A COMPARISON OF LEADING PALM OIL CERTIFICATION STANDARDS
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – PALM OIL COMPARATIVE STUDY

This study compares the world’s principal oil palm sustainability standards (RSPO, ISCC, ISPO, MSPO, SAN, HCS and RSB) by measuring them against a comprehensive set of over 39 social and human rights indicators within six different themes.

Methodology
The study is based on the requirements offered in each of the certification schemes tested. Forest Peoples Programme (FPP) identified a total of 39 different indicators, across six key themes, ranging from protection of human rights defenders to requirements pertaining to minimum wage for workers. Depending on the provisions of the certification standard, each one of them was given a score between 0 and 3 based on the depth, detail, and stringency of requirements for compliance.

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Strong and clear requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Theme is addressed but requirements less clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theme is not directly addressed and/or requirements are not clearly defined or comparatively lenient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Theme is not addressed and/or no clearly defined requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, when testing the standard strength against the indicator “Rights to water”, RSB standard scored 3 points, RSPO scored 2 points, HCS approach scored 1 point and ISPO scored 0 points.

3 points: RSB standard, criteria 9d states “Operations shall contribute to the enhancement or maintaining of the quality of the surface and ground water resources”, furthermore, it includes a number of minimum requirements relating to this criterion including minimum requirement 6 which asserts “for existing operation, degradation of water resources that occurred prior to certification and for which the participating operator is directly accountable shall be reversed. Wherever applicable, operators shall participate in projects that aim to improve water quality at a watershed scale”. Such detailed and clear requirements earned the RSB standard 3 points.

2 points: RSPO standard, criteria 4.4 states “Practices maintain quality and availability of surface and ground...”
of consultation, thus respecting indigenous peoples’
right to self-determination.

Other standards fall between these two extremes. ISCC
does not require participatory mapping. SAN only requires
FPIC in critical activities when use rights are affected and
not in all communications with indigenous peoples. MSPO
lacks an explicit requirement to prevent coercion outside
of the context of FPIC. The absence of a requirement in
RSPO standard for all communication with communities to
be recorded makes it weaker than RSPO standard which
provides the strongest safeguard for indigenous rights.

Treatment of smallholders was scored against four
indicators which took into account smallholders’ access
to fair credit, their ability to access markets to sell their
Fresh Fruit Bunches (FFB) and whether the standard
gives provisions to ensure smallholders are paid fair
prices for their FFB.

Much improvement is needed across the board. HCS
approach has yet to be adapted to smallholders, whilst
ISPO has no requirements at all for smallholder contracts.
MSPO is only slightly better in requiring all smallholders to
receive training to improve productivity. Meanwhile RSB
provides its own smallholder standard with its own set of
restrictions which only serve to limit their access to markets
and fair treatment. Alarmingly, none of the standards require
fair credit to smallholders, where instead credit has been
decided without involving farmers in a participatory manner.

Standards must also be reformed if smallholder palm
oil productivity is to grow while mitigating negative
social and environmental impacts. Even though RSPO
has broader and more tightly defined requirements on
growers’ responsibilities towards smallholders, the
significant shortfall between the costs for smallholders of
compliance with RSPO standards, their ability to
secure fair credit, and to get access to higher premium
markets creates a disincentive for smallholders to
become certified or maintain their certificates.

Social and environmental safeguards were judged
against eight indicators including participatory
social and environmental impact assessments, rights
to water, protection of human rights defenders and
whether the standards offered conditions for providing
community development.

In terms of environmental standards, ISCC provides the
most restrictive safeguards particularly when addressing
peat land conversion, while RSPO is stronger on the social
impact of oil palm. MSPO provides strict standards for
plantation management while ISPO is based on existing
Indonesian regulations that pertain to palm oil cultivation
and processing and is by far the weakest at reducing the
negative environmental and social impacts of oil palm.

RSPO standard, by comparison, provides some of the most
restrictive requirements on land use rights, customary
rights, core labour standards and the rights and wellbeing
of people affected by plantations. RSPO standard also has
a lot of similarities with RSPO standard and is the most
progressive in its approach to food security and water rights,
something which should be mirrored in all the standards.

It is worth noting that RSPO is the only standard
pioneering work on human rights defenders although
the resolution, passed in November 2016, requiring the
adoption of a mechanism to protect human rights
defenders has yet to be acted on.

Core Labour Standards were assessed against eight
indicators including commitments to no child labour, no
slavery-like practices, as well as requirements pertaining
to minimum wage, protection of migrant workers and free
collective bargaining.

Almost all standards have strong provisions for employee
contracts that must be fair and clearly understood,
provide minimum wage requirements, support workers’
rights to form trade unions and bargain collectively.
However, overall relatively weak protections are offered
to migrant workers, something especially troubling given
the high reliance on plantations on migrant labour.

ISPO is noticeably poor on labour standards which
raises concern about the exploitation of workers within
Indonesia particularly considering reports of forced and
child labour on plantations.1 The standard simply states
that child labour is prohibited, but offers no further details
on the restrictions for different age groups or even until
what age one is considered a child.

Gender and discrimination looks specifically at
provisions for gender sensitive complaints procedures,
the protection of reproductive rights, and no
discrimination and sexual harassment commitments.

ISC, RSB, ISPO and MSPO do not have any criteria
specifically aimed at supporting women but they do
include gender in their categories for which discrimination
is not permitted. RSPO and HCS are the only standards
that have a policy specifically aimed at protecting
women from sexual harassment in the workplace and
at supporting their reproductive rights. Both standards
also state the need to have a company policy specifically
aimed at addressing gender-based abuses.

All standards have mandatory criteria prohibiting
discrimination, but definitions of what constitutes
discrimination vary widely. Whilst RSPO, ISCC and HCS
require publicly available equal opportunity policies,
ISPO and MSPO require more generic commitments from
companies which are requested not to engage or support
discriminatory practices (there is no mention of whether
or not these should be made public).

Quality Assurance scored certification schemes against
five indicators including requirements to provide
independent third-party verification of adherence to the
schemes' principles and criteria, to accredit certification
bodies and to include formal public consultations during
the audit process.

1 Amnesty International. The Great Palm Oil Scandal: Labour Abuses Behind Big Brand Names, Amnesty International (2016), London.
RSB, ISCC, SAN and RSPO apply a two-tiered system involving various certification and accreditation bodies. SAN and ISCC, on the other hand, do not allow for public summaries of the audit reports to be produced. ISPO and MSPO also rely upon accredited third-party certification bodies to conduct audits, but it is the ISPO and MSPO commissions respectively that issue certificates based on reviews of audit reports. Both commissions maintain an elevated level of control over the entire certification process, which does raise questions about transparency and the independence of supply chain verification.

Audit quality remains a major challenge for many certification systems. The level of ambiguity which arises in the implementation of standards is deeply concerning as well as the apparent disparity between principles and criteria and their interpretation by certification bodies.

Another serious gap across all standards is the lack of a clear requirement to include a formal public consultation during the audit process. It is vital that all key stakeholders are independently interviewed during the audit process to provide a complete picture of a company’s performance.

Access to remedy scored standards against their ability to provide fair and transparent grievance and complaints mechanisms, indicators included the presence of an appeals procedure, ombudsman type processes and how the standard addressed land disputes.

RSPO, HCS, MSPO, RSB, ISPO and ISCC have established complaints procedures. Surprisingly, SAN provides no materials on how this remedy can be obtained unless at the micro- level through the farms grievance procedure. Details of the systems and timelines for resolution vary widely across the standards, where RSPO and ISCC offer appeals procedures and ombudsman type processes for mediation whilst MSPO and ISPO rely on national laws and bodies to deliver redress and compensation. In terms of land disputes, all the standards except ISCC and ISPO turn to the FPIC standard to safeguard land rights. If these two standards are to provide protection to land rights holders this process must be integrated into their certification schemes.

In general, the grievance mechanism is best defined within the RSPO system which has undergone a process of evolution based on the past decade of experience and implementation of the standards principles and criteria, providing on-line status updates of cases and a relatively high-level of transparency throughout the complaints process.

**Conclusion**

The principal finding of the study is that the RSPO has the most robust scheme for certification whilst the ISPO has the weakest certification process and carries the least requirements on social issues. Despite the strength of elements of ISCC and SAN standards not all the criteria are mandatory, whilst RSPO, ISPO and MSPO require compliance with their principles and criteria to successfully achieve certification. These considerations have been taken into account when analysing the strength of each corresponding provision.

MSPO and ISPO, whilst requiring compliance with their respective national legal frameworks, do not provide the same level of protection that multi-stakeholder international certification schemes offer. This is most apparent in the way in which ISPO and MSPO standards provide very weak access to remedy compared to the complex multi-tiered approach of multi-stakeholders initiatives to ensure that certification holders comply with criteria set out in the standards.

The RSB standard has a lot of similarities with RSP standard, falling short on the protection of women and migrant workers. Both standards offer the most comprehensive and nuanced approach to human rights protections and social safeguards across the schemes explored, with detailed and thoroughly explained requirements for compliance, reflecting a broad consideration of the social issues facing the industry and communities affected by it.

The HCS Approach is not a stand-alone certification scheme but has been included in this review as its standard may apply to uncertified producers that are supply companies seeking to demonstrate their compliance with No Deforestation, No Peat, No Exploitation commitments. HCA Approach draws heavily on RSPO principles and criteria but to date lacks a clearly defined mechanism to ensure the calibre of social assessments. Furthermore, the approach does not yet provide standards on the treatment of smallholders, a shortcoming common across the certification scheme landscape. Standards must address this core challenge to provide credible protection and acknowledge smallholder realities.

FPF concludes that on paper the RSPO should be the standard of choice when it comes to palm oil certification. Building on its experience over the last ten years of implementation, RSPO now provides the most robust standard for palm oil certification, although as the study reveals there are still some gaps. The main challenges for RSPO are ensuring RSPO members actually apply the standard in practice and the unreliability of challenge and remedy procedures when non-compliances are identified.

**What next?**

These differences caution against drawing conclusions about the impact of different standards on the ground. FPF notes that there is a significant shortfall in practice of certification schemes upholping and enforcing their standards. Despite RSPO being the most outspoken on the issue of gender, for instance, evidence from analysis of RSPO audits and NGO investigations suggest that abuses regarding terms and conditions of oil palm plantation workers, including gender discrimination, continue to be widespread. ²

The RSPO NEXT, a set of ‘add on’ criteria to bolster RSPO standard, and the development of the POIG certification are encouraging steps forward for the industry. POIG outlines specific requirements to strengthen food security and more detailed indicators related to workers’ rights in order to address the rising incidence of forced or child labour. RSPO NEXT, on the other hand, tackles the growing inequalities faced by migrant workers and offers a forward-looking approach to eradicating gender discrimination and harassment.

Both these new standards attempt to address the question of protecting smallholders’ rights whilst ensuring that they also respect human rights. POIG articulates specific guidance on smallholder support, including the development of a group certification plan, something echoed in the RSPO NEXT through its outreach program. POIG crucially requires companies to develop a strategy for smallholder inclusion in the supply chain which is a positive step forward for the development of smallholders.

**Recommendations for RSPO**

In view of the next revision in RSPO Principles and Criteria and accompanying Certification Systems document, which is to be concluded in 2018, FPF highlights some key areas of needed improvement:

- **Audits:** To avoid the current conflict of interest experienced by auditors who are directly paid by the companies they are verifying, audits should be paid out of an ESCROW fund into which the companies seeking certification pay their contributions. RSPO or a fourth party should choose which audit teams are allocated to which companies and arrange for them to be paid from the ESCROW account.

- **Remedy:** The provision of remedy to the communities remains elusive for the loss of lands taken or damaged and their resulting economic and environmental losses. To bring itself into compliance with the norms for non-judicial remedies set out by the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, a mechanism to hold RSPO certified companies accountable for human rights violations and other damages (even if the company ceases to be RSPO-certified) is required. We recommend the use of a bond. The bond would act as an agreement between the certificate holder and RSPO to uphold the standard’s principles and to provide remedy to a third party in circumstances where these are violated.

- **Human rights defenders:** By using RSPO complaints procedures, communities have been able to expose land grabbing, violations of standards and human rights abuses. This has allowed dialogues between
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INTRODUCTION

Presented below is a structured, in-depth comparison of environmental and social requirements of the leading palm oil certification standards. The study highlights areas of commonality and difference, and draws attention to noticeable gaps in each of the standards human rights obligations. Our aim is to determine which of these standards provides the most comprehensive coverage of social safeguards.

To make the comparison accessible, a theme-based approach has been used, in which certification criteria are organized around 40 indicators reflecting priorities in terms of protection of customary rights, the fair treatment of smallholders, core labour standards, quality assurance and access to remedy.

The comparison has been divided into two parts. The first part compares eight different global certification standards where a quick-view, high-level scoring of standards is provided, capturing overall features of how the standards compare. The second part looks at two new certification schemes RSPO NEXT and POIG which are not stand-alone standards but build on the work of RSPO.

Executive Summary

companies and the communities, but has also resulted in the harassment and criminalisation of community spokespersons and complainants. Proper protection mechanisms must be put in place to avoid escalations of violence.

- **Smallholder protection**: Promote the development of support mechanisms to reduce the barriers for smallholders to adopt sustainable production practices and RSPO certification.

- **RSPO governance**: Indigenous people are poorly represented in RSPO scheme’s governance, we recommend the establishment of a Permanent Indigenous Peoples Committee which liaises with RSPO’s Board of Representatives to mirror similar structures found in Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and the Aluminium Sustainability Initiative (ASI).

**Disclaimer:** This review has been carried out as a desk-based study of the documents that are available through the websites of the various schemes. Some schemes’ websites are quite hard to navigate and so this review may have omitted reviewing some documents. We also recognise that all the schemes examined are constantly evolving, so the findings soon go out of date. The views expressed are those of FPP and do not imply any endorsement of the findings by other parties or by the sources cited. FPP would welcome any comments on this report. Comments should be sent to: info@forestpeoples.org with the subject line: comparative study.
BACKGROUND ON EACH STANDARD

**Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO)**
RSPO was formed in 2004 with the objective of promoting the growth and usage of sustainable palm oil products through credible international standards. It adopted its first Principles and Criteria (P&C) in 2005, revised them in 2007, and again in 2013. They comprise of eight basic principles. The P&C’s require compliance with key indicators (‘majors’) of all criteria to gain RSPO certification. To claim compliance with the P&C and achieve RSPO certification, growers must be assessed by a third-party RSPO-accredited certification body every five years, with an annual audit for continued compliance.

**Malaysian Sustainable Palm Oil (MSPO)**
The Malaysian standard was published in September 2013. MSPO provides general principles for the implementation, establishment and improvement of the operational practices of a sustainability system incorporated in Malaysia to ensure the sustainable production of palm oil. Like the ISPO, the standard is strongly aligned with existing national legal and regulatory requirements. This standard currently covers the oil palm industry supply chain comprising independent and organised smallholders, plantations and oil palm mills. It requires full compliance with all criteria to gain MSPO certification.

**Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO)**
ISPO was established on 6th July 2009 to implement a certification policy system designed by the Indonesian Ministry of Agriculture. In 2011 Indonesia’s Ministry of Agriculture decreed the mandatory Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO) standard. Under ISPO, all producers must bring operations into compliance with the standard by 2014, or face risk of losing their license to operate. ISPO is now part of the wider Sustainable Palm Oil (SPO) initiative, developed with the support of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

By design, ISPO criteria are strongly aligned with existing legal and regulatory requirements, and for this reason it is sometimes referred to as Indonesia’s “legality standard” for palm oil. It requires full compliance with all criteria to gain ISPO certification.

**International Sustainability & Carbon Certification (ISCC)**
ISCC is a biomass standard, it was fully financed by a government agency (German Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection) until 2012 when it became independent. ISCC is a system for certifying the biomass and bioenergy industries, oriented towards the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, sustainable land use, protection of the natural biosphere and social sustainability. We focus on two ISCC certifications – ISCC EU and ISCC PLUS. Only a subset of specified criteria must be met to achieve ISCC certification - It divides its criteria into ‘major’ and ‘minor’ musts, where all major and at least 60% of minor musts shall be met to achieve certification.

ISCC EU, a certification scheme developed in 2011, was the first certification standard to demonstrate compliance with EU Renewable Energy Directive (RED) requirements1 which aims to ensure that biomass is not produced at the expense of valuable natural habitats. ISCC PLUS standard was published in 2012, and allows producers under the ISCC EU to convert to certified food. The system currently certifies over 3,000 operations worldwide, of which at least 300 are palm related.

Both standards have been assessed and included within the evaluation of ISCC standard.

**Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials (RSB)**
RSB was established in 2007. It launched its global certification system in 2011 as a set of comprehensive sustainability criteria to encourage the sustainable production of biofuels and other biomaterials. In 2013, it increased its scope to include all biomaterials. It was originally launched as a partnership between WWF and biofuel/feedstock producers and was administered by the University of Lausanne. RSB’s minimum requirements require full compliance. Not all the principles and criteria apply equally to all operators. RSB recognises the SAN standard which is implemented by the Rainforest Alliance. Like ISCC, RSB certificates are recognised by the EU’s RED initiative.

**High Carbon Stocks Approach (HCS)**
The HCS Approach is a methodology designed to enable companies to put their no deforestation commitments into practice in their operations and supply chains. The HCS Approach calls for the rigorous implementation of High Conservation Value (HCV) assessment, and mapping of peatland and riparian areas. It integrates Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) processes for the recognition of rights and interests of local communities.

The HCS Approach identifies types of HCS forest class that require protection and prioritizes the allocation of two degraded land classes (low-carbon scrub areas and open land) for any proposed development.

