

Supplementary material belonging to:

Balancing Ambitions and Realities: Stakeholder Perspectives on Jurisdictional Approach Outcomes in Sabah’s Forests

Ng, Julia Su Chen^{ab}; Chervier, Colas^{cd}; Carmenta, Rachel^e; Samdin, Zaiton^a; Azhar, Badrul^a, and Karsenty, Alain^f

^a University Putra Malaysia, Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia

^b ABIES Doctoral School, AgroParisTech, Palaiseau, France

^c Centre de Coop´eration Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le D´veloppement (CIRAD), UR Forests and Societies, Environnements et Soci´etes, Montpellier, France

^d Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Bogor, Indonesia

^e School of International Development, University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom

^f Centre de Coop´eration Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le D´veloppement (CIRAD), UMR SENS, Montpellier, France

Corresponding author: Julia Ng Su Chen (julia.ngsuchen@gmail.com)

Annex 1 RSPO’s stepwise approach for jurisdictional approach certification requirements

	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
System Performance Indicators	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-stakeholder group established with a government mandate. Statement of intent to achieve 100% RSPO compliance made public by government. Plan developed for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> establishment of the Jurisdictional Entity. relevant policies, systems, and procedures to support JA. Spatial mapping of all producers, millers, refinery, crushers, HCV/HCS, and other relevant information. Database of information on producers, processors, and supply chain actors within the jurisdiction. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> A Jurisdictional Entity is legally established with a Multi-stakeholder Board in place. A Jurisdictional Entity Internal Control System developed. Oil palm planted areas and a land bank of all producers, millers, refineries, and crusher and refinery facilities spatially mapped. Database compiled on producers, processors, and supply chain actors within the jurisdiction. Jurisdictional Entity becomes an RSPO member. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Jurisdictional Entity Internal Control System is functioning. Quality control system and policy framework in place. Plan in place to establish Internal Grievances, Complaints & Appeals Mechanisms. Financing viability and transparent accounting procedures in place. Oil palm planted areas and a land bank of Jurisdictional Entity members, and a detailed database required for RSPO certification in place.
Landscape Performance Indicators	Plan developed to conduct and/or develop jurisdictional level:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Indicative map of peatlands and HCV and HCS areas available. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> FPIC and land rights recognition procedures and guidelines are in

1. Procedures for FPIC and recognition of land rights formulated.	2. Jurisdictional level ‘No-go’ zones (for conservation and protection) mapped.	place and being implemented.
2. Indicative HCV and HCS mapping (in alignment with RSPO requirements) includes mapping of peatlands.	3. Land Use Change Analysis completed with (potential) liability declared and made publicly available.	2. Spatial planning is in place, including HCV and HCS areas and peatland, and Remediation and Compensation Procedures requirements are being implemented.
3. Historical Land Use Change Analysis in accordance with the RSPO Land Use Change Analysis guidance document.	4. Procedures for recognition of land rights developed.	3. Social and Environmental Impact Assessment procedures and guidelines are being implemented.
4. Legal gap analysis of differences between RSPO P&C and jurisdiction law and policies.	5. FPIC procedure and guidelines completed for the jurisdiction.	4. Remediation and Compensation Procedures approved (for conservation liability(s) identified in Step 2) and in implementation
5. Regulation on the use of fire, fire prevention, and control measures.	6. Regulation on the use of fire, fire prevention, and control measures in place.	5. New Planting Procedures as per RSPO requirements implemented.
	7. System developed and fully operating at a jurisdictional level to monitor, detect and verify deforestation, hotspots/ burning, and conversion of peatlands, HCV areas, HCS areas, and other ‘no-go’ zones, including social risks and impacts.	6. Enforceable regulations or procedures adopted and applied to overcome gaps with RSPO P&C.
	8. Legal gaps identified on the differences between RSPO P&C and jurisdiction law and policies and the necessary regulations or procedures developed.	7. Disqualifying social and environmental issues are addressed, or certification cannot proceed.
	9. Assessment of disqualifying social and environmental issues and steps taken to address them, including no conversion of HCV and HCS areas or peatlands, serious human rights violations, and systemic land grabbing.	8. System developed and fully operating at a jurisdictional level to monitor, detect and verify deforestation, hotspots/burning, and conversion, including social risks and impacts.

