

Standard Revision Working group meeting – Drafting version 5.7a

29th July 2021 at 13pm – 14:30pm (London time)

Present		Absent
Cristina Lopez (Chair)	Ineke Wesseling	Peter Allsopp
Miguel Tejada (Vice-Chair)	Olivia Scholtz	Luiz Iaquina
Marionne Lips	Danielle Lima	Ruth Ascencio
Kendyl Salcito	Mario Amador	Ilana Weiss

Agenda

After the publication of the second draft of the Bonsucro Production Standard for public consultation, the Secretariat identified several instances which the standard is not clear or there are to improve consistency and robustness of standard. The Secretariat would like the WG to resolve these inconsistencies before the comments from the second public consultation are received and can dedicate its time to addressing the comments as soon as they are received. [These suggestions for the WG can be found here.](#) The inconsistencies identified by the secretariat were categorised using the following framework and were sent to the WG ahead of the meeting:

1. Non substantive changes – inconsistencies that can be corrected by amending the title of indicator or wording of indicators that **do not change its intent or scope**
2. Substantive changes - Inconsistencies that require amendments that alter the scope or verifier **but not the intent of the indicator**. These are usually to correct any errors, omissions, or consistency.
3. Clarification from Working Group on specific issues - Inconsistencies that require clarification from working group before any changes are made as these **could result in a change of intent or scope**

1. Non substantive changes

The Chairs of the working group have approved the non-substantive changes presented in the Inconsistencies v5.7 documents, however, they identified a few items in which they would prefer for the working group to discuss and approve:

- **1.3.3 – system in place to demonstrate compliance vs promote law** – The secretariat suggests amending the indicator to mention promoting compliance with the law rather than demonstrating law compliance to avoid misrepresenting Bonsucro audits as legal audits which they are not. The WG has approved this item.
- **2.1.3 Right to water and sanitation safeguards are designed implemented and enforced.** – The indicator mentions “close proximity” and “safe drinking water”, however, without providing no definition. The secretariat recommends the following definitions: (< 5 min walk, and WHO standard for safe drinking water). The WG has approved this item.
 - Robert – is it the terminology accepted globally and have operators to test the water. NT: The definition of safe drinking water is in the current version of the Standard and therefore operators have experience in using it.

- **2.1.7 Lost time accident frequency** – The indicator mentions that fatalities have to be recorded separately but no action attached - the Secretariat proposed to add some specific actions (root cause analysis and implementation of corrective actions) as well as adding a data entry point to the calculator. The WG has approved this item.
 - **2.2.1 – existence of contract or equivalent** – The secretariat evaluated that there were some uncertainties around what would happen if local legislation allowed for non-written contracts and add suggested to add a sentence to support that objective. The WG clarified that it was deliberate to remove non-written contract and therefore the WG has not approved this item but agreed to discuss once the comments of the public consultation are received.
 - Robert: it has been an issue with a grower in Oz who employs 10 workers. They didn't have a written contract, however, in Australia it is a requirement to have written contracts; Kendyl in other context there is a risk that the contracts are badly interpreted.
 - **2.2.6 – Living Wage benchmark** – The secretariat evaluated that the timeline for implementation is confusing and suggests amending the indicator wording (implementation period starting following publication of the benchmark or initial certification) – The WG has approved this item.
 - Kendyl what is Bonsucro commitment to issue benchmark? There are 5 certified countries in which there are no benchmarks available. Bonsucro will join the Living Wage Action Network to coordinate the development of missing benchmarks
 - Miguel – what is the methodology? The Anker & Anker Methodology
 - Robert – how do we manage desire to work more by workers? In the current standard workers are permitted to work as many hours as the legislation allows or up to 60 hours per week, whichever is stricter.
 - **2.4.3 Grievance mechanism for workers are in place.** The secretariat believes that there is a mistake in the indicator. The word “Impact” should be replaced with the word “grievance”. The WG has approved this item
 - **2.4.3 Grievance mechanism for workers are in place** – The secretariat believes that including the scope “whole supply area” in the wording of the indicator creates confusion over what the grievance mechanism applies to and suggests removing the sentence. The WG has approved this item
 - Kendyl: Change to “grievance is open to all stakeholders”. add to the guidance that sugarcane suppliers are covered by the grievance mechanisms. This has also been adopted.
 - **5.4.3. Gender inclusion in management and technical positions** – There is a discrepancy with the title of the indicator: “management and technical positions”, and the indicator description “all workers”. The secretariat asks the WG to define the correct term. The WG have approved that gender inclusion refers to management positions (supervisor, team leaders...).
- 2. Substantive changes**

