

### **Summary of Thirteenth Technical SRWG Meeting**

The thirteenth Shared Responsibility Working Group (SRWG) technical meeting (fourteenth teleconference meeting) was opened at 4.30PM (MYT), December 9, 2021, by the Secretariat. The Environmental NGOs sent their apologies.

The agenda of the meeting was presented to the SRWG briefly just after the anti-trust statement was read and acknowledged. Meeting minutes of the previous meeting was not approved during the meeting as the SRWG requested for more time to review it by the end of the week.

The Secretariat provided a detailed update to the SRWG on the action points, governance updates, status of key deliverables, outreach plan to non-compliant members, the adopted GA resolution and the SR workshop.

The objectives of the meeting include clarifying the uptake targets, ACOP questions and changes on the Verification Manual. Recommendations were presented to the SRWG and they agreed with them. As some of the SRWG members did not manage to review the ACOP questions prior to the meeting, they will send in their feedback by the end of the week. The draft concept for the verification process of SR requirements was presented to the SRWG. However, some sectors raised their concerns on de-linking verification from SCC audits. The Secretariat thanked their feedback and agreed to discuss internally with the Assurance Unit, and then come back to the SRWG during the next meeting.

The Secretariat proposed to conduct regular SRWG meetings every 6 weeks starting from January 2022.

As it is the last meeting for Miho, the Secretariat and SRWG thanked her for her participation and support and wished her the best of luck.

The Secretariat thanked everyone for attending the meeting and looks forward to seeing everyone in the next meeting on January 25, 2022.

The meeting was closed at 6.00 PM (MYT).

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF RSPO**  
**RSPO Shared Responsibility Working Group (SRWG) 12th Technical Meeting**

Date: December 9, 2021 (Thursday)

Time: 4.30 PM to 6 PM (MYT)

Venue: Video Conference (RSPO ZOOM 6)

**Attendance:**

<p><b>Members and Alternates</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Girish Deshpande (GD, P&amp;G)</li><li>2. Lim Sian Choo (LSC, Bumitama)</li><li>3. Mariama Diallo (MD, SIAT SA)</li><li>4. Lee Kuan Yee (LKY, KLK)</li><li>5. Ben Vreeburg (BV, Bunge)</li><li>6. Julian Walker-Palin (JWP, RPOG)</li><li>7. Miho Yamazaki (MY, AEON)</li><li>8. Catarina Vivalva (CV, BNP Paribas)</li><li>9. Nursanna Marpaung (NM, HUKATAN)</li></ol> <p><b>Absent with Apologies</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Ilka Peterson (IP, WWF International)</li><li>2. Harjinder Kler (HK, HUTAN)</li><li>3. Joshua Lim (JL, Wilmar)</li><li>4. Ian Orell (IO, Sime Darby/ NBPOL)</li><li>5. Brian Lariche (Humana Child Aid Society, Sabah)</li></ol>	<p><b>RSPO Secretariat</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Inke van der Sluijs (IS)</li><li>2. Joyce Van Wijk (JW)</li><li>3. Chung Yee Ling (CYL)</li><li>4. Ashwin Selvaraj (AS)</li></ol> <p><b>Absent with Apologies</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Imam Marzuq (IM)</li></ol>
--	---

No	Description	Action Points
1.0	<p><b><u>Welcome Note</u></b>  The Secretariat welcomed the SRWG members to the meeting.</p> <p>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"> <li>1. Welcome, Agenda, Antitrust Statement</li> <li>2. Approval of Meeting Minutes</li> <li>3. RSPO Secretariat Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Action Points</li> <li>o Governance Updates</li> <li>o Status of Key Deliverables</li> <li>o Outreach Plan to Non Compliant Members</li> <li>o GA Resolution</li> <li>o Workshop on Defining Success of SR</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Uptake Targets (Clarifications)</li> <li>5. ACOP Questions</li> <li>6. Verification Manual</li> <li>7. AOB and Next Meeting</li> </ol> <p>The P&amp;T representative asked the Secretariat on the follow up of his questions about uploading documents during ACOP submission. The Secretariat clarified that the ACOP submission is only mandatory for Ordinary members. The SR questions are already part of the ACOP, and the SR Unit will access the response of the SR section in the ACOP submission. The SR Unit will not go through the policies and details. The SR section in the ACOP questionnaire will help the Secretariat to understand the members in complying with the SR requirements and policies. The Secretariat will propose the concept of the verification process to the SRWG in the future. The P&amp;T raised the issue about credibility, and the Secretariat will take this concern on board when developing the assurance process.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The SRWG will provide feedback on the previous meeting minutes by the end of the week.</li> </ol>

