

Comparative Analysis: POIG Indicators (March 2016) and RSPO P&C Draft 2 (June 2018)



Text in red: The major indicators for each section of POIG requirements.
Text in green: where the RSPO was found to be more comprehensive than POIG.

RSPO P&C (June 2018 - Draft 2)		Relevant POIG Requirements & Indicators (March 2016)		POIG Aligned?	Comparison Analysis / Commentary
Criteria	Indicator				
Principle 1: Transparency & Ethics	Putting credible social, environmental and business information in people's hands, enables more informed – and therefore better – decisions. Information that is relevant, truthful and easily understandable increases credibility and trust.				
<i>1.1 (old 1.1) The unit of certification provides adequate information to relevant stakeholders on environmental, social and legal issues relevant to RSPO Criteria, in appropriate languages and forms to allow for effective participation in decision making.</i>	1.1.1 (old 1.2.1) Management documents that are specified in the RSPO P&C are made publicly available. 1.1.2 (old SPG for 1.1.1) Information is provided in appropriate languages and accessible to relevant stakeholders. 1.1.3 (old 1.1.2.) Records of requests for information and responses are maintained. 1.1.4 (old 6.2.1) Consultation and communication procedures are documented, disclosed, implemented, made available, and explained to all relevant stakeholders by a nominated management official. 1.1.5 (old 6.2.3) There is a current list of stakeholders and their nominated representatives.	No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found		YES	If this is interpreted correctly, all management documents required in the RSPO P&C are to be made public. It is not clear what "management documents" means. If it means all plans, assessments, monitoring, etc., that would be all encompassing.
<i>1.2 (old 1.3) The unit of certification commits to ethical conduct in all</i>	1.2.1 (old 1.3.1 & 1.3.2): A policy for ethical conduct is in place and implemented in all business operations and transactions, including recruitment and third-party contracts.	<u>3.1 Anti-corruption and transparency</u> Producer companies shall publicise a	3.1.1 An ethical policy prohibiting all forms of corruption is publicly available.	NO	RSPO 1.2 has no specific requirement with regards to corruption. In most countries, corruption is the primary ethical issue that allows for the

<p><i>business operations and transactions.</i></p>	<p>1.2.2 (old 1.3.3) A system is in place to monitor compliance and the implementation of the policy and overall ethical business practice.</p>	<p>commitment to prohibit any form of corruption including during the concession acquisition process and within their operations, and support efforts to establish and comply with anti-corruption legislation where this exists. In the absence of anti-corruption law, the producer company shall implement other anti-corruption measures proportionate to scale and intensity of management activities and the risk of corruption</p>	<p>3.1.2 The ethical policy covers: a) Bribery; b) Facilitation payments; c) Guidance and procedure for gifts and hospitality d) Disclosure of political contributions; and e) Guidelines for charitable donations and sponsorships, f) Respect for fair conduct of business; g) Proper disclosure of information in accordance with applicable regulations and accepted industry practices and h) Compliance with existing anti-corruption legislation.</p>		<p>exploitation of people and the environment. It could be included in what RSPO is calling ethical conduct, but in some cultures, forms of "facilitation payments", or political quid pro quo, are not considered unethical.</p>
<p>Principle 2: Legality</p>	<p>Compliance or obeying laws and regulations ensure responsible behaviour in order to protect people and planet.</p>				
<p><i>2.1 (old 2.1) There is compliance with all applicable local, national and ratified international laws and regulations.</i></p>	<p>2.1.1 (old 2.1.1) The unit of certification complies with relevant legal requirements. 2.1.2 (old 2.1.2) A documented system for ensuring legal compliance, including by contracted third parties, recruitment agencies, service providers and labour contractors, is</p>	<p>There are POIG indicators that are relevant to "Legality", however, a detailed comparison is not necessary, given that the RSPO requires that all laws and regulations applicable to operating an oil palm plantation are followed.</p>		<p>N/A</p>	<p>RSPO 2.3 requires FFB to originate from legal sources, which in itself is a positive development. Guidance suggests that mills have three years to comply. POIG, on the other hand, has specific and tighter timeline</p>

	<p>implemented. This system has a means to track changes to the law.</p> <p>2.1.3 (old 2.1.3b) For smallholder sources, including through intermediaries, a progressive time bound plan toward compliance is developed.</p> <p>2.1.4 (old 2.2.2) No planting beyond the legally defined area and legal or authorized boundaries are clearly demarcated and visibly maintained.</p>			<p>requirements under 3.2 concerning traceability, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement that within 24 months, only legal FFB is sourced (3.2.2). • The requirement that within 12 months all mills under the management of the grower member have a traceability system in place to identify the location (at least GPS coordinates) of FFB production (3.2.1).
<p><i>2.2 (old 2.X.NEW1) Third party contractors providing operational services and supplying labour, comply with legal requirements.</i></p>	<p>2.2.1 (old 2.x.1) A list of contracted third-parties is maintained.</p> <p>2.2.2 (old 2.x.2) Relevant contracted third parties can demonstrate they comply (mentioned in the contracts) with legal requirements.</p> <p>2.2.3 (old 6.12.4) Clauses against forced and trafficked labour are incorporated in agreements with service providers and suppliers.</p>			
<p><i>2.3 (old 2.X.NEW2) All FFB supplies from outside the unit of certification are from legal sources.</i></p>	<p>2.3.1 (old 2.1.3) Mills must demonstrate that all FFB sources meet legality requirements.</p> <p>2.3.2 (old 2.x.New2.1) For all directly sourced FFB, the mill records:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (old 2.x.1.1.) Information on geo-location of FFB origins • (old 2.x.1.2.) Proof of the ownership status or the right/claim to the land by the grower/ smallholder • (old 2.x.1.3) Where applicable, valid planting/operating/trading license, or is part of a cooperative which allows the buying and selling of FFB 			

	2.3.3 (old 2.x.New2.2) For all indirectly sourced third-party FFB, such as collection centres, agents, or other intermediaries, the evidence as listed in (old) 2.x.1 is provided.			
Principle 3: Planning Procedures and Improvement	The overall goal of this principle is to help growers become more professional, by better managing the many social, environmental and agronomics aspects of their operations. To achieve that, the grower implements a long-term management plan, establishing procedures and systems for ensuring continuous improvement. As a result, this planning and management system supports optimized productivity and efficiency, positive social impacts, reduced environmental impact, and an increased resiliency to adapt to change.			
<i>3.1 (old 3.1) There is an implemented management plan that aims to achieve long-term economic and financial viability.</i>	<p>3.1.1 (old 3.1.1) A business or management plan is documented that includes, where appropriate, a business case for scheme smallholders.</p> <p>3.1.2 (old 3.1.2) An annual replanting programme projected for a minimum of five years (but longer where necessary to reflect the management of fragile soils, see (old) Criterion 4.3), with yearly review, is available.</p> <p>3.1.3 (old SCCS 5.13.1/5.13.2) The organization is required to hold management reviews at planned intervals appropriate to the scale and nature of the activities undertaken, including the review of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results of audits • Customer feedback • Process performance and product conformity • Status of preventive and corrective actions 	No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found	N/A	N/A

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-up actions from management reviews • Changes that could affect the management system • Recommendations for improvement 			
<i>3.2 (old 8.1) The unit of certification regularly monitors and reviews their activities, and develops and implements action plans that allow demonstrable continual improvement in key operations.</i>	3.2.1 (old 8.1.1) The action plan for continual improvement are implemented, based on a consideration of the main social and environmental impacts and opportunities of the grower/mill and include all relevant Indicators covered by these Principles and Criteria.	No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found	N/A	N/A
<i>3.3 (old 4.1) Operating procedures are appropriately documented, consistently implemented and monitored.</i>	<p>3.3.1 (old 4.1.1) Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for estates and mills are in place.</p> <p>3.3.2 (old 4.1.2) A mechanism to check consistent implementation of procedures is in place.</p> <p>3.3.3 (old 4.1.3) Records of monitoring and any actions taken are maintained and available, as appropriate.</p>	No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found	N/A	N/A
<i>3.4 (old 5.1 & 6.1) Aspects of plantation and mill management, including replanting, that have environmental and social impacts are identified in a participatory way, and plans to mitigate the negative impacts and promote the positive</i>	<p>3.4.1 (old 5.1.1 & 6.1.1) A social and environmental impact assessment (SEIA), undertaken through a participatory methodology including the relevant affected stakeholders, including the impacts of any smallholder/outgrower scheme, is documented.</p> <p>3.4.2 (old 5.1.2 & 6.1.3) A management and monitoring plan, including timelines, for avoidance or mitigation of negative impacts and enhancement promotion of the positive ones, are</p>	<p><u>2.4 Social conditions</u> A comprehensive social programme with regular monitoring is in operation to ensure palm oil production does not result in human rights violations, trigger social conflicts, or produce 'land grabbing', and addresses key social</p>	<p>2.4.1 Social impact assessments and plans for the avoidance or mitigation of impacts address the issues of potential human rights violations, social conflicts, impacts of migrant workers on local communities, and land grabbing.</p>	<p>PARTIALLY</p> <p>The POIG indicators mention key issues like human rights, empowerment of women, education and healthcare, etc., where the RSPO 3.4 does not. However, RSPO does require stakeholder participation in identifying issues relevant to communities, which POIG does not. A little wordsmithing and this could be 'Yes'.</p>