It is not conceived as a stand-alone certification system but, as its social requirements are designed to be applied to companies that are not part of certification schemes, it is assessed here against the other schemes. In practice, most palm oil companies so far applying the HCS Approach in their own operations are also RSPO members.

---

METHODOLOGY

The study is based on a comprehensive analysis of the principles and criteria (and supporting documentation) of nine palm oil certification schemes. FPP evaluated the requirements of each certification scheme’s standard, and the strength of each standard quality assurance.

Each standard’s strength was evaluated – the requirements that palm oil operations need to fulfill to become certified or recognized. This covers social and environmental safeguards, protections for customary rights, provisions for smallholders to ensure fair treatment and policies relating to discrimination and gender. The quality assurance of each standard was considered i.e. the rules and procedures that regulate how the standard is implemented, assessed and governed. This includes how the standard is audited and verified, the control of the certification bodies, scheme governance and grievance procedures.

FPP identified a total of 36 different indicators, across six key themes, ranging from protection of human rights defenders to requirements pertaining to minimum wage for workers. Depending on the provisions of the certification standard, each certification standard was given a score between 0 and 3 based on the depth, detail, and stringency of requirements for compliance.

Treatment of each indicator was scored in accordance with the following scoring methodology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong and clear requirements</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme is addressed but requirements less clear</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme is not directly addressed and/or requirements are not clearly defined or comparatively lenient</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme is not addressed and/or no clearly defined requirements</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, when testing the standard strength against the indicator “Rights to water”, RSB standard scored 3 points, RSPO scored 2 points, HCS approach scored 1 point and ISPO scored 0 points.

3 points: RSB standard, criteria 9d states “Operations shall contribute to the enhancement or maintaining of the quality of the surface and ground water resources”, furthermore, it includes a number of minimum requirements relating to this criterion including minimum requirement 6 which asserts “for existing operation, degradation of water resources that occurred prior to certification and for which the participating operator is directly accountable shall be reversed. Wherever applicable, operators shall participate in projects that aim to improve water quality at a watershed scale”. Such detailed and clear requirements earned the RSB standard 3 points.

2 points: RSPO standard, criteria 4.4 states “Practices maintain quality and availability of surface and ground water, the water management plan will aim to ensure local communities, workers and their families have access to adequate, clean water for drinking, cooking, bathing and cleaning purposes.” Whilst the indicator has been addressed, the specific requirements put on companies is less clear. Companies should aim to provide clean water, yet, there is no requirement to enhance the quality of water. As a result, the RSPO scored 2 points.

1 point: HCS approach, module 2.1 (social and baseline study) states “Access to water, health and education facilities and other social and economic infrastructure shall be considered… the social baseline study shall take into account the potential impacts of the proposed development of…water quality and availability…over the time frame of the development”. Water rights are only considered there is no requirement to maintain or enhance water quality, thus it is judged that the requirement is comparatively lenient and only scores 1 point.

0 points: ISPO standard only states within it that “water is to be monitored”. There are no clearly defined requirements. MSPO standard does not mention water rights either explicitly or implicitly and as a result also scores 0 points.

When testing the indicator quality assurance against each of the standards, RSPO scored 3 points, ISCC scored 2 points, ISPO scored 1 point.

3 points: Within the RSPO standard, public summaries of audit reports are available on the RSPO website. RSPO passed a resolution in November 2015 that committed the organization to ensuring the quality, oversight and credibility of RSPO assessments by developing clear and mandatory guidelines and to improve the quality and performance of all RSPO Certification Body’s auditors and 3rd party assessors.

2 points: ISCC requires all six of its principles to be fulfilled and audited. Under ISCC, compliance with the standard is evaluated and certificates issued by accredited third-party certification bodies. Although in 2016, it was agreed summaries of audit reports will be made publicly available for each issued certificate, this has yet to come into effect. Whilst the indicator has been addressed, the lack of realization of public summaries means that the standard scores 2 points (as it does not offer the same level of stringency as the RSPO standard).

1 point: Within the ISPO framework, plantation and environmental management practices are assessed by independent third-party auditors (from a government approved certification body). ISPO audits are undertaken in two stages, the first stage is an audit requiring compliance with all legal plantation licences, the second stage is a full plantation audit assessing all documentation concerning adherence to ISPO’s Principles and Criteria. ISPO Commission itself, not the certification bodies, issues certificates based on reviews of audit reports and recommendations provided by the certification body. However, there are no public summaries of these audit reports. Whilst the indicator is addressed, it is unclear how the audit process can undergo public scrutiny introducing a high level of leniency to the process.

Information sources used were current standard documents as well as publicly available information, or accessible via standard organization’s homepages and other relevant external organisations’ websites.
## SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

### A. Customary Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RSPO</th>
<th>RSB</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>ISCC</th>
<th>HCS</th>
<th>MSPO</th>
<th>ISPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legality</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customary Rights</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Tenure Study</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participatory Mapping</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Free Prior Informed Consent</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiated Agreements</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Information</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Coercion</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legal Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RSPO</th>
<th>RSB</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>ISCC</th>
<th>HCS</th>
<th>MSPO</th>
<th>ISPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customary Rights</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Tenure Study</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participatory Mapping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Free Prior Informed Consent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiated Agreements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Coercion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSPO</th>
<th>RSB</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>ISCC</th>
<th>HCS</th>
<th>MSPO</th>
<th>ISPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- **Legality**
  - **3 points**: RSPO is explicit in its legal compliance requirement. A principle is dedicated to legality accompanied by an appendix listing social and environmental treaties applicable to countries that have signed them. ISCC has a similarly all-encompassing principle for legality, its social and labor criteria closely mirror core ILO standards but this similarity is not made explicit. RSB takes a similar approach to RSPO explicitly stating in its first principle the legal compliance requirement. As a regional standard, the MSPO does not offer the same level of legal compliance as RSPO, RSB and ISCC because it is limited to the international laws ratified by the State of Malaysia, nevertheless, the standard requires subscribed parties to be in compliance with the applicable local, state, national and ratified international laws and regulations.
  - **2 points**: SAN has a non-critical criterion for compliance with national laws. Because it is non-critical, the criterion is not binding for audit purposes, weakening the criterion to a form of guidance rather than a requirement.

- **Customary Rights**
  - **3 points**: RSPO, RSB, SAN and ISCC require the company to demonstrate a legal right to use land. RSPO, RSB and HCS have an additional provision whereby companies must prove absence of conflict over land rights/use, create a map of the area displaying legal use rights through participatory mapping, and provide evidence that individuals with rights have had access to information and advice, independent of the proponent, on the implications of the proposed development.

- **Land Tenure Study**
  - **3 points**: RSPO, MSPO, ISCC, SAN and HCS provide strong and clear requirements regarding land tenure and land use assessments. SAN and ISCC include this provision as a critical/major requirement for certification under their respective schemes. MSPO, RSB and HCS are comparatively insistent on the importance of the inclusion of such provision.

- **Participatory Mapping**
  - **3 points**: RSPO, RSB, HCS and SAN provide clear guidelines on the participatory mapping process to indicate the location, boundaries and planned uses of lands and other resources over which communities have legal, customary or use rights. RSB also states that in the absence of participatory methodologies “satellite images can help identify areas of cultivated land, and participatory mapping and transects can be undertaken with residents to identify the spatial distribution of the population and various land and resource uses”. It notes the all members of the community must meaningfully participate in the process.

- **Free Prior Informed Consent**
  - **3 points**: MSPO requires that where lands are encumbered by customary rights, “the company shall demonstrate that these rights are understood and are not being threatened or reduced”. This said, it does not offer the same level of protection as other provisions and could be tightened to ensure against illegal land acquisition.

- **Negotiated Agreements**
  - **3 points**: ISPO provides no appropriate explanation in the indicator relating to land sustainability maps or soil surveys to plan for long term suitability of the land for cultivation of oil palm. It does not detail how legal land boundaries are to be mapped and preserved nor is there a measurable indicator to map the status of lands in dispute.

- **Access to Information**
  - **2 points**: MSPO requires that where lands are encumbered by customary rights, “the company shall demonstrate that these rights are understood and are not being threatened or reduced”. This said, it does not offer the same level of protection as other provisions and could be tightened to ensure against illegal land acquisition.

- **No Coercion**
  - **1 point**: ISPO does not require the land title process to be documented and makes no reference to customary rights allowing for certification of land grabs if the land acquisition process is not properly documented.

- **Recognition of community land rights – customary rights**
  - **3 points**: RSPO, SAN, HCS, RSB and ISCC require the company to demonstrate a legal right to use land. RSPO, RSB and HCS have an additional provision whereby companies must prove absence of conflict over land rights/use, create a map of the area displaying legal use rights through participatory mapping, and provide evidence that individuals with rights have had access to information and advice, independent of the proponent, on the implications of the proposed development.

- **Land Tenure Study**
  - **3 points**: RSPO, MSPO, ISCC, SAN and HCS provide strong and clear requirements regarding land tenure and land use assessments. SAN and ISCC include this provision.

1. ISCC EU certification system requires compliance with the legal sustainability requirement specified in the RED - Renewable Energy Directive, Directive 2009/28/EC - of the European Commission. For markets not regulated by RED or FQD (Fuel Quality Directive), ISCC PLUS requires through an audit all farms and plantations to comply with relevant laws and regulations.

2. Both Malaysia and Indonesia have not endorsed ILO Convention 169 and thus do not offer the same level of protection to indigenous peoples as multi-stakeholder initiatives like RSPO, HCS and RSB which cite this convention.
Summary of Key Findings
A Comparison of Leading Palm Oil Certification Standards

Communities if they are supported by local government companies and local communities despite requiring facilitated balanced negotiations between large plantation ISPO does not recognise FPIC and does not meetings. This is only a minor consideration, it is not communities and local government through regular assessment with two-way communication between all negotiated agreements for any compensation, of the whole community. RSB states “FPIC shall form the basis of all negotiated agreements for any compensation, acquisition or voluntary relinquishment of rights”, this is mirrored in the other standards which provide for agreements to be documented and shared between all relevant parties.

Access to information
3 points: RSPO, MSPO and SAN require that documents are made publicly available so relevant stakeholders can access information relevant to environmental, social and legal issues. All three standards explicitly note that this information should be in an appropriate language for effective participation in decision-making.

Negotiated agreements and inclusive participation
3 points: RSPO, RSB, SAN, HCS and MSPO all provide requirements that the community may decide whether to enter negotiations, and if negotiations do occur between a community and a certified operator the terms of relinquishment of rights is clarified with the inclusion of the whole community. RSB states “FPIC shall form the basis of all negotiated agreements for any compensation, acquisition or voluntary relinquishment of rights”, this is mirrored in the other standards which provide for agreements to be documented and shared between all relevant parties.

Conclusion
ISCC, SAN and RSB make little specific reference to indigenous peoples. Instead, they quote international conventions to safeguard indigenous rights. RSPO, HCS and MSPO provisions on indigenous peoples, on the other hand, largely focus on land acquisition and on requirements to ensure they are not taken advantage of in the process.

All standards require their members to demonstrate the legal right to use land. Critically, ISPO does not require this process to be documented and instead it advocates one-off consultations with communities, making it the weakest standard in upholding basic land rights and customary rights. RSPO, in contrast, has the most comprehensive requirements for consultation and consent, emphasising transparency, participatory processes and strong measures for proof of consultation, thereby seeking to ensure respect for indigenous peoples’ right to self-determination.

Other standards fall between these two extremes. ISCC does not require participatory mapping. SAN only requires FPIC in critical activities when use rights are affected and not in all communications with indigenous peoples. MSPO lacks an explicit requirement to prevent coercion outside of the context of FPIC. The absence of a requirement for all communications with communities to be recorded makes the RSB standard a bit weaker than the RSPO standard.

Footnotes:
1 This is clearly not consistent with National Forestry Council Policy Recommendations on the implementation of FPIC and Indonesian National REDD+ Strategy which requires a process and implementation of FPIC with communities affected by REDD+ proposed projects.
2 A NGO working with smallholders has demonstrated numerous examples where local communities did not actively participate in negotiations with companies at all, communities were unable to refuse new plantation establishments and instead had to accept the company’s plantations with negotiated compensation. The NGO notes that this situation did not only result from a lack of regulation about the negotiation processes, but also from the way in which companies interpret existing ISPO regulations. For example, companies noted that they do follow the requirements to inform local communities, however often do not give a balanced overview of the situation (only referring to potential positive impacts of establishing a plantation and ignoring potential negative ones) – see footnote 7.
Fair treatment of Smallholders
3 points: RSP0 provides the most comprehensive protection for smallholders. Although other standards provide standalone policies on smallholders they are not as stringent in considering smallholders’ needs. RSP0 requires fair and transparent dealings with smallholders, and smallholders to be considered in applicable management planning.

2 points: RSB is one of the standards that provides a standalone smallholder standard which requires the group management to provide that any common benefit is fairly shared among all the group members. There is no mention of transparency in these dealings although principles and criteria are regularly audited. Nevertheless, it appears to tailor the RSB global standard to the needs of smallholders but relates more to their obligations rather than their rights. SAN strives to ensure that certification is affordable, feasible and contributes to significant positive value to smallholders’ farming operations. The standard provides safeguards including freedom from discrimination, the right to organise and collectively bargain and payment of at least the minimum wage. The standard also states that “less-advantaged group members, those in remote areas, and those with limited literacy” will have access to training and support to implement best practices outlined in the SAN standard. To verify that each smallholder complies with SAN standard, an internal control system to evaluate each member against the standard’s criteria is applied. Under the SAN group certification approach, smallholders are organised into groups that are managed and supported by a group administrator. The criteria that apply to group administrators who help smallholders achieve certification are not deemed critical criteria, it can take up to three years for these requirements to be addressed in which time smallholders may face unfair treatment. MSPO requires that smallholders are appropriately trained, however it offers little information on other rights i.e. that the impacts and implication of how each scheme is managed is to be monitored and reviewed.

1 point: ISCC is very prescriptive in the dealings with smallholders, requiring fair and transparent contracts to be in place. There is little mention of smallholders’ rights, training schemes or benefit sharing.

0 points: To date the HCS method has not been adapted to suit palm oil smallholders. A separate working group has been set up to develop suitable guidance for smallholders and HCS. ISPO has no specific measurable indicator or standard for smallholders. Not all palm oil plantations are eligible for an ISPO audit or certification program. ISPO certification can only be filed by large palm oil plantations. There are no specific measurable indicators for partnerships with farmers, or that there must be resources allocated to improve the productivity or welfare of smallholders.

Fair Credit for Smallholders
1 point: RSP0, in its additional guidelines surrounding smallholders’ states that “scheme smallholders while also very diverse, are characterised as smallholders who are structurally bound by contract, by a credit agreement or by planning to a particular mill”. It does not go into detail surrounding these credit agreements and so cannot be judged to be fair.

0 points: All other standards provide no information on whether credit agreements are in place and what these may look like.

Fair Prices for Smallholders
3 points: RSP0 requires that smallholders are dealt with fairly. Current and past prices of FFB should be publicly available, contractual agreements are understood, payments are agreed and made in a timely manner and any transactions made consider the role of middlemen. Furthermore, smallholders should have access to a grievance procedure if they consider they are not receiving a fair price for FFB, whether middlemen are involved or not.

2 points: SAN is the other standard that provides for fair prices for smallholders where a mechanism is implemented for “the non-discriminatory calculation and distribution of revenues” to smallholders. However, this is not a critical criteria and for this reason has been awarded only 2 points.

1 point: ISCC requires companies to offer training to smallholders, but it is not stated whether this is specifically to enable them better access to markets or to improve productivity. Specific guidance on smallholder access to markets is missing. Similarly, SAN has made several steps to include smallholder in its certification standard where many of the requirements in the SAN standard are not applicable to smallholders. However, how this specifically guarantees fair access to emerging markets is unclear. MSPO, ISPO and HCS similarly provide little guidance on this matter.

Conclusion
Much improvement is needed across the board. HCS approach has yet to be adapted to smallholders, whilst ISPO has no requirements at all for smallholders. MSPO is only slightly better in requiring all smallholders to receive training to improve productivity. Meanwhile, RSB provides its own smallholder standard with its own set of restrictions which may limit their access to markets and fair treatment. Alarmingly, none of the standards offer fair credit to smallholders who often need to replant and increase yields to access financial support at the expense of the environment.

Standards need to be reformed if smallholder palm oil productivity is to grow while mitigating negative social and environmental impacts. Even though RSP0 has broader and more tightly defined requirements on responsibilities towards smallholders, the significant shortfall between RSP0 compliance costs, the ability to secure fair credit, and access to higher premium markets creates a disincentive for smallholders to become certified.
### C. Social and Environmental Safeguards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RSPO</th>
<th>RSB</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>ISCC</th>
<th>HCS</th>
<th>MSPO</th>
<th>ISPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Development</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protection of HRDs</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEIAs</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participatory SEIAs</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rights to Food</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rights to Water</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rights to a Clean Environment</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score** 14 18 12 14 12 11 7

**Social Development – Community benefits**

3 **points**: RSPO provides that in regions of poverty, the socio-economic status of impacted local stakeholders should be improved, encouraging the participation of indigenous communities in the design and implementation of such projects. MSPO requires growers to contribute to local development in consultation with local communities and SAN requires growers to support identified needs and priorities of the community.

2 **points**: RSPO is less forceful with its words stating growers should only contribute to local sustainable development where appropriate, it does not specifically mention the inclusion of the community in this process. This said, it does provide for positive discrimination in favour of local communities. ISPO members are required to have a program for increasing the welfare of local customary community and culture. ISPO requires 20% of a plantation area to be developed for the community, which follows the national law, and that the company empowers indigenous peoples, supports local business, and contributes to community development. Again, there is no mention of consultation with the community, opening the possibility for social development projects to be imposed on communities rather than with their conscious involvement.

