

Discussion notes for NDTF#6 Call

Time: 2.30pm – 5.30pm (MYT)

Attendance:

1. Lee Kuan Yee (KLK)
2. Jenny Walther-Thoss (WWF)
3. Anne Rosenbarger (WRI)
4. Michael Guindon (ZSL)
5. Lim Sian Choo (Bumitama)
6. Geetha Govindan (PT ANJ)
7. Olivier Tichit (Musim Mas)
8. Lee Kuan-Chun (P&G)
9. Natasha Schwarzbach (PepsiCo)
10. Cristina Cedillo Torres (Robeco)
11. Ruth Silva (HCVRN)
12. Charlotte Opal (Earthworm)
13. Amir (RSPO)

Discussion

1. Legacy Cases: Scenarios & definitions

- Secretariat gave a brief on update from NDJSG discussion. It was mentioned that the NDJSG requested the NDTF to define the meaning of “legacy” for RSPO as some members felt that it be more appropriate that the definition was discussed in an RSPO member platform as the HCSA definition of legacy is already clear from the HCSA Legacy TF ToR.
- Questions were raised by members on whether the scope of the definition to be discussed covered the scenarios found in the interpretation document or also included cases in HFCs (HFCC & HFCL).
 - **Scenarios in interpretation document** – These cases are not termed as ‘legacy cases’ and are simply transitional measures to ensure compliance to criteria 7.12.2
 - **HFCC** – The group agreed that this was not within the mandate given to the NDTF as it would make more sense that this was discussed within the NDJSG as the group was given a mandate to develop and discuss all issues regarding HFCL within HFCCs. There was concern raised as the NDJSG was a joint group with HCSA - whether they could decide on this definition. It was mentioned that the it would not be an issue as it would need to be reviewed by the Standards SC prior to endorsement by the BoG. Clarification was given that the Standards SC was only mandated to ensure that the standard setting procedures were followed and not the content itself. It was agreed that the NDTF could provide recommendations to the NDJSG on the definitions but the mandate for discussions around HFCC was with the NDJSG.

- **HFCL outside HFCCs** – The question of companies already within HFCLs outside HFCCs was mentioned. It was which group was mandated define this. A member of the group clarified that the NDJSG scope was limited to HFCLs within HFCCs only and for anything outside of HFCCs, was within the scope of this group. However, during the development of the P&C, it was clearly mentioned that there would be no separate procedure for HFCLs outside HFCCs. Another member added that this was not specifically mentioned in the NDTF ToR.
Secretariat to clarify on which group is mandated to discuss HFCLs and report to the NDTF.

2. HCSA Standalone Checklist

- The secretariat mentioned the purpose of the of the document – A checklist for auditors verify the recommendations from reviewers and management & monitoring plans found in the HCSA assessment was properly implemented on the ground. The group requested more time to go through the document as only the HCSA review template was circulated, however comments template was not circulated prior to the meeting. **Secretariat to send the complete documents (HCSA review template, commenting template) to the NDTF members by 30 Aug 2019. NDTF members are then to review and send in their comments by 2 Sept 2019 for discussion in the 2nd NDTF physical meeting.**
- A member raised a point that the auditors would only verify the implementation during the initial certification – development would have already taken place and completed. A more important checklist to be discussed was the review of HCSA assessment prior to development.
- The secretariat mentioned that it was its understanding that though the HCSA peer review did not have a pass/fail mechanism (excluding future assessments that would have a pass/fail for the forest identification portion) the review would ensure that the assessment was done following the HCSA toolkit, and as such the remaining portion to be verified was that the recommendations by reviewers and also implementation of the management & monitoring plans were followed.
- It was clarified that the recommendations by reviewers could also include comments on portions of the assessments that were incorrectly/inadequately done, not only recommendations on the implementation plans. There would need to be another layer of review to ensure that the assessments were done correctly prior to development.
- It was proposed that the group also develop a review template for this based on HCVRNs HCV-HCSA review template (using the HCS portion only) and engage an expert to conduct the reviews.
- **Secretariat to send a copy of the a completed HCSA review to the NDTF.**

3. Capacity & availability of assessors

- Secretariat presented on NPP stats.
 - Total of 44 NPPs submitted from 2015-2019 (as at June 2019) with an average of 10 NPP submissions/year.
 - 58 cases were registered in the RSPO case register. 86% are for completed & on-going assessments not yet submitted to HCVRN ALS. 8 Cases of pre-ALS HCVs for older approved NPPs.

- There is a total of 145 NPPs from a total of 175 approved NPPs (including those not requiring registration in the case register) at various percentages of land clearing completion.
- Secretariat raised concern specifically for the older NPPs with non-ALS HCVs as there are more cases that have not registered from the 145 NPPs. A member added that some companies may have made the corporate decision to stop development due to problems such as land title and social issues, and that the number would be much lower. However, it is important to ensure these companies are informed of the requirement directly. The secretariat has identified these companies and plan to send targeted emails on the requirements based on the interpretation document – **Secretariat to send targeted email blast to the companies identified above with weekly reminders till the deadline.**
- HCVRN presented on the number of HCV-HCSA, HCV assessors currently available to lead HCV-HCSA and HCV assessments (32 HCV-HCSA assessors, 53 HCV assessors). It was mentioned currently HCVRN is aiming to train more qualified lead HCV-HCSA assessors and the focus now was to train the existing pool of HCV licenced assessors to lead HCV-HCSA assessments.
- HCVRN was working to reduce the duration of the peer review by having an ALS personnel lead the team of reviewers and serve as focal point for more efficient coordination. Currently for HCV only assessments, the benchmark is 55 days and this new arrangement successfully ensured that HCV only assessments were reviewed within 55 days.
- HCV-HCSA reviews were not meeting this target, specifically those done for scheme smallholders. The HCV-HCSA were designed for corporate growers and when applied to the context of smallholders, the requirements caused a lot of problems specifically for the social aspect. It was mentioned that HCVRN were discussing this matter with HCSA and would discuss how these requirements would apply to smallholders.
- HCVRN added that currently it had a sufficient number of English-speaking reviewers, however there were problems in getting Bahasa Indonesia speaking reviewers. This was also an issue that needed to be resolved as a high number of assessments were coming from Indonesia.
- Secretariat presented the number of HCSA licenced assessors (79 freelance/consultant, 44 grower/P&T/CGM) and reviewers (29 reviewers) for HCSA standalone assessments.
- Secretariat raised a concern on the possibility of high volumes of HCSA standalone assessments which will be submitted based on the NPP statistics presented. **Secretariat to obtain the full information of ongoing NPPs and report back to the NDTF.**

-Meeting Adjourned -