<p><i>ones are made, implemented and monitored, to demonstrate continual improvement.</i></p>	<p>developed in participation with the affected parties.</p>	<p>equity issues including housing, healthcare, education and empowerment of women.</p>	<p>2.4.2 Social impact assessments and plans for the avoidance or mitigation of impacts address key equity issues, including housing, healthcare, education, and empowerment of women.</p>	<p></p>	<p></p>
<p></p>	<p></p>	<p><u>3.3 Report on social, labour and environmental performance</u> Disclose the company's social, labour and environmental performance including the elements of the POIG Charter, and how the organisation demonstrates good governance of its sustainability system using the guidance of the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) or equivalent approach.</p>	<p>3.3.1 A publicly available sustainability report is prepared at a minimum every two years, covering as a minimum all issues relevant to compliance with this Charter. This includes relevant RSPO indicators and the additional POIG indicators.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>While RSPO requires 1.1.1 (old 1.2.1), Management documents that are specified in the RSPO P&C are made publicly available, it is not clear what constitutes a "management document". While management documents are required for different aspects of the standard, it does not appear that RSPO requires a public, consolidated, comprehensive sustainability report.</p>
			<p>3.3.2 The public sustainability report includes details relating to the company's governance of its sustainability systems, consistent with the GRI Sustainability Reporting Guidelines (or equivalent approach).</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>RSPO Does not require a public sustainability report about the governance of their sustainability systems.</p>
<p><i>3.5 (old 7.1) For new plantings, a comprehensive and participatory</i></p>	<p>3.5.1 (old 7.1.1) An independent social and environmental impact assessment (SEIA), undertaken through a participatory methodology including the relevant affected stakeholders, is</p>	<p>No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

<p><i>independent social and environmental impact assessment is undertaken prior to establishing new operations, or expanding existing ones, and the results incorporated into planning, management and operations.</i></p>	<p>documented, including the impacts of any outgrower scheme.</p> <p>3.5.2 (old 7.1.2) A management and monitoring plan, including timelines, for avoidance or mitigation of negative impacts and enhancement of the positive ones, are developed in participation with the affected parties.</p> <p>3.5.3 The plan is implemented and adaptive to operational changes.</p>			
<p><i>3.6 (old 6.4b) A system for managing employees is in place.</i></p>	<p>3.6.1 (old 6.4b.1) Procedures for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement and termination of employment are documented.</p> <p>3.6.2 (old 6.4b.2) A mechanism to check consistent implementation of these procedures is in place and records are maintained.</p>	<p>No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><i>3.7 (old 4.7) An occupational health and safety plan is documented, effectively communicated and implemented.</i></p>	<p>3.7.1 (old 4.7.2) All operations are risk assessed to identify health and safety issues are risk assessed, and procedures are documented and implemented.</p> <p>3.7.2 (old 4.7.1) The effectiveness of the health and safety plan is monitored, to address health and safety risks to people and the environment.</p>	<p>No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><i>3.8 (old 4.8) All staff, workers, scheme smallholders, outgrowers, and contract workers are appropriately trained.</i></p>	<p>3.8.1 (old 4.8.1) A documented training programme is in place that is accessible to all workers and scheme smallholders and outgrowers, taking into account gender-specific needs, and that covers all aspects of the RSPO Principles and Criteria, in a form they understand, and that includes regular assessments of training.</p>	<p>No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p><i>KEY WORDS for (NEW/expanded criteria) A comprehensive training program increases knowledge and competencies to carry out work, understand rights and to comply with legal and standard requirements.</i></p>	<p>3.8.2 (old 4.8.2) Records of training are maintained (where appropriate on an individual basis).</p> <p>3.8.3 (old SCCS 5.8.2) Appropriate training is provided for personnel carrying out the tasks critical to the effective implementation of the supply chain certification system. Training is specific and relevant to the task(s) performed.</p>				
<p>Principle 4: Community Rights and Benefits</p>	<p>Community rights are respected, equal opportunities are provided, benefits from engagement in palm oil are maximized and remedy ensured.</p>				
<p><i>4.1 (old 6.13) The unit of certification respects human rights, which includes respecting the rights of Human Rights Defenders.</i></p>	<p>4.1.1 (old 6.13.1) A policy to respect human rights, including prohibiting retaliation against Human Rights Defenders, is documented and communicated to all levels of the workforce, operations and local communities.</p> <p>4.1.2 (old 6.13.x) Company policy prohibits extra-judicial intimidation and harassment by contracted security forces.</p>	<p>No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p><i>4.2 (old 6.3) There is a mutually agreed and documented system for dealing with complaints and grievances, which is implemented and accepted by all affected parties.</i></p>	<p>4.2.1 (old 6.3.1) The system, open to all affected parties, resolves disputes in an effective, timely and appropriate manner, ensuring anonymity of complainants, human rights defenders, community spokespersons and whistleblowers, where requested and following RSPO protocol on the respect of human rights defenders.</p> <p>4.2.2 (old 6.3.6) An adequate and effective grievance/ complaint mechanism is established through which affected parties can confidentially</p>	<p><u>2.3 Effective conflict resolution</u> A balanced, accountable, mutually agreed and documented conflict resolution system is established that is accessible to smallholders, indigenous peoples, rural</p>	<p>2.3.1 The mutually agreed and documented system for dealing with complaints and grievances is accessible to all affected parties.</p> <p>2.3.2 The system provides a clear and known procedure with</p>	<p>PARTIALLY</p>	<p>The suggestions are minor because RSPO has adopted a lot of the POIG language. Enough to likely say that this criteria and indicator meets the POIG indicators.</p> <p>However: RSPO does not mention "internationally recognised human rights" and does not specifically</p>

	<p>communicate grievances or complaints without risk of reprisal or intimidation is established, documented and communicated.</p> <p>4.2.3 (old 6.3.3) Procedures are in place to ensure that the system is understood by the affected parties, including by illiterate parties.</p> <p>4.2.4 (old 6.3.4) Companies keep parties to a grievance informed of its progress, including against agreed timeframe and the outcome is available.</p> <p>4.2.5 (old 6.3.5) The conflict resolution mechanism includes the option of access to independent legal and technical advice, the ability for complainants to choose individuals or groups to support them and/or act as observers, as well as the option of a third-party mediator.</p>	<p>communities and other affected parties in order to deal with complaints, grievances and resolve conflicts to the mutual satisfaction of the parties. The system will include the option of access to independent legal and technical advice, the ability for complainants to choose individuals or groups to support them and/or act as observers, as well as the option of a third-party mediator.</p>	<p>an indicative time frame for each stage.</p> <p>2.3.3 The system keeps parties to a grievance informed of its progress.</p> <p>2.3.4 The system includes the options of a) access to independent legal and technical advice; b) support from representatives of local communities' own choosing, and c) third party mediation.</p> <p>2.3.5 Evidence that where conflicts have arisen the conflict resolution mechanism is being used and outcomes are considered mutually agreed including by affected parties.</p> <p>2.3.6 Evidence that outcomes and remedies resulting from use of the mechanism are compatible with internationally recognised human rights.</p>		<p>require evidence that the "outcome was mutually agreed".</p> <p>Suggested language for RSPO: 4.2.1 (old 6.3.1) The system, open to all affected parties, resolves disputes in an effective, timely and appropriate manner, ensuring anonymity of complainants, human rights defenders, community spokespersons and whistleblowers, where requested and following RSPO protocol on the respect of human rights defenders and compatible with internationally recognised human rights.</p> <p>Suggested New 4.2.6 - Where conflicts have arisen, the resolution outcomes are considered mutually agreed between the company and affected parties.</p>
--	---	--	--	--	--

<p>4.3 (old 6.11) <i>The unit of certification contributes to local sustainable development where appropriate.</i></p>	<p>4.3.1 (old 6.11.1) Contributions to community development that are based on the results of consultation with local communities are demonstrated.</p>	<p>No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>LAND USE - FPIC 4.4 (old 2.3) <i>Use of the land for oil palm does not diminish the legal, customary or user rights of other users without their free, prior and informed consent.</i></p>	<p>4.4.1 (old 2.2.1) Documents showing legal ownership or lease, or authorized use of customary land authorized by customary land owners through a Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) process (see Criterion 2.3). The documents related to the history of land tenure and the actual legal or customary use of the land is available.</p> <p>4.4.2 (old 2.2.2 & SPG) There is no planting beyond the legally defined area and legal or authorized boundaries are clearly demarcated and visibly maintained.</p> <p>4.4.3 (old 2.3.2) Copies of negotiated agreements detailing the FPIC process are available and include: a) Evidence that a plan has been developed through consultation and discussion in good faith with all affected groups in the communities, with particular assurance that vulnerable, minorities and gender groups are consulted, and that information has been provided to all affected groups, including information on the steps that are taken to involve them in decision making; b) Evidence that the company has respected communities' decisions to give or withhold their consent to the operation at the time that this decision was taken; c) Evidence that the legal, economic, environmental and social implications</p>	<p><u>2.1 Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)</u> Comprehensive FPIC is obtained for all oil palm development including in particular: full respect for their legal and customary rights to their territories, lands and resources via local communities own representative institutions, with all the relevant information and documents made available, with resourced access to independent advice, through a documented process, through a long term two-way process of consultation and negotiation where the communities are informed and understand that saying no to development is an option, and not constrained by local legal frameworks. Newly acquired already planted plantation areas shall redress any lack of proper FPIC when the plantations were established. Lands will not be acquired through expropriations in the national interest ('eminent domain').</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>For the most part, the RSPO is more comprehensive than POIG. A couple of differences could make the RSPO indicators very comprehensive and eliminate the need for the POIG indicators:</p> <p>Suggested Change: 4.5.3 (old 7.5.2) FPIC is obtained for all oil palm development through a comprehensive process, including, in particular, full respect for their legal and customary rights to the territories, lands and resources via local communities' own representative institutions, with all the relevant information and documents made available, with option of resourced access to independent advice through a documented, long-term, two-way process of consultation and negotiation where the communities are informed and understand that saying no to development is an option and not constrained by local legal frameworks. ("<i>option</i>" may be defined as the company having an option to provide the resources, however this is</p>