1 **point**: ISCC approach to social development is through incentivising employees, families and communities for work-related performance. Other standards require growers to support the communities where they work. ISCC is slightly different, whilst it does require that all children living on the farm should have access to quality primary education, other forms of social development such as the provision of health care services, social support, or professional development training, are only required where communities maintain responsible relations with the grower/employer. HCS acknowledges the developmental aspirations and options of affected communities and local stakeholders but only through their access to information as opposed to concrete measures to improve their welfare.

**Protection of human rights defenders**

1 **point**: RSPO passed resolution 6e (2016) on the “Protection of human rights defenders, whistle-blowers, complainants and community spokesperson”. The resolution has yet to be put into effect. It is the only standard currently developing a HRD protocol to protect human rights defenders and fundamental freedoms.

0 **points**: All other standards have no specific requirements protecting human rights defenders.

**Social and Environmental Impact Assessments (SEIAs)**

3 **points**: RSPO, RSB, ISCC, MSPO require that independent environmental and social impact assessments are conducted prior to land conversion. SAN goes one step further and integrates SEIAs into developments and expansion plans. HCS approach requires baseline study reports from both socio-economic and biological and ecological surveys. ISPO evaluates impacts to the environment through AMDAL, UKL, HCV and UPL assessments. Social impacts are not evaluated separately but are covered in the AMDAL and HCV assessments.

**Participatory SEIAs**

3 **points**: RSPO, RSB, MSPO, ISCC, SAN and HCS provide safeguards for participatory social impact assessments enabling meaningful stakeholder engagement.

1 **point**: ISPO makes to explicit requirement that assessments are participatory but AMDAL procedures do require assessors to interview impacted communities. There is no indicator to mitigate the negative impacts on communities or indigenous groups identified by assessments or to monitor the identified impacts.

**Right to food – Local Food Security**

3 **points**: HCS, RSB and ISCC all mention food security explicitly. HCS requires that areas, which are part of active subsistence food production cycles to meet the food security needs of communities, are enclaved from consideration as HCS forest or plantation development. ISCC provides safeguards to guarantee that biomass production does not impair food security. RSB goes even further, requiring assessments and mitigation plans to reduce risks of food security in the region and locality resulting from operations. Where assessments indicate food security is at risk, “operations shall enhance the local food security of the directly affected stakeholders”.

1 **point**: RSPO provides definitions and some guidance on livelihoods in which it notes that this is the means in which communities “assure themselves and following generations secure access to food”. Specific indicators, however, are lacking. Livelihoods are mentioned in indicators relating to SEIAs and RSPO’s New Planting Procedure, however, these only acknowledge potential scarcity of food resources and do not provide instructions to mitigate against the possible lack of access to food. SAN, similarly, acknowledges how proposed plantation operations can diminish community rights over land for primary subsistence activities but only requires for community members to be made aware of this fact in the FPIC process.

0 **points**: ISPO and MSPO offer no indicator to assess the food security needs of communities, nor require any consideration of the positive and negative changes to the source of livelihood of communities resulting from planned plantation activities.

**Rights to water**

3 **points**: RSB and ISCC are the only standard to explicitly reference water rights. RSB states “operations shall contribute to the enhancement or maintaining of the quality of the surface and ground water resources”, furthermore, it includes a number of minimum requirements relating to this criterion which assert “for existing operation, degradation of water resources that occurred prior to certification and for which the participating operator is directly accountable shall be reversed. Wherever applicable, operators shall participate in projects that aim to improve water quality at a watershed scale”. ISCC requires the producer to respect existing water rights, both formal and customary, and must justify irrigation activities considering accessibility of water for human consumption.
2 points: Although RSPO requires HCV assessments which should identify and protect critical ecosystem services (HCV4), the RSPO standard’s only explicit safeguard of water rights is the requirement that “Practices maintain quality and availability of surface and ground water, the water management plan will aim to ensure local communities, workers and their families have access to adequate, clean water for drinking, cooking, bathing and cleaning purposes”. The specific requirements put on companies is unclear.

1 point: HCS approach states “Access to water, health and education facilities and other social and economic infrastructure shall be considered… the social baseline study shall take into account the potential impacts of the proposed development of…water quality and availability…over the time frame of the development”. Water rights are only considered, there is no requirement to maintain or enhance water quality. This is mirrored in the SAN standard where water rights only have to be identified in the FPIC process, no guidance is offered on how this should be protected.

0 points: ISPO standard only states within it that “water is to be monitored”. There are no clearly defined requirements. MSPO standard does not mention water rights either explicitly or implicitly.

Rights to a clean environment
3 points: RSB offers the most comprehensive protection of the environment. RSB requires provisions for conservation values and ecosystem functions to be maintained and enhanced. Operations shall protect, restore and create buffer zones. Ecological corridors shall be protected and restored and operations shall implement practices to maintain and enhance soil conditions.

2 points: RSB offers protection but less comprehensively whereby the standard mitigates against any negative environmental impacts, where waste is reduced, recycled, re-used and disposed of in an environmentally responsible manner. HCV habitats existing in a plantation are identified and operations managed “to best ensure they are maintained and/or enhanced”. MSPO provides similar safeguards including a programme to promote the positive impacts of environmental management which must be included in the continual improvement plan.

1 point: SAN, ISCC and HCS recognise the negative impacts to the environment that operations may cause but offer very little in guidance over how these should be mitigated in the long term. ISPO provides indicators to monitor environmental impacts but the details of a monitoring protocol and what constitutes best practice is absent from the standard.

Conclusion
In terms of environmental standards, ISCC provides the most restrictive safeguards particularly when addressing peat land conversion, while RSPO is stronger on the social impact of palm oil. MSPO provides strict standards for plantation management while ISPO is based on existing Indonesian regulations that pertain to palm oil cultivation and processing, and is by far the weakest at reducing the negative environmental and social impacts of palm oil.

RSPO standard, by comparison, provides some of the most restrictive requirements on land use rights, customary rights, core labour standards and the rights and wellbeing of people affected by plantations. RSB standard also draws a lot of similarities with RSPO standard and is the most progressive in its approach to food security and water rights, something which should be mirrored in all the standards.

It is worth noting that RSP is the only standard pioneering work on human rights defenders although the details of the resolution, passed in November 2016, have yet to be published.

D. Core Labour Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions and Benefits</th>
<th>RSPO</th>
<th>RSB</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>ISCC</th>
<th>HCS</th>
<th>MSPO</th>
<th>ISPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Wage</th>
<th>RSPO</th>
<th>RSB</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>ISCC</th>
<th>HCS</th>
<th>MSPO</th>
<th>ISPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Free Collective Bargaining</th>
<th>RSPO</th>
<th>RSB</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>ISCC</th>
<th>HCS</th>
<th>MSPO</th>
<th>ISPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Child Labour</th>
<th>RSPO</th>
<th>RSB</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>ISCC</th>
<th>HCS</th>
<th>MSPO</th>
<th>ISPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Slavery-Like Practices</th>
<th>RSPO</th>
<th>RSB</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>ISCC</th>
<th>HCS</th>
<th>MSPO</th>
<th>ISPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracting Third Parties</th>
<th>RSPO</th>
<th>RSB</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>ISCC</th>
<th>HCS</th>
<th>MSPO</th>
<th>ISPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessible Grievance Mechanisms</th>
<th>RSPO</th>
<th>RSB</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>ISCC</th>
<th>HCS</th>
<th>MSPO</th>
<th>ISPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection of Migrant Labour</th>
<th>RSPO</th>
<th>RSB</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>ISCC</th>
<th>HCS</th>
<th>MSPO</th>
<th>ISPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSPO</th>
<th>RSB</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>ISCC</th>
<th>HCS</th>
<th>MSPO</th>
<th>ISPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditions and benefits
3 points: RSPO, RSB, MSPO, ISCC, SAN and HCS provide multiple safeguards requiring safe working conditions, fair employment conditions and social benefits. These range from access to health and education services for family members to the provision of safe working conditions through training and education programs integrated into the standard or as standalone labour policies.

1 point: ISPO only provides one criterion relating to the welfare of workers. There is no requirement for employee contracts to be fair, legal and transparent, the standard only states that employees/workers must be enrolled in the government’s social security program, as per applicable regulations.

Minimum Wage
3 points: All standards provide for workers to be paid minimum wage, many also require that certain benefits are included in the contract. RSPO has a list of benefits that need to be accounted for (including overtime, insurance, sick and maternity leave) in one of its indicators but fails to provide further guidance on these benefits. ISCC provides more specific detail on working hours but again these are ranked as “minor musts” weakening the strength of the criteria. SAN is the only standard to provide instruction on severance. ISPO requires employees/workers to be enrolled in the employee social security program as per Indonesian regulations. MSPO provides for a health policy to
be documented and effectively implemented for workers and other forms of social benefits to be offered to employees and their families including bonus payments and medical care. HCS and RSB turn to international labour conventions to set out their labour best practice.

Free collective bargaining
3 points: All standards have criteria supporting the employees/workers’ right to form trade unions and bargain collectively. RSPO, MSPO and ISPO mention that the company should facilitate the means for workers to establish such unions. RSPO, ISCC, SAN, RSB and HCS all refer to ILO Conventions to guide such policies.

2 points: ISPO and MSPO offer the weakest policies as they both provide no details on how workers are encouraged to join unions or indicators detailing how meetings with workers’ representatives/trade unions are to be documented.

No child labour
3 points: SAN provides the most detailed guidance on child labour, the safeguards provided for different age groups and the corresponding work restrictions. RSPO, ISCC and RSB provide clear guidelines, all referring to ILO Conventions to further define their position on child labour. HCS has less clear guidelines but again refers to international law for guidance.

2 points: ISPO has a general criterion prohibiting child labour, but it does not provide any information on age or categories and associated restrictions. MSPO is the only standard that does not provide a specific criterion dedicated to child labour, but companies receiving MSPO certificates are expected to have a separate policy banning child labour, and companies are required to document and record the workers’ date of birth.

No slavery-like practices
3 points: RSPO, ISCC, RSB, and SAN all have mandatory criteria prohibiting use of forced labour.

2 points: HCS turns to international conventions to protect workers against slavery-like practices.

0 points: ISPO makes no mention of forced labour in the standard’s indicators. MSPO also lacks a specific criterion and only states that “the management shall establish a policy on good social practices regarding human rights in respect of industrial harmony” but it is unclear what this translates to in practice.

Contracting third parties
3 points: RSPO requires employers to implement mechanisms to safeguard human rights and labour rights outlined in international conventions and that these are equally applied when labour is contracted through third parties.

2 points: MSPO, RSPO, ISCC, HCS and SAN all provide protections for third party contractors but make no reference to mechanisms to guarantee they are applied. ISCC require that any engagement with subcontractors must fully comply with ISCC’s sustainability requirements. HCS indicators are less binding and only solicit developers to monitor compliance of contractors with their requirements. MSPO offers some level of protection where management must provide evidence of agreed contracts with third parties who are responsible for their wellbeing (questions should be asked of the independence of such a mechanism and the potential biases that could arise in reporting). RSPO commits growers to ethical conduct of business operations including stand-alone policies relating to workers’ rights to be communicated with all levels of the workforce. Nevertheless, there is very little guidance specific to temporary workers. SAN provides provision whereby farmers are not to “engage in arrangements or practices designed to eliminate or reduce pay benefits due to workers being temporary”. No mechanism is offered as to how this will be regulated.

0 points: ISPO standard does not contain an indicator that specifically defines labour policies or human rights policies and procedures relating to temporary workers. Although company operations are expected to be in line with national law.

Accessible grievance mechanisms
3 points: Both RSPO and RSB provide for easily accessible grievance mechanisms open for all workers and contracted workers. RSPO provides a transparent system for migrants rights and obliges separate employment agreements to be undertaken to meet immigration requirements for foreign workers and observation of international standards.

2 points: Under SAN standard, employers should implement complaints and grievance mechanisms, but this is not as watertight as those provided by RSPO and RSB and does not detail how such a system should function and how it can be accessed by workers.

1 point: HCSPO and ISCC require complaints forms to be available on site where employers can make a complaint. Further details are not provided by MSPO. This is only a minor consideration under ISCC.

0 points: HCS does provide for grievance mechanisms which aim to ensure that misunderstandings (such as those between communities and operators) do not escalate into disputes. Such grievance mechanisms need to be agreed in advance to address complaints that arise under HCS social requirements. There is not a grievance mechanism which tackles problems that may arise in the workplace which is open to all workers and contracted workers. Similarly, ISPO offers no grievance mechanism for workers. The only grievance mechanism is related to land disputes and compensation. Indonesian national law does provide protection to workers but this is not explicitly stated in the standard.

Protection of migrant labour
3 points: RSPO offers the most comprehensive protection for migrant and trans-migrant workers, the standard protects their right to bargain collectively, requires operators to have special labour policies relating to migrants rights and obliges separate employment agreements to be undertaken to meet immigration requirements for foreign workers and observation of international standards.

1 point: ISCC and SAN bracket migrant workers into the term “temporary worker” where reference to their rights are scant. They rely on the operator to be aware of its obligations under national and international law, and to act in accordance with this. HCS does include migrant workers in their safeguards relating to collective bargaining requirements but there is no reference to separate employment agreements or other protection measures.

0 points: RSB, ISPO and MSPO provide no guidance or protection of migrant workers.

Conclusion
Almost all standards have strong provisions for employee contracts that must be fair and clearly understood, provide minimum wage requirements, support workers’ rights to form trade unions and bargain collectively. That said, relatively weak protection is offered to migrant workers, something especially troubling given the high reliance of many plantations on migrant labourers.

ISPO is noticeably poor on labour standards which raises concern about the exploitation of workers within Indonesia particularly considering reports of forced and child labour on plantations. The standard simply states that child labour is prohibited, but offers no further details on the restrictions for different age groups or even until what age one is considered a child.

9 The Indonesian government’s mandatory employee social security program, Jamsostek, is a retirement pension fund and provides limited employee disability, death, and medical benefits.
E. Gender and discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Discrimination</th>
<th>Protection of Women</th>
<th>No Sexual Harassment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSPO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISCC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSPO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISPO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score 8 5 5 3 9 5 3

No discrimination

3 points: All standards have mandatory criteria prohibiting discrimination. Each standard lists a distinct set of grounds that could potentially serve as basis for discrimination, including race, religion, caste, social class, nation of origin, disability, sexual origin, disability, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation, age, gender, colour, civil status or ethnic group. RSPO, HCS and ISCC standards require an equal opportunity policy that is made publicly available and which is accessible, transparent and translated into local languages where necessary. SAN provides several critical must criteria which span this area referencing ILO Conventions 100 and 111. It states that equal pay, training and promotion opportunities must be made available to all workers for the same type of work. RSB, ISPO and MSPO, on the other hand, offer more generic policies where companies are requested not to engage or support any discriminatory practices. There is no mention as to whether these policies should be made public or not.

Gender sensitive complaints procedure/Provision of women

3 points: HCS approach provides that wherever there is a non-negligible proportion of women in the workforce, developers establish a gender committee managed by women to address their problems.

2 points: RSPO provides a gender sensitive complaints mechanism in so far as the grievance mechanism respects anonymity and protects complainants where requested.

0 points: Though RSB, ISPO, MSPO, ISCC and SAN reference gender in their non-discrimination policies, within their standards there is no acknowledgement of the need for specific indicators to be in place to protect women in the workplace.

No sexual harassment/Protection of reproductive rights

3 points: RSPO and HCS offer strong safeguards against harassment and abuse in the workplace. RSPO has additional provisions to promote equality for women in land rights and smallholder schemes.

2 points: RSPO guarantees that works sites are safe for women, “free from sexual harassment and other discrimination and abuse” whilst promoting “access to jobs, skills training, recruitment and career development for women to ensure more gender balance in work and career development”. MSPO states that “The management shall establish a policy and provide guidelines to prevent all forms of sexual harassment and violence at the workplace”. In both cases, reproductive rights are not specifically mentioned. SAN is the opposite; while providing strong guidance on reproductive rights where “pregnant women who are active workers receive fully-paid maternity leave of at least 12 weeks before or after birth, with at least six of these weeks being taken after birth”, guidance on sexual harassment is less explicit, applying to a work-related set of circumstances rather than encompassing the broader threats women may face on a plantation.

0 points: ISCC makes no mention of tackling sexual harassment or protecting reproductive rights other than to say the person responsible for good social practice should demonstrate awareness of national regulations on maternity leave. ISPO is similarly lacking in indicators relating to harassment or violence against women, again relying on Indonesian law to act as the guide.

Conclusion
ISCC, RSB, ISPO and MSPO do not have any criteria specifically aimed at protecting women but they do include gender in their categories for which discrimination is not permitted. RSPO and HCS are the only standards that have a policy specifically aimed at protecting women from sexual harassment in the workplace and at supporting their reproductive rights. Both standards also state the need to have a company policy specifically aimed at addressing gender-based abuses.

All standards have mandatory criteria prohibiting discrimination, but definitions of what constitutes discrimination vary widely. Whilst RSPO, ISCC and HCS require publicly available equal opportunity policies, ISPO and MSPO require more generic commitments from companies who are requested not to engage or support discriminatory practices.¹³

¹³ Provisions on indigenous people largely focus on land acquisition and provide requirements that indigenous peoples are not taken advantage of in the process (same applies to RSPO and MSPO).
¹² ISCC makes little reference to indigenous people; they are included only once when defining what level of human activity defines visible indications of human activity. Otherwise, there are a few mentions of traditional land rights and uses in criteria that require that appropriate measures are taken to acquire land rights and soil management.
¹⁰ SAN makes no specific reference to indigenous or tribal people, but does state several ILO Conventions that were adapted to form the standard, including ILO Conventions 87 and 98 and Convention 169 concerning indigenous and tribal people. The standard instead uses the more all-encompassing term community.
¹⁴ RSB refers to similar international conventions as SAN to act as safeguards for indigenous peoples’ rights.
¹¹ SAN has provisions for specifically looking out for their welfare by providing employment and preserving local knowledge. ISPO has a criterion that requires companies to improve the welfare of indigenous people, with indicators including a program designed and implemented to do such, including establishment of a program to preserve local knowledge. Guidance includes providing employment opportunities for indigenous people. ISPO also mentions indigenous people in the list of categories of people not to be discriminated against.
¹⁵ The farm does not use extortion, debt, threats or sexual abuse or harassment, or any other physical or psychological measure to force workers to work or stay on the farm, or as a disciplinary measure.
¹⁶ There is no mention of whether or not these should be made public.

