &amp; FairTrade:</b> Belinda Howell commented that the GreenPalm website is a good example of information on trademark that is simple and easy to find. Caroline Hansen commented about FairTrade website with regards to comprehensive listing of products.
6.4	<b>Education &amp; raising awareness:</b> there was a comment that a campaign in raising awareness towards the TM is a different one from that which educates the consumers, consumer goods manufacturers and the trade. A comment was raised that the consumer education should begin at the same time or after there are trademark labeled products in the market.

<b>7. Trademark Review of rules &amp; guidelines by Jan Kees Vis</b>	
7.1	<i>T&amp;T requests for review: Marieke commented that there is an urgent need from T&amp;T committee to review rules because most are doubtful of guidelines and its credibility. Mentioned that T&amp;T should be more involved in establishing the rules – when the document was sent to the team, there was no time to peruse through the documents. T&amp;T supports review of the rules</i>
7.2	<b>Begin process now:</b> <i>Adam Thomas commented that the process should start now in terms of identifying who should be involved in it as it will all take some time to put in place</i>
7.3	<b>Original review:</b> <i>was scheduled to deliver its findings and recommendations by April 2012. Now based on T&amp;T comments, it should be seriously started immediately.</i>
7.4	<i>ALL Agreement on review of the rules: A working group drawn from C&amp;C and T&amp;T standing committees will review the rules of the Trademark. Jan Kees will speak to Hidde on who leads this and who are the members in it – timing and multi stakeholder group will be established.</i>
7.5	<b>Comments from constituent representatives:</b> <i>Simon Lord suggested that those who already have comments and feedback on the trademark from various groups can send Anne Gabriel of the Secretariat an email so there is an initial document to start with. This document will be reviewed by identified members of the small subcommittee of the C&amp;C and T&amp;T.</i>

<b>8. GreenPalm Evaluation by Jan Kees Vis</b>	
8.1	<b>Comments on the GP evaluation include:</b> <b>Bob Norman:</b> <i>GP has contributed to good success to RSPO. Reduce brokerage fee further to USD1.50 and in 2012 to USD1; with the arrangement to extend contract for next 5 years.</i>
8.2	<b>Marieke:</b> <i>worthwhile to get alignment between GP &amp; UTZ reviews from the T&amp;T WG</i>
8.3	<b>Hugo :</b> <i>Contract to be given till 2013 (one year)</i>
8.4	<b>Simon:</b> <i>when board decision was made on the franchise, there were rules set on how to renew it and the duration – should go back to the minutes of that meeting. Recalled the word ‘tender’</i>
8.5	<b>Yves:</b> <i>5 years is too long a period of time – to review the time period</i>
8.6	<b>Adam Thomas:</b> <i>suggested that GP equally reviewed by the T&amp;T group. Jan Kees</i>

	<i>confirmed that this has been sent to Hidde</i>
8.7	<b>Patrick:</b> <i>GP has contributed to the success of RSPO without a doubt. T&amp;T reviewing the UTZ scheme. Logical process is to include that this scheme discussion also into the working group. Suggested to move forward but GP should not be a profit centre for RSPO; look into lowering the threshold for entry level. What is missing is the surveillance – buyers of GP may not be RSPO members. For redeemed values: there is no special checks on this redemption</i>
8.8	<b>Jan Kees:</b> <i>reason why the EB asked GP to look at fee structure, the cost for administration is more than value paid to growers for the certificates. RSPO didn't ask for a higher royalty fee so was surprised with GP proposal. The volume of RSPO CSPO is going up, doubling it up at the same time may not be a good proposal. T&amp;T should be involved in this.</i>

<b>9.</b>	<b>C&amp;C Standing Committee by Jan Kees Vis:</b>
9.1	<i>Jan Kees: does the C&amp;C need to consider a geographical stretch &amp; representation: do we set up 3 regional teams to include as well India; China; SE Asia; Rest Of World</i>
9.2	<i>Puvan: would all the regional C&amp;Cs have the same standing or will there be a hierarchy?</i>
9.3	<i>Carrie: any working groups in India &amp; China would work well for WWF as they are already involved actively in those markets. But need to decide if the RSPO Advisory Board or current Coalition initiatives in India &amp; China should also be involved in this group</i>
9.4	<i>Puvan: logical structure for different decisions at different levels also based on geographies. To commensurate on what needs to be done on the strategic side. India, China and SE Asia programs will have a stamping from some geographical representation</i>
9.5	<i>Simon: form should follow function – to decide on what function the committees need to have in terms of focus &amp; budget, communications efforts should be weighted within Europe outside the growers markets that Communications Director is overseeing</i>

## Key Decisions & Action Points

10.	<b>Subject matters &amp; focal points:</b>
10.1	<p><b>Global Communications Plan:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>H&amp;K to develop a detailed communications plan for Europe; India &amp; China which will include (working closely with Anne Gabriel):</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Communications Objectives &amp; Strategies for individual markets</i></li> <li>○ <i>Stakeholder identification; mapping; messages for individual markets</i></li> <li>○ <i>Detailed tactical plan for individual markets</i></li> <li>○ <i>KPIs and measurement metric for success of campaign in all 3 markets</i></li> <li>○ <i>Exact budget required to deliver this program – based on weightage on individual/priority markets</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
10.2	<p><i>H&amp;K to present submit the plan to C&amp;CSC 2 weeks prior to meeting (mid August).</i></p>
10.3	<p><i>H&amp;K to present the plan to C&amp;CSC on August 30<sup>th</sup></i></p>
10.4	<p><i>C&amp;CSC to endorse the plan by H&amp;K first prior to recommendation to the EB for increased budgets during the next EB meeting scheduled for September 2011</i></p>
10.5	<p><b>Malaysia; Indonesia &amp; ROW:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Anne Gabriel to discuss details of this plan with members represented in these markets to augment current communications outreach plan</i></li> </ul>
10.6	<p><b>Membership helpdesk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Regular updates to be provided to C&amp;CSC on incoming questions that are considered ‘critical’ as well as data on number of enquiries on a monthly basis.</i></li> </ul>
10.7	<p><b>Trademark rules review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Jan Kees Vis &amp; Hidde will decide on subcommittee composition to review the rules &amp; guidelines of the trademark</i></li> <li>• <i>All those with feedback from constituents to send Anne Gabriel a note on comments. Feedback will be collated within a document for review by the sub committee</i></li> </ul>
10.8	<p><b>GreenPalm evaluation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Jan Kees Vis &amp; Hidde to review this as part of the UTZ review</i></li> </ul>
10.9	<p><b>C&amp;CSC geographical representation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Homework: all to think about composition of the committee meetings and provide recommendations to the chair</i></li> </ul>
10.10	<p><b>Terms of Reference:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>To be reviewed by all and comments sent through via email</i></li> </ul>



## **All Other Business**

<b>11.</b>	<b>Next C&amp;C Meeting:</b>
11.1	August 30 <sup>th</sup> in London
11.2	Scheduling to be mapped out in terms of timing and possible extension of meeting
11.3	Start at 10am and conclude at 4pm
11.4	Venue / location to be confirmed by Jan Kees Vis
11.5	Agenda and Presentation materials to be sent through to C&CSC members 2 weeks before meeting

*Prepared by:*

*RSPO Secretariat*

*Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia*

**###**