	<p>for permitting operations on their land have been understood and accepted by affected communities, including the implications for the legal status of their land at the expiry of the company's title, concession or lease on the land.</p> <p>4.4.4 (old 2.3.1) Maps of an appropriate scale showing the extent of recognised legal, customary or user rights are developed through participatory mapping involving affected parties (including neighbouring communities where applicable, and relevant authorities).</p> <p>4.4.5 (old 2.3.3) All relevant information is available in appropriate forms and languages, including assessments of impacts, proposed benefit sharing, and legal arrangements.</p> <p>4.4.6 (old 2.3.4) Evidence is available to show that communities are represented through institutions or representatives of their own choosing, including by legal counsel if they so choose.</p> <p>4.4.7 (old 2.3.5) There is evidence that implementation of FPIC agreements is annually reviewed.</p>			<p><i>a minor edit if the option if meant for the community).</i></p>
--	---	--	--	---

<p><i>LAND USE FPIC - FOR NEW PLANTINGS</i> <i>4.5 (old 7.5) No new plantings are established on local peoples' land where it can be demonstrated that there are legal, customary or user rights, without their free, prior and informed consent. This is dealt with through a documented system that enables these and other stakeholders to express their views through their own representative institutions.</i></p>	<p>4.5.1 (old 7.6.1) Documents showing identification and assessment of demonstrable legal, customary and user rights are available.</p> <p>4.5.2 (old 7.5.1) Evidence is available that affected local peoples understand they have the right to say 'no' to operations planned on their lands before and during initial discussions, during the stage of information gathering and associated consultations, during negotiations, and up until an agreement with the grower/miller is signed and ratified by these local peoples.</p> <p>4.5.3 (old 7.5.2) FPIC is obtained for all oil palm development through a comprehensive process, including, in particular, full respect for their legal and customary rights to the territories, lands and resources via local communities' own representative institutions, with all the relevant information and documents made available, with option of resourced access to independent advice through a documented, long-term, two-way process of consultation and negotiation where the communities are informed and understand that saying no to development is an option and not constrained by local legal frameworks.</p>	<p><u>2.1 Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)</u> <i>See previous text (p. 10)</i></p>	<p>2.1.1 Resourced access to independent expert advice is offered at each stage of an FPIC or conflict resolution process to affected communities.</p> <p>2.1.2 Processes of consultation and negotiation, in accordance with internationally recognised FPIC standards, are not constrained by local legal frameworks.</p>		
---	--	---	---	--	--

	<p>4.5.4 (old 7.5.3) To ensure local food security, as part of the FPIC process, participatory SIA and participatory land-use planning with local peoples, the full range of food provisioning options are considered. There is transparency of the land allocation process.</p>	<p><u>2.2 Food security</u> As part of the Free, Prior and Informed Consent process, participatory Social Impact Assessments and participatory land use planning with indigenous and local communities, food security is maintained or strengthened in order to maintain their land use choice and future food security options. This will include not undermining local control of and diversity of food production systems. There is transparency of the land allocation process.</p>	<p>2.2.1 Food security for workers, smallholders, and indigenous and local communities affected by existing plantations is assessed and included in a social management plan. The scope of the food security assessment includes the additional impacts that oil palm production operations may have, including on land, water, labour and infrastructure as well as substitutability between income generation for food purchase and subsistence food production of workers, smallholders and affected communities.</p> <p>2.2.2 After March 2014, in new plantations or expansion of existing plantations, a minimum of 0.5 ha of garden or farmland per person is identified via participatory mapping, and enclaved for meeting food security needs.</p> <p>2.2.3 Measures designed to maintain or enhance</p>	<p>PARTIALLY</p>	<p>RSPO 4.5.4 food security indicator is not detailed, but allows community participation in land use decisions. One could assume that if the community needed land for food production, local communities can advocate for land use priorities that favor food production.</p> <p>RSPO does not nearly address food security issues on the same scale as POIG. Although the specificity in the POIG indicator 2.2.2, for example, may not be desired by the local community. The RSPO gives flexibility for the "full range of food provisioning option".</p> <p>While the RSPO requirements with respect to food security are not sufficient to meet the POIG indicators, combined with 4.5.3 they may be better in terms of community options than POIG's 2.2.1 - 2.2.4.</p>
--	--	---	---	-------------------------	---

			<p>local food security are included in participatory land use planning, including transparency in any land allocation process.</p> <p>2.2.4 Evidence that measures identified in assessments and planning are being implemented and are effective.</p>		
	<p>4.5.5 (old 7.6.6) Evidence is available that the affected communities and rights holders have had the option to access to information and advice, that is independent of the project proponent, concerning the legal, economic, environmental and social implications of the proposed operations on their lands.</p> <p>4.5.6 (old SPG for 7.6.6): Evidence is available that the communities (or their representatives) gave consent to the initial planning phases of the operations prior to the new issuance of a concession or land title to the operator.</p>	<p>No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

	<p>4.5.7 (old 7.6.7) New lands will not be acquired for plantations and mills in or after [2018] as a result of recent (2005 or later) expropriations in the national interest without consent (eminent domain).</p> <p>4.5.8 (old 7.6.8) New lands are not acquired in areas inhabited by communities in voluntary isolation.</p>	<p><u>2.1 Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)</u> See previous text (p. 10)</p>	<p>2.1.4 Plantations have not been developed on land acquired through expropriations in the national interest (eminent domain) after March 2014.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>RSPO 4.5.7 Allows plantation development by appropriation after March 2014.</p>
<p><i>LAND USE - COMPENSATION</i> 4.6 (old 6.4) Any negotiations concerning compensation for loss of legal, customary or user rights are dealt with through a documented system that enables indigenous peoples, local communities and other stakeholders to express their views through their own representative institutions.</p>	<p>4.6.1 (old 6.4.1) A procedure for identifying legal, customary or user rights, and a procedure for identifying people entitled to compensation, is in place.</p> <p>4.6.2 (old 6.4.2) A procedure for calculating and distributing fair and gender-equal compensation (monetary or otherwise) is established and implemented, monitored and evaluated in a participatory way, and corrective actions taken as a result of this evaluation.</p> <p>4.6.3 (old SPG from 6.4.2) Evidence is available that best efforts are made to ensure that equal opportunities are provided to both female and male heads of households to hold land titles for small holdings.</p> <p>4.6.4 (old 6.4.3) The process and outcome of any negotiated agreements and compensation claims is documented, with evidence of the participation of affected parties, and made publicly available.</p>	<p>No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

<p><i>LAND USE COMPENSATION - NEW PLANTINGS</i> 4.7 (old 7.6) Where it can be demonstrated that local peoples have legal, customary or user rights, they are compensated for any agreed land acquisitions and relinquishment of rights, subject to their free, prior and informed consent and negotiated agreements.</p>	<p>4.7.1 (old 7.6.2) A system for identifying people entitled to compensation is in place.</p> <p>4.7.2 (old 7.6.3) A system for calculating and distributing fair compensation (monetary or otherwise) is in place.</p> <p>4.7.3 (old 7.6.5) The process and outcome of any compensation claims is documented and made publicly available.</p> <p>4.7.4 (old 7.6.4) Communities that have lost access and rights to land for plantation expansion are given opportunities to benefit from plantation development.</p>	<p>No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><i>LAND USE - CONFLICT</i> 4.8 (old 2.2) The right to use the land is demonstrated, and is not legitimately contested by local</p>	<p>4.8.1 (old 2.2.3) Where there are or have been disputes, additional proof of legal acquisition of title and evidence that fair compensation has been made to previous owners and occupants is available, and that these have been accepted with free, prior and informed consent (FPIC).</p> <p>4.8.2 (old 2.2.4) There is an absence of land conflict, unless requirements for acceptable conflict resolution processes (see Criteria 6.3 and 6.4) are implemented and accepted by the parties involved. In the case of newly acquired plantations, companies address any unresolved conflict.</p>	<p>No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

