

**MINUTES OF MEETING (DRAFT)**

**32<sup>nd</sup> SSC Meeting**

**Time:** 1500 - 1730 (MYT)

**Date:** Tuesday, 28<sup>th</sup> February 2023

**Venue:** Zoom Meeting <https://zoom.us/j/92622978276> Meeting ID: 926 2297 8276 Passcode: 32@SSC

**ATTENDEES**

Name	Initial	Organisation	
1. Lim Sian Choo (Co-Chair)	LSC	Bumitama Group	Grower (INA) - Substantive
2. Olivier Tichit (Co-Chair)	OT	Musim Mas	P & T - Substantive
3. William Siow	WS	MPOA/IOI	Grower (MY) – Substantive
4. Anne Rosenbarger	AR	WRI	ENGO – Substantive
5. Jenny Walther-Thoss	JWT	WWF Singapore	ENGO – Substantive
6. Sander Van den Ende	SvE	SIPEF	Grower (RoW) – Substantive
1. Leena Ghosh	LG	RSPO Secretariat	
2. Javin Tan	JT	RSPO Secretariat	
3. Azlinah Al-Aydeross	AAA	RSPO Secretariat	
4. Daniel Liew	DL	RSPO Secretariat	
<i>Absence with apology:</i>			
1. Brian Lariche	BL	Humana	SNGO – Substantive
2. Ian Orrell	IO	NBPOL	Grower (Smallholder) - Substantive
3. Nurul Hasanah	NH	FGV	Grower (MY) – Alternate
4. Mohammed Dao	MD	OLAM Group	Grower (RoW) – Alternate
5. Librian Angraeni	LA	Musim Mas	P & T – Alternate

**AGENDA**

Time	Item	Agenda	PIC
1500 - 1505	1.0	<b>Opening</b>	Co-Chairs
	1.1	Acceptance of agenda	
	1.2	RSPO Antitrust Law	
	1.3	RSPO consensus-based decision making	
	1.4	RSPO Declaration of Conflict of Interest	
1505 - 1515	2.0	<b>Meeting Dashboard</b>	Co-Chairs
	2.1	Confirmation of the 31st MoM on 27 <sup>th</sup> Oct 2022	
	2.2	Action Tracker	
	2.3	Progress Update WG/TF/SG under SSC	
	2.4	Membership	
1515 - 1600	3.0	<b>For Endorsement</b>	AAA DL
	3.1	Women Safety Project	
	3.2	Jurisdictional Approach	
1600 - 1645	4.0	<b>For Update</b>	JT
	4.1	Resolution GA18-2C: Assessing the Robustness of the RSPO Mass Balance Model	

	4.2	Standards Review 2022/2023	JT
	4.3	Living Wage Revised Strategy	AM/LG
1645 - 1655	5.0	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
1700		<b>END</b>	

**DISCUSSION:**

No.	Description	Action Points (PIC)
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Opening</b>	
1.1	The Chairs welcomed everyone to the meeting and presented the agenda of the meeting.	
1.2	The RSPO Antitrust Law, consensus-based decision making, and Declaration of Conflict of Interest were read out to the Committee.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Meeting Dashboard</b>	
2.1	<b><u>Confirmation of the 31st MoM on 27th Oct 2022</u></b> The minutes of the meeting were adopted.	
2.2	<b><u>Action Trackers</u></b> Action tracker of the previous meeting was presented. No comments were received.	
2.3	<b><u>Progress Update WG/TF/SG under SSC</u></b> The progress update for the WG/TF/SG Committee was presented. No comments were received.	
2.4	<b><u>Membership</u></b> The Secretariat received an email from Alice Lemont, a Sustainable Sourcing Manager from L'Oréal operations, expressing her interest to join as a member of the Standard Standing Committee (SSC). She reached out to the Secretariat to understand more on the context of RSPO and commitment of being a member of SSC. She will be representing the Consumer Goods Manufacturer (CGM) sector.  <b>Decision</b> The Committee has no objection and is in favour of accepting their membership in the SSC as it will be good to have their point of view as downstream players.  The Secretariat will proceed to send them the Code of Conduct (CoC) to inform them about the meeting frequency, roles and responsibilities. It is important to make it clear to them about the commitment of an SSC member. Once all is	1. Send CoC to L'Oréal representative to join as SSC member 2. Circulate the decision to SSC members who are not present for

