

Summary of Ninth Technical SRWG Meeting

The ninth Shared Responsibility Working Group (SRWG) technical meeting (tenth teleconference meeting) was opened at 4PM (MYT), April 22, 2021 by the SRWG co-chair and was attended by the SRWG members, Secretariat staff and Technical Facilitators. The SRWG achieved 100% representation of all membership sectors during this meeting.

The objective of the meeting was to align the implementation manual and verifiers document prior to the public consultation that is scheduled for June 2021. The agenda of the meeting was presented to the SRWG.

Updates from the Secretariat include the resignation of the Secretariat's Director of Stakeholder Engagement, RT Series, extension of the ACOP submission deadline, launch of the RSPO ScanApp, and the Human Rights Working Group Strategy.

The Secretariat also provided an update on the SR communication activities. The SRWG acknowledged that there is a lack of SR knowledge among members, and it is necessary to share the basic knowledge of SR.

The Implementation Manual was circulated within the Secretariat internally to gather comments and doubts from the Secretariat staff on the verifiers section prior to the public consultation, and the comments were shared with the SRWG intensively during the call.

As the SRWG needed to relook the documents and consult with their constituencies, decisions will be made later. In order to ensure the issues and concerns are addressed and to ensure consensus is reached within the working group, the Secretariat will organise subgroup discussion with the SRWG sector representatives to address the challenges and to reach consensus. This would also assist the Secretariat in gathering feedback effectively from the SRWG and to simplify the process.

It was also noted that the June timeline for public consultation is ambitious and the SRWG will need to change the timeline.

The co-chair thanked everyone for attending the meeting and looks forward to seeing everyone next month. The meeting was closed at 6.00 PM (MYT).

MINUTES OF MEETING OF RSPO
RSPO Shared Responsibility Working Group (SRWG) 7th Technical Meeting

Date: April 22, 2021 (Thursday)

Time: 4 PM to 6 PM (MYT)

Venue: Video Conference (RSPO ZOOM 6)

Attendance:

<p>Members and Alternates</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Natasha Schwarzbach (NS, PepsiCo)2. Ilka Peterson (IP, WWF International)3. Harjinder Kler (HK, HUTAN)4. Lim Sian Choo (LSC, Bumitama)5. Lee Kuan Yee (LKY, KLK)6. Mariama Diallo (MD, SIAT SA)7. Ian Orell (IO, Sime Darby/ NBPOL)8. Ben Vreeburg (BV, Bunge)9. Joshua Lim (JL, Wilmar)10. Julian Walker-Palin (JWP, RPOG)11. Miho Yamazaki (MY, AEON)12. James Whitehead (JW, FPP)13. Catarina Vivalva (CV, BNP Paribas) <p>Absent with Apologies</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Girish Deshpande (GD, P&G)1. Nursanna Marpaung (NM, HUKATAN)	<p>RSPO Secretariat</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Inke van der Sluijs (IS)2. Lilian Garcia Lledo (LGL)3. Chung Yee Ling (CYL) <p>Absent with Apologies</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Imam Marzuq (IM)
---	---

No	Description	Action Points
1.0	<p><u>Welcome Note</u> The Head of SR welcomed the SRWG members to the meeting. The SRWG members acknowledged the anti-trust statement prior to the meeting.</p> <p>The agenda of the meeting include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Antitrust statement 2. Welcome and updates 3. Timeline 4. RSPO Secretariat updates 5. SR Comms activities 6. Preparing for consultations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Logistics ○ Implementation Manual comments/ doubts - alignment ○ Verifiers comments/ doubts - alignment 7. AOB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Endorsed document addendum 8. Next meeting 	
2.0	<p><u>Timeline</u> The Head of SR presented the latest timeline to the SRWG. The purpose of the 9th SRWG Meeting is to align the Implementation Manual prior to the public consultation. The 10th SRWG Meeting is tentatively set for May 2021, where the SRWG will reach a final alignment with the Secretariat comments, and the SRWG will resume the discussion on Incentives and Sanctions and Resourcing (quality piece) by then. It is also scheduled that the working group will finalise the document and announce the public comment during the 11th SRWG Meeting in June.</p>	

3.0	<p><u>RSPO Secretariat Updates</u></p> <p>The Secretariat provided some updates to the SRWG:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Director of Stakeholder Engagement, Dan Strechay has resigned. 2. The Secretariat has conducted several RT series since January. The deadline for ACOP 2020 submission has been extended to May 12, 2021. 3. RSPO ScanApp is launched in France. 4. The Standards Standing Committee had endorsed the Human Rights Working Group Strategy: priorities for the next three years to move towards achieving RSPO's objectives as set out in the Theory of Change. 	
4.0	<p><u>SR Comms Activities</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A SR page will be available on the RSPO website 'Resources' section 2. Shared Responsibility Requirements and Implementation 2019 document to be translated into Spanish, French, German, Polish, Thais, Bahasa Indonesia and Chinese 3. The socialisation sessions are on: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. April 21, 2021: SR session at the SCC African webinar series b. May 6, 2021: Internal (RSPO Secretariat) c. May 18 & June 3, 2021: External. The Secretariat welcome any support from the SRWG members 4. The Comms team proposed ideas to create a video and factsheets. 5. The Secretariat welcomes any specific request from the SRWG members on communications activities. <p>A Retailer member commented that some retailer members are not aware of the SR requirements. The SRWG acknowledged that there is a lack of SR knowledge among members, and it is necessary to share the basic knowledge of SR. Lilian will share the content of webinar and with the SRWG members</p> <p>A member reminded that May 3 is a public holiday in the UK and suggested moving the timeline.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lilian will share the content of the webinar with the SRWG members.
5.0	<p><u>Preparing for Consultations</u></p> <p>The Secretariat proposed to change the internal document logistics from Dropbox to Google</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As several SRWG members have limitations to access to Google Drive, it is agreed that the Secretariat will send