	<p>4.8.3 (old SPG from 2.2.4) Where there is evidence of acquisition through dispossession or forced abandonment of customary and user rights prior to the current operations and there remain parties with customary and land use rights, these historical claims will be settled using the relevant requirements (old refs 2.3.1, 2.3.2, and 2.3.3).</p>	<p><u>2.1 Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)</u> <i>See previous text (p. 10)</i></p>	<p>2.1.3 When acquiring land or replanting existing plantations, measures are taken to redress any issues arising from the lack of or inadequate FPIC processes carried out when those plantations were established. In such cases, participatory surveys will be conducted to identify HCV's 4, 5 and/or 6 that existed before the plantation was established.</p>	<p>PARTIALLY</p>	<p>The RSPO indicator allows for "historic claims" to be "settled". This is equivalent to a "redress of any issues"(Not sure what "relevant requirements" are). 4.8.4 allows for participatory mapping of the disputed area, not actually a participatory survey, but could have the same results. RSPO does not identify HCVs 4,5,6, that existed prior to plantation establishment.</p> <p>Suggestion: 4.8.4 (old 2.2.5) For any conflict or dispute over the land, the extent of the disputed area is mapped out and HCV's 4,5 and/or 6 identified in a participatory way with involvement of affected parties (including neighbouring communities where applicable).</p>
	<p>4.8.4 (old 2.2.5) For any conflict or dispute over the land, the extent of the disputed area is mapped out in a participatory way with involvement of affected parties (including neighbouring communities where applicable).</p> <p>4.8.5 (old 2.2.6 & SPG) Palm oil operators do not instigate violence or use any form of harassment, including the use of mercenaries and paramilitaries in their operations.</p>	<p>No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

<p>Principle 5: Smallholder Inclusivity</p>	<p>Smallholders are important players in achieving the RSPO Vision and a key strategy in the ToC. SH also face challenges, such as low productivity, soil quality, lack of agricultural and business skills, lack of access to finance, climate change, food insecurity, and unequal bargaining positions that make smallholders struggle to make a decent living.</p> <p>Through inclusion in RSPO supply chains, we see smallholders prosper, become sustainable, and contribute to the improved livelihoods of their families and the surrounding communities. In turn, these smallholders are stronger partners and enable more secure and stable supply chains. This is enabled through Fair and Transparent Relations and support from growers and mills and the rest of the supply chain.</p>				
<p>5.1 (old 6.10) <i>The unit of certification deals fairly and transparently with smallholders and other local businesses.</i></p>	<p>5.1.1 (old 6.10.1) Current and past prices paid for Fresh Fruit Bunches (FFB) are publicly available.</p> <p>5.1.2 (old 6.10.2) Evidence is available that growers/millers have explained FFB pricing, and pricing mechanisms for FFB and inputs/services are documented (where these are under the control of the unit of certification).</p>	<p><u>2.6 Support to smallholders</u> Contracts with smallholders are based on a fair, transparent and accountable partnership. Smallholders are supported to improve economic, social and environmental outcomes</p>	<p>2.6.2 Progress in implementation of the smallholder support programme is included in public reporting.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>RSPO does not require public reporting for their smallholder support programme.</p>

	<p>5.1.3 (old 6.10.3) Evidence is available that all parties understand the contractual agreements into which they enter, and that contracts are fair, legal and transparent.</p>	<p>including: increase productivity to a comparable benchmark of productivity for the region and a target of having the same productivity as the company nucleus plantation. The productivity gains shall</p>	<p>2.6.3 Report on percentage of schemed smallholders, percentage of independent smallholders and percentage RSPO certified of each.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>The RSPO P&C does not require a report on the percentage of smallholders or percentage of smallholders RSPO certified.</p>
	<p>5.1.4 (old 6.10.4) Agreed payments are made in a timely manner.</p>	<p>be achieved without expansion that threatens local community food security or additional environmental impact, and support should include financial management and budgeting, logistics and FFB processing, and improved market access such as through group certification. Companies</p>			
	<p>5.1.5 If a company supports a group of independent smallholders with certification there is a clear agreement between the company and the smallholder on who runs the ICS, who holds the certificates, and who holds and sells the certified material. If this is in context of RSPO Group Certification, then RSPO certification requirements apply.</p>	<p>shall report on the support they have provided to smallholder</p>	<p>2.6.4 Develop a group certification plan for independent smallholder identified in the supply base of each mill within three years of the mill obtaining its own certificate and support the independent smallholders to achieve certification and progress towards POIG verification.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>It appears that RSPO 5.1.5 allows this indicator to be an option ("If a company supports...") for the company rather than a requirement.</p>
<p>5.2 <i>The Unit of certification supports improved livelihoods of smallholders.</i></p>	<p>5.2.1 (old 6.11.2) Based on consultation, companies develop, implement, and regularly review, outreach programmes of support directed at all smallholders (irrespective of type) in the supply base that will enhance productivity and yields, and support their competencies (entrepreneurial, managerial), market access, and legality, as mutually agreed.</p>		<p>2.6.1 A smallholder support programme is developed, documented and monitored, which includes: a) Measures to increase the productivity of smallholders to a comparable benchmark of productivity for the region, and a target of reaching at least the</p>	<p>PARTIALLY</p>	<p>RSPO 5.2.1 essentially meets part of the POIG indicator 2.6.1. The target productivity issue is missing from RSPO. The supporting of "competencies" could be seen as equal to the other elements of the POIG indicators.</p>

			<p>same productivity level as company estates; b) Support relating to financial management and budgeting and c) Support relating to logistics, FFB processing and market access.</p>		
Principle 6: Workers rights and conditions	Protecting workers rights and ensuring safe and decent working conditions				
<p>6.1 (old 6.8) Any form of discrimination is prohibited.</p>	<p>6.1.1 (old 6.8.1) A publicly available non-discrimination policy is implemented in such a way to prevent discrimination based on ethnic origin, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, union membership, political affiliation, or age, and equal opportunities policy.</p> <p>6.1.2 (old 6.8.2) Evidence is provided that employees and groups including local communities, women, and migrant workers have not been discriminated against. Evidence includes migrant workers' non-payment of recruitment fees.</p> <p>6.1.3 (old 6.8.3) It demonstrates that recruitment selection, hiring, access to training and promotion are based on skills, capabilities, qualities, and medical fitness necessary for the jobs available.</p> <p>6.1.4 (old 6.8.4) Pregnancy testing is not conducted as a discriminatory measure and is only permissible when it is legally mandated.</p>	<p><u>2.5 Workers' rights</u> Palm oil producers shall respect worker's rights including the International Labour Organization (ILO) requirements for 'decent work' and core conventions on child labour, forced or compulsory labour, freedom of association, and elimination of discrimination.</p>			

	<p>Alternative equivalent employment is offered for pregnant women.</p> <p>6.1.5 (old 6.8.5) A gender committee is in place specifically to raise awareness, identify and address issues of concern; opportunities and improvements for women.</p> <p>6.1.6 (old 6.8.6) There is evidence of equal pay for the same work scope.</p>				
<p><i>6.2 (old 6.5) Pay and conditions for employees and for contract workers always meet at least legal or industry minimum standards and are sufficient to provide decent living wages.</i></p>	<p>6.2.1 (old 6.5.1) Applicable labour laws, union and/or other collective agreements and documentation of pay and conditions are available to the workers in national languages and explained to the workers in language they understand.</p>				
	<p>6.2.2 (old 6.5.2) Employment contracts and related documents detailing payments and conditions of employment (e.g. regular working hours, deductions, overtime, sick leave, holiday entitlement, maternity leave, reasons for dismissal, period of notice, etc. in compliance with national legal requirements) and payroll documents give accurate information on compensation for all work performed, including such work as done by family members.</p>		<p><u>Terms and Contracts of Employment</u> 2.5.3. Wages are paid to all workers regularly, on time, directly to the worker and in legal tender or cheque.</p> <p>2.5.4 Wage advances, loans and deductions are legal, recorded, communicated and available to workers upon request, and do not result in debt bondage.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>RSPO 6.2.2 does not prescribe how payment or when payment should be made, only following lawful requirements. However, the RSPO indicator requires a comprehensive contract and related employment documents detailing conditions of employment. It does not say that all personnel policy documents are available to the employees.</p>

	<p>6.2.3 (old 6.5.3) There is evidence of legal compliance for regular working hours, deductions, overtime, sickness, holiday entitlement, maternity leave, reasons for dismissal, period of notice and other legal labour requirements.</p>	<p><u>Working Hours and Leave</u> 2.5.6. The normal work week does not exceed 48 hours, not including overtime, and workers are entitled to at least one day off in 6 consecutive days. Overtime in excess of what is permitted by law is prohibited, and workers report that all overtime is voluntary.</p> <p>2.5.7 All workers are provided legally mandated public holidays and periods of leave consistent with applicable law, including paid annual, parental, compassionate and sick leave. Workers not covered under applicable laws are entitled to equivalent benefits.</p> <p>2.5.8 Records are maintained and demonstrate that hours of work do not exceed the maximum allowed by local law, regulation or collective agreement or</p>	<p>PARTIALLY</p>	<p>RSPO 6.2.3 does not require a time limit of 48 hours nor a day off in 6 consecutive days. Again, this may not be desired by employees themselves. Because RSPO requires "evidence of legal compliance", it can be assumed that records are kept as "evidence".</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------	---