A Comparison of Leading Palm Oil Certification Standards
F. Quality Assurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RSPO</th>
<th>RSB</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>ISCC</th>
<th>HCS</th>
<th>MSPO</th>
<th>ISPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Certifiers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor Licensing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Public</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation During</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score: 15 14 12 11 2 7 7

Strength of quality assurance procedures
3 points: RSPO relies on accredited outside third parties, certification bodies, to assess compliance and issue a certificate. Accreditation of certification bodies is renewed annually, and is carried out by an independent third party – Accreditation Services International (ASI). RSBD has a comparable assurance system which is comprised of an Accreditation Body (AB – again ASI), Certification Bodies (CBs) and auditors, who are either employed or subcontracted by CBs.

2 points: ISCC has a similar assurance system to that of RSPO and RSB, comprising of a two-tiered system involving various certification bodies and an accreditation body, ANSI (American National Standards Institute), which renews CBs licences. The ISCC standard has strong links to other European Commission Standards and has a strong focus on a cross-compliance control system. ISCC requires all six of its principles to be fulfilled and audited. Under ISCC, compliance with the standard is evaluated and certificates issued by accredited third-party certification bodies. Although in 2016, it was agreed summaries of audit reports will be made publicly available for each issued certificate, this has yet to come into effect. SAN also relies on accredited third parties to lead the verification and certification process, including determining applicability of each criterion to an individual farm/plantation, undertaking audits, and issuing certificates. This is carried out by certification bodies accredited by the International Organic Accreditation Service (IOAS). However, SAN does not require for the public summaries of the audit reports making the process far less transparent.

1 point: ISPO requires that the Certification Body has implemented ISPO 17021-2011 concerning the requirements for certification bodies providing auditing and certification of management systems and/or ISPO/IEC 17065 concerning the requirements for certifying products, processes, and services. The distinction is in the organisation that gives the approval. ISPO Certification Bodies are accredited directly by ISPO Commission. MSPO certification bodies are similarly accredited directly by MSPO Commission. These commissions are not independent of ISPO/MSPO, thus giving both standards an elevated level of control over the entire certification process from standard setting through to certification decisions.

0 point: HCS Approach’s long-term goal is to have the HCS Approach incorporated into relevant certification system standards (such as RSPO). Meanwhile, assessors carrying out combined HCS/HCV assessment are subject to the HCV Resource Network’s Assessor Licensing Scheme.

Quality assurance of assessor (assessor licencing)
3 points: RSPO uses the HCV Resource Network’s Assessor Licensing Scheme (ALS) which evaluates the quality of HCV assessment reports produced by teams led by an ALS-licensed assessors. RSPO will require licensed assessors for all HCV assessment carried out in the context of new planting procedures. A full HCV assessor licence is obtained after leading two assessments and submitting two adequate HCV assessment reports. To maintain a full licence, the assessor is required to submit the reports of all HCV assessments to the ALS Quality Panel (failure to do so can result in suspension or revocation of licence) – A Quality Manager reviews applications and a Quality Panel evaluates reports for compliance with ALS procedures – stakeholders also have access to public summary. In 2016, SAN also became a full member of HCV Resource Network. In October 2017 the Rainforest Alliance became the sole owner and operator of the SAN certification scheme.

2 points: Within ISCC standard auditors should comply with the requirements of the ISAE 3000 when performing an ISCC audit. The requirements and regulations for CBs are specified in internal documentation. It also provides for ISCC Integrity Assessments which are planned randomly or on a risk basis after risk evaluations, complaints or reports of non-conformity or fraud. Integrity Assessments are conducted by ISCC Integrity Auditors and can take place in any country where CBs carry out activities and audits in the.
framework of ISCC. ISCC Integrity Auditors must be independent and free of any conflicts of interest. The ISCC Integrity Auditor carries out an evaluation of the conformity of the certified system user based on the applicable ISCC procedure documents. The results of this assessment are then compared with the CB’s audit report from the last regular certification audit. RSB assurance system is carried out by auditors who are either employed or contracted by certification bodies, they must comply with RSB Procedure for Certification Bodies and Auditors.

1 point: ISPO audit teams should consist of auditors who understand licensing requirements, palm oil plantations, good management practices, occupational health and safety systems, have an awareness of environmental, social and economic issues. They should speak Indonesian, and understand ISO 19011 on managing audit systems. ISPO auditors must also pass a training course organised by the ISPO Commission and run by a training institution approved by ISPO Commission. MSPO auditors undergo a similar process, they will carry out an annual surveillance audit each year which is peer reviewed. The HCS-Approach Steering Group now requires all new HCS-Approach assessments to be combined with HCV assessments. All lead assessors carrying out combined HCS/HCV assessment are subject to the HCV Resource Network’s Assessor Licensing Scheme.

Formal public consultation required during audit process
3 points: RSB standard requires that the audit team conducts a stakeholder consultation for all certification and re-certification audits. Certification bodies should keep records of stakeholder consultation conducted during the audit process. The lead auditor conducts a stakeholder consultation appropriate to the certification scope, risk class and screening results. Stakeholder consultations are designed to solicit direct, factual observations with regard to compliance of the operator with the RSB standard. RSPPO allows for public stakeholder consultation at the compliance stage of the certification process. If a member meets the criteria, Certification Bodies can issue a certificate, they assess Corrective Action Requests on an annual basis through surveillance audits. The assessments required by RSPPO’s New Plantings Procedure are carried out by independent consultancies or other technical service organisations. They are then submitted to RSPPO following a desk-based review by a certification body. The NPP notifications are posted on the RSPPO website to enable stakeholders to provide comments during a 30-day consultation period. After the consultation period, companies start clearing land. RSPPO places responsibility for sharing assessment summaries at the local level with companies. This effectively mean local stakeholder consultation is done by the party with a vested interest and is not fully independent. Public comments submitted during the consultation period are referred to the plantation company even where there is evidence of substantial violations.

1 point: A requirement under Indonesian law involves “public consultation with the relevant stakeholders.” According to Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning the Protection and Management of the Environment, for land larger than 3,000 hectares, it is compulsory to have an environmental Impact Assessment (AMDAL) and Social Impact Assessment, something which ISPO standard adheres to. This said, it is a one-off consultation and does not require formal public consultations at each audit. If land conflicts do arise, it is up to the National Land Board to manage land issues and community related conflicts. MSPO also has stakeholder consultation but unlike ISPO this is during the certification process, following the Stage 1 of the audit process. It is a one-off consultation, although stakeholders are notified 30 days prior to the field visit, there are seven further stages of the audit process that occur before certification. All certified premises are subject to one annual surveillance audit, these require public consultation only in case of minor or major non-conformities raised by stakeholders. Within ISCC audit process, operators are assessed in compliance with the standards six principles, interviews with relevant stakeholders “should be implemented as far as possible” in relation to compliance with collective agreements. SAN standards, like MSPO only requires public consultation with all relevant stakeholders if there has been a minor or major non-conformance raised.

0 points: Within the HCS approach, the Quality Assurance Working Group is discussing how information from local stakeholders can be incorporated into the monitoring of ICLUP implementation, in particular the social considerations. Stakeholders could access and potentially upload information about possible problems with communities or land use change within conservation areas.

Conclusion
RSB, ISCC, SAN and RSPO apply a two-tiered system involving various certification and accreditation bodies. SAN and ISCC, on the other hand, do not require for public summaries of the audit reports to be produced. ISPO and MSPO also rely upon accredited third-party certification bodies to conduct audits, but it is the ISPO and MSPO commissions respectively that issue certificates based on reviews of audit reports. Both commissions maintain an elevated level of control over the entire certification process, which does raise transparency issues and questions surrounding the independence of supply chain verification.

Audit quality remains a big issue for many certification systems. The level of ambiguity which arises in the implementation of standards is deeply concerning as well as the apparent disparity between principles and criteria and their interpretation by certification bodies. Another worrying gap across most standards is lack of a requirement to hold a formal public consultation during the audit process. It is vital that all key stakeholders are interviewed during the audit process to provide a complete picture of a company’s performance.

23 The ISPO assessment team consists of government officials, ESELOI II, which is lower than ESLOI I (see footnote 18) in the organisational structure from the same ministries as the ISPO commission.
24 Agrarian Minister/Head of the National Land Agency Regulation Number 2 of 1999, article 6, states: (i) Dissemination of information on the investment and development plans to be implemented, the scope of impact, and any land acquisition plans, as well as solving any problems related to land acquisition.
G. Access to Remedy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RSPO</th>
<th>RSB</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>ISCC</th>
<th>HCS</th>
<th>MSPO</th>
<th>ISPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman-Type Process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-stakeholder Governance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score**: 10 9 4 7 6 4 2

Grievance procedures and mechanisms

3 points: RSPO, HCS and RSB provide a mutually agreed upon, transparent and documented system for addressing complaints and grievances accessible to all affected parties.

2 points: MSPO standard requires a complaints and grievance mechanism for employees and communities to be documented, timely and appropriate. Though employees and surrounding communities should be made aware that complaints can be made at any time, they are not involved in the formation of the mechanism. ISCC provides for a complaints procedure to be available on the farm where employees and affected communities can make a complaint. This is regarded as a minor must. They also provide for complaints to be made directly to ISCC management.

1 point: ISPO does not offer a complaints system, whereby complaints and grievances can be addressed to the Secretariat of ISPO Commission but documentation and results of the process are not published. SAN requires farm management to develop a system to receive, respond to, and document the resolution of complaints from communities. This criterion is only Level B, 90% of which isn’t minimally required until year 6. There is no mention of a standard-wide complaints system, nothing is listed beyond authorised certification bodies and subcontracted authorised auditors.

Land Disputes

3 points: RSPO requires that the right to use the land is demonstrated and not legitimately contested by local people who can demonstrate that they have legal, customary or use rights. Furthermore, a mutually agreed and documented system for dealing with any complaints or grievances which may arise is required. RSB similarly states that land under legitimate dispute cannot be used for operations until such time as they have been settled through FPIC and negotiated agreements. HCS provides mechanism for resolution of any grievances or disputes that arrive in community agreements, again turning to FPIC to safeguard land disputes that may arise. SAN within its FPIC processes guide requires the farm management and group administrator to communicate openly with local communities to identify community concerns and interests related to the farm or group administrator’s operations. A mechanism to receive, respond to, and document the resolution of complaints from communities should be implemented, such a mechanism should allow communities to raise grievances in any circumstance.

2 points: Within MSPO principles, where there have been disputes, documented proof of legal acquisition of land title and fair compensation made to previous occupants must be made available linked with due FPIC processes. This said, MSPO does not offer a standalone grievance mechanism which is mutually agreed with all stakeholders, instead grievances relating to land disputes should be brought first to the certificate holder who may have a conflict of interest in the matter.

1 point: ISCC offers weak protection regarding land conflicts, only stating that mediation should be available in case of social conflict, but this is categorised as a minor requirement. ISPO requires that dispute resolution mechanism are documented and complaints relating to land disputes are coordinated by the Deputy of the Land Dispute and Conflict Assessment and Handling Department within the National Land Agency. This process does not require FPIC processes to be adhered to.

Appeals procedure

3 points: RSPO allows for complaints to be re-submitted once within 4 weeks of original submissions. New submissions are allowed in case of new evidence. RSB allows appeals to be submitted to the organisation overseeing the activities of the Accountable Organization with which the grievance was originally filed – there are three possible accountable organisations: the certifying body, the accreditation body and RSB Secretariat – only one appeal is allowed – the outcome of the appeals process is final. If new evidence is presented it is the equivalent to a new complaint. ISCC allows appeals to be submitted to ISCC management.

0 points: HCS, SAN, ISPO and MSPO do not make explicit reference to an appeal process within their grievance mechanisms.

Ombudsman-type process for mediation

1 point: RSPO Complaints Panel may appoint experts for advice or verification of the complaint. In addition, once complaints have been adjudicated by the Complaints Panel they may be passed to the RSPO’s Dispute Settlement Facility which can provide mediators, subject to the agreement of both parties. ISCC arbitration board will consult an independent expert but only in undefined ‘critical cases’.

0 points: RSB, SAN, ISPO, ISPO and HCS make no explicit reference to ombudsman-type processes for resolving complaints.

Multi-stakeholder governance

0 points: In none of the standards examined were indigenous peoples or communities represented in the standards’ governance structures.

Conclusion

RSPO, HCS, MSPO, RSB, ISPO and ISCC have established complaints procedures. Surprisingly, SAN provides no materials on how remedy can be obtained unless at the micro-level through the farms’ grievance procedure. Details of the systems and timelines for resolution vary widely across the standards, where RSPO and ISCC offer appeals procedures and ombudsman-type processes for mediation whilst MSPO and ISPO rely on national laws and bodies to deliver redress and compensation.

In terms of land disputes, all the standards except ISCC and ISPO turn to the FPIC principle to safeguard land rights. If these two standards are to provide protection to land rights holders this process must be integrated into their certification schemes.

In general, grievance mechanism is best defined within the RSPO system which has undergone a process of evolution based on the past decade of experience and implementation of the standards principles and criteria, providing on-line status updates of cases and a relatively high level of transparency throughout the complaints process.

---

27 ISPO requires that plantation managers seek to have the land they manage free from disputes with communities and surrounding farmers. When disputes arise, an agreement must be reached in accordance with applicable state laws or customary regulations. If an agreement cannot be reached, then legal action should be taken to settle the matter.

CONCLUSION

Total Score of Palm Oil Certification Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RSPO</th>
<th>RSB</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>ISCC</th>
<th>HCS</th>
<th>MSPO</th>
<th>ISPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key findings:
From the results of the comparative study, FPP have found that the RSPO standard provides the most comprehensive human rights safeguards whilst ISPO has the least clearly defined requirements. As a national standard MSPO has addressed many of the key indicators and provides a more rigorous certification scheme to that of its neighbour, nevertheless, there is a lot of room for improvement in its quality assurance mechanisms. MSPO and ISPO, whilst requiring compliance with their respective national legal frameworks, do not provide the same level of protection that multi-stakeholder international certification schemes offer. This is most apparent in the way in which ISPO and MSPO standards provide weak access to remedy compared to multi-stakeholder initiatives with their complex multi-tiered approaches designed to ensure that certification holders comply with criteria set out in the standards. However, the strength of these grievance mechanisms to deliver remedy or resolution on the ground has been questioned.24

The RSPO standard draws a lot of similarities with RSPO standard, falling short on the protection of women and its protection of migrant workers. Both standards offer the most comprehensive and nuanced approach to human rights protections and social safeguards across the themes explored, detailing worded and thoroughly explained requirements for compliance reflecting broad consideration of social issues facing the industry and communities affected by it. FPP asserts that RSPO should be the standard of choice when it comes to palm oil certification. Heavily guided by experience over the last ten years of implementation, RSPO provides the most robust scheme for palm oil certification, although as the study has proven there are still many gaps and rooms for improvement in the standard’s principles and criteria and with its realisation on the ground.

Further considerations:
In making this comparative study, it is important to state that there are some key differences among standards concerning minimum requirements for compliance to achieve certification. Only RSPO, ISPO and MSPO require full compliance with all criteria to be certified, or an approved time-bound plan for addressing minor non-compliances.

These differences caution against drawing conclusions about the impact of different standards on the ground, when not all provisions are mandatory under all schemes. This is most apparent when it comes to drawing comparisons on fair labour standards where the RSPO standard provides clear and relatively ambitious mandatory targets for companies seeking certification whilst ISCC and SAN standards provide detailed guidance on matters relating to employment conditions. Their weakness is that not all of the criteria are mandatory, making it difficult to compare them against the mandatory standards. SAN requires compliance with 50% of criteria within each principle, and 80% of all applicable criteria, except for critical criteria, which must be fulfilled. ISCC divides its criteria into major and minor musts, where all major and at least 60% of minor musts shall be met to achieve certification.

Criteria are the heart of the standards, with ISPO having the fewest, 28, and SAN the most, 100. As with principles, the number of criteria is partly a result of presentation, but it also reflects differences in the level of detail embodied in each standard, with SAN having numerous, very detailed criteria, and ISPO generally providing fewer, less detailed criteria. It could be argued that the lack of clear guidance makes ISPO considerably weaker than its counterparts.

Recommendations to RSPO:
In view of the next revision in RSPO Principles and Criteria which is scheduled for 2018, FPP has highlighted some key areas of improvement:

• **Audits:** To avoid the current conflict of interest experienced by auditors who are directly paid by the companies they are verifying, audits should be paid out of an ESCROW fund into which the companies seeking certification pay their contributions. RSPO or a fourth party should choose which audit teams are allocated to which companies and arrange for them to be paid from the ESCROW account.

• **Remedy:** The provision of remedy to the communities remains elusive for the loss of lands taken or damaged and their resulting economic and environmental losses. To bring itself into compliance with the norms for non-judicial remedies set out by the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, a mechanism to hold RSPO certified companies accountable for human rights violations and other damages (even if the company ceased to be RSPO-certified) is required. We recommend the use of a bond. The bond would act as an agreement between the certificate holder and RSPO to uphold the standard’s principles and to provide remedy to a third party in circumstances where these are violated.