	<p>A Grower representative asked to amend her attendance in the last meeting minutes. The Secretariat apologised and will amend it accordingly and will wait for further feedback from the SRWG on the meeting minutes by the end of the week.</p>	
2.0	<p><b><u>RSPO Secretariat Updates</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Secretariat provided an overview of the action points from the previous SRWG meetings and updated the SRWG on the status of each action point.</li> <li>2. There are three vacancies within the SRWG, and the Secretariat will reach out to the relevant membership categories.</li> <li>3. The Year 3 targets were presented to the SSC on October 25, and they will review the proposed targets and conclude at consensus by December 9. Upon the approval from the SSC, the proposed targets will be shared with the BoG for endorsement.</li> <li>4. The status of the key deliverables was shown to the SRWG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Verification Manual and guidance documents for each membership category will be discussed during the call.</li> <li>○ Endorsement on the Year 3 update target is currently pending.</li> <li>○ Update on the ACOP 2021 questions is expected to be finalised by the end of December.</li> <li>○ The Secretariat has completed the two communication and outreach activities: (1) with CBs and (2) members in China.</li> <li>○ A new SR section on the RSPO website should be ready soon.</li> <li>○ The SR manual has already been translated into Thai and Chinese, and Bahasa Indonesia. Translation to Spanish is currently ongoing.</li> <li>○ The SR Unit is working on an eGazette article that is scheduled to be sent to members by the end of December. A SR related article is scheduled to be sent to members every quarter.</li> <li>○ Outreach material is currently being developed, as well as member engagement.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>The co-chair asked the Secretariat if there is any support needed from the SRWG. The Secretariat welcomes the SRWG to inform them of any possible platforms or events that could help socialise SR with the stakeholders, and welcome the SRWG to reach out if they need any assistance in developing communication materials on SR.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Secretariat will reach out to the relevant membership categories on the vacant SRWG seats.</li> <li>2. The Secretariat will reach out to the underperforming members in December 2021/ January 2022.</li> <li>3. The SRWG members will share their feedback on the underperformers survey by the end of the week.</li> <li>4. The Secretariat will develop a draft text on Clause 3.2 on the Code of Conduct and present it to the SRWG during the meeting in January 2022.</li> </ol>

	<p>5. The Secretariat has drafted an outreach plan and shared it with the SRWG prior to the call. They have analysed the Year 1 uptake target performance, and will reach out to the underperforming members in December 2021/ January 2022:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Non-performing members: Non-submitters have been listed on the RSPO website according to the existing ACOP sanctions.</li> <li>○ Underperforming members: will receive email reminders on the SR uptake targets, including a survey to get insights on the reason of underperformance.</li> <li>○ Prioritised underperforming members: will receive additional targeted/ personalised email for one-on-one engagement.</li> </ul> <p>The SRWG members will share their feedback on the survey by the end of the week.</p> <p>6. Resolution 2b was adopted during GA18. The Secretariat will develop a draft text and present it to the SRWG during the meeting in January 2022.</p> <p>7. Currently, there is no common definition of impact of SR. Some define it as uptake, and some define it as resourcing and others as compliance to policy requirements. There are no clear metrics/ KPIs for impact and successful implementation of SR. There is also a lack of a common definition of success of SR, and it creates different expectations for different members, resulting in misunderstanding thereby reducing the space for a constructive discussion on several topics. To overcome this, the Secretariat proposes to organise a joint workshop with SRWG members and BoG to develop a common understanding. The objective is to establish a shared vision on the success and impact of the implementation of the current set of SR requirements and the interpretation developed by the SRWG. The workshop is expected to organise during the end of January or early February 2022.</p> <p>The CGM and Retailer representative agreed with the proposal and commented that specific objectives should be set for the workshop to avoid the discussion being polarised.</p>	
3.0	<p><b><u>Uptake Targets</u></b></p> <p>Although uptake targets have been set for Year 3, it is unclear if the targets are cumulative year on year. Two scenarios were presented to the SRWG, and the Secretariat proposed the scenario where targets are annual and not cumulative. Reason is that data modelling for setting the targets is based on yearly performance of members and does not consider the cumulative nature of targets, cumulative targets will serve as a disincentive for members who overperform their expected targets and will make it harder for underperformers to reach the targets.</p>	