			48 hours (per 2.5.5 above), whichever is lower.		
	<p>6.2.4 (old 6.5.4) The unit of certification provides adequate housing, water supplies, medical, educational and welfare amenities to national standards or above, where no such public facilities are available or accessible.</p> <p>National laws, or in their absence the ILO Guidance on Workers' Housing Recommendation No. 115, are used. In the case of acquisitions of non-certified units, a plan is developed detailing the upgrade of infrastructure with a reasonable time (5 years) is allowed to upgrade the infrastructure.</p> <p>6.2.5 (old 6.5.5) The unit of certification makes efforts to improve workers' access to adequate, sufficient and affordable food.</p>				
	<p>6.2.6 (old 6.5.6) A decent living wage is being paid to all workers, including those on piece rate/quotas, for whom the calculation are based on achievable quotas during regular work hours.</p> <p>6.2.7 (old 6.5.7) Permanent, full-time employment is used for all core work performed by the company. Casual, temporary and day labour is limited to jobs that are temporary or seasonal or explicitly requested as such by workers.</p>		<p><u>Remuneration</u> 2.5.2 A living wage assessment for all workers, whether employed directly by the company or indirectly by a private employment agency, is conducted based on a credible methodology.</p> <p>2.5.1 Permanent, full-time employment is used</p>	PARTIALLY	<p>RSPO 6.2.6 provides for a "decent living wage", but does not expand that requirement to an employment agency nor does it define living wage. POIG states that a credible methodology must be used for measuring the living wage, linking to the methodology defined by the Global Living Wage Coalition. The phrase "indirectly by a private employment agency" could be added to the RSPO indicator. RSPO 6.2.6</p>

			for all core work performed by the company. Casual, temporary and day labour is limited to jobs that are genuinely temporary or seasonal, and account for no more than 20% of the workforce.		includes piece rate/quota workers where POIG 2.5.2 does not. RSPO 6.2.7 does not specify a percentage of the company's workforce to be fulltime or part time. While, RSPO 6.2.7 does allow the worker to choose how they want to be employed, which is more flexible for the worker than what is stated under POIG, this flexibility can also be used as an excuse by plantation companies to justify keeping a large percentage of workers in precarious employment.
<i>6.3 (old 6.6) The employer respects the rights of all personnel to form and join trade unions of their choice and to bargain collectively. Where the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining are restricted under law, the employer facilitates parallel means of independent and free association and bargaining for all such personnel.</i>	<p>6.3.1 (old 6.6.1) A published statement recognising freedom of association and right to collective bargaining in national languages is available and is explained to all workers in languages that they understand.</p> <p>6.3.2 (old 6.6.2) Minutes of meetings between the company with main trade unions or workers representatives, who are freely elected, are documented.</p> <p>6.3.3 (old 6.6.3) Evidence is provided that company has recognized the Freedom of Association and the right to collective bargaining</p> <p>6.3.4 (old 6.6.4) Management does not interfere with the formation or operation of registered unions/ labour organisations or associations, or</p>	No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found		N/A	N/A

	other freely elected representatives for all workers including migrant and contract workers.			
6.4 (old 6.7) Children are not employed or exploited.	6.4.1 (old 6.7.1) A formal policy for the protection of children, including prohibition of child labour and remediation is in place, and included into service contracts and supplier agreements.	No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found		N/A
	6.4.2 (old 6.7.2) There is evidence that minimum age requirements are met. Personnel files show that all workers are above the national minimum age or above company policy minimum age, whichever is higher. There is a documented age screening verification procedure.	2.5 Workers' rights <i>See previous text (p. 20)</i>	Child labour 2.5.9. A clear policy and compliance system is in place that prohibits child labour and its worst forms and sets the minimum age for employment consistent with applicable law	YES
	6.4.3 (old 6.7.3) Young workers may be employed only for non-hazardous work, with protective restrictions in place for that work.		2.5.10 Young workers legally permitted to work but subject to compulsory education laws only work outside school hours. 2.5.11 The company maintains an up-to-date list of hazardous activities and functions in the workplace that are prohibited for young	PARTIALLY

			workers consistent with or exceeding national regulation, where applicable.		
	6.4.4 (old 6.7.4) Growers demonstrate communication on no child labour policy and the negative effects of child labour, and promote child protection to supervisors and other key staff and smallholders and communities, where workers live and FFB suppliers.				
6.5 (old 6.9) <i>There is no harassment or abuse in the work place, and reproductive rights are protected.</i>	<p>6.5.1 (old 6.9.1) A policy to prevent sexual and all other forms of harassment and violence is implemented and communicated to all levels of the workforce.</p> <p>6.5.2 (old 6.9.2) A policy to protect the reproductive rights of all, especially of women, is implemented and communicated to all levels of the workforce.</p> <p>6.5.3 (from SPG for 6.9.2) Adequate space and paid breaks are provided to enable mothers to breastfeed or express and store breastmilk with privacy.</p> <p>6.5.4 (old 6.9.3) A specific grievance mechanism which respects anonymity and protects complainants where requested is established, implemented, and communicated to all levels of the workforce.</p>	No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found		N/A	N/A
6.6 (old 6.12) <i>No forms of forced or trafficked labour are used.</i>	6.6.1 (old 6.12.1) All work is voluntary and following are prohibited:	<u>2.5 Workers' rights</u> <i>See previous text (p. 20)</i>	<u>Forced or trafficked labour</u>	NO	RSPO 6.6.1 covers most of the prohibitions in POIG 2.5.12 - 2.5.13. However, it allows for the holding of

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention of identity documents or passports without consent. • Payment of recruitment fees. • Contract substitution. • Involuntary overtime • Lack of freedom of workers to resign • Penalty for termination of employment • Debt bondage • Withholding of wages (in accordance with the national law). 		<p>2.5.12. No fees or costs are charged to workers, directly or indirectly, for recruitment or employment services by recruitment agencies, private employment agencies or the employer. Where it is discovered that fees have been charged, workers are reimbursed the total amount paid.</p> <p>2.5.13 The retention of passports, other government-issued identification and any personal valuables by the employer or third-party recruitment or employment agency is strictly prohibited in policy and monitored in practice.</p> <p>2.5.14. Growers and millers conduct a risk assessment of their FFB supply chain to identify and take steps to address risk of forced labour, human trafficking and child labour.</p>		<p>identity documents with consent which provides a loophole for abusive employer practices, including workers being coerced into signing of "consent" documents as a condition of employment or not having unfettered access to their documents. It also does not require that the company reimburse workers if fees have been charged or a risk assessment of their supply chain.</p>
--	---	--	---	--	---

	<p>6.6.2 (old 6.12.3) Where temporary or migrant workers are employed, a specific labour policy and procedures are established and implemented.</p>		<p>2.5.5 All workers, including casual, temporary, seasonal and migrant workers, are provided compensation and benefits consistent with applicable law, including health, pension and social security.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>RSPO 6.6.2 and 2.1.2 (A documented system for ensuring legal compliance, including by contracted third parties, recruitment agencies, service providers and labour contractors, is implemented. This system has a means to track changes to the law) meet POIG 6.6.2, which allows companies to make their own policies.</p>
<p>6.7 (old 4.7) An occupational health and safety plan is documented, effectively communicated and implemented.</p>	<p>6.7.1 (old 4.7.4) The responsible person/persons for H&S is identified. There are records of regular meetings between the responsible person/s and workers. Concerns of all parties about health, safety and welfare are discussed at these meetings, and any issues raised are be recorded.</p> <p>6.7.2 (old 4.7.5) Accident and emergency procedures are in place and instructions are clearly understood by all workers. Accident procedures are available in the appropriate language of the workforce. Assigned operatives trained in First Aid are present in both field and other operations, and first aid equipment is available at worksites. Records of all accidents are kept and periodically reviewed.</p> <p>6.7.3 (old 4.7.3 & SPG) Adequate and appropriate protective equipment is available free of charge to all workers at the place of work to cover all potentially hazardous operations, such as pesticide application, machine operations, and land preparation, harvesting and, if it is used, burning. Sanitation facilities for those applying pesticides are available, so that workers can</p>	<p>No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

	<p>change out of PPE, wash and put on their personal clothing.</p> <p>6.7.4 (old 4.7.6) All workers are provided with medical care and covered by accident insurance. Costs incurred from work-related incidents leading to injury or sickness are covered by the company.</p> <p>6.7.5 (old 4.7.7) Occupational injuries are recorded using Lost Time Accident (LTA) metrics.</p>				
Principle 7: Natural Resource Management and Biodiversity Enhanced	The Environment is protected, natural resources are well managed, and biodiversity is conserved.				
<i>7.1 (old 4.5) Pests, diseases, weeds and invasive introduced species are effectively managed using appropriate Integrated Pest Management techniques.</i>	<p>7.1.1 (old 4.5.1) Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plans are implemented and monitored.</p> <p>7.1.2 (old 4.5.4 NEW) Species referenced in the Global Invasive Species Database are not to be used in managed areas, unless plans to prevent their spread are implemented.</p> <p>7.1.3 (old 4.5.3) There is no use of fire for pest control unless in exceptional circumstances and with prior approval of government authorities. [For NI to define process].</p>	<p><u>1.6 GMOs prohibition</u> The cultivation of GMOs in the management area is prohibited.</p>	<p>1.6.1 The use of GMOs in the management area is prohibited.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>RSPO has no GMO prohibition.</p>
<i>7.2 (old 4.6) Pesticides are used in ways that do not endanger health or the environment.</i>	<p>7.2.1 (old 4.6.1) Justification of all pesticides used is demonstrated. The use of selective products that are specific to the target pest, weed or disease and which have minimal effect on non-target species are used where available.</p> <p>7.2.2 (old 4.6.2) Records of pesticides use (including active ingredients used and their LD50,</p>	<p><u>1.4 Pesticide use minimisation</u> Highly toxic, bio-accumulative and persistent pesticides shall not be used. These include chemicals on the</p>			
			<p>1.4.2 The grower preferences natural</p>	<p>PARTIALLY</p>	<p>RSPO 7.1.1 requires an IPM plan to be implemented and 7.2.3 requires</p>