<p>2.5</p>	<p>completed, they will be invited to the upcoming SSC meeting.</p> <p>Secretariat will also circulate to SSC members who are not present to request their approval in appointing the new member.</p> <p><b>Quorum</b> Committee highlighted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There is always difficulty in reaching quorum and we need to improve this.</li> <li>● Committee suggested circulating papers requiring endorsement 5-7 days prior to the SSC meeting. If any member has an objection, they must attend the meeting and voice their objections. If they are unable to attend, they should communicate in writing their objections, ahead of the meeting.</li> <li>● There were some feedbacks received from the downstream players that they cannot contribute much as they lack knowledge around the technical issues (such as National Interpretation, guidance documents)</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision:</b> Secretariat to draft a guideline for decision-making. In the guideline, it will state that any document for decision which has been shared 5 - 7 working days prior to the meeting will be automatically approved unless there are any objections. Once SSC approves this procedure for adoption of papers, the Secretariat will propose to the Board of Governors for endorsement.</p>	<p>approval via email.</p> <p><b>Action by:</b> <b>Secretariat</b></p> <p>Draft a guideline for decision-making in SSC.</p> <p><b>Action by:</b> <b>Secretariat</b></p>
<p><b>3.0</b></p>	<p><b>For Endorsement</b></p>	
<p>3.1</p>	<p><b>Women Safety Project</b> The Secretariat presented an overview on the Women Safety Project (WSP) Strategy Paper.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● This activity is led by the Gender Subgroup and is under the purview of the Human Rights Working Group (HRWG). It started as an initiative from RSPO members. The project was developed to ensure that women and girls in the palm oil value chain and surrounding communities affected by operations are safe, valued, integrated, empowered and their rights are respected.</li> <li>● It is a multi-phase project with the first phase being a baseline study (June 2023 – December 2023). The baseline study is a research brief which aims to assess and inform on the challenges, give recommendations and ideas on how to progress forward with the project especially with the intention for upscaling.</li> <li>● The WSP received approval from the HRWG on 1 December 2022 and is seeking endorsement from the SSC.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Scale of the project for the baseline study will look at Indonesia (2 large growers and 1 smallholder in North Sumatera, West Kalimantan and Central Kalimantan). It should be noted that the participation of these companies are subject to receiving their express agreement.</li> <li>● Grant Funding Modality – the project will be funded collaboratively by RSPO Members through a Grant Facility and the RSPO Secretariat.</li> <li>● The estimated cost of the baseline study is USD 49,000 – 60,000.</li> </ul> <p><b>Next Step:</b> After the endorsement from SSC, the Secretariat will put up the Expression of Interest (EOI) on the RSPO website and review the proposals received from consultants. The selected consultant will then prepare a detailed work plan and budget. Commitment of funds through Grant Funding will be from RSPO Members. The baseline study is expected to commence in June 2023.</p> <p>The Committee highlighted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The project has been delayed and the trial will now be conducted only in one country instead of three different countries. The Committee expressed regrets that the study could not be done in Africa. There’s a lot of development in Africa and it would be a good time to look into the situation to know how we can adapt the requirements for the African growers, as there has been reports received from Africa that include sexual abuse allegations. It would be good to try to do something in one of the African countries.</li> <li>● It is a lot more relevant to do the study in Africa compared to Indonesia. However it was understood that due to the funding issue, it was changed to Indonesia.</li> <li>● The Grant Facility Management by the RSPO Secretariat is new. There is some hesitancy about the RSPO Secretariat taking on this role. It was asked whether this Grant Facility is specific for only this project or is the RSPO Secretariat looking at a scalable approach?</li> <li>● Secretariat commented that this is the first time RSPO is using a Grant Funding Modality and it will be a test run. The Secretariat already had several discussions with the Finance Department.</li> <li>● Committee suggested informing the Finance Committee about the Grant Facility Management as it may become a precedent for other projects.</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision</b> This document is endorsed. The Secretariat will bring up the Grant Funding Modality with the Finance Department. Secretariat to seek approval from members that are not present, informing them</p>	<p>1. Request the Finance Department to raise the Grant Funding Modality with the Finance Committee 2. Seek approval from SSC members that are not present via email. <b>Action by:</b> <b>Secretariat</b></p>
--	---	--