• **Human rights defenders:** By using RSPO complaints procedures, communities have been able to expose land grabbing, violations of standards and human rights. This has allowed dialogues between companies and the communities, but has also resulted in the harassment and criminalisation of community spokespersons and complainants. Proper protection mechanisms must be put in place to avoid escalations of violence.

• **Smallholder protection:** Promote the development of support mechanisms to reduce barriers for smallholders to adopt sustainable production practices and RSPO certification.

When the revised RSPO P&C were adopted in 2013, there was considerable, voiced dissatisfaction with the new standard by some NGOs, some growers and many global brands which expressed the view that the standard did not go far enough, especially with regard to deforestation, peat and also some human rights provisions. Two efforts were therefore undertaken to raise the bar and satisfy the higher expectations of the market. The first was an enhanced standard open to certification adopted by a group of NGOs, growers and traders called the Palm Oil Innovators Group.

Three years later, RSPO responded with its own enhanced standard called RSPO Next which comprised of a voluntary add-on to its existing Principles & Criteria (P&C). Both systems rely on the RSPO’s verification procedures but require auditors to also check company compliance with the additional higher standards.

Palm Oil Innovation Group (POIG)

POIG is an initiative between environmental and civil society organisations and industry companies that aims to build upon the RSPO P&C and existing company commitments – especially on issues of deforestation, carbon stocks, biodiversity, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, pesticide use and social relations. It was launched at the Tropical Forest Alliance meeting in 2013. In 2014 POIG released its first ‘Charter Indicators’ list, which stipulates the specific conditions to be met regarding issues such as peat development, HCV and HCS management, FPIC and labour standards, among others.

RSPO NEXT

RSPO NEXT has been developed to recognise the efforts of RSPO members which are exceeding the requirements of the generic RSPO P&C. It was drawn up by RSPO at the end of 2015 and launched in February 2016. It is an additional voluntary commitment put forth in addition to the existing P&C and incorporates more stringent assessment standards, with additional requirements on deforestation, fire, peat, human rights and landscape approaches, among other issues. These are measured through a combination of reviewing company policies and on-the-ground verification. This additional assessment gives member companies the opportunity to go beyond the requirements of the RSPO and demonstrate a stronger commitment to environmental and social responsibility. The first RSPO Next certification was issued in April 2017.

WHAT NEXT? – RSPO NEXT AND POIG

As illustrated from the findings from the comparative study, RSPO offers the most comprehensive set of criteria and principles. Although not complete, they offer the most stringent and robust human rights safeguards among the competing schemes. As a result, other certification schemes have set to build on the work of RSPO. The tables below offer a comparison of two standards attempting to enhance the current RSPO standards – RSPO NEXT and POIG. Each certification standard is given a score of 1 or 2 in the themes in which it enhances the current RSPO P&C. No points are given (0) if there is no reference or significant difference between the standard and RSPO P&C’s. (1) point is given if there is a minor difference in degree between the standard and the P&C’s. (2) points are given if there is a difference in substance between the standard and the RSPO P&C’s. A more comprehensive break down of how the score was deduced is provided in Annex 2.

METHODOLOGY

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Difference in substance – NEXT or POIG make substantially different requirements. Some parts may be included in RSPO Principles and Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Difference in degree – Principles and Criteria includes requirement in guidance. RSPO NEXT and/or POIG make a minor difference in requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not referenced or no significant difference in guidance to RSPO guidance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A. Customary Rights

#### FPIC

**2 points:** POIG also states FPIC is a long-term, two-way process where communities must be informed that they have the right to say no to development and are not constrained by local legal frameworks. POIG makes more specific requirements to provide resourced access to independent advice and to redress any lack of FPIC on newly acquired plantations. Where companies are required to identify and seek to resolve inconsistencies between FPIC and legislation.²⁹

**1 point:** NEXT strengthens some of RSPO’s P&C by requiring the grower to demonstrate evidence of action to resolve any conflicts arising relating to customary land rights. It stipulates that FPIC is a long-term, two-way process which requires planning to be adaptive and allow for yearly or more consultations with affected stakeholders.

#### Negotiated Agreements

**1 point:** NEXT provides stronger wording, especially regarding consultation with vulnerable minority and gender groups, affirming “communication and consultation processes established in consensual agreement with assurances for vulnerable groups” whilst the RSPO P&Cs only goes as far as to state “mechanisms should be designed in collaboration with… and take into account access to information” rather than assure vulnerable groups will be consulted. NEXT requires certificate holders to consult vulnerable minority and gender groups and that consensual agreements are reached with these stakeholders.

#### Access to Information

**1 point:** NEXT requires a documented Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for responding constructively to stakeholder requests for information, including a specific timeframe to respond to enquiries, whilst for RSPO P&Cs this is guidance only where the timeframe is open to the grower or miller’s decision. NEXT requires this timeframe to be specified. POIG requires more comprehensive public reporting on some areas – particularly progress reporting and monitoring reports, and social, labour and environmental performance.

### B. Treatment of Smallholders

#### Treatment of Smallholders

**2 points:** NEXT requires certificate holders to develop outreach programs of support directed at all smallholders (irrespective of type) in the supply base that will enhance and support their competencies and market access. Programs shall cover sustainability issues as well as yields and productivity support, hazardous material trainings, fiscal management and budgeting, logistics of processing and market access and educating smallholders on their rights. This is a significant move from RSPO P&Cs as the outreach program covers all smallholders in their supply chain not only scheme smallholders. POIG also requires a smallholder support programme which is to be documented and monitored, which includes “measures to increase the productivity of smallholders to a comparable benchmark of productivity for the region, and a target of reaching the same productivity level as company estates; support relating to financial management and budgeting; and support relating to logistics, FFB processing and improved market access”. Progress of the programmes implementation is to be included in public reporting. In comparison, RSPO P&Cs provide limited requirements on support for smallholder development as part of local sustainable development and only applies to scheme smallholders. Both the new standards require companies to develop more proactive strategies for smallholder inclusion in the supply chain.

**NB** POIG and NEXT both make provisions support financial management and budgeting, however, more specific details on what constitutes fair credit is lacking.

#### Access to Market

**1 point:** NEXT states outreach programmes will “support [smallholder] competencies and market access”. POIG states programmes should “improve market access through group certification”.

---

²⁹ RSPO P&Cs have no requirement to resource advisers or legal counsel, only that communities can choose their own advisors, and there is no retrospective requirement to redress potential financial resource inequalities of the community.
## C. Social and Environmental Safeguards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NEXT</th>
<th>POIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory SEIAs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to Food</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to a Clean Environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social development

1 point: NEXT states “Positive social impacts of plantation development shall be actively promoted”, including … preference shall be given to hiring from local communities…understanding and supporting existing alternative livelihoods and ensuring they are not threatened or reduced…the provision of health and educational facilities where these are lacking or not available within accessible distance”. POIG requires a comprehensive social programme to “to ensure palm oil production does not result in human rights violations, trigger social conflicts, or produce ‘land grabbing’ and addresses key social equity issues including housing, healthcare and the empowerment of women”.

### Participatory Social and Environmental Impact Assessments (SEIAs)

1 point: NEXT requires companies to show evidence that they are managing and protecting areas deemed unsuitable for palm oil development in areas under their control because of the magnitude of potential environmental and/or social negative impacts. This also applies to the resolution of any conflict on such land.

### Right to Food

2 points: POIG provides a standalone requirement on food security, whereby the parameters of food security are defined by three factors “1) Availability and stability: a. Stability of food price and supply b. household food production c. food crop diversity (2) Access: a. Sufficiency of household food consumption b. Number of meals taken in a day c. Household dietary diversity (3) Utilisation a. Degree of access to utilities and services (water, energy, health, sanitisation)”. The standard specifies areas of land that should be left to meet food security needs, requires evidence that measures are implemented and effective and which specify the length of the planning cycle.

1 point: NEXT requires that the food security of local communities, including those not in the immediate vicinity of the project, to be addressed within the participatory SEIAs, whereby food security should be guaranteed through participatory land use planning.

### Rights to Water

1 point: Within the proposed additional POIG indicators, the scope of the food security assessment shall include assessing additional impacts that palm oil production operations may have on water rights.

### Rights to Clean Environment

1 point: NEXT takes a wider landscape approach to HCV management and monitoring, requiring plans at the landscape level and action and collaboration with a variety of stakeholders on the management of HCVs outside of the management unit. POIG requires certificate holders (CH) to make a “positive contribution” to the survival of rare, threatened and endangered species outside of the CH’s management unit and for comprehensive biodiversity surveys to be conducted to identify HCV 1-3.
Minimum wage

1 point: NEXT offers provision for a Decent Living Wage where "the company shall document a process of collective bargaining with the workforce to establish and implement a mutually agreed upon total compensation package that provides a decent living which shall include at least the minimum wage". POIG provides detailed, prescriptive list of labour requirements that specify how workers’ pay and conditions should meet minimum standards. These standards require: permanent, full-time employment for all core work; all workers are paid on time, directly, in legal tender; wage advances, etc are legal, recorded and do not result in debt bondage; all workers receive legally prescribed compensation and benefits; specify maximum normal working week and time off; and records to be kept of hours worked.

Free collective bargaining

1 point: NEXT clarifies that it is a requirement for all workers to be able to join an association. Where the RSPO P&Cs mentions migrant, trans-migrant workers and/or contracted workers being prevented from forming or joining associations and/or participating in collective bargaining.

No child labour

1 point: NEXT requires that no hazardous work is carried out by children whereby hazardous work is prohibited for under 18s and tasks which are not to be undertaken by minors are specified.

No slavery-like practices

2 points: POIG prohibits charging fees or costs to workers for recruitment or employment services. It prohibits the retention of ID or valuables by employers or recruiters and requires risk assessment of FFB supply chain to address risk of forced labour, trafficking and child labour.

D. Core Labour Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NEXT</th>
<th>POIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Wage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Child Labour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Slavery-Like Practices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Gender and Discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NEXT</th>
<th>POIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Discrimination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum wage

1 point: NEXT offers provision for a Decent Living Wage where "the company shall document a process of collective bargaining with the workforce to establish and implement a mutually agreed upon total compensation package that provides a decent living which shall include at least the minimum wage". POIG provides detailed, prescriptive list of labour requirements that specify how workers’ pay and conditions should meet minimum standards. These standards require: permanent, full-time employment for all core work; all workers are paid on time, directly, in legal tender; wage advances, etc are legal, recorded and do not result in debt bondage; all workers receive legally prescribed compensation and benefits; specify maximum normal working week and time off; and records to be kept of hours worked.

Free collective bargaining

1 point: NEXT clarifies that it is a requirement for all workers to be able to join an association. Where the RSPO P&Cs mentions migrant, trans-migrant workers and/or contracted workers being prevented from forming or joining associations and/or participating in collective bargaining.

No child labour

1 point: NEXT requires that no hazardous work is carried out by children whereby hazardous work is prohibited for under 18s and tasks which are not to be undertaken by minors are specified.

No slavery-like practices

2 points: POIG prohibits charging fees or costs to workers for recruitment or employment services. It prohibits the retention of ID or valuables by employers or recruiters and requires risk assessment of FFB supply chain to address risk of forced labour, trafficking and child labour.

No discrimination

2 points: RSPO P&Cs include no gender requirements for planning processes, NEXT includes a provision whereby “both the planning as well as the plans shall take a gender-inclusive approach, considering the different roles that men and women have in relation to e.g. landownership, use, food crop or cash crop production, markets and credit”.

Gender sensitive complaints procedure – Protection of women

2 points: NEXT requires a gender committee to be established specifically to address areas of concern to women where management representatives responsible for communication with the gender committee shall be female.

No sexual harassment – Reproductive rights protected

1 point: NEXT requires cases of harassment to be documented, monitored and targets introduced to reduce the number of harassment or abuse cases.
What next? – RSPO NEXT and POIG

F. Quality Assurance

Quality Assurance

2 points: NEXT requires "the HCV Assessment of all new plantings shall be led by an Independent Assessor who is licensed under the HCV Resource Network Assessor Licensing Scheme (ALS)". RSPO P&Cs state that NPP requires licensed assessors for plantings after 2010. For plantings between 2005 and 2010, there is no requirement to have a licensed HVC ALS assessor. RSPO P&Cs only require appropriate training and expertise for HCV assessment.

Social Development

CONCLUSION

Total Score of standards based on the seven themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEXT</th>
<th>POIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Total Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEXT</th>
<th>POIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two progressive standards are steps in the right direction for palm oil standards. Both provide innovations to the way in which sustainable palm oil is certified. On the one hand POIG outlines specific requirements for the maintenance or strengthening of communities’ food security and includes detailed indicators relating to workers’ rights, including specific provisions to protect the rights of temporary, contract and migrant workers, and more specific provisions on hours and leave, remuneration, child labour, forced labour and human trafficking. POIG also articulates specific guidance on smallholder support, including developing a group certification plan. Something which is also addressed in the RSPO NEXT standard.

One of the strengths of POIGs counterpart, RSPO NEXT, is that it provides improved quality assurance of assessors, strengthening the licensing system within RSPO. RSPO NEXT makes a very forward-looking approach to addressing cases of gender discrimination and harassment as well as the growing inequalities faced by migrant workers. Putting the burden of proof on the certification holder to demonstrate evidence of action taken to resolve conflicts puts the standard in a stronger position than that of the POIG Charter.
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## ANNEX 1

### Criteria 1.1 - Indicators 1.1.1 - Documents showing legal ownership or leases, history of land tenure and the actual legal use of the land shall be available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 1</th>
<th>Compliance with applicable laws and regulations. Criteria 1.1.1 - There is compliance with all applicable local, national and ratified international laws and regulations. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership is allocated to the landowner or company that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership and the actual legal use of the land is allocated to the person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. The person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities shall have an obligation to respect customary use, human rights and those with customary rights and informal use rights. Developers shall respect these customary laws and ensure that customary owners or their agents are properly informed of the legal, environmental and social implications of any land deals before they agree to them. Responsibility by companies that, in line with international law, customary communities have rights to the lands, territories and resources that they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used and have the right to prevent or withhold their IPCs as expressed through their own representatives, recognizes some quite fundamental changes in the way they go about land acquisition.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principle 2</td>
<td>Compliance to legal requirement. - Promises subscribed to ISPO requirements shall be met within the time frame provided. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership is allocated to the landowner or company that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership and the actual legal use of the land is allocated to the person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. The person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities shall have an obligation to respect customary use, human rights and those with customary rights and informal use rights. Developers shall respect these customary laws and ensure that customary owners or their agents are properly informed of the legal, environmental and social implications of any land deals before they agree to them. Responsibility by companies that, in line with international law, customary communities have rights to the lands, territories and resources that they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used and have the right to prevent or withhold their IPCs as expressed through their own representatives, recognizes some quite fundamental changes in the way they go about land acquisition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 3</td>
<td>Compliance to legal requirement. - Promises subscribed to ISPO requirements shall be met within the time frame provided. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership is allocated to the landowner or company that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership and the actual legal use of the land is allocated to the person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. The person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities shall have an obligation to respect customary use, human rights and those with customary rights and informal use rights. Developers shall respect these customary laws and ensure that customary owners or their agents are properly informed of the legal, environmental and social implications of any land deals before they agree to them. Responsibility by companies that, in line with international law, customary communities have rights to the lands, territories and resources that they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used and have the right to prevent or withhold their IPCs as expressed through their own representatives, recognizes some quite fundamental changes in the way they go about land acquisition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 4</td>
<td>Compliance to legal requirement. - Promises subscribed to ISPO requirements shall be met within the time frame provided. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership is allocated to the landowner or company that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership and the actual legal use of the land is allocated to the person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. The person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities shall have an obligation to respect customary use, human rights and those with customary rights and informal use rights. Developers shall respect these customary laws and ensure that customary owners or their agents are properly informed of the legal, environmental and social implications of any land deals before they agree to them. Responsibility by companies that, in line with international law, customary communities have rights to the lands, territories and resources that they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used and have the right to prevent or withhold their IPCs as expressed through their own representatives, recognizes some quite fundamental changes in the way they go about land acquisition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 5</td>
<td>Compliance to legal requirement. - Promises subscribed to ISPO requirements shall be met within the time frame provided. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership is allocated to the landowner or company that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership and the actual legal use of the land is allocated to the person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. The person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities shall have an obligation to respect customary use, human rights and those with customary rights and informal use rights. Developers shall respect these customary laws and ensure that customary owners or their agents are properly informed of the legal, environmental and social implications of any land deals before they agree to them. Responsibility by companies that, in line with international law, customary communities have rights to the lands, territories and resources that they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used and have the right to prevent or withhold their IPCs as expressed through their own representatives, recognizes some quite fundamental changes in the way they go about land acquisition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 6</td>
<td>Compliance to legal requirement. - Promises subscribed to ISPO requirements shall be met within the time frame provided. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership is allocated to the landowner or company that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership and the actual legal use of the land is allocated to the person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. The person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities shall have an obligation to respect customary use, human rights and those with customary rights and informal use rights. Developers shall respect these customary laws and ensure that customary owners or their agents are properly informed of the legal, environmental and social implications of any land deals before they agree to them. Responsibility by companies that, in line with international law, customary communities have rights to the lands, territories and resources that they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used and have the right to prevent or withhold their IPCs as expressed through their own representatives, recognizes some quite fundamental changes in the way they go about land acquisition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 7</td>
<td>Compliance with applicable laws and regulations of the coun- try, state, county, province, state or national law. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership is allocated to the landowner or company that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership and the actual legal use of the land is allocated to the person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. The person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities shall have an obligation to respect customary use, human rights and those with customary rights and informal use rights. Developers shall respect these customary laws and ensure that customary owners or their agents are properly informed of the legal, environmental and social implications of any land deals before they agree to them. Responsibility by companies that, in line with international law, customary communities have rights to the lands, territories and resources that they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used and have the right to prevent or withhold their IPCs as expressed through their own representatives, recognizes some quite fundamental changes in the way they go about land acquisition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Land Tenure Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 1</th>
<th>The right to use the land is demonstrated, and it is not legitimately contested by local people who can demonstrate that they have legal, customary or user rights. Criterion 1: - The right to use lands for the operations shall be established only when there are formal land users. Criterion 2: - Compliance with applicable laws and regulations of the country, state, county, province, state or national law. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership is allocated to the landowner or company that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership and the actual legal use of the land is allocated to the person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. The person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities shall have an obligation to respect customary use, human rights and those with customary rights and informal use rights. Developers shall respect these customary laws and ensure that customary owners or their agents are properly informed of the legal, environmental and social implications of any land deals before they agree to them. Responsibility by companies that, in line with international law, customary communities have rights to the lands, territories and resources that they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used and have the right to prevent or withhold their IPCs as expressed through their own representatives, recognizes some quite fundamental changes in the way they go about land acquisition.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
<td>The right to use the land is demonstrated, and it is not legitimately contested by local people who can demonstrate that they have legal, customary or user rights. Criterion 1: - The right to use lands for the operations shall be established only when there are formal land users. Criterion 2: - Compliance with applicable laws and regulations of the country, state, county, province, state or national law. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership is allocated to the landowner or company that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. Responsibility for maintaining legal ownership and the actual legal use of the land is allocated to the person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities. The person or institution that first used the land to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities shall have an obligation to respect customary use, human rights and those with customary rights and informal use rights. Developers shall respect these customary laws and ensure that customary owners or their agents are properly informed of the legal, environmental and social implications of any land deals before they agree to them. Responsibility by companies that, in line with international law, customary communities have rights to the lands, territories and resources that they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used and have the right to prevent or withhold their IPCs as expressed through their own representatives, recognizes some quite fundamental changes in the way they go about land acquisition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participatory Mapping