	<p>area treated, amount of active ingredients applied per ha and number of applications) are provided.</p>	<p>FSC 'Highly Hazardous' list and SAN prohibited pesticide list. Producers shall by preference practice natural weed and pest control and IPM, and strive to avoid the use of toxic pesticides, only using them as an absolute last resort. There shall be full transparency of any pesticide use.</p>	<p>weed and pest control and IPM.</p>		<p>pesticides use to be minimised, but does not require the grower to show evidence of a preference for natural weed and pest control.</p>
	<p>7.2.3 (old 4.6.3) Any use of pesticides is minimized as part of a plan, and in accordance with Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plans. There is no prophylactic use of pesticides, except in specific situations identified in national Best Practice guidelines.</p>		<p>1.4.3 Emergency use of listed pesticides is permitted subject to POIG Organising Committee approval.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>RSPO 7.2.4 provides for a range of due diligence actions to be taken before a toxic pesticide can be used. Although the indicator does not require approval from RSPO to use a toxic pesticide, the company must have justified its use.</p>
	<p>7.2.4 (old 4.6.4) Pesticides that are categorised as World Health Organisation Class 1A or 1B, or that are listed by the Stockholm or Rotterdam Conventions, and paraquat, are not used, except in specific situations validated by a due diligence process, or when indicated by government authorities for pest outbreaks.</p> <p>The due diligence has to refer to: a) judgment of the threat and verify why this is a major threat b) why there is no other alternative which can be used c) which process was applied to verify why there is no other less hazardous alternative d) what is the process to limit the negative impacts of the application e) estimation of the timescale of the application and steps taken to limit application to the specific outbreak.</p>		<p>1.4.1 Highly toxic, bio-accumulative and persistent pesticides (PBT) are prohibited. This includes chemicals listed by the following: a) World Health Organization Class 1A or 1B, Stockholm or Rotterdam Conventions, b) FSC 'Highly Hazardous' list, c) SAN prohibited pesticide list and d) Paraquat.</p>	<p>PARTIALLY</p>	<p>RSPO 7.2.4 does not include the FSC or SAN list of prohibited pesticides. These two items could be added to the RSPO indicator. Given the other requirements in 7.2.4, the indicator is more comprehensive than POIG already. Therefore, POIG indicator 1.4.1 could be eliminated.</p>

	<p>7.2.5 (old 4.6.5) Pesticides are only be handled, used or applied by persons who have completed the necessary training and are always be applied in accordance with the product label. All precautions attached to the products are properly observed, applied, and understood by workers (see Criterion 4.7).</p>				
	<p>7.2.6 (old 4.6.6) Storage of all pesticides is according to recognised best practices. All pesticide containers are properly disposed of and/or handled responsibly if used for other purposes.</p> <p>7.2.7 (old 4.6.8) Pesticides are applied aerially only where there is documented justification. Communities are informed of impending aerial pesticide applications with all relevant information within reasonable time prior to application.</p> <p>7.2.8 (old 4.6.9) Maintenance of employee and associated smallholder knowledge and skills on pesticide handling is demonstrated, including provision of appropriate information materials.</p> <p>7.2.9 (old 4.6.11) Specific annual medical surveillance for pesticide operators, and documented action to treat related health conditions, is demonstrated.</p> <p>7.2.10 (old 4.6.12) No work with pesticides is undertaken by young persons, pregnant or breast-feeding women or other people that have</p>				

	medical restrictions and they are offered alternative equivalent work.				
<i>7.3 (old 5.3) Waste is reduced, recycled, reused and disposed of in an environmentally and socially responsible manner</i>	<p>7.3.1 (old 5.3.3) A waste management plan which includes reduction, recycling, reusing, and disposal based on toxicity and hazardous characteristics, is documented and implemented.</p> <p>7.3.2 (old 4.6.10) Proper disposal of waste material, according to procedures that are fully understood by workers and managers, is demonstrated.</p>	No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found		N/A	N/A
<i>7.4 (old 4.2) Practices maintain soil fertility at, or where possible improve soil fertility to, a level that ensures optimal and sustained yield.</i>	7.4.1 (old 4.2.1) Good agriculture practices, as contained in Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), are followed to manage soil quality to optimise yield.	<p><u>1.5 Chemical fertiliser</u> To reduce climate and environmental impacts producers shall strive to minimise chemical fertiliser use, and preferentially use ‘precision agriculture’, organic fertilisers, and where possible use waste as a source of phosphorus. Phosphorus and nitrogen levels in water courses are monitored and disclosed.</p>	<p>1.5.1 Use of chemical fertilisers is minimised through producers demonstrating preferential use of alternatives to manage soil fertility.</p>	NO	RSPO has no requirement regarding chemical fertilisers. RSPO 7.4.4 requires records of fertiliser use, but does not specify "chemical" fertiliser as a category.
	7.4.2 (old 4.2.3) Periodic tissue and soil sampling is carried out to monitor and manage changes in soil quality and plant health.		<p>1.5.2 Phosphorus and nitrogen levels in relevant watercourses are monitored and when the results of monitoring indicate an increased level of such elements in water due to fertiliser application, company will adjust fertiliser rates and procedures.</p>		

	7.4.3 (old 4.2.4) A nutrient recycling strategy is in place and may include use of Empty Fruit Bunches (EFB), Palm Oil Mill Effluent (POME), and palm residues after replanting.		1.5.3 Results of phosphorous and nitrogen monitoring in water courses are included in public reporting.		
	7.4.4 (old 4.2.2) Records of fertiliser inputs are maintained.				
<i>7.5 (old 4.3a) Practices minimise and control erosion and degradation of soils.</i>	7.5.1 (old 4.3a.1) Maps identifying marginal and fragile soils, including steep slopes, are available. 7.5.2 (old 4.3a.2) A management plan is developed and implemented to minimize and control erosion and degradation of soil, with specific attention to slopes and roads. Where marginal soils (e.g. sandy, low organic matter, acid sulphate and alkaline soils) are planted, the plan includes measures to manage them.	No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>7.6 (old 7.2) Soil surveys and topographic information are used for site planning in the establishment of new plantings, and the results are incorporated into plans and operations.</i>	7.6.1 (old 7.2.1) To demonstrate the long-term suitability of land for palm oil cultivation, soil maps or soil surveys identifying marginal and fragile soils, including steep slopes, are taken into account in plans and operations. 7.6.2 (old 7.2.2) Soil surveys and topographic information guide the planning of drainage and irrigation systems, roads and other infrastructure.	No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>7.7 (old 7.4a) Extensive planting on steep terrain, and/or marginal and fragile soils, is avoided.</i>	7.7.1 (old 7.4.1) There is no planting on steep slopes. 7.7.2 (old 7.4.2) Where limited planting on fragile and marginal soils is proposed, plans are developed and implemented to protect them without incurring adverse impacts.	No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found	N/A	N/A	N/A

	[Note: consistency check needed in language between criterion and indicator]					
7.8 (old 4.3b & 7.4b) No new planting on peat, regardless of depth (after GA+1D) and all peatlands are managed responsibly.	7.8.1 (old 7.4b.1) There is no new planting on peat (after GA+1).	<u>1.2 Peatland</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No peat clearance: All areas of undeveloped peat lands (peat of any depth) are protected and all drainage, fires or road building on peat soils is prohibited. Maintenance of peat lands: Water tables are managed in existing plantations on peat in order to minimise both the subsidence of the peat and the release of GHG emissions. Strategies are employed to progressively restore critical peat land ecosystems, with a preference for replanting on mineral soils, including via 'land swaps'. 	1.2.1 Undeveloped areas of peat land (of any depth) are not developed or drained.	YES	RSPO 7.8.1 states: No new planting on peat. An ambiguous statement. Need clarification on the peat definition.	
	7.8.2 (old 4.3b.1) Peat soils within the managed areas are inventorised, documented and reported to RSPO Secretariat.					
	7.8.3 (old 4.3b2) Subsidence of peat soils is monitored, documented and minimized; and a documented water and ground cover management programme is in place.					
	7.8.4 (old 4.3b.3) Drainability assessments are undertaken in line with the RSPO Drainability Assessment Procedure prior to replanting on peat and the result is used to determine the long-term viability of the necessary drainage for oil palm growing or whether the oil palm needs to be replaced with alternative, more water tolerant, crops or rehabilitated with natural vegetation.			1.2.3 Where there is existing planting on peat, critical peatland ecosystems are identified and assessed for restoration opportunities.	NO	RSPO 7.8.2 and 7.8.4 do not mention identifying critical peat ecosystems and specifically assessing for restoration opportunities. The emphasis is on whether the palm plantation is viable and if not, then look for either an alternative crop or rehabilitation. Moreover, there is no timebound plan for restoration nor expert reviews.
		1.2.4 Based on the results of the assessment above (1.2.3), peatland restoration strategies that are time-bound and expert reviewed are developed and implemented, including those to replant on mineral soils using 'land swaps'.				

