

<b>Principle 1 09/03</b>	
<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
<b>Danielle, Cristina, Luiz, Ilana, Kendyl</b>	<b>Miguel</b>
<p>Agenda</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Homework analysis and pending points to agree (1.30 mins) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Indicator 1.2.2 Risk and Impact Assessment are conducted</li> <li>○ Indicator 1.3.1 Standard Operation Procedures are developed</li> <li>❖ Mini-detour: Social Dialogue [from P2 subgroup yesterday] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Indicator 1.1.1 Sustainability policies are in place</li> <li>○ Indicator 1.3.2 Management Plans are developed</li> <li>○ Indicator 1.3.4 FPIC – review Guidance</li> <li>○ Indicator 1.3.5 Cane Supply Agreements complied with</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ol>	
<p><b>Discussion Point - 1.2.2 – Risk and Impact Assessment are conducted - What is the scope of stakeholders who have access to the risk assessment documents?</b></p>	<p><b>Agreement</b> The summary must be sufficiently robust but will not compromise operators with legal challenges. The stakeholders must be made available to all stakeholders who request.</p>
<p><b>Discussion Point 1.3.1 – Standard Operation Procedure are developed –</b> Does “all activities” include only the unit of certification or does it also include the entire supply area?</p>	<p><b>Agreement</b> “all activities” includes all areas inside the unit of certification. The objectives should be set for the short, medium, and long term (when applicable). Indicator title changed to “standard operating procedures”</p>
<p><b>Discussion Point Social Dialogue:</b></p>	<p><b>Agreement – Agree to add terminology in 1.1.1 &amp; 1.3.2.</b> Pending questions to resolve in homework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clarify if worker consultation should be sought on all procedures (like for example aerial spraying) or only in procedures that affect the wellbeing of workers (H&amp;S, discrimination) etc.</li> <li>• Do operators have to review existing procedures if not developed with worker consultation or do the requirements only apply to procedures developed since the granting of certification.</li> <li>• The auditor guidance shall set clear instructions on how this indicator can be audited.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Discussion Point – FPIC</b></p>	<p><b>Agreement</b></p>

Review of guidance draft	Agreement with guidance content as long as the sentence around requiring FPIC prior to any new acquisition is taken out or rephrased to focus more on expansion. Agreement with indicator wording in combo with guidance
<b>Discussion Point – Cane Supply Agreements Complied with.</b>	<b>Agreement</b> This indicator needs to be strengthened in terms of what are the responsibilities of the mills. Additional wording to be added to the indicator text: “The operator establishes a control system, such as an internal audit mechanism, to ensure suppliers comply with the requirements in the cane supply agreements.”
<b>Discussion Point</b>	<b>Agreement</b>
<b>Next steps:</b> Homework due on the 26 <sup>th</sup> March Internal deadline 23 <sup>rd</sup> March – Presentation <a href="#">here</a>	

<b>Principle 2 01/03</b>	
Present	Absent
Marionne, Cristina, Ilana, Ineke, Ruth, Kendyl	Mario
Agenda: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicator 2.1.5 H&amp;S training</li> <li>• Indicators 2.4.1 &amp; 2.4.2 Social dialogue</li> <li>• Indicator 2.2.6 DLW</li> <li>• Indicator 2.2.7 Working Hours</li> <li>• Indicator 2.3.4 Minimum age of workers</li> </ul>	
Discussion Point – 2.1.5 – H&S Training Change the wording in the indicator to training on occupational health and safety instructions prior to beginning activities. The training includes	Agreement All in agreement and the following comments were added: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify what sorts of training can be included as part of the guidance.</li> </ul>