Criterion 2.2.3: Maps of an appropriate scale showing extent of recognized customary land, customary or user rights shall be developed and kept up to date. Criterion 2.5.3: Mapping should be participatory in nature. Criteria 2.2 and 2.3 are to be undertaken in a participatory way with involvement of all stakeholders (including neighboring communities where applicable). Criterion 2.2.3: Participatory planning and management should be in a participatory way with involvement of all stakeholders (including neighboring communities where applicable). Criterion 2.2.3: Participatory planning and management should be in a participatory way with involvement of all stakeholders (including neighboring communities where applicable).

Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC)

Criterion 7.5.1: There are open and transparent methods for participation with the grower/miller is signed and result in consensus driven negotiated agreements.

Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO)

Indonesian regulations refer to the importance of a participatory approach and require participation mapping to be conducted with affected parties and with involvement of the local district land office. The local government is involved because land is controlled by the state. Further, the local government land ownership rights generally are subject to one-off consultation and negotiation processes do not have to be documented.

Malaysian Sustainable Palm Oil (MSPPO)

No mention participatory or otherwise. Only states that documents of emancipation or transfer, history of land tenure and the identity of the land. Maps of fragile units must be available.

International Sustainability and Carbon Certification (ISCC)

No explicit mentions of FPIC.

Baseforest Alliance/Sustainable Agriculture Network (SAN)

Principle 4.20: Critical activities diminishing or threatened by the project shall be recorded and copies of negotiated agreements should be made available. Principle 4.20: Critical activities diminishing or threatened by the project shall be recorded and copies of negotiated agreements should be made available.

A Comparison of Leading Palm Oil Certification Standards Annex 1

Criterion 2.5.1: Evidence shall be available that information will take to ensure it is accessible to communities.

Criterion 2.5.1: Evidence shall be available that information will take to ensure it is accessible to communities.

Criterion 2.5.1: Evidence shall be available that information will take to ensure it is accessible to communities.

Criterions 2b and 2c: No new plantings are planned on their lands before and during initiation. Evidence shall be available of all consultation and communication procedures. Principle 4.19: Evidence shall be available that information will take to ensure it is accessible to communities.

Criterions 2b and 2c: No new plantings are planned on their lands before and during initiation. Evidence shall be available of all consultation and communication procedures. Principle 4.19: Evidence shall be available that information will take to ensure it is accessible to communities.

Criterions 2b and 2c: No new plantings are planned on their lands before and during initiation. Evidence shall be available of all consultation and communication procedures. Principle 4.19: Evidence shall be available that information will take to ensure it is accessible to communities.

Criterions 2b and 2c: No new plantings are planned on their lands before and during initiation. Evidence shall be available of all consultation and communication procedures. Principle 4.19: Evidence shall be available that information will take to ensure it is accessible to communities.

Criterions 2b and 2c: No new plantings are planned on their lands before and during initiation. Evidence shall be available of all consultation and communication procedures. Principle 4.19: Evidence shall be available that information will take to ensure it is accessible to communities.

Criterions 2b and 2c: No new plantings are planned on their lands before and during initiation. Evidence shall be available of all consultation and communication procedures. Principle 4.19: Evidence shall be available that information will take to ensure it is accessible to communities.

Criterions 2b and 2c: No new plantings are planned on their lands before and during initiation. Evidence shall be available of all consultation and communication procedures. Principle 4.19: Evidence shall be available that information will take to ensure it is accessible to communities.

Criterions 2b and 2c: No new plantings are planned on their lands before and during initiation. Evidence shall be available of all consultation and communication procedures. Principle 4.19: Evidence shall be available that information will take to ensure it is accessible to communities.

Criterions 2b and 2c: No new plantings are planned on their lands before and during initiation. Evidence shall be available of all consultation and communication procedures. Principle 4.19: Evidence shall be available that information will take to ensure it is accessible to communities.

Criterions 2b and 2c: No new plantings are planned on their lands before and during initiation. Evidence shall be available of all consultation and communication procedures. Principle 4.19: Evidence shall be available that information will take to ensure it is accessible to communities.

Criterions 2b and 2c: No new plantings are planned on their lands before and during initiation. Evidence shall be available of all consultation and communication procedures. Principle 4.19: Evidence shall be available that information will take to ensure it is accessible to communities.
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Criterions 2b and 2c: No new plantings are planned on their lands before and during initiation. Evidence shall be available of all consultation and communication procedures. Principle 4.19: Evidence shall be available that information will take to ensure it is accessible to communities.

Criterions 2b and 2c: No new plantings are planned on their lands before and during initiation. Evidence shall be available of all consultation and communication procedures. Principle 4.19: Evidence shall be available that information will take to ensure it is accessible to communities.


discipline. This of the appropriate language and co-signed by all members of the organization and the appropriate sustainability management plan. The signing process is confirmed in writing and the organization must provide evidence of its implementation and participation in the project. The certification process involves an independent third-party auditor who assesses the organization’s compliance with the standards and regulations.


documentation, and the group must also provide information about the project’s objectives and activities. The team is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the project and for providing regular updates to the organization. The team must also ensure that all information is managed and stored in a secure and confidential manner. The organization must also provide evidence of its participation in international forums and events, and for its active involvement in the certification process. The organization’s commitment to sustainable practices is assessed through regular audits and reviews, and the organization must provide evidence of its continuous improvement in the area.
The additional guidance states that “scheme smallholders, while also very diverse, are characterised as smallholders due to the fact that they are outside the reach of large or medium scale operators, by a credit agreement or by planning to a particular rate” it is not clear what specific guidance is being referenced.

Not mentioned.
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To date the HCS method has not been adopted as a standard by smallholders, another key set of stakeholders, including those attached directly to plantations and independent smallholders. A separate working group has been set up to develop suitable guidance for smallholders and HCS, so that they are not excluded from “zero deforestation” supply chains, as in the current case. Accordingly, this draft document has not been addressed to suit smallholder realities. (HCS Toolkit Version 2.0 - May 2017)
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Community benefits - Social Development

Criteria 3.1.3: Growers and millers contribute to local sustainable development where appropriate. Guidance: Where conditions are of labour employment, preference should always be given to members of indigenous communities. Positive discrimination based on need, and the company’s agreement with Criterion 3.4.4. Local development actions or investments should be made to contribute to the improvement of their farming practices. No mention of involvement of the community.

Social and Environmental Impact Assessments (SEIA)

Principle 4.1.4: Social impact assessment includes the following outcomes of the FPIC process shall be engaged in all five ESIA steps, and internal or external stakeholders.

Participatory SEAs

Criteria 7.3.1: A comprehensive and participatory independent social and environmental impact assessment undertaken prior to establishing new plantings or operations, or expansion or modification of existing plantations or operations, will be necessary. The results of the assessment shall be used in the development of effective, efficient and equitable procedures for immediate mitigation and monitoring.

Protection of Human Rights Defenders (HRDs)

Resolution 6.4: passed on “Protective Human Rights Defenders, WHRDs, Women, Children and Community. Sebastogencia”.

P4. Criteria 3.2: Commitment to contribute to local sustainable development, indicate 3. Growers should contribute to local development in consultation with the local community.

Participation of local stakeholders is important. Any negative impacts that overlap with an SIA shall be documented. 7.1.2 Approaching the protection and development of the operations, for instance: a) Creation

Criterion 4.7: The farm management and group administrator implement and document actions to support identified new needs and priorities of the local community, such as support for local schools or other education, health, infrastructure, small business.
In the definitions provided in the Guidance, food security includes the availability of food for consumption, affordability of food, as well as access to food, nutrition, and safety of food. The definition of food security also includes the capacity of the local population to obtain food and the environmental and social conditions that contribute to food security. The Guidance emphasizes the importance of identifying and mitigating the negative impacts of food production and consumption activities. It also highlights the need to consider the rights and needs of affected communities, including indigenous peoples and local communities, in the planning and implementation of food production activities.

The Guidance also mentions the importance of promoting sustainable agricultural practices, including agroforestry, integrated pest management, and the use of organic and agroecological methods. It encourages the development and implementation of agroforestry systems that can contribute to food security, biodiversity conservation, and climate change mitigation. The Guidance also highlights the importance of ensuring that food production activities do not lead to the displacement of vulnerable populations, including indigenous peoples and local communities, and that they do not exacerbate existing social and economic inequalities.

The Guidance also emphasizes the importance of ensuring that food production activities are carried out in a manner that respects the rights and needs of affected communities, including indigenous peoples and local communities. It highlights the importance of involving affected communities in the planning and implementation of food production activities and in the development of strategies to mitigate the negative impacts of these activities. The Guidance also emphasizes the importance of ensuring that food production activities do not lead to the displacement of vulnerable populations, including indigenous peoples and local communities, and that they do not exacerbate existing social and economic inequalities.

The Guidance also emphasizes the importance of ensuring that food production activities are carried out in a manner that respects the rights and needs of affected communities, including indigenous peoples and local communities. It highlights the importance of involving affected communities in the planning and implementation of food production activities and in the development of strategies to mitigate the negative impacts of these activities. The Guidance also emphasizes the importance of ensuring that food production activities do not lead to the displacement of vulnerable populations, including indigenous peoples and local communities, and that they do not exacerbate existing social and economic inequalities.

The Guidance also emphasizes the importance of ensuring that food production activities are carried out in a manner that respects the rights and needs of affected communities, including indigenous peoples and local communities. It highlights the importance of involving affected communities in the planning and implementation of food production activities and in the development of strategies to mitigate the negative impacts of these activities. The Guidance also emphasizes the importance of ensuring that food production activities do not lead to the displacement of vulnerable populations, including indigenous peoples and local communities, and that they do not exacerbate existing social and economic inequalities.
Principal 4 - Human and Labour Rights. Work-related operations shall not violate human rights or labour rights, and shall promote decent work and the well-being of workers. Criterion 4.1 - Employees' wages and working conditions shall respect all applicable legal and industry minimum standards as per agreed Collective Agreements. Criterion 4.2 - Employees shall be provided with fair legal contracts. A copy of employment contract is provided to the employee in the employment records. Indicator 4.1 - Other forms of social benefits shall be offered by the employer to employees, their families or the community such as incentives of good work performance, bonus payment, professional development, medical care and health provisions. Criterion 4.2 - An occupational safety and health policy and program shall be developed and implemented.

Criterions 4.1 - 4.19 describe the compliance and performance of the individual, collective and group administrators and representatives that handle or come into contact with harmful substances. They also include the activities to be undertaken and the responsibilities of the administrators and representatives in monitoring, assessing and implementing theSphere of influence of each individual, collective or group administrator.

The farm management shall establish policies to monitor and control occupational health and safety with the following indicators:

- Criterion 4.12 Labour and Safety: The farm management shall ensure that all workers are provided with fair legal contracts. Copies of working contracts can be shown to the employee and are always compensated at a premium rate during peak season. Overtime shall be voluntary and time recorded. Overtime work. Payments are made on the date, of all of their wages due, including for overtime.

- Criterion 4.13 Overtime and Breaks: Employees are provided with fair legal contracts. All overtime is paid at the rate required by law. For higher overtime pay, overtime is paid at 1.5 times the regular wage rate.

- Criterion 4.14 Working Conditions: Developers obtain and use PPE. Substances with hazardous materials for workers under the control or supervision of the employer. A copy of employer's contracts for all employers is maintained at the employment records. Indicator 4.11 - Other forms of social benefits shall be offered by the employer to employees or their families as incentives of good work performance, bonus payment, professional development, medical care and health provisions.

The farm management shall establish policies to monitor and control occupational health and safety with the following indicators:

- Criterion 4.10 Labour and Safety: The farm management shall ensure that all workers are provided with fair legal contracts. Copies of working contracts can be shown to the employee and are always compensated at a premium rate during peak season. Overtime shall be voluntary and time recorded. Overtime work. Payments are made on the date, of all of their wages due, including for overtime.

- Criterion 4.11 Overtime and Breaks: Employees are provided with fair legal contracts. All overtime is paid at the rate required by law. For higher overtime pay, overtime is paid at 1.5 times the regular wage rate.

- Criterion 4.12 Working Conditions: Developers obtain and use PPE. Substances with hazardous materials for workers under the control or supervision of the employer. A copy of employer's contracts for all employers is maintained at the employment records. Indicator 4.11 - Other forms of social benefits shall be offered by the employer to employees or their families as incentives of good work performance, bonus payment, professional development, medical care and health provisions.

The farm management shall establish policies to monitor and control occupational health and safety with the following indicators:

- Criterion 4.10 Labour and Safety: The farm management shall ensure that all workers are provided with fair legal contracts. Copies of working contracts can be shown to the employee and are always compensated at a premium rate during peak season. Overtime shall be voluntary and time recorded. Overtime work. Payments are made on the date, of all of their wages due, including for overtime.

- Criterion 4.11 Overtime and Breaks: Employees are provided with fair legal contracts. All overtime is paid at the rate required by law. For higher overtime pay, overtime is paid at 1.5 times the regular wage rate.

- Criterion 4.12 Working Conditions: Developers obtain and use PPE. Substances with hazardous materials for workers under the control or supervision of the employer. A copy of employer's contracts for all employers is maintained at the employment records. Indicator 4.11 - Other forms of social benefits shall be offered by the employer to employees or their families as incentives of good work performance, bonus payment, professional development, medical care and health provisions.

The farm management shall establish policies to monitor and control occupational health and safety with the following indicators:

- Criterion 4.10 Labour and Safety: The farm management shall ensure that all workers are provided with fair legal contracts. Copies of working contracts can be shown to the employee and are always compensated at a premium rate during peak season. Overtime shall be voluntary and time recorded. Overtime work. Payments are made on the date, of all of their wages due, including for overtime.
**Core Labour standards - Minimum wage**

**Criteria 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.** Indicators 6.5.1-6.5.3

**Wednesday and millers shall provide adequate housing, water and sanitation, a living wage which meets at least legal minimum standards, health and safety for workers shall follow internationally recognised standards.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.5.1</td>
<td>Minimum wages are paid in accordance with local laws and/or collective bargaining agreements. (Minor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.2</td>
<td>Employees’ pay and conditions meet legal and international conventions, as well as any relevant collective agreements, where a government-regulated minimum wage is in place in a given country and applies to the specific industry sector, this shall be observed. Where a minimum wage is absent, the wage paid for a particular activity shall be negotiated and agreed on as an annual basis with the worker and wages shall receive equal remuneration for work of equal value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.3</td>
<td>Conditions of occupational safety and health for workers shall follow internationally recognised standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annex 1**

**A Comparison of Leading Palm Oil Certification Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO)</td>
<td>- Conditions of occupational safety and health for workers shall follow internationally recognised standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials (RSB)</td>
<td>- Conditions of occupational safety and health for workers shall follow internationally recognised standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO)</td>
<td>- Conditions of occupational safety and health for workers shall follow internationally recognised standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian Sustainable Palm Oil (MSPSO)</td>
<td>- Conditions of occupational safety and health for workers shall follow internationally recognised standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Sustainability and Carbon Certification (ISCC)</td>
<td>- Conditions of occupational safety and health for workers shall follow internationally recognised standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainforest Alliance/Sustainable Agriculture Network (SAN)</td>
<td>- Conditions of occupational safety and health for workers shall follow internationally recognised standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The High Carbon Stock (HCS) Approach</td>
<td>- Conditions of occupational safety and health for workers shall follow internationally recognised standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Core Labour Standards - Free Collective Bargaining

**Criteria 4.1:** Management shall ensure that employees have the right to freely associate and the right to bargain collectively.

