

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**34<sup>th</sup> SSC Meeting**

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

**Date:** Wednesday, 10<sup>th</sup> May 2023

**Venue:** Zoom Meeting <https://zoom.us/j/92550037150> Meeting ID: 925 5003 7150 Passcode: 34@SSC

**ATTENDEES**

Name	Initial	Organisation	
1. Lim Sian Choo (Co-Chair)	LSC	Bumitama Group	Grower (INA) - Substantive
2. William Siow	WS	MPOA/IOI	Grower (MY) – Substantive
3. Jenny Walther-Thoss	JWT	WWF Singapore	ENGO – Substantive
4. Librian Angraeni	LA	Musim Mas	P & T – Alternate
5. Sander Van den Ende	SvE	SIPEF	Grower (RoW) – Substantive
6. Ian Orrell	IO	NBPOL	Grower (Smallholder) - Substantive
7. Alice Lémont	AL	L’Oréal	CGM – Substantive
1. Leena Ghosh	LG	RSPO Secretariat	
2. Javin Tan	JT	RSPO Secretariat	
3. Ariel Toh	AT	RSPO Secretariat	
4. Lee Jin Min	LJM	RSPO Secretariat	
5. Siti Nurhayati Kamaruddin	SNK	RSPO Secretariat	
6. Akmal Arif Razali	AAR	RSPO Secretariat	
<i>Absence with apology:</i>			
1. Olivier Tichit (Co-Chair)	OT	Musim Mas	P & T – Substantive
2. Nurul Hasanah	NH	FGV	Grower (MY) – Alternate
3. Anne Rosenbarger	AR	WRI	ENGO – Substantive
4. Mohammed Dao	MD	OLAM Group	Grower (RoW) – Alternate
5. Brian Lariche	BL	Humana	SNGO – Substantive

**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	
	1.5	Welcoming new SSC Member: Ms. Alice Lemont, L’Oréal	
1505 - 1515	2.0	<b>Meeting Dashboard</b>	Co-Chairs
	2.1	Confirmation of the 33rd MoM on 5 <sup>th</sup> Apr 2023	
	2.2	Action Tracker	
	2.3	Progress Update WG/TF/SG under SSC	
1515 - 1600	3.0	<b>For Update</b>	Sec LJM/AT Sec JT
	3.1	BHCVWG Reporting Line	
	3.2	BHCVWG Revised ToR	
	3.3	Formation of Peat Task Force (PTF)	
	3.4	Standards Review 2023	

1600 – 1610	4.0	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
	4.1	No Deforestation Joint Steering Group (NDJSG) Next Step	
1610		<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.	
1.3	The Chairs welcomed a new SSC Member, Ms. Alice Lemont from L’Oréal, representing Consumer Goods Manufacturers.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Meeting Dashboard</b>	
2.1	<p><b><u>Confirmation of the 33rd MoM on 5th Apr 2023</u></b></p> <p>Page 4, Item 2.3 Resolution GA19-2c was amended according to the changes shared by LSC via email.</p> <p>Page 6, part on Shared Responsibility Verification Manual Draft, to remove the comments made before publishing on the website.</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting were adopted subject to the correction mentioned above.</p>	
2.2	<p><b><u>Action Trackers</u></b></p> <p>Action tracker of the previous meeting was presented. No comments were received.</p>	
2.3	<p><b><u>Progress Update WG/TF/SG under SSC</u></b></p> <p>The progress update for the WG/TF/SG Committee was presented. No comments were received.</p>	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>For Update</b>	
3.1	<p><b><u>BHCVWG Reporting Line</u></b></p> <p>The Secretariat presented the issue regarding the Biodiversity and High Conservation Value Working Group (BHCVWG) Reporting Line.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under the 6th SSC Minutes of Meeting, it was stated that the BHCVWG reports to the Assurance Standing Committee (ASC). The Secretariat had an internal discussion with the Assurance Unit and the</li> </ul>	