<p>3.2</p>	<p>of the decision that was made.</p> <p><b><u>Jurisdictional Approach</u></b></p> <p>Secretariat presented an overview on the Jurisdictional Approach Strategy Paper.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Jurisdictional Working Group (JWG) was set up in 2018 to support the development of a Jurisdictional Approach (JA) to RSPO certification.</li> <li>● Despite disruptions during the pandemic period of 2020 to 2021, the JWG published the RSPO JA Piloting Framework Document in July 2021.</li> <li>● The framework document is to establish the requirements for jurisdictional certification. It also forms the basis of jurisdictional certification system documents.</li> <li>● Requirements for RSPO JA certification:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Multi stakeholders board with balanced representation</li> <li>○ Jurisdictional entity (JE) which is a legal entity recognised in a jurisdiction.</li> <li>○ Functioning internal control system and grievance mechanism</li> <li>○ Compliance to landscape indicators is measured.</li> <li>○ Progressive adoptions of sustainable practices</li> </ul> </li> <li>● The strategy paper was prepared by the JWG:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To expedite and guide efforts to establish certification system requirements, as listed in the JA piloting Framework Documents</li> <li>○ To better communicate to RSPO members, the Secretariat and external stakeholders the concept of RSPO JA, pilots involved and their activities and progress updates.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Overview of the strategy paper was divided into 2 main parts: Action points to establish technical requirements for jurisdictional certification (RSPO membership for JE, Remediation and Compensation Procedure (RaCP), methodology for jurisdictional screening of HCV and HCS) and communication strategy to promote better understanding of JA and activities update.</li> </ul> <p><b>Next Step:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Secretariat would like to seek feedback, comments, guidance from the SSC regarding the strategy paper.</li> <li>● Secretariat also seeks agreement from the SSC to bring the paper to the attention of the Board of Governors for further guidance and strategic support from the Board.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee highlighted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● JA and certification are two different steps. Certification should not be put as the immediate first step in the JA strategy of the RSPO. Making certification as a prerequisite of JA is not a correct approach as it does</li> </ul>	
------------	--	--

not provide the best impact for RSPO and is not the most manageable.

- Providing the clarifying steps around JA and JA for certification is key meaning disaggregating the two pieces, elements of JA and JA for certification. Objective 2 in the strategy paper describes two main varieties of the approaches, the follow up steps only focus on the JA to certification. Are we only focusing on JA to certification or also looking at the broader strategy that is linked to the preparedness steps in engaging the government?
- All the initial preparation to certification, the identification and JA entity did not really show who is really targeted. It is a great opportunity to engage smallholders, medium growers, and independent mills, and bring them to a minimum level of compliance or to improve practices and governance in jurisdictions instead of forcing them to certification. This will be more consistent with RSPO strategy and will give us a great impact on landscapes without just pushing for certification.
- What is the value to the members or RSPO if we put focus on the preparedness of the JA? What the JWG should focus more on is impact. Looking at the connection between the two main varieties: “enabling environment to simplify RSPO certification for smallholders” and some capacity building elements that might be happening ahead of moving towards full certification, how can that be more broadly encompassed in the strategy? How are these efforts linked to the certification further down the road? Is it a singular strategy rather than being viewed as two separate tracks?
- It is a matter of degrees of involvement or commitment in some jurisdiction that might want to achieve certification at the jurisdiction level. People should be allowed to choose to go to one level instead of going to certification level. They can join and create the entity and have a certain set of requirements, and we provide support. Then decide if the jurisdiction wants to go for the certification at jurisdictional level. This gives RSPO the opportunity to engage with medium growers and smallholders at the landscape level or jurisdictional level and make some regulations that will be easier for them to become certified.
- The document gives the impression that the only outcome is certification. This might restrict the number of people in the jurisdiction that are interested in joining. They may be more interested in the building blocks of engagement with the government and understanding better the needs to do assessment at the landscape level rather than achieve certification.
- Suggest doing more communication around it. The main point is what are the basic requirements for sustainable agriculture and forestry and how we can implement them at a broader level. It is important to stress this harmonisation approach in the document. Maybe try writing in a