<p>the information related to the risks and activities to be performed by the workers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Auditor guidance should clarify how the 90% metric threshold is to be calculated</li> <li>• Add before start of work</li> <li>• Psychosocial wellbeing can be included in the risk matrix. This is aligned with the latest ISO standards.</li> </ul>
<p>Discussion Point - 2.4.1 &amp; 2.4.2 Social dialogue Move text “The operator promotes other mechanisms of social dialogue...” to indicator 2.4.2 Make indicator to CORE</p>	<p>Agreement: All in agreement and the following comments were added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rename 2.4.1 – To promote social dialogue</li> <li>• Rename 2.4.2 – to “Social Dialogue by consultation and information exchange between and among employers and workers organizations</li> </ul>
<p>Discussion Point - Indicator 2.2.6 Decent Living Wage Nahuel presented data on current amount of living wage reference values and current wages of certified operators.</p>	<p>Agreement: Sub-group on DLW will discuss changes to the indicator: Marionne, Ilana, Peter</p>
<p>Discussion Point - Indicator 2.2.7 Working Hours Nahuel presented the view of the ILO on working hours and current working hours of certified operators</p>	<p>Agreement: Sub-group on Working hours will discuss changes to the indicator: Ilana, Ruth, Cristina, Mario, Luiz.</p>
<p>Next steps:</p> <p>Homework will be on excel on the dropbox so everyone can see each other’s comments. Working group will self-organise to discuss the comments between themselves before sending to PF Guidance review due on the 19<sup>th</sup> of March. Working group on LW: Marionne, Nahuel, Ilana Working Hours: Cristina, Ruth, Nahuel, Ilana.</p>	

<b>Principle 4 08/03</b>	
<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Luiz, Peter, Robert, Ruth, Olivia, Miguel?	

<b>Agenda:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction and updates (15 mins) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Update since last SRWG call (December)</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Homework analysis and pending points to agree (1h30 mins) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Update HVC risk assessment &amp; BESMP (Olivia)</li> <li>○ Update from soil expert group &amp; associated indicators</li> <li>○ Indicator 4.3.1 Identify main water resources Discuss rational for moving away from “water resources and catchment areas”</li> <li>○ Indicator 4.3.5 Review value and indicator wording</li> <li>○ Indicator 4.4.2 &amp; 4.4.3 Pest and weed control review guidance</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Homework and Next Steps (10 mins)</li> </ol>	
<b>Discussion Point:</b> Olivia presented the HCV risk assessment and guidance or indicator 4.1.1, 4.1.2 & 4.1.5	<b>Agreement</b> There were concerns abouts the cost of hiring experts and concern around ambiguity of demonstrating compliance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach was approved for not, waiting for more details to provide a more complete review.</li> <li>• Olivia will share examples of similar approaches used by other standards.</li> </ul>
<b>Discussion Point:</b> Health of the Soil	<b>Agreement – not discussed due to time constraints.</b>
<b>Discussion Point: 4.3.1 – Identify main water resourced</b> – change in the indicator to focus on main water resources, rather than all water resources and set objectives for water stewardship. Also changes to wording to	<b>Agreement</b> Concern with microbasin. That is why the word OR is in the standard. Provide comments with the homework section on this.
<b>Discussion Point 4.3.5 – Irrigation water productivity</b>	<b>Agreement</b> - >66 does not make sense. need to rewrite this. Provide alternatives in the comments.
<b>Discussion Point</b> – Merge indicators 4.4.2 (Agro-ecological pest and disease management practices implemented) and 4.4.3 – Integrated Weed Management Plan	<b>Agreement – not discussed due to time constraints.</b> Comments to be inputted into the homework.
<b>Discussion Point</b>	<b>Agreement</b>
<b>Next steps:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Active/Passive agreement to indicator wording</li> <li>• Detailed comments on each indicator &amp; corresponding guidance</li> <li>• Proposal to use same mechanism as suggested by Kendyl for P2 subgroup:</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Shared Excel on dropbox where each member of subgroup has 2 columns: one to signal agreement (Yes/No) and one for suggestions</li> <li>● PF analyse HW responses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Edits in track changes where straight forward</li> <li>○ Bigger items for more work identified &amp; distributed</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>HW due 24<sup>th</sup> of March - <a href="#">here</a></b></p>	
---	--