<p>3.2</p>	<p>recommendations were as per the requirements for Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) under Standard Development; papers submitted by BHCVWG that are related to standards or guidance will be submitted to SSC for decision and the decision will be shared with ASC. Documents related to operational matters on RaCP or the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the BHCVWG will be channelled to the SSC first for information and final decision is to be made by the ASC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretariat would like to seek the guidance of SSC whether this is acceptable and to record it for institutional memory.</li> </ul> <p>Committee highlighted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This was discussed during the early meetings of SSC. BHCVWG reports to both SSC and ASC, as standards related matters are brought to SSC while operational matters are brought to ASC. Both standing committees will be informed of the working group’s development. All documents submitted should be specific stating whether it is for update or decision.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>BHCVWG Revised ToR</u></b></p> <p>The Secretariat provided an update on the amendment to the revised Terms of Reference (ToR) for BHCVWG. Amendments made were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The outcome of the BHCVWG activities will be reported to the relevant standing committees of SSC and ASC.</li> <li>• The required representation for the BHCVWG is for a balanced number of members to represent the respective caucuses.</li> <li>• In the event there is an increased in the number of social NGO seats from two to three then this also means that Processors and Traders will also gain another seat ie. increase from two to three as set out in the ToR of BHCVWG, to ensure balance representation.</li> <li>• This amendment is to allow better discussion from the inputs by NGO caucus particularly on the social aspect of the BHCVWG matters.</li> </ul> <p>Committee highlighted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently there are no representatives from the Consumer Goods Manufacturer and Financial Institutions. We want representatives from different categories to ensure a balanced decision-making matrix, however it is difficult for those who have no knowledge on HCV, etc to participate. Committee suggested getting them in as an expert instead of being a member for these caucuses.</li> <li>• Is it definite to have 3 representatives for social NGO? The number can be increased but can we get them to commit to the working group? Secretariat stated that currently the representatives for social NGO are from SEPA and FPP and have approached potential members from BCI.</li> </ul>	<p>Share the revised</p>
------------	---	--------------------------

<p>3.3</p>	<p><b>Next Step</b> There are no further comments from SSC. The Secretariat will proceed to share the proposed revision to the ToR with ASC.</p> <p><b>Formation of Peat Task Force (PTF)</b> The Secretariat presented the amended decision paper on the Formation of Peat Task Force (PTF) and is seeking endorsement from SSC.</p> <p>Committee highlighted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Remediation and Compensation Procedure (RaCP) was never the subject of Peatland Working Group 2 (PLWG2)'s discussion.</li> <li>● Secretariat explained that as there is a peat element in RaCP, this task force is mainly to give clarity on what members do if they come across this situation.</li> <li>● Whilst it is agreed that clarity is needed on peat remediation, the RaCP process is drastically inefficient. There are over 600 cases in line and cases entering faster than able to process, there is no need for more complication in this process. Committee suggested sorting out the process that creates a backlog of 600 cases and a waiting time of over 2 years. Should be wary of creating more complications to this process.</li> <li>● Before implementing No Deforestation, No Peat, and No Exploitation (NDPE), planting on peat has been a practice on plantations. If a penalty is given to the members, this is a matter of concern.</li> <li>● The previous PLWG2 had developed the Drainability Assessment Guidelines and until today only less than half of the growers were able to do the assessment. It was very difficult for them to achieve, and growers needed to hire consultants to comply with the criteria. There are severe reservations that this same group has been re-tasked to look at RaCP.</li> <li>● The PTF currently have 14 confirmed members that are from the previous PLWG2. BHCVWG members will not be a part of PTF and there is a consultant to co-facilitate the meeting.</li> <li>● Secretariat also stated that the elements of the discussion in PTF will be driven by a peat remediation table. Committee highlighted that misconception could happen as some of the members are not involved in the construction of this table.</li> <li>● It is important to ensure that the interpretation of RaCP on peat will not be overlapping with the Drainability Assessment and all is aligned with current standards in RSPO.</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision</b> The formation of PTF is not approved as a sustained objection has been</p>	<p>ToR with ASC for decision <b>Action by:</b> <b>Secretariat</b></p> <p>Seek approval via email.</p>
------------	---	---