		<p>1.2.6 Where drainability assessments have identified areas unsuitable for oil palm replanting, including the likely GHG emissions associated with continued cultivation, plans should be in place for appropriate rehabilitation or alternative use of such areas. If the assessment indicates high risk of GHG emissions, fires, flooding and/or saltwater intrusion, growers cease replanting and implement rehabilitation.</p>	<p>PARTIALLY</p>	<p>RSPO 7.8.4 does not include a GHG risk assessment.</p>
	<p>7.8.5 (old 4.3b.4) All existing planting on peat within the managed is managed at least to the standard in the 'RSPO Manual on Best Management Practices (BMPs) for existing oil palm cultivation on peat', version 2, revised xx 2018</p>	<p>1.2.5 For existing plantings on peat, records show that the water table is maintained (at an average of 50cm (between 40 - 60 cm) below ground surface measured with groundwater piezometer readings, or an average of 60 cm (between 50 - 70 cm) below ground surface as measured in water collection drains) through a network of</p>	<p>PARTIALLY</p>	<p>RSPO BMPs partly address this indicator: "Good water management to maintain the water level at 50-70 cm (from water level in collection drains) or 40-60 cm (groundwater piezometer reading) is crucial to minimize peat subsidence and reduce palm leaning" (RSPO BMPs page 26).</p>

			appropriate water control structures e.g. weirs, sandbags, etc. in fields, and water gates at the discharge points of main drains (RSPO Criteria 4.4 and 7.4)		
	7.8.6 (old 4.3b.4 partially) All areas of undeveloped peatlands in the managed area (regardless of depth) are protected; new drainage, road building and power lines on peat soils is prohibited; and peatlands are managed at least to the standard in the RSPO Best Management Practices for Management and Rehabilitation of Natural Vegetation associated with Oil Palm cultivation on Peat ("BMP") - version 2, xx 2018).		1.2.2 Fires and road-building on peat soils are prohibited.	NO	RSPO 7.8.6 does not mention fire here, but elsewhere. However, POIG does not differentiate between undeveloped and developed plantations for the prohibition of road building and fire, whereas RSPO only mentions undeveloped peatlands for the prohibition of road-building. It seems that there needs to be a clear definition of road-building. It may be that RSPO believes that road-building in developed peatland plantation would not be necessary given that all the roads needed may already be built. If roads in developed peatland plantations need to be refurbished, would POIG see that as "roadbuilding"?
			1.2.7 A report will be made public that includes assessments and maps of all peatlands (of any depth) within the company land bank, critical peatland ecosystems, planted	PARTIALLY	RSPO would require that the information collected in 7.8.2 and 7.8.3 would be public, however the categories of assessments and maps are different from POIG. There is no mention of critical peatland ecosystems, or areas identified for restoration.

			peatlands, and degraded or planted areas identified for peatland restoration.		
7.9 (old 4.4) Practices maintain the quality and availability of surface and ground water.	7.9.1 (old 4.4.1 & SPG) An implemented water management plan is in place to promote more efficient use and continued availability of water sources and to avoid negative impacts on other users in the catchment including contamination of surface or ground water as well as aim to ensure communities and workers have adequate access to clean water sources.	<u>1.7 Water accountability</u> The quality and quantity of water is maintained with responsible water management adopted including minimisation and disclosure of water use, pollution elimination, equity with other users, and consideration of catchment level impacts of irrigation.	1.7.1 Water use, consumption and pollution by plantation operations and mills are monitored.	PARTIALLY	RSPO 7.9.4 requires mill water use per tonne of FFB and mill effluent monitoring, however there is no provision for water use on the plantations.
	7.9.2 (old 4.4.2) Water courses and wetlands are protected, including maintaining and restoring appropriate riparian and other buffer zones in line with RSPO BMP for Management of Riparian Reserve).		1.7.2 The water management plan includes targets and measures to minimise and/or reduce water use, consumption, and pollution, including in both plantations and mills.		NO
	7.9.3 (old 4.4.3) Mill effluent is treated to required levels and regular monitoring of discharge quality, especially Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD), is in compliance with national regulations.		1.7.3 Water use, consumption and pollution by plantations and mills are included in public reporting.	PARTIALLY	RSPO 1.1.1 requires public reporting for management documents. It is not clear if documents that contain monitoring data would be public.
	7.9.4 (old 4.4.4) Mill water use per tonne of Fresh Fruit Bunches (FFB) is monitored.		1.7.4 A water stewardship assessment is undertaken involving relevant stakeholders to address water equity issues.	NO	RSPO has nothing regarding POIG 1.7.4.

<p>7.10 (old 5.4) <i>Efficiency of fossil fuel use and the use of renewable energy is optimised.</i></p>	<p>7.10.1 (old 5.4.1) A plan for improving efficiency of the use of fossil fuels and to optimise renewable energy is in place and monitored.</p>	<p>No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found</p>		<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>7.11 (old 5.6 & 7.8) <i>Plans to reduce pollution and emissions, including greenhouse gases, are developed, implemented and monitored and new developments are designed to minimize GHG emissions.</i></p>	<p>7.11.1 (old 5.6.1) Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are identified and assessed. Plans to reduce or minimise them are implemented, monitored through the Palm GHG calculator and publicly reported.</p>	<p><u>1.3 Greenhouse gas (GHG) accountability</u> Companies shall publicly report on annual GHG emissions from all sources and on the progress towards reaching targeted reductions of non-land use GHG emissions (per tonne of CPO).</p>	<p>1.3.1 All sources of GHG emissions, including those related to land use and non-land use activities, are identified and monitored using the RSPO PalmGHG methodology or equivalent.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>RSPO 7.11.1 requires that GHG emissions be identified, assessed and monitored.</p>
	<p>7.11.2 (old 7.8.1 & 7.8.2) Starting 2014, the carbon stock of the proposed development area and major potential sources of emissions that may result directly from the development are estimated and a plan to minimize them prepared and implemented (following the RSPO GHG Assessment Procedure for New Development).</p>		<p>1.3.2 Targeted reductions of non-land use related GHG emissions (per tonne of CPO) and/or targeted adoption of technologies or techniques which reduce global emissions of CO₂eq are defined and documented.</p>	<p>PARTIALLY</p>	<p>RSPO 7.11.1 requires reducing or minimising GHG emissions, but sets no targets.</p>
	<p>7.11.3 (old 5.6.2) Other significant pollutants are identified, and plans to reduce or minimize them implemented.</p>		<p>1.3.3 Annual GHG emissions from all sources and progress towards the targets documented in 1.3.2 are publicly reported.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>RSPO 7.11.1 requires public reporting of emissions, but there are no "targets", only to either have some reduction or minimisation.</p>

<p>7.12 (old 5.5 & 7.7) Fire is not used for preparing land and is prevented in the managed area</p>	<p>7.12.1 (old 5.5.1) Land for new planting or replanting is not prepared by burning.</p> <p>7.12.2 (old 5.5.2) Growers should establish fire prevention and control measures for the managed area including engagement with adjacent stakeholders.</p>	<p>No specific corresponding requirement/POIG indicator(s) found</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	---	---	-------------------	-------------------

Note for public consultation for 7.13

A formal RSPO No Deforestation Task Force/Working Group will be constituted to oversee implementation of the RSPO No-deforestation work including:

- Review use of High Carbon Stock Approach (HCSA) toolkit and associated procedures in countries with fragmented tropical moist forest landscapes, including
 - o Propose governance processes
 - o Feedback and lessons from initial application
- Oversee implementation of the RSPO High Forest Cover (HFC) procedure and review where it may be applied.
- Defining rules for local community and legacy case eligibility
- Review experience in implementing RSPO HFC procedure and make adjustments as necessary.
- Provide guidance on capacity development and procedures to address non-compliances.
- Monitor and report on progress implementation of the RSPO No-deforestation work
- Guidance on implementation, audit checklists and cross link with current best practice
- Guidance on landscape level application (in alignment with Jurisdictional certification approach)
- Identification of changes needed to the New Planting Procedure (NPP) to incorporate Criterion 7.13
- Development of procedures to address non-conformities.

Review: The effectiveness of guidance and methodology to be reviewed 2 years after adoption.

Preamble for 7.13:

The RSPO Criterion 7.13 integrates previous Criteria 5.2 and 7.3 and aims to balance the need for development, poverty alleviation and community livelihoods in high forest cover (HFC) countries; with the aim to reduce deforestation in high carbon stock forests. There will be monitoring and a review of the impacts of implementation of Criterion 7.13 within 2 years of endorsement of the P&C (Nov 2018). A timebound limit on the application of 7.13.2.2 and 7.13.2.3 may also be needed.