**Indicators 4.1:**
1. Employees shall have the right to form and join trade unions of their choice and to bargain collectively.
2. Union representatives are elected by the workers for the purposes of collective bargaining and that they are fully informed and are free to organize themselves for collective bargaining.
3. Employees have the right to organize and negotiate their work conditions. Employees exercising this right should not be discriminated against or suffer repercussions.

### Core Labour Standards - No Child Labour

**Criteria 4.6:** The use of child labour and discrimination against children are prohibited.

**Indicators 4.6:**
1. No minors are employed or engaged in hazardous work, and no employment of children with a minimum age requirement is met.
2. Children are not employed or engaged in or support the use of forced, bonded, or trafficked labour.
3. No minors are employed on the farm.

### Core Labour Standards - No Slavery-like practices

**Criteria 4.24:** There are records that provide an accurate overview of all employees (including seasonal workers and subcontracted workers on the farm) and indicate full names, parent(s) or legal guardian(s) consent and authorisation for the young worker’s employment; type of assigned work or tasks; and number of daily and weekly working hours.

**Indicators 4.24:**
1. The mandatory minimum working age is 15 years and no exceptions are allowed.
2. No minors are employed in the worst forms of child labour, ensuring and demonstrating that no child labour is used in their operations.
A Comparison of Leading Palm Oil Certification Standards

**Annex 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Labour Standards - Contracting Third parties</th>
<th>Core Labour Standards - Accessible grievance mechanism</th>
<th>Core Labour Standards - Protection of Migrant Labour</th>
<th>No Discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria 1.1 Growers and millers commit to ethical conduct in all business operations and transactions. Indicators 1.1.1 These standards should contribute to a code of ethical conduct and integrity in all operations and transactions, which shall be transparent and effective in the governance of the workplace. Operations and guidance are levels of operations and guidance for the elimination of third parties (e.g., those involved in security). Criteria 1.2 Growers and millers respect human rights. Guidance All levels of operations should facilitate the contact of third parties.</td>
<td>Criteria 6.1 There is a mutually agreed, transparent system of dealing with complaints and grievances, which are prompted and ensured to be resolved. Indicators 6.1.3 The system is clear on how to deal with complaints and grievances, open for all workers, and their concerns are resolved.</td>
<td>Criteria 6.6 Guidance - The right of employees, including migrant and temporary workers, to elect representatives and, where appropriate, to organise collectively with their employer should be respected, in accordance with Conventions 87 and 194 of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). Indicators 6.6.1 Migrant workers should be legalised, and a national permanent residency should be granted, followed up with their entitlements related to their conditions and rights.</td>
<td>Any form of discrimination (whether in recruitment, employment, promotion, and/or exit) on the basis of age, gender, disability, sexual orientation, religion, political opinion, nationality, social origin, or any other distinguishing characteristics. (Indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria 6.8 Workers should be free of any form of discrimination, exploitation, and long hours, as evidenced by employment or opportunity, with respect to wages, working conditions, and social benefits.</td>
<td>Criteria 6.3 Grievance mechanism should be established and implemented. - Guidance</td>
<td>Criteria 6.3 - Grievance and redress procedures for social risks - Indicators 6.3.1 Developers shall ensure that migrant workers are not permanently disenfranchised or excluded in their rights to trade union membership and representation. These standards shall apply to the entire workforce, whether casual or permanent workers, employed directly or via contractors, and whether engaged in agricultural or non-agricultural activities. Employees who are not permanently disenfranchised or excluded in their rights to trade union membership and representation shall have the right to join to their right to obtain their documents and facilitate the process to the charge economic recruitment fees.</td>
<td>No indicators specifically defined and applied in the case of migrant workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria 6.9 - Grievance systems should be established and implemented.</td>
<td>4.4.2 There is an accessible complaint form or procedure available on the farm, where employees and affected community can make a complaint.</td>
<td>Criteria 6.3.2 Indicators of the complaint should be made clear, making it possible to make a complaint.</td>
<td>No indicators specifically defined and applied in the case of migrant workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria 4.1 - Contractor - Indicator 1: 4.4.3 The farm management and group administrator implement complaint forms and procedures to all workers. They ensure that complaints are made and processed.</td>
<td>4.4.4 The farm management and group administrator ensure that complaints are processed and gender-related complaints are processed equally and transparently. (Indicators)</td>
<td>Criteria 6.3.4 The complaints system shall be based on a fair and non-discriminatory approach in addressing complaints. These systems shall apply to all affected workers, regardless of their status. (Indicators)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO)

Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO)

- **Quality Assurance**
  - No Disadvantage - Gender Sensitive
  - No Disadvantage - Sexual Harassment/Reproductive Rights Protected

#### Principles

- There is no harassment or abuse in the workplace, and reproductive rights are protected. 

#### Criteria

- **5.6.2** A policy to prevent sexual and all other forms of harassment and violence shall be implemented, and communicated to all levels of the workforce.

- **6.9.3** A policy to prevent sexual and all other forms of harassment and violence shall be implemented and communicated to all levels of the workforce.

- **6.10** Sexual orientation or political affiliation.

### Malaysian Sustainable Palm Oil (MSPPO)

Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials (RSB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 6:</strong> No harassment or abuse in the workplace, and reproductive rights are protected.</td>
<td><strong>No mentioned - either explicitly or implicitly</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not mentioned - either explicitly or implicitly</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not mentioned.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not mentioned.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not mentioned - either explicitly or implicitly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 5:</strong> The management shall establish a policy and provide guidelines to prevent all forms of sexual harassment and violence at the workplace.</td>
<td><strong>Not mentioned.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The ISCC standard have strong links to other European Commission Standards and has a strong focus on a cross - compliance control systems. Summaries of audit reports will be made publicly available together with the certificates.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The criteria for the external third party certification do not mention gender sensitivity.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No public summaries of audit reports.</strong></td>
<td><strong>They shall also ensure that there is no harassment or abuse in the workplace and that reproductive rights are protected.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 4:</strong> Contractor - Misconduct.</td>
<td><strong>No sexism - either explicitly or implicitly</strong></td>
<td><strong>They also rely on accredited third parties to help verify the certification process, including determining applicability of each criterion to either individual farm/ plantation, undertaking audits, and issuing certificates.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No public summaries of audit reports.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No public summaries of audit reports.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Secretariat select the Peer Review Panel for each application of the certification process. The Secretariat allows the Peer Review Panel to make a decision without the Secretariat's involvement.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 3:</strong> Contractor - Employee Conduct.</td>
<td><strong>No sexism - either explicitly or implicitly</strong></td>
<td><strong>The ceritifiers help verify the certification process, including determining applicability of each criterion to either individual farm/ plantation, undertaking audits, and issuing certificates.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No public summaries of audit reports.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No public summaries of audit reports.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Secretariat select the Peer Review Panel for each application of the certification process. The Secretariat allows the Peer Review Panel to make a decision without the Secretariat's involvement.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 2:</strong> Contractor - Management.</td>
<td><strong>No sexism - either explicitly or implicitly</strong></td>
<td><strong>The ceritifiers help verify the certification process, including determining applicability of each criterion to either individual farm/ plantation, undertaking audits, and issuing certificates.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No public summaries of audit reports.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No public summaries of audit reports.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Secretariat select the Peer Review Panel for each application of the certification process. The Secretariat allows the Peer Review Panel to make a decision without the Secretariat's involvement.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 1:</strong> Contractor - Farm/ Plantation.</td>
<td><strong>No sexism - either explicitly or implicitly</strong></td>
<td><strong>The ceritifiers help verify the certification process, including determining applicability of each criterion to either individual farm/ plantation, undertaking audits, and issuing certificates.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No public summaries of audit reports.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No public summaries of audit reports.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Secretariat select the Peer Review Panel for each application of the certification process. The Secretariat allows the Peer Review Panel to make a decision without the Secretariat's involvement.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 6.10</strong> Women who are pregnant, nursing or have recently given birth are not assigned to activities that pose risk to the woman’s, fetus’s or infant’s health. In cases of 5.4.6: The farm management and group administration offer women who are pregnant, nursing or have recently given birth flexible working schedules or work site arrangements and in the provision of sick leave and child care; no discrimination against the health and safety of the woman’s, fetus’s or infant’s health.</td>
<td><strong>Not mentioned.</strong></td>
<td><strong>They also rely on accredited third parties to help verify the certification process, including determining applicability of each criterion to either individual farm/ plantation, undertaking audits, and issuing certificates.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No public summaries of audit reports.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No public summaries of audit reports.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Secretariat select the Peer Review Panel for each application of the certification process. The Secretariat allows the Peer Review Panel to make a decision without the Secretariat's involvement.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 6.9.3</strong> A policy to prevent sexual and all other forms of harassment and violence shall be implemented and communicated to all levels of the workforce.</td>
<td><strong>No sexism - either explicitly or implicitly</strong></td>
<td><strong>They also rely on accredited third parties to help verify the certification process, including determining applicability of each criterion to either individual farm/ plantation, undertaking audits, and issuing certificates.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No public summaries of audit reports.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No public summaries of audit reports.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Peer Review Panel sends its findings to the company, which can then submit new information or correct mistakes for further review by the panel.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance - Accreditation of Certifiers</td>
<td>Quality Assurance - Quality Assurance of assessor (assessor licensing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited by Accreditation Services International (ASI), which provides a service to RSPO to assure the quality of its CBs through accreditation. Similarly the scheme is helping on independent 3rd parties to conduct assessment on environmental, social and economic issues. The concept of a single body is not used as it would struggle with conflicts of interest. In the case of ISPO, the scheme requires the assessor to be licensed under HCS Resource Network. For example: Criteria 7.1 - A comprehensive and participatory independent social and environmental impact assessment is undertaken prior to establishing new plantations or operations or expanding existing ones, and the results incorporated into planning, management and operations. Guidance - The terms of reference should be defined and impact assessment should be carried out by accredited independent experts, in order to ensure an objective process. Both should not be done by the same body. A participatory methodology including external stakeholder groups is essential to the identification of impacts, particularly social impacts. Stakeholders such as local communities, government departments and NGOs should be involved through the use of interviews and meetings, and in reviewing findings and plans for mitigation.</td>
<td>HCS audit reports are based on assessments for all HCV assessment carried out in the context of new planting procedures (NPPs). A HCS HCV assurance licence is obtained after having two assessments and submitting two adequate assessment reports. To maintain HCS licence, the assessor is required to submit the reports of all HCV assessments in the HCS Quality Panel. Failure to do so can result in suspension or removal of licence. A Quality Manager reviews applications and a Quality Panel evaluates reports for compliance with HCS procedures. Stakeholders also have access to public summary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The RSB Accreditation Body (ASI) - ASI (Accreditation Services International) provides services to RSB to assure the quality of its CBs through accreditation. RSB Certification bodies are accredited directly by the RSB Commission. (not independent of RSB) - the RSB maintains a high level of control over the entire certification process from standard setting through to certification issuance.</td>
<td>RSB is a full member of the ISGAL Alliance and operates a quality management system based on ISO 9001:2015 requirements for accreditation bodies. The RSB model is verified by third party RSB certification - the primary use of the RSB standard is a certification system involving independent 3rd party certification bodies. RSB assurance system is carried out by auditors who are either employed or contracted by certification bodies. They must comply with RSB Procedures for Certification Bodies and Auditors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited by ISPO Commission (not independent of ISPO).</td>
<td>ISPO audit teams should consist of auditors who understand licensing requirements, palm oil plantations, good management practices, occupational health and safety systems, have an awareness of environmental, social and economic issues. They should speak Indonesian and understand ISO 19011 on managing audit systems. ISPO auditors must also pass a training course organised by the ISPO Commission and be trained by approval by ISPO commission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited by ISPO Commission. General requirements laid out in ISCC (EU) 2011 - Requirements on Certification Bodies. American National Standards Institute (ANSI) works as an independent third party program to accredit the ISCC’s Certification Bodies. This ensures that the certification bodies comply with international standards as well as with the ISCC system, including conformance with ISO/IEC 17065.</td>
<td>The IAOC is a signatory to the International Accreditation Forum (IAF) MLA, which demonstrates ISO/IEC 17011 compliance to your users and the Multilateral Recognition Arrangement for Product Certification operated by Pacific Accreditation Cooperation (PAC). Multilateral Recognition Arrangements for Product Certification (under ISO/IEC 17050), Greenhouse Gas Validation/Verification (under ISO/IEC 17025) and Process Certification (under ISO/IEC 17065). ISCC Integrity Assessments are planned randomly or on a risk basis after risk evaluations, complaints or reports of non-conformity or fraud. Integrity Assessments are conducted by ISCC Integrity Auditors and can take place in any country where CBs carry out activities. ISCC Integrity Assessments are carried out on the basis of the applicable ISCC procedures documentation. The results of the assessment are then compared with the CBs’ audit report from the last regular certification audit. ISCC does not charge any costs to the participants. Annually, more than the square root of all ISCC system users and their CBs are reviewed within the framework of the ISCC Integrity Program. The Integrity Assessments take place additionally to the annual certification audits of the ISCC system users conducted by the CBs and additionally to the controls or “witness audits” conducted by the bodies responsible for the recognition or accreditation of the CBs. This ensures highest integrity of the certification scheme and the claims made under the scheme. The participation of ISCC system users in a scheduled ISCC Integrity Assessment is mandatory. Failure to participate may be considered a serious non-conformity with the ISCC requirements and will be sanctioned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ADG is a signatory to the International Accreditation Forum (IAF) MLA, which demonstrates ISO/IEC 17011 compliance to your users and the Multilateral Recognition Arrangement for Product Certification operated by Pacific Accreditation Cooperation (PAC). In 2014, SAN also became a CB Member of HCS Resource Network. In October 2017 the Rainforest Alliance became the sole owner and operator of the certification scheme.</td>
<td>The HCS Approach Steering Group now requires all new HCS approach assessments to be combined with HCV assessments. All was an outcome of the HCS approach assessment of the Rainforest Alliance developed a comprehensive HCV assessment that is responsive to the HCS Resource Network’s Assessor Licensing Scheme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO)</td>
<td>Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials (RSB)</td>
<td>Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO)</td>
<td>Malaysian Sustainable Palm Oil Certification (MPOBC)</td>
<td>International Sustainability and Carbon Certification (ISCC)</td>
<td>Rainforest Alliance/Sustainable Agriculture Network (SAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance - Formal Public consultations required during audit process</td>
<td>The RSPO allows for public stakeholder consultations at the compliance stage of the certification process if a member meets the criteria. Certification Bodies can decide to include a complaints system as part of the audit. However, the ISCC only requires a complaints system if requested by the certification body. The RSB requires companies to engage with local communities to identify any contradictions between national legal requirements and social requirements. The HCS requires public consultation only in case of major non-conformity caused by stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A requirement under Indonesian law involves public consultation with the relevant stakeholders. According to Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the Protection and Management of the Environment, for land larger than 5,000 hectares, it is compulsory to have an Environmental Impact Assessment, and Social Impact Assessment, something which ISPO standard adheres to. The RSPO requires a formal public consultation at each audit of land conflicts, at least to the National Land Board to manage land issues and community conflicts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No, only in standards development and decision-making. ISPO standard in audit process only requires public consultation with all relevant stakeholders if there has been a minor or major non-compliance noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedy - Grievance procedure/mechanism</td>
<td>Criteria B.2: Operations shall implement and maintain a transparent and easily accessible grievance mechanism for directly affected local communities. The grievance mechanism shall be a documented system for dealing with complaints and grievances, and which has the following characteristics:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 2 - The system shall be able to resolve disputes in an effective, timely and appropriate manner that is accepted by all parties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 3 - A compliant form should be made available at the premises, where employees and affected stakeholders can make a complaint.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 4 - Employees and the surrounding communities should be made aware that complaints or suggestions can be made in time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 5 - Complaints and resolutions for the last 24 months shall be documented and made available to affected stakeholders upon request.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criteron 6.11: There is a compliant form and/or procedure available on demand, where employees and affected stakeholders can make a complaint.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ISCC audit process also requires a complaints system. Following the Stage 1 of the audit process, in a one-off consultation, although stakeholders are notified 20 days prior to the field visit, there are seven further stages of consultation for the complaint or appeal, ISCC is entitled to contact the parties and stakeholders affected and to ask for supporting evidence, documentation or statements in order to obtain a sufficient understanding of the situation. ISCC may schedule an independent assessment of grievances and complaints and a process for social requirements of HCS - Developers shall provide representation of all those affected, and to address any grievances or complaints raised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a complaint System, complaints and grievances can be addressed to the certification body the RSPO does not provide a measure indicator that provides documentation of the grievance process when the dispute was raised and where the results shall be made. Complaints have system indicates applicable for identifying employees entitled to compensation. ISPO does not have an indicator that shall be a system for calculating and distributing fair compensation. There is no time line for follow-up for a mechanism for independent investigation mentioned. ISO it's a Land related conflicts, the National Land Board has a Land Dispute and Conflict Assessment and Handling department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criterion 4.4.1: Is there a mechanism for follow-up for a system to address any grievances or complaints raised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criterion 6.4.1: The farm management and group administration communicate openly with local communities to identify community concerns and interests related to the farming or group administration’s operations. The farm management and group administration develop and implement a system to address any grievances or complaints, and to its members to raise grievances and have these grievances duly considered and resolved. ISPO this criteria is Level B. 90% of which is not minimally required until year 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annex 1 - Information from local stakeholders can be incorporated into the monitoring of ICLUP Working Group is also discussing how to resolve conflicts in a timely manner. Any result and decision will be communicated to the compliance body by the ISCC management without delay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.B. No details on remedies available after a complaint has been made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Module 7** - The Quality Assurance System is discussed in more detail. Information from local stakeholders can be incorporated into the monitoring of ICLUP Working Group is also discussing how to resolve conflicts in a timely manner. Any result and decision will be communicated to the compliance body by the ISCC management without delay.
**Conflict Resolution (Land disputes)**

**Criterium 2.3.** The right to use the land is documented, and is not legitimately contested by local people who can demonstrate that they have legal, customary or usage rights. **Criterium 3.3** There is a mutually agreed and documented system for dealing with land disputes, which is implemented and accepted by all affected parties. Indicators: **4.4.** The panel, open to all affected parties, shall resolve disputes in an effective, timely and appropriate manner, ensuring anonymity of complainants and stakeholders, where requested. **3.3.** Documentation of both the process by which a dispute was resolved and the outcome shall be available.