<p>3.4</p>	<p>expressed. The Secretariat will seek approval from the other members via email.</p> <p><b><u>Standards Review 2023</u></b></p> <p>The Secretariat presented updates regarding the Standards Review 2023.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Task Force Memberships – two substantive members have withdrawn from the Task Force (TF), one in the social NGO category, i.e., Solidaridad, as the person has left the organisation. Currently awaiting from the social NGO regarding his replacement. Another withdrawal is from the smallholders category and is currently waiting for replacement as well. Alfred Yee will step up from alternate member to substantive member.</li> <li>● From the retailer category, a representative from Tesco has left the organisation and is awaiting replacement. Aeon representatives will take up the substantive seat while Tesco will take up the alternate seat.</li> <li>● The TF members conducted 3 days physical meeting on 21-23 April 2023 in Jakarta and six 2-hour virtual meetings in April and May to look at the remaining indicators that have not been able to come to consensus during the physical meeting.</li> <li>● The second draft of the Independent Smallholder Standard has no sustained objection.</li> <li>● NGOs raised sustained objections on the entire Principle 4 after the 3-days physical TF meeting, and new proposed wordings were tabled and discussed over the virtual meetings.</li> <li>● There are a total of ten unresolved indicators that will be brought forward for Steering Group deliberations:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Indicator 2.4.5: Effectiveness of grievance mechanism</li> <li>○ Indicator 4.1.1 and 4.1.2: FPIC process for existing plantation</li> <li>○ Indicator 4.2.2 and 4.2.5: FPIC documentation requirement</li> <li>○ Indicator 4.2.4: SEIA requirement under Criteria 3.4</li> <li>○ Indicator 6.2.10: Policy on wage payment during Force Majeure</li> <li>○ Indicator 6.7.4: Work on rest day</li> <li>○ Indicator 7.10.3 and 7.10.4: ALS and HFCC</li> </ul> </li> <li>● There are some concerns recorded from the task force members on the time constraints for deliberation and difficulty reaching quorum. There are also concerns raised on the need to have a process for consolidation and streamlining of criteria and indicators.</li> <li>● In response to these concerns, two support groups have been formed within the Task Force:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Process sounding board – Secretariat will go to the sounding board and seek comments or feedback on the process planning for the 4<sup>th</sup> TF meeting.</li> <li>○ Consolidation of criteria and indicators – This group will identify which indicators that can be merged or are redundant and look</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by:</b> <b>Secretariat</b></p>
------------	---	---

	<p style="text-align: center;">at the whole picture of the standards.</p> <p><b>Next Step</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Steering Group will be meeting on 23 May to make decisions on the unresolved indicators.</li> <li>● The 2<sup>nd</sup> round of Public Consultation will be held in June for 30 days. There will be fewer physical workshops and more webinars for this round. The Public Consultation will be conducted around specific critical topics and the emphasis will be on getting comments from auditors and certification bodies.</li> <li>● The next TF meeting will be conducted in Kuala Lumpur in early August. The Secretariat are currently proposing to have five physical days meeting; 3 consecutive days then the weekend off and come back for another 2 consecutive days. This is to ensure that the TF members can meet, discuss and come to a consensus on the final draft.</li> <li>● The Secretariat has also started discussing the pilot testing to cover at least three countries (Asia, Latin America, and Africa) that will be conducted in September to make it in time for the General Assembly endorsement in November.</li> </ul> <p>Committee highlighted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Enough time should be given to ensure the discussion can take place and the result will be a better-quality document as everything seems to be rushed now.</li> <li>● The facilitation during the meeting must be able to draw out the nuances. This can simplify the process, making it more concise and easier for members to make decisions. This might be what is missing from the current process.</li> <li>● Having the weekend in between the TF meeting might be a concern for those who are not local. It is important to consider if this is usable or effective for all the TF members.</li> <li>● The process seems rushed might be due to the format as the online meeting system doesn't replace physical meetings. Physical meetings for 5 days are workable but online meetings are difficult due to time zones.</li> <li>● The Secretariat shared that the Technical Committee will not be engaged (except for SH TC, which by far working effectively), and TF will look directly at the comments received during the public consultation. Async work will also be done with the TF after the public consultation period to consolidate the comments.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>4.0</b></p>	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p>	
<p>4.1</p>	<p><b><u>No Deforestation Joint Steering Group (NDJSG) Next Step</u></b> As discussed during the 33<sup>rd</sup> SSC Meeting, SSC has suggested the Secretariat draft</p>	<p>Circulate the draft letter and seek SSC</p>

<p>4.2</p>	<p>a letter to NDJSG to address the operational challenges within the group. The Secretariat has drafted a letter and would like to seek the SSC's feedback via email.</p> <p>There was a research paper done by RSPO European colleagues on the gap analysis between EU regulations on No Deforestation and RSPO standards.</p> <p>Committee would like to discuss this for the next SSC meeting.</p> <p>The Secretariat will share the paper with SSC members. Committee can then provide feedback or comments to the paper before the discussion in the next meeting.</p>	<p>feedback via email. <b>Action by:</b> <b>Secretariat</b></p> <p>Share the paper with SSC and discuss in the next meeting. <b>Action by:</b> <b>Secretariat</b></p> <p>Provide comments or feedback before the meeting. <b>Action by:</b> <b>SSC</b></p>
------------	--	--

**MEETING ENDED AT 1615 MYT**