	<p>The CGM, Retailer and Grower representatives agreed with the recommendation, but commented that there should be clear incentives and disincentives for the members. Another Grower representative added that it is also important to encourage underperformers and suggest looking at the reasons to motivate them. The Secretariat thanked the SRWG for their feedback and stated that a scheduled survey will be sent out to the underperformers in 2022 to understand their challenges.</p> <p>The annual uptake for Year 1 was decided in 2019 based on existing members. Many new members have joined RSPO since 2020 and it is unclear which targets are applicable for new members. It is important to note that new members do not have to submit their ACOP in the first year of membership. Thus, the Secretariat recommends that new members that submit their second ACOP will show compliance to the uptake target set for the ACOP reporting period. Sanctions (if any) for that calendar year will also be applicable.</p> <p>A Grower representative agreed with the recommendation. No further comments were received from the floor, and this is considered approved from the SRWG.</p>	
4.0	<p><b><u>ACOP Questions</u></b></p> <p>The Secretariat thanked the SRWG for providing their feedback on the ACOP questions. Some of the suggestions are beyond the scope of the SR requirement, and the Secretariat will amend them accordingly in order to ensure they are in line with the requirements. Due to the confidentiality of business plans among companies, the Secretariat will remove ‘business plan’ from the ACOP questions. A Grower added that if some existing documents are already available, access to the information should be easy, however if the information we require from the member is new, the member might not be sharing with the Secretariat. Thus, this has to be considered and reviewed to the ACOP questions.</p> <p>The Secretariat has discussed with the ACOP Unit about the Retailer representative’s proposed change in the multiple-choice answer, to move from ‘yes/no’ to a gradient option (‘none/partly/all’). It was concluded not to change the structure of the answers as that would require additional clarifications on what the different levels of compliance would mean and verifying that would become resource intensive. The Secretariat does not have the capacity to analyse and verify these</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The SRWG members will share their feedback on the ACOP questions by the end of the week.</li> </ol>

	<p>responses. This would also create conflict with the previous year's ACOP reporting. Due to the time constraints, they will revisit this suggestion next year, after the Secretariat has done analysis on the performance.</p> <p>The SRWG members will share their feedback on the ACOP questions by the end of the week.</p>	
5.0	<p><b><u>Verification Manual</u></b> Some of the sections in the Verification Manual have already been discussed and agreed by the SRWG.</p> <p>Changes and recommendation on the draft are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SR and Supply Chain Certification audits: The Secretariat recommends de-linking assurance of SR from Supply Chain Certification.</li> <li>2. Scope of verification: The Secretariat recommends all requirements are verified at the same frequency.</li> </ol> <p>The draft concept for the verification process of Shared Responsibility requirements was presented to the SRWG in a visual form. The process includes (1) data collection mechanism, (2) assurance of SR requirements, (3) performance data on the website. The Secretariat proposes to prioritise the checks on completeness and compliance to policy requirements using ACOP data followed by the independent verification from Year 3 onwards.</p> <p>The CGM representative agrees de-linking of audits and having independent third-party verification will increase the credibility and independence. He asked if the audit cost will be borne by the RSPO. The Secretariat will need to discuss this with the CFO and probably require approval from the board.</p> <p>A Grower representative was not convinced with the suggestion of de-linking audits and having the audit cost borne by the RSPO. She added that the growers go through audits for the P&amp;C standards and bear the cost of audits. The Secretariat explained that the supply chain actors will also go through the SCC audits at the same time. However, it would be challenging to audit SR requirements as they are applicable at the group level whereas SCC audits are at the site. Another Grower questioned the reason for delinking the audits and asked how the verification process will apply for</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Secretariat will discuss with the Assurance Unit on the topic of delinking SR from SCC audits.</li> </ol>

	<p>other sectors such as NGOs and banks. She felt that the verification process will require further discussion and should not be meant to be another audit for the members. Despite SR verification not resulting in a certificate, a grower member stated that the costs of verification of SR should be borne by the SCC members similar to grower members bearing the costs of the P &amp; C audits. A sNGO asked who will be the independent third party. The Secretariat explained that a decision is not made for now, but it could be a group of assessors and experts or accredited certification bodies.</p> <p>The Secretariat thanked the SRWG for their feedback.</p>	
6.0	<p><b><u>AOB &amp; Next Meeting</u></b></p> <p>The Secretariat proposed to conduct regular SRWG meetings every 6 weeks starting from January 2022 and reminded the SRWG to fill in the Doodle poll for the 14th SRWG meeting in January 2022.</p> <p>The Secretariat will ensure the SR calendar is aligned with the SSC calendar, and they will share the calendar with the SRWG soon.</p> <p>As it is Miho's last SRWG meeting, the Secretariat and SRWG thanked her for her participation and wished her the best of luck.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SRWG will complete the Doodle poll for the 14th SRWG meeting.</li> </ol>