<p>Drive. As several SRWG members have limitations to access to Google Drive, it is agreed that the Secretariat will send the documents via emails.</p> <p>The Implementation Manual was circulated within the Secretariat internally to gather comments and doubts from the Secretariat staff on the verifiers section prior to the public consultation. These comments were shared with the SRWG.</p> <p>The ACOP Unit suggested including 10,000 metric ton under the categorisation of small companies. A grower member commented that small growers and smallholders are categorised based on the hectare size and expected yield and suggested the Secretariat to coordinate with the medium size grower working groups on the methodology.</p> <p>An NGO member suggested using public information to identify the country risk profiles, where countries that have human rights and environmental concerns. Another member suggested looking at regional risk. The Secretariat will check with Assurance internally on the country risk profile.</p> <p>It was noted that the 'one size fits all' concept is not in line with the flexibility given in the Principles & Criteria (National Interpretation). As there is no consensus on this matter within the SRWG, and the SRWG will need to gather more input.</p> <p>It was also noted that Ordinary members who are currently holding traders/ distributor licenses are exempted. The Secretariat raised a concern on how to address Ordinary members that switch category to Associate due to low palm oil volumes, then switch to Ordinary a few years later. As this is a rare case scenario, the SRWG decided that the said member can restart the SR target when a new membership number is issued.</p> <p>The Secretariat raised another comment on the group and site scope. What if a group member has different policies developed for different units due to mergers/ acquisitions and have no intention of consolidating their various policies into a group-level policy? Currently, there is no clause allowing this scenario. A member said that all policies should be consolidated on the group level. It is decided that Lilian will find out how often this scenario happens.</p>	<p>the documents via emails.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The Secretariat will coordinate with the medium size grower working groups on the methodology. 3. The Secretariat will check with Assurance internally on the country risk profile. 4. The Secretariat will organise subgroup discussion with the SRWG sector representatives to address the challenges and to reach consensus.
--	---

	<p>As part of the incentives, a LinkedIn type platform will be offered, and the platform will share job opportunities related to the palm sector sustainability. Questions were raised on who will fund, moderate, and manage the platform. It was agreed that more discussion is needed to refine the incentives and sanctions section. The scorecard portal was planned for the second half of 2021. However, this will be postponed to a realistic time.</p> <p>The challenges identified on the verification section include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The Membership Rules do not include the SR policy as a requirement for acceptance, and any changes to the Membership Rules should be raised during the General Assembly2. The SR Unit lacks capacity, knowledge, and time for content verification on the sampling methods. The Secretariat cannot raise non-conformities and there will be a conflict of interest if the Secretariat is the 'auditor'.3. The subset of requirements in the SCC standard will require changes on the SCC system, SCC lead auditor course, accreditation of auditors, and this will induce price and duration of audits, risking members that would run away from SCC. <p>Given the challenges raised, it was proposed that both the Membership and ACOP Unit will inform members to declare the SR requirements at MyRSPO, and the SR Unit will verify the reporting progress on an annual basis, to monitor and prioritise the uptake targets volumes. If there is a sampling method and content verification is a must, a peer review among RSPO members is proposed. And a clear guidance will need to be developed on what to check. The SRWG will get back to the Secretariat on the challenges raised.</p> <p>If warning letters need to be included in the Membership Rules document, it will need to be endorsed by the Board of Governors or during the General Assembly (GA). The Time Bound Plan (TBP) declared in ACOP are non-bonding and only serve as a guideline. If the SRWG would like to propose making ACOP TBP binding, a GA resolution is required.</p> <p>There is a 'mismatch' between the general and specific SR requirements on SR requirement 11 and 16.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>The Secretariat will organise focus group discussion with the SRWG sector representatives to address the challenges and to reach consensus. Subgroups were suggested to assist the Secretariat in gathering feedback effectively from the SRWG and to simplify the process.</p> <p>A SRWG member suggested simplifying the documents to the members as part of the Communication Plan.</p>	
6.0	<p>AOB</p> <p>There is confusion among members on the baseline methodology. The Secretariat proposed to rephrase the term 'baseline' to 'percentage uptake baseline', to clarify the terms.</p> <p>The Secretariat will relook the documents, and then resume the discussion with the SRWG later.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Secretariat will relook the documents, and then resume the discussion with the SRWG later.
7.0	<p>Closing Remarks</p> <p>The group acknowledges that improvements need to be made on the documents prior to the public consultation. To ensure the whole working group is aligned in addressing the challenges and issues raised, the Secretariat will list and categorise the areas of concerns, form subgroups meetings with the SRWG and then reconvene with the whole group on the discussion to resolve the concerns. It was also noted that the June timeline for public consultation is ambitious and the SRWG will need to change the timeline.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The SRWG considers postponing the June timeline for public consultation.