	<p>different way as it is missing the common understanding of the minimum sustainable requirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Clarify that JE is not a grower and new rules have to be made for them.</li> <li>● Creating awareness is also missing in the document. What is the work JA is doing, why are we doing JA, how this jurisdictional certification relates to the jurisdictional activities, what does this mean to the broader context, and how can we sell this to the stakeholders.</li> </ul> <p>Secretariat commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What JWG has been working on is to have the government play an important role and more of a top-down approach to let the government play the leadership role. All the stakeholders within the jurisdiction will have a balanced representation, from the growers, downstream and NGOs. Any decision made by the jurisdiction is done in consensus.</li> <li>● Other approaches such as the landscape approach where the commercial sector with NGO work within their jurisdiction and get the government to involve, this is not the model that JWG have been working on. Governments should be involved from day 1 onwards as they have the power to do enforcement and ability to make structural changes that are needed when doing jurisdictional certification.</li> <li>● JA was developed in a way to see how we can upscale the whole certification uptake at the jurisdictional level and the focus is around the role of the government and regulation change that will benefit stakeholders within a jurisdiction.</li> <li>● This is not separate tracks as you require a jurisdiction with the governance reliability to enable, not just any jurisdiction would be willing to or assume the responsibility to implement upwardly delegated requirements of the RSPO. It is a precondition to have a governance system that would assume that responsibility and willing to be audited against (looking at landscape level compliance, no deforestation, HCV-HCS, FPIC). Once the preconditions / infrastructures are in place and the government assumes the responsibility on upwardly delegated criteria, jurisdictional certification can then be rolled out.</li> <li>● Jurisdictions feel that there is a need to have jurisdictional certification in the area and we provide technical support for them to achieve. The ultimate goal is to push for adoption of sustainable practices through certification.</li> <li>● It is not that everyone must get certified in the jurisdiction, there is a minimum requirement the government imposed in the jurisdiction. It is more of a catalyst rather than an end goal.</li> <li>● The paper will be amended and presented to the SSC again to receive feedback, gain approval on the objective and what to bring to the Board. JWG to also propose what is the membership requirement of the JE.</li> </ul>	<p>Rewrite the document and</p>
--	--	---------------------------------

	<p><b>Decision</b> Secretariat to rewrite the document and present it again to the SSC in the next two meetings.</p>	<p>present it to SSC in the next meeting. <b>Action by:</b> <b>Secretariat</b></p>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>For Update</b>	
4.1	<p><b><u>Resolution GA18-2C: Assessing the Robustness of the RSPO Mass Balance Model</u></b></p> <p>The Secretariat presented updates on Resolution GA18-2C: Assessing the Robustness of the RSPO Mass Balance Model. The Market Development Standing Committee (MDSC) co-chairs and SSC co-chairs had a meeting during RT2022; and the secretariat presented the findings to MDSC over RT and again in January 2023. Comments received from MDSC mainly on seeking better understanding of the gaps and highlighting the challenges and feasibility of identified recommendations.</p> <p>Secretariat proposed the way forward as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● SSC to accept the study report until further analysis is conducted, for example on the economic implications of proposed recommendations – focusing on 1:1 conversion; traceability to estate/farm level.</li> <li>● The Secretariat to develop a detailed way forward plan for all identified gaps within the study – and MB model analysis remained a constant agenda item for SSC.</li> <li>● The SSC suggested MDSC take lead on the supply chain 1:1 conversion matter; including communication on the RSPO MB Model.</li> </ul> <p>Secretariat is seeking SSC’s acceptance towards the report, which means that SSC understood the gaps that has been identified and mandate the Secretariat to conduct more study around the critical issue e.g., traceability, one to one conversion and get experts around the supply chain to know what to change and the potential implication.</p> <p>Committee commented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Suggest having regular meetings between MDSC and SSC</li> <li>● What does it mean to accept the report – is it accepting identified issues for further analysis, how does this socialise with MDSC, digitalisation proposal on traceability, the relationship of mass balance to EU Deforestation Regulation (EUDR)? There is a need to look at the holistic efforts of the secretariat towards compliance to EUDR and addressing the gaps of the MB model.</li> <li>● Secretariat clarified that accepting the document meant SSC recognised the findings and moved forward on how we can strengthen the gaps as the comments from MDSC are not conflicting, more on how to resolve</li> </ul>	