<p><i>Criterion 7.13 New plantings do not cause deforestation or replace any area required to maintain or enhance High Conservation Values (HCVs). High conservation values and high carbon stock forests in the managed area are identified, maintained and enhanced.</i></p>		<p><u>1.1 High Carbon Stock and High Conservation Values</u> The link between oil palm expansion and deforestation will be broken through undertaking a High Carbon Stock (HCS) approach in addition to a High Conservation Value (HCV) assessment, and a process of obtaining Free, Prior and Informed Consent to use land. The approach combines biodiversity and carbon conservation, as well as social considerations (including community needs)</p>		PARTIALLY	<p>At the general principle and criterion level, the RSPO largely meets the POIG indicator 1.1, but with the significant difference that RSPO have proposed exemptions for High Forest Cover country situations, and their stated aim is to only 'reduce deforestation' rather than 'break the link' i.e. halt, in POIG.</p>
	<p>7.13.1 For existing plantations and NPPs submitted prior to Nov 2018, a comprehensive HCV assessment, including stakeholder consultation is conducted following the RSPO endorsed procedures and taking into account wider landscape-level considerations.</p> <p>7.13.2 For NPPs submitted after Nov 2018, high carbon stock forests and high conservation values are identified through an integrated RSPO endorsed methodology, as follows:</p>		<p>1.1.1 Prior to establishing new plantations or expanding existing ones, in addition to or integrated with a HCV assessment, a HCS approach which combines biodiversity, carbon conservation and social considerations (including community needs) has been conducted.</p>	PARTIALLY	<p>POIG does not specify dates. RSPO 7.13.1. HCS is not included in assessment for existing plantations prior to November 2018. Unclear what 'taking into account wider landscape-level considerations' means in practice.</p> <p>RSPO also includes stakeholder consultation, which would take into account social considerations and community needs.</p> <p>RSPO 7.13.2 does include HCS assessment, but only after November 2018.</p>
	<p>7.13.2.1 The High Carbon Stock Approach (HCSA) Toolkit and the Integrated HCV-HCSA Assessment Manual (November 2017 or updated version) are used.</p> <p>7.13.2.2 In high forest cover (HFC) landscapes in HFC countries, only local communities are eligible to conduct limited development in accordance</p>		<p>1.1.3 After March 2014 no new plantings take place in HCS forest areas identified for conservation.</p>	NO	<p>The HCS/HCV assessment in RSPO 7.13.2.1 would include identification and mapping of HCS forest areas. RSPO HFC exemptions allow for HCS forest areas identified to be converted. Also, POIG has an earlier cut-off date than RSPO's proposed date of November 2018.</p>

	<p>with the RSPO HFC procedure. [See note for public consultation above.]</p> <p>7.13.2.3 In HFC landscapes in HFC countries legacy cases will be reviewed based on RSPO HFC procedure. [See note for public consultation above.]</p>				<p>RSPO 7.13.2.2 would allow continued deforestation of HCS forest and is not consistent with the only accepted HCS methodology, the HCS Approach.</p> <p>RSPO 7.13.3 would allow continued deforestation of HCS forest and is not consistent with the only accepted HCS methodology, the HCS Approach.</p>
	<p>7.13.3 New plantings since 2005 do not replace primary forest or any area required to maintain or enhance HCVs and new plantings after 2018 do not replace high carbon stock forests. A historic land use change analysis is conducted prior to any new plantings as part of NPP, in accordance with the RSPO Land Use Change Analysis (LUCA) guidance document.</p>		<p>1.1.1 Prior to establishing new plantations or expanding existing ones, in addition to or integrated with a HCV assessment, a HCS approach which combines biodiversity, carbon conservation and social considerations (including community needs) has been conducted.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>It appears that with the addition of indicator 7.13.3 much of the protection for HCS is achieved.</p>
	<p>7.13.4 Where there has been land clearing without prior HCV assessment since November 2005, the Remediation and Compensation Procedure (RaCP) applies.</p>		<p>1.1.6 A summary report of the HCS assessment including maps is made public.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>If assessments are considered management documents, then RSPO 1.1.1 would require it to be public.</p>
	<p>7.13.5 Where HCV, HCS and other set-aside areas have been identified, an integrated management plan to maintain and/or enhance them is developed and implemented, monitored and reviewed regularly through a participatory approach, to include the managed area and relevant wider landscape level considerations in consultation with relevant stakeholders.</p>		<p>1.1.4 Community participatory mapping has identified and mapped garden and future farmlands that are fundamental to meeting their basic food needs over the license period</p>	<p>PARTIALLY</p>	<p>RSPO 7.13.5 and POIG 1.1.4 has compatible elements. POIG is more specific about what is assessed in terms of community participation. RSPO allows for a broader participation in assessing set-aside areas. Adding RSPO 7.13.6 also allows</p>

			of the plantation, and excluded them from being considered HCS forest.		for recognition of community rights and participation.
	7.13.6 Where existing rights of local communities have been identified in HCV, HCS and other set-asides, there is evidence of a negotiated agreement that optimally safeguards both the HCVs and these rights.		1.1.5 HCS forest areas are actively conserved as part of a community participatory land use plan including FPIC, and an integrated conservation and land use plan (that includes HCV areas, riparian zones, and peat land areas).	YES	RSPO 7.13.6 and POIG 1.1.5 are compatible
	7.13.7 The implementation of the management plan is regularly monitored and reviewed, including documentation of the status of HCVs, HCS, peatland areas and RTE species. Outcomes of monitoring are fed back into the management plan.				
	7.13.8 Land preparation only commences after approval of the NPP notice of completion.				
		<u>1.8 Protect and conserve wildlife</u> Following comprehensive biodiversity surveys to identify HCV 1-3, in	1.8.1 Comprehensive biodiversity surveys to identify HCV 1-3 have been undertaken.	YES	If the HCV assessment under RSPO 7.13.1 is done properly, HCV 1-3 would be assessed and identified.

		<p>addition to ensuring the protection and survival of all rare, threatened or endangered species (RTE) within their concession land, concession holders also make a positive contribution to their survival in the wild in areas beyond the concession.</p>	<p>1.8.2 Management plans for all rare, threatened or endangered species include actions for their protection, survival, and prevention of poaching, in the landscape outside the management area.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>RSPO 7.13.7 provides for management plans and monitoring of the status of RTE species, however, it does not specifically provide for actions to be taken to protect and enhance the survival chances of the RTE species nor the prevention of poaching thereof.</p>
			<p>1.8.3 The RTE management plan takes into consideration traditional hunting by communities outside the management area and includes specific activities to contribute to the protection and survival of RTE species affected by hunting.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>RSPO does not consider hunting and protection measures to ensure survival of RTE species.</p>

Proposed definition:

HFC countries: Defined using the RSPO procedure [>60% forest cover, <1% oil palm of total land area using the most up-to-date forest cover data, historically low but increasing deforestation trajectory, known palm frontier area] currently including Democratic Republic of Congo, Gabon, Liberia, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Republic of Congo and Solomon Islands.² West Papua and Papua provinces in Indonesia are also included on a provisional basis given the current business as usual deforestation trajectory, as a way of allowing the RSPO to influence a transition to an alternative development pathway that safeguards forests and stops deforestation as soon as possible.

Local community land: land where indigenous peoples or local communities (as defined in P&C 2013) legally own or have customary rights to the land.

Legacy cases: lands directly owned or controlled by an RSPO member at the date of endorsement of this standard [GA 2018] where an ongoing RSPO process for new development can be demonstrated and registered with RSPO within 6 months of the endorsement date.

Proposed guiding principles for implementation:

These guiding principles will be fully developed into comprehensive guidelines by the RSPO HFC Working Group prior to November 2018.

Local community land

In local community lands in HFC landscapes in HFC countries, development must be initiated only by the local community. Companies working in these areas must work in collaboration with the local community. Local communities will continue to own and maintain their right to manage the land; development may be assisted by a company under the following conditions:

- There must be demonstrable benefits to the local community.
- Clear recognition of legal and customary lands by the company, based on participatory land use planning
- HCVs and HCS forests are identified and there is a process of FPIC
- Medium Density Forest and High Density Forest vegetation classes are not converted for new plantings [using HCSA classes]
- Development and implementation of an integrated conservation and land use plan (using RSPO methodology drawing on HCSA Toolkit) that ensures a develop:conserve ratio of at least 1:1 and the maintenance of areas for community livelihoods and food security.
- Clear and documented participation of communities in the development and implementation of a mutually-agreed integrated conservation and land use plan
- Local food security is assured
- There is a welfare baseline and projection of alternative sources of income, showing predicted gains from palm oil development compared to the alternatives
- Carbon neutrality
- All HCVs and other conservation areas are managed and maintained in line with the HCV Common Guidance on Management and Monitoring
- Strategic social and environmental impact assessment takes into account the broader impacts across the landscape to take into account impacts of infrastructure (cross reference to combined old 5.1/ 6.1/ 7.1)

Legacy cases

In legacy cases within HFC landscapes in HFC countries, there will be:

- Integrated HCV-HCS-FPIC assessment
- Medium Density Forest and High-Density Forest vegetation classes are not converted for new plantings [using HCSA classes]
- Development and implementation of an integrated conservation and land use plan (using RSPO methodology drawing on HCSA Toolkit, and ensuring a develop: conserve ratio of at least 1:1 and the maintenance of all community use areas)
- All HCVs and other conservation areas are managed and maintained in line with the HCV Common Guidance on Management and Monitoring
- Carbon neutrality (using RSPO GHG assessment procedure for new developments)
- A mutually agreed decision-making process with affected communities
- Strategic social and environmental impact assessment takes into account the broader impacts across the landscape to take into account impacts of infrastructure (cross reference to combined old 5.1/ 6.1/ 7.1)