- **2.1.2 Health and safety risks are managed through implemented and enforced plans.** – The secretariat believes that indicator 2.1.2 and 2.1.1 repeat each other as they both refer to mitigating risks. The WG has agreed to remove mitigation from 2.1.1.
- **2.1.6 All workers have access to first aid and provision for emergency response** – The secretariat believes that changing the verifier from 100% to yes/no would make the indicator simpler to audit and comply with. The WG has approved this item.
 - Robert: It would be interesting to have a specific number of trained workers with 1st aid.
 - Kendyl – we could add this to the guidance.
- The agenda moved on due to time constraints. The following remaining issues will be discussed at a later date.
 - 3.1.4 - Efficiency of harvesting operations: amending scope to farm
 - 3.2.3 - Net GHG emissions per tonne of sugar: remove farm from scope
 - 5.1.3 – clarify if biannually means every 2 years or every 6 months.

3. Clarification from Working Group on specific issues:

Time Bound Improvement Plan & Whole Supply area scope: The secretariat believes that there are significant contradictions and confusion as to which indicators apply to the whole supply area. While some indicators are clearly marked as applying to the whole supply area, the inclusion of “1.2.2 Risk and Impact Assessment are conducted” and the mention to “whole supply area” in the text of the indicators means that potentially all high-risk indicators (as defined by the operator) could apply to the whole supply area. The WG is asked to look again at these indicators and provide clarity.

As a way of starting the conversation, the secretariat identified the following options to move forward:

1. Remove the scope category “whole supply area” from all indicators. The risk and impact assessment (indicator 1.2.2) will determine which CORE indicators the producers should focus their attention on to promote improvement in the whole supply area.
2. Remove the notion of TBIP and clearly lists all indicators that should apply to the whole supply area by including “whole supply area” in the full wording of the indicators.
 - Olivia – The Standard should precisely define what is the list of indicators applicable to the whole supply area and that this list should be aligned with Bonsucro’s strategy.
 - Marianne – The notion of TBIP is more for the guidance and specifically for the indicators where it is mentioned the whole supply area. TBIP is a tool to go beyond the UoC. There is no risk to the standard by prioritising the risk issues mentioned in 1.2.2.

Nahuel – If we also look at the risk assessment and the mitigating actions, it is also confusing. The risk assessment asks for: a) social & environmental risk assessment, B) an identification of impacts (potential and actual) & c) a business context analysis. The Management Plans indicator asks for measures to counteract the highest risks identified in the risk and impact assessment (1.2.2) & to implement the Bonsucro Production Standard. It also goes on to state that priorities will be given to control the highest risks identified related to indicators of the Bonsucro Production Standard in the Unit of certification and work progressively to enact actions that will seek to mitigate in the whole cane supplying area.

- Miguel – we need to better define the risk assessment. There are already social, health and safety assessment. Then you have one for legal compliance.
Determination of the risk is tight to legal compliance, HR impact, reputation impact. But there is no guidance for this.
- NV reminded that the standard in itself is a risk assessment defined by the WG. The TBIP could become a separate indicator of P1 to ask operators to work on issues outside the unit of certification (be the indicators of the standard or additional risks identified by the risk assessment)..
- Risk assessment and mitigation become just around meeting the standard. The highest priorities, informed by the risk assessment are rolled out outside the UOC.
- Marianne – there is risk of changing the priorities set by the WG.
- Cristina; it is important to define what highest priority is – how do we define highest risk. What is the list of indicators that needs to be removed from the whole supply area; how to we address Continuous Improvement?
- Miguel – I prefer to keep the list of indicators that go beyond the unit of certification rather than relying on a risk assessment.
- Nahuel – In that case I would advise to look again at the indicators that apply to the whole supply area, as there could be some that should apply, like the social indicators.

Due to the complexity of information presented the WG asked more time to reflect on what the best course of action will be and will revert with their decision.

AOB:

Robert – comments on soil for acide suflate soil (ASS) – 1 mln ha of cane is grown on ASS –pH is 3.7 which means you couldn't meet the indicator 4.2.3 – and this would be the case for the whole of East Coast of Australia.

NT: We can connect later this as we are out of time.