**Complaints can be re-submitted (only one attempt within 4 weeks of original submission).** New submissions are allowed where new evidence is presented it is the equivalent of a new complaint.

**Remedy - Appeals procedure**

- **Complaints may be submitted to the organisation overseeing the activities of the certification scheme.** If the grievance is originally filed, there are three possible accountable organisations: - the certifying body, the accreditation body and RSPO secretariat. If the case is unresolved, the outcome of the appeals process is final. If any grievance issues presented is the equivalent of a new complaint.

**Multistakeholder Scheme Governance - Are IPs/local communities represented?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annex 1</th>
<th>A Comparison of Leading Palm Oil Certification Standards</th>
<th>78</th>
<th>79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO)</td>
<td>Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials (RSB)</td>
<td>Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO)</td>
<td>Malaysian Sustainable Palm Oil (MSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mentioned - either explicitly or implicitly</td>
<td>Not mentioned - either explicitly or implicitly</td>
<td>Not mentioned - either explicitly or implicitly</td>
<td>Not mentioned - either explicitly or implicitly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Principle 3.** Criteria 2.3 - Land use rights, Indicator 4 (Where there are, or have been, disputes, documented proof of legal acquisition of land title and/or compensation that have been or are being made to present owners and communities, shall be provided. Where there is no mutual agreement, the dispute resolution mechanism to be documented or open to the public. Documentation of both the process by which a dispute was resolved and the outcome shall be available.**

**Remedy - Ombudsmen type process, for mediation**

**Not mentioned - either explicitly or implicitly**

**Not mentioned - either explicitly or implicitly**

**Not mentioned - either explicitly or implicitly**

**Criterium 4.1.** There is a complaint form and/or procedure available on the farm, where employees and affected communities can make a complaint. **Criterium 4.2.** The complaint including name and organisation. In any case the complaint is intended to maintain anonymity throughout the further process, the complaint is not be made public in the process. **N.B.** Only a minor consideration and no details on mediation available is given. **Criterium 4.4.** The farm management and group administrator communicate openly with local communities to identify common concerns and interests related to the farms or group administrator’s operations. The farm management and group administrator shall resolve the dispute. 

**Not mentioned - either explicitly or implicitly**

**Not mentioned - either explicitly or implicitly**

**Not mentioned - either explicitly or implicitly**

**Not mentioned - either explicitly or implicitly**

**Not mentioned - either explicitly or implicitly**

**Not mentioned - either explicitly or implicitly**

**Not mentioned - either explicitly or implicitly**

**Module 3.3. Community agreement**

**Processes** will need to be agreed for participation management and monitoring, as well as for the resolution of any grievances and disputes between the parties. Implementation will need to be agreed upon. The grievance mechanism shall rely instead on those of its members to raise grievances and have these duly considered and resolved. **N.B.** There are a number of key steps to be followed. A simple grievance mechanism (so that any disagreements over the status and management objectives of conservation areas in the CLUP are resolved).
A Comparison of Leading Palm Oil Certification Standards

**Palm Oil Innovation Group (POIG)**

- **POIG NEXT**
  - **Criterion 1.2**
    - POIG NEXT requires long-term two-way process, NEXT requires planning to be adaptive and allow for more year-on-year consultations.

- **POIG NEXT**
  - **Indicator 6.2**
    - POIG NEXT requires more comprehensive public reporting on some areas – particularly progress reporting and monitoring reports, and social, labour and environmental performance. POIG requirement is MR 6.2 above.

**RSPO NEXT**

- **Criterion 4.2**
  - RSPO NEXT strengthens some POIG guidance as requirements. Requires the grower to demonstrate evidence of action taken to resolve conflicts. RSPO agrees with POIG guidance as requirements. Requires the grower to demonstrate evidence of action taken to resolve conflicts. RSPO agrees with POIG guidance where necessary.

- **POIG NEXT**
  - **Criterion 6.2**
    - POIG NEXT requires more comprehensive public reporting on some areas – particularly progress reporting and monitoring reports, and social, labour and environmental performance. POIG requirement is MR 6.2 above.

- **POIG NEXT**
  - **Criterion 1.2**
    - POIG NEXT requires long-term two-way process, NEXT requires planning to be adaptive and allow for more year-on-year consultations.

**POIG NEXT**

- **Criterion 1.2**
  - POIG NEXT requires long-term two-way process, NEXT requires planning to be adaptive and allow for more year-on-year consultations.

- **POIG NEXT**
  - **Criterion 6.2**
    - POIG NEXT requires more comprehensive public reporting on some areas – particularly progress reporting and monitoring reports, and social, labour and environmental performance. POIG requirement is MR 6.2 above.

**POIG NEXT**

- **Criterion 1.2**
  - POIG NEXT requires long-term two-way process, NEXT requires planning to be adaptive and allow for more year-on-year consultations.

- **POIG NEXT**
  - **Criterion 6.2**
    - POIG NEXT requires more comprehensive public reporting on some areas – particularly progress reporting and monitoring reports, and social, labour and environmental performance. POIG requirement is MR 6.2 above.

**POIG NEXT**

- **Criterion 1.2**
  - POIG NEXT requires long-term two-way process, NEXT requires planning to be adaptive and allow for more year-on-year consultations.

- **POIG NEXT**
  - **Criterion 6.2**
    - POIG NEXT requires more comprehensive public reporting on some areas – particularly progress reporting and monitoring reports, and social, labour and environmental performance. POIG requirement is MR 6.2 above.
A Comparison of Leading Palm Oil Certification Standards

Community benefits - Social Development

Criteria 6.11. Growers and millers contribute to local sustainable development when they
profitably support: Education - provision of education services; Health care - provision of
care; Income - increase in household income; Other local benefits; Recreation -
provision of recreational facilities.

Participatory SEIs

Criterion 7.1. A comprehensive and participatory social and environmental impact
assessment is undertaken prior to new palm oil plantings or operations, or
expansion on existing plantations. Proposed additional POIG indicators:
Criterion 7.1: Does the company undertake a regular participatory process with
affected parties for the development of a social management plan?
Criterion 7.3. The company shall have social management plans that cover the
entirety of the company’s operations and demonstrate an approach to
compliance with the Guidance.

Local food systems, right to food

In the definitions provided in the Guidance, the right to food is defined as a person’s or a group’s
right to have access to adequate, clean, safe and nutritious food to meet their nutritional needs
on a regular basis, including to have access to water for drinking, cooking, bathing and cleaning
purposes.

Rights to water

Criterion 6.4. Practices maintain the quality and availability of surface and ground
water.

Rights to clean environment

Principle 5. Environmental Responsibility and Conservation of Natural Resources and
Biodiversity: A company shall have policies and plans that acknowledge the
importance of both biodiversity and carbon conservation, as well as social
consideration.

Carb Lioh standards - Minimum wage

Criterion 6.5. Payment and conditions for employees and for contract workers always meet
at least the minimum standards and are sufficient to provide a “living wage”.

Carb Lioh standards - Free Collective Bargaining

Criterion 6.6. The employer respects the rights of all personnel to form and join trade unions
of their choice and to bargain collectively.

Carb Lioh standards - No Child Labour

Criterion 6.7. Children are not employed or exploited.

POIG NEXT

HCS NEXT: The company shall have independent and participatory SEIs to develop plans to
mitigate the negative and promote the positive indirect or secondary impacts of the
development. COMPARISON: POIG NEXT requires independent and participatory SEIs.

Palm Oil Innovation Group (POIG)

2.4 Food Security: Apart of its POIG process, palm oil rigorous impact assessments and
participatory and/or palm oil plantings with indigenous and local communities, food security is
monitored or strengthened in order to meet their local food needs and future food
security options. This will include undermining local control of and diversity of food
production systems. There is transparency of the land allocation process – the
provenance of food that needs to be taken into account in assessments are generally (POIG)
1. Food availability and stability. Safety of food and supply and household food production
(food and gender - it looks at food availability; food crop diversity) 2. Access
(availability); 3. Sufficiency of household food consumption. Number of meals taken in a day;
4. Household dietary diversity 5. Urbanisation and degree of access to utilities and services
water, energy, health, sanitation.)
### Core Labour Standards - No Slavery-like practices

**Criteria 6.12** - No forms of forced or trafficked labour are used - **Indicators 6.12.1**

There shall be evidence that no forms of forced or trafficked labour are used. 6.12.2 Where applicable, it shall be demonstrated that in contract substitution has occurred. 6.2.3 Where temporary or migrant workers are employed, a special labour policy and procedures shall be established and implemented.

#### RSPO NEXT

- **6.12.1**
  - No explicit reference to this indicator

#### Palm Oil Innovation Group (POIG)

- **6.12.1**
  - No forms of forced or trafficked labour are used - **Indicators 6.12.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>POIG</strong></th>
<th><strong>RSPO NEXT</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comparison</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.12.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.12.1</strong></td>
<td>No specific reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### No Discrimination

**Criteria 6.8 - Any form of discrimination based on race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation, or age, is prohibited.**

**Indicators:** 6.8.1 publicly available equal opportunity policy including description of relevant affected groups in the local environment shall be documented. 6.8.2 Evidence shall be provided that employers and groups including local communities, women, and migrant workers have not been discriminated against. 6.8.3 It shall be demonstrated that recruitment selection, hiring and promotion are based on skills, capabilities, qualities, and medical fitness necessary for the job available.

#### RSPO NEXT

- **6.8.1**
  - No specific reference

### No Discrimination - Gender Sensitive Complaints Procedures/Protection of Women

**Criteria 6.9 - There is no harassment or abuse in the work place and reproductive rights are protected.**

**Indicators:** 6.9.1 A policy to prevent sexual and all other forms of harassment and violence shall be implemented and communicated to all levels of the workforce.

**6.9.2** A policy to prevent sexual and all other forms of harassment and violence shall be implemented.

**6.9.3** A specific grievance mechanism which respects anonymity is required.

All complaints/grievances of harassment or abuse shall be documented and responses & actions monitored. There shall be time bound targets for reducing the number of harassment or abuse cases.

#### RSPO NEXT

- **6.9.1**
  - No specific reference

### No discrimination - No sexual harassment/reproductive Rights protected

**Criteria 6.8 - Any form of discrimination based on race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation, or age, is prohibited.**

**Indicators:** 6.8.1 publicly available equal opportunity policy including description of relevant affected groups in the local environment shall be documented. 6.8.2 Evidence shall be provided that employers and groups including local communities, women, and migrant workers have not been discriminated against. 6.8.3 It shall be demonstrated that recruitment selection, hiring and promotion are based on skills, capabilities, qualities, and medical fitness necessary for the job available.

#### RSPO NEXT

- **6.8.1**
  - No specific reference

### Quality Assurance - Quality Assurance of assessor (assessor licensing)

**RSPO will require licensed assessors for all HCV assessment carried out in the context of new-planting procedures.**

A full HCV assessor licence is obtained after leading two assessments and submitting two adequate HCV assessment reports. To maintain a full licence, an HCV assessor is required to submit the reports of all HCV assessments to the ALS Quality Panel. Failure to do so can result in suspension or revocation of licence - **Criteria 6.12**

- **6.12.1**
  - No specific reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>POIG</strong></th>
<th><strong>RSPO NEXT</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comparison</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.12.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.12.1</strong></td>
<td>No specific reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Core Labour Standards - No Slavery-like practices

**Criteria 6.12 - No forms of forced or trafficked labour are used - **Indicators 6.12.1**

There shall be evidence that no forms of forced or trafficked labour are used. 6.12.2 Where applicable, it shall be demonstrated that in contract substitution has occurred. 6.2.3 Where temporary or migrant workers are employed, a special labour policy and procedures shall be established and implemented.

#### RSPO NEXT

- **6.12.1**
  - No explicit reference to this indicator

### No Discrimination

**Criteria 6.8 - Any form of discrimination based on race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation, or age, is prohibited.**

**Indicators:** 6.8.1 publicly available equal opportunity policy including description of relevant affected groups in the local environment shall be documented. 6.8.2 Evidence shall be provided that employers and groups including local communities, women, and migrant workers have not been discriminated against. 6.8.3 It shall be demonstrated that recruitment selection, hiring and promotion are based on skills, capabilities, qualities, and medical fitness necessary for the job available.

#### RSPO NEXT

- **6.8.1**
  - No specific reference

### No Discrimination - Gender Sensitive Complaints Procedures/Protection of Women

**Criteria 6.9 - There is no harassment or abuse in the work place and reproductive rights are protected.**

**Indicators:** 6.9.1 A policy to prevent sexual and all other forms of harassment and violence shall be implemented and communicated to all levels of the workforce.

**6.9.2** A policy to prevent sexual and all other forms of harassment and violence shall be implemented.

**6.9.3** A specific grievance mechanism which respects anonymity is required.

All complaints/grievances of harassment or abuse shall be documented and responses & actions monitored. There shall be time bound targets for reducing the number of harassment or abuse cases.

#### RSPO NEXT

- **6.9.1**
  - No specific reference

### No discrimination - No sexual harassment/reproductive Rights protected

**Criteria 6.8 - Any form of discrimination based on race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation, or age, is prohibited.**

**Indicators:** 6.8.1 publicly available equal opportunity policy including description of relevant affected groups in the local environment shall be documented. 6.8.2 Evidence shall be provided that employers and groups including local communities, women, and migrant workers have not been discriminated against. 6.8.3 It shall be demonstrated that recruitment selection, hiring and promotion are based on skills, capabilities, qualities, and medical fitness necessary for the job available.

#### RSPO NEXT

- **6.8.1**
  - No specific reference

### Quality Assurance - Quality Assurance of assessor (assessor licensing)

**RSPO will require licensed assessors for all HCV assessment carried out in the context of new-planting procedures.**

A full HCV assessor licence is obtained after leading two assessments and submitting two adequate HCV assessment reports. To maintain a full licence, an HCV assessor is required to submit the reports of all HCV assessments to the ALS Quality Panel. Failure to do so can result in suspension or revocation of licence - **Criteria 6.12**

- **6.12.1**
  - No explicit reference to this indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>POIG</strong></th>
<th><strong>RSPO NEXT</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comparison</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.12.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.12.1</strong></td>
<td>No specific reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Core Labour Standards - No Slavery-like practices

**Criteria 6.12 - No forms of forced or trafficked labour are used - **Indicators 6.12.1**

There shall be evidence that no forms of forced or trafficked labour are used. 6.12.2 Where applicable, it shall be demonstrated that in contract substitution has occurred. 6.2.3 Where temporary or migrant workers are employed, a special labour policy and procedures shall be established and implemented.

#### RSPO NEXT

- **6.12.1**
  - No explicit reference to this indicator

### No Discrimination

**Criteria 6.8 - Any form of discrimination based on race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation, or age, is prohibited.**

**Indicators:** 6.8.1 publicly available equal opportunity policy including description of relevant affected groups in the local environment shall be documented. 6.8.2 Evidence shall be provided that employers and groups including local communities, women, and migrant workers have not been discriminated against. 6.8.3 It shall be demonstrated that recruitment selection, hiring and promotion are based on skills, capabilities, qualities, and medical fitness necessary for the job available.

#### RSPO NEXT

- **6.8.1**
  - No specific reference

### No Discrimination - Gender Sensitive Complaints Procedures/Protection of Women

**Criteria 6.9 - There is no harassment or abuse in the work place and reproductive rights are protected.**

**Indicators:** 6.9.1 A policy to prevent sexual and all other forms of harassment and violence shall be implemented and communicated to all levels of the workforce.

**6.9.2** A policy to prevent sexual and all other forms of harassment and violence shall be implemented.

**6.9.3** A specific grievance mechanism which respects anonymity is required.

All complaints/grievances of harassment or abuse shall be documented and responses & actions monitored. There shall be time bound targets for reducing the number of harassment or abuse cases.

#### RSPO NEXT

- **6.9.1**
  - No specific reference

### No discrimination - No sexual harassment/reproductive Rights protected

**Criteria 6.8 - Any form of discrimination based on race, caste, national origin, religion, disability, gender, sexual orientation, union membership, political affiliation, or age, is prohibited.**

**Indicators:** 6.8.1 publicly available equal opportunity policy including description of relevant affected groups in the local environment shall be documented. 6.8.2 Evidence shall be provided that employers and groups including local communities, women, and migrant workers have not been discriminated against. 6.8.3 It shall be demonstrated that recruitment selection, hiring and promotion are based on skills, capabilities, qualities, and medical fitness necessary for the job available.

#### RSPO NEXT

- **6.8.1**
  - No specific reference

### Quality Assurance - Quality Assurance of assessor (assessor licensing)

**RSPO will require licensed assessors for all HCV assessment carried out in the context of new-planting procedures.**

A full HCV assessor licence is obtained after leading two assessments and submitting two adequate HCV assessment reports. To maintain a full licence, an HCV assessor is required to submit the reports of all HCV assessments to the ALS Quality Panel. Failure to do so can result in suspension or revocation of licence - **Criteria 6.12**

- **6.12.1**
  - No explicit reference to this indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>POIG</strong></th>
<th><strong>RSPO NEXT</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comparison</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.12.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.12.1</strong></td>
<td>No specific reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>