<b>Principle 5 05/03</b>	
<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Ilana, Danielle, Miguel, Kendyl, Ruth	
<b>Agenda:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Progressive implementation</li> <li>● Indicator 5.1.2 Value added per tonne cane</li> <li>● Indicator 5.2.1 Ambient air quality update from Kendyl and Ilana</li> <li>● Indicator 5.3.1 Vocational training</li> <li>● Indicator 5.4.1 Occupational H&amp;S</li> </ul>	
<b>Discussion Point:</b> Revised language on Progressive indicators	<b>Agreement:</b> Agree
<b>Discussion Point:</b> List of indicators applicable to the whole supply area	<b>Agreement:</b> 4.3.1 – Difficult to make core as not everyone can conduct these studies. This will be discussed in the P4 session.
<b>Discussion Point:</b> 5.1.2 – Value added per tonne of cane	<b>Agreement:</b> What is the value of this indicator? An alternative is needed. Nicolas will consult with the ISO. Homework will include 3 options, improve the guidance, re-develop or remove.
<b>Discussion Point:</b> Indicator 5.2.1 Ambient air quality update from Kendyl and Ilana	<b>Agreement:</b> There was not an alignment around the objective of this indicator, in particular around measuring ambient air emissions in the nearest population centre. The misalignment was around what are the action plans that can result from ambient air emissions above

	threshold due to operations outside the control of the operator. This question will be addressed in the homework.
<b>Discussion Point:</b> Indicator 5.3.1 Vocational training	<b>Agreement</b> : add mention of “full time equivalent of 16 hours per year” in ‘Standard’ column to clarify what is expected for seasonal workers WG still needs to discuss how many hours per year should be expected on vocational training – some still feel this is too high
<b>Discussion Point:</b>	<b>Agreement:</b>
<p><b>Next steps:</b>  PF to circulate v0.2 of the strawman with edits in track changes on 5.2.1/5.2.2 and any from today’s discussion  + HW</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Active/Passive agreement to indicator wording</li> <li>• Detailed comments on each indicator &amp; corresponding guidance</li> </ul> <p>☒ Proposal to use same mechanism as suggested by Kendyl for P2 subgroup:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shared Excel on dropbox where each member of subgroup has 2 columns: one to signal agreement (Yes/No) and one for suggestions</li> <li>• PF analyse HW responses</li> <li>• Edits in track changes where straight forward</li> <li>• Bigger items for more work identified &amp; distributed</li> </ul> Homework due on the – 22 <sup>nd</sup> of March. <a href="#">here</a>	

Principle: <b>All Working Group 17/03</b>	
Present	Absent
Cristina, ilana, Luiz, Olivia, Ruth, Adre, Miguel, Ruth, Marionne, Kendyl, Pat, Mario, Danielle	
Agenda: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secretariat support needs: facilitators for standard revision process</li> <li>• ToR for Standard Revision</li> <li>• Latest work &amp; status of documents</li> <li>• Explore other remote methods</li> <li>• SRWG availability in the next few months</li> <li>• Decision making for public consultation draft</li> <li>• Comms plan for public consultation</li> </ul>	
Discussion Point: <b>facilitators for standard revision process</b>	DM shared the reasons for inclusion of Proforest and adding clarity and appreciation of WG. Mentioned that Bonsucro needs to have the process finished by September – so to work towards that objective
Discussion Point: <b>ToR for Standard Revision</b>	Nahuel reminded everyone of the governance of the Standard Revision, including roles and responsibilities for each body.
Discussion Point: <b>Update on work by sub-working groups</b>	Claire gave an update of the changes the sub-working groups are currently working on the following agreements we made. P4: Bella and Pat will exchange on water irrigation efficiency Want to see the whole indicators that apply to the whole supply area. – Discussed in P5 – will share with the whole supply area Confusion around meaning of whole supply area P5 – Capture cost in the calculator if indicator on value added is removed
Discussion Point: <b>New Methods for remote work</b>	Use of common homework excel for all to see each other’s comments simultaneously. An internal deadline for comments is now set, which will allow WG members to review each other’s comments to find internal alignment. For changes that cannot be agreed during the calls, a separate sub-group will be created to work through the changes. These sub-groups will be self-organized and may ask Nahuel for support.

<p>Discussion Point: <b>Comms plan for consultation</b></p>	<p>The secretariat is responsible for developing the communications plan for the standard revision, including how to socialise the new draft.</p> <p>Bonsucro is going to launch its revised global strategy in May. The launch will take 3 weeks and after a week cool down period the Standard Revision consultation can start.</p> <p>The strategy and the standard are quite complimentary, which will aid in the socialisation of the standard.</p>
<p>Next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Revised timeline circulated to SRWG</li><li>• Homework submission subgroups</li><li>• Homework analysis &amp; topics for further work distributed</li><li>• Mini groups submit (re)drafted text portions</li><li>• Collation to next version of standard SRWG review</li></ul>	