<p>4.2</p>	<p>and rectify the gaps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● SSC co-chairs had a brief with MDSC co-chairs during RT to share the report and understand how we can collaborate further. The whole report was presented to MDSC, and MDSC provides inputs on timeline wise such as the supply chain standard revision process.</li> <li>● Secretariat also shared the draft with the Traceability Working Group for feedback, but there is no response from them yet.</li> <li>● The Secretariat will need to ensure collaboration across different efforts of different departments (i.e. Digital Framework) in resolving the findings of the report.</li> <li>● The Committee suggested bringing more details during the next SSC meeting on different governance parties and the different initiatives within the Secretariat and how we address the gaps.</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision</b> SSC accepted the recommendations by the Secretariat and suggested having constant scheduled meetings with MDSC before the monthly SSC meeting with few representatives from SSC and MDSC. Secretariat will circulate to members who are not present for confirmation of endorsement.</p> <p><b>Standards Review 2022/2023</b> The Secretariat presented progress updates of the Standards Review 2022/2023.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The 1<sup>st</sup> draft of standards review was made available in 6 languages: English, Bahasa Indonesia, Bahasa Malaysia, Spanish, French and Thai.</li> <li>● The launch for public consultation was from 1 November 2022 to 15 January 2023.</li> <li>● 2 launching webinars &amp; 11 physical workshops in 8 countries were conducted.</li> <li>● The commenting platform (Konveio) for the public consultation was set up for comments via online.</li> <li>● The comments received:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There are a total of 2516 comments received for the 1<sup>st</sup> draft of Principles &amp; Criteria 2023 for English, Bahasa Indonesia and Spanish. There were no comments for French, Bahasa Malaysia and Thai. Thai comments were received during the Public Consultation Workshop in Thailand.</li> <li>○ The comments were mostly on Principles 6 &amp; 7, as well as Principles 1, 2, 3, management plan issue and legality issue.</li> <li>○ For the 1<sup>st</sup> draft of Independent Smallholder Standard (ISH), there are a total of 131 comments received, majority from English and Bahasa Indonesia. The comments were mainly on the social, people and planet, and Principle 1.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>1. Schedule regular meetings with MDSC.</p> <p>2. Seek approval from SSC members that are not present via email.</p> <p><b>Action by:</b> <b>Secretariat</b></p>
------------	--	---

<p>4.3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These comments were then put forward for the Technical Committee (TC). The 2<sup>nd</sup> running of TC was from 26 January to 28 February 2023. The TC has the same membership and structure as the previous round with members representing experts, Certification Bodies and growers.</li> <li>• The TC will come up with propositions on critical issues for the Task Force (TF) to look at. The Next TF meeting will be held in Jakarta on 21-23 March. The focus will be mainly on RSPO proposition on: ILO (recruitment fee; PPE and sanitation); LW; Traceability; HFCC (HCSA/HCV); pollution mitigation; prevention of soil erosion and degradation.</li> </ul> <p>Secretariat provided details about the Public Consultation comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As the Konveio platform was closed after the dateline, last minute comments were submitted directly to the Secretariat and incorporated in the dissolving of comments.</li> <li>• The comments received are mostly similar comments for RSPO to look at on generating outcome and how the indicator should allow that, how would outcome-based indicator with the information collected by the auditors can be embedded across different indicators but not having a separate indicator. There are also some conflicting views on HFCC, HCV, HCS, forced labour matters and recruitment fees. The comments can be mainly divided into 3 aspects:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Alignment tweak around the indicators</li> <li>○ Conflicting views where TF needs to make sound decisions.</li> <li>○ How to deal with those that cannot implement</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>Living Wage Revised Strategy</u></b></p> <p>The Secretariat presented updates on the Living Wage Revised Strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Living Wage Revised Strategy paper was shared to all the SSC members on 2<sup>nd</sup> February. Comments were received from on 17<sup>th</sup> February with replies by the Secretariat on 24<sup>th</sup> February.</li> <li>• The Secretariat would like to seek confirmation from SSC whether the document has been endorsed as it needs to be published soon and it was raised during the Standards Review process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>The Secretariat will share the comments and response to all the SSC members. SSC members to provide any comment or feedback by 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2023, Friday. The document will be automatically endorsed unless any objection was received.</p>	<p>Share the comments received and response to SSC to provide feedback.</p> <p><b>Action by:</b> <b>Secretariat</b></p>
<p>5.0</p>	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p>	
<p>5.1</p>	<p>Next SSC Meeting in March The SSC Meeting originally scheduled on 30<sup>th</sup> March will be changed to 27<sup>th</sup></p>	<p>Share the amended date in March to</p>

	March as LG will not be around during that time.	SSC members. <b>Action by:</b> <b>Secretariat</b>
--	--	---

**MEETING ENDED AT 1648 MYT**