Note: This table was adapted from RSPO (2021).

Annex 2 The MSPO Principles and Criteria 2022 that complement the RSPO Standards

MSPO Principles and the RSPO Principle it complements	Criteria
<p>Principle 1: Management commitment and responsibility</p> <p>Complements RSPO Principle 7: Protect, conserve, and enhance ecosystems and the environment (Note: HCS not mentioned, and new planting on peat can still be done)</p>	<p><i>Criterion 2: New planting</i> Comprehensive HCV, environmental and social impact assessments should be undertaken prior to new planting. New plantings on peatland are prohibited unless permitted by the state authorities that have jurisdiction over land matters. No new plantings are carried out on customary land without the owners' FPIC. No conversion of natural forests, protected areas, and HCV areas should occur after 31 December 2019.</p>
<p>Principle 3: Compliance with legal and other requirements</p> <p>Complements RSPO Principle 4: Respect community and human rights and deliver benefits</p>	<p><i>Criterion 2: Rights to use land</i> To cultivate oil palm, there must be proof of ownership, such as a land title, lease, or joint venture agreement with indigenous peoples.</p> <p><i>Criterion 3: Native customary rights</i> Customary rights shall not be threatened or reduced. Any conflict or land disputes shall be resolved in accordance with an FPIC process.</p>
<p>Principle 4: Responsibility to social, health, safety, and employment conditions</p> <p>Complements RSPO Principle 6: Respect workers' rights and conditions</p>	<p><i>Criterion 3: Employment conditions</i> A policy on respecting human rights shall be established and implemented. The policy shall be in line with the Federal Constitution, the UN Declaration on Human Rights, and the ILO Decent Work Agenda. There shall be no forms of forced/trafficked labor, child labor, discrimination, or harassment.</p> <p><i>Criterion 4: Living conditions</i> When housing is provided, decent living conditions, including clean water for domestic use, are provided to employees and families.</p>
<p>Principle 5: Environment, natural resources, biodiversity, and ecosystem services</p> <p>Complements RSPO Principle 7: Protect, conserve, and enhance ecosystems and the environment</p>	<p><i>Criterion 6: Environmental conservation and protection</i> Information shall be collected within or adjacent to the management area, and appropriate measures will be taken to protect the species or habitat following the HCV approach and relevant local authorities' requirements.</p> <p><i>Criterion 7: Zero burning practices</i> There shall be no open burning except in situations under the legal framework (e.g., in areas where no other effective measures exist, like stopping the disease from spreading to the next crop)</p>

Source: Government of Malaysia (2022)

Note: Table 2 does not compare MSPO versus RSPO standards; it only informs readers of the principles and criteria that complement both standards relevant to this research.

Annex 3 Factor loadings for each respondent's Q-sort (bold fonts are significant loadings that are auto-flagged, and these are the Q-sorts that are most representative of the factor) (Zabala et al., 2018).

Q sort	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
CV1	0.5615	0.1904	-0.0057
CV2	0.5755	-0.376	-0.1062
CV3	0.2296	-0.1501	0.7639
BI4	0.3423	-0.0669	0.0206
GM5	-0.0624	0.0878	0.4264
CV6	0.4856	0.2078	0.2618
OT7	0.4534	0.5681	0.3457
GM8	-0.0511	0.5997	-0.1127
CV9	0.7225	0.1485	0.148
BI10	0.7075	-0.1419	0.1403
CV11	0.5083	0.1251	0.5738
GM12	0.6112	-0.095	0.3607
GM13	0.1959	0.2041	0.4802
RI14	0.0283	-0.0005	0.6851
CV15	0.2514	0.6973	0.0371
GM16	0.5654	0.0562	0.0077
CV17	0.6741	0.442	0.0351
CV18	-0.041	0.4068	0.5588
OT19	0.2129	-0.6724	0.0743
CV21	-0.1198	0.4194	0.4467
RI22	0.3846	0.4014	-0.2391
CV23	0.6442	-0.1743	-0.3003
CV24	0.0481	-0.1417	-0.1301
BI25	-0.0021	0.3279	0.1904
BI26	0.2666	0.6051	0.2213
BI27	0.133	-0.3551	0.6083
% Explained Variance	17	13	13

Note: CV – civil society, BI – business and industry, GM – government, OT – others, RI – research institution.