

# No Deforestation Joint Steering Group (NDJSG)

Call 3 (30<sup>th</sup> April 2020)

## Meeting notes

---

Name	Organisation
Audrey Lee (AL)	OLAM
Charlotte Opal (CO)	Earthworm Foundation
Emily Kunen (EK)	Nestle
Gemma Tillack	RAN
Grant Rosoman	Greenpeace
Peetra Meekers (PM)	Unilever
Laure D'Astorg (LD)	Cerelia/ Alliance Forets
Jenny Walther-Thoss (JWT)	WWF
Lee Kuan-Chun (LKC)	P&G
Melissa Thomas (MT)	Conservation International
Patrick Anderson (PA)	FPP
Surina Ismail (SI)	IOI
Sander Van Der Ende (SVE)	SIPEF
Laszlo Mathe (LM)	NBPOL
Hendi Hidayat (HH)	GAR
Javin Tan (JT)	RSPO Secretariat
Amir Afham (AAF)	RSPO Secretariat
Sheun Su Sin (SS)	HCSA Secretariat
Darren Brown (DB)	HCSA Secretariat
<b>Absent with apologies:</b>	
Anne Rosenbarger (AR)	WRI
David Burns (DB)	NWF
Ibrahim Gulagnar (IG)	SPKS
Kiryssa Kasprzyk (KK)	NWF
Laure Gregoire (LG)	Cerelia/ Alliance Forets
Marcus Colchester (MC)	FPP
Mike Senior (MS)	Proforest
Sabaruddin (SBD)	SPKS

No	Item	Action/Decision points
1	<p><b>Review of previous call notes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The meeting notes were reviewed by the NDJSG.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Decision point:</b> No objections were raised. The NDJSG confirmed the previous meeting notes.</p>
2	<p><b>Proposal on decision making process within NDJSG</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The NDJSG was agreeable to have a standardized decision-making process as it would assist in ensuring decisions were made in a timely manner.</li> <li>• DB informed the group that the HCSA had a separate call to discuss the proposal provided by the RSPO on decision making process. HCSA have provided their comments and feedback on additional requirements as below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <b>Meeting/call agenda items</b> - Provide opportunity for members to comment on the agenda for calls/meetings. 1 week shall be given for members to comment on the agenda items after which a finalized agenda shall be sent 2 weeks prior to the meeting/call.</li> <li>ii. <b>Representation during decision making</b> - Decisions during calls are considered final if all representatives from both organisations present. If not the case, the proposed decision and relevant information shall be furnished to those absent for their consideration. These members shall have 1-week to revert with their approval/objection to the proposed decision.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Members also requested to add more information to ensure the decision-making process was clear. Proposed items were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Include wording on consensus as per the NDJSG ToR</li> <li>ii. Clarification on the scope and authority if the NDJSG and distinguish between decisions by the group vs. proposals and recommendations to the RSPO BoG and HCSA EC.</li> <li>iii. Include table showing the definition of quorum for both RSPO &amp; HCSA and a list of all sectors/caucuses represented within the NDJSG</li> <li>iv. To add a footnote on the issue of attendance of NDJSG members for calls/meetings.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Decision point:</b> Group agreed for the NDJSG to have a standardised decision-making process; however the content is to be further refined by the NDJSG.</p> <p><b>Action point:</b> RSPO secretariat to revise the document based on the comments made by HCSA and during the NDJSG call. Once completed, to circulate to members for further review and finalisation.</p>
3	<p><b>BoG request for NDJSG recommendation on proposed Resolution</b></p> <p>The RSPO BoG requested the NDJSG to review a proposed resolution sent to RSPO titled <i>“The consideration of Indonesian West Papua and Papua Provinces, as being contiguous, with the Papua New Guinea landscape and thus be accorded the same status given to High Forest Cover Country (HFCC) and subject to the same procedures”</i>.</p>	<p><b>Decision point:</b> The NDJSG agreed that the proposed resolution is not supported by the NDJSG and shall provide the RSPO BoG of its recommendation</p> <p><b>Action point:</b> The RSPO &amp; HCSA secretariat to work together to develop a note to the BoG on its decision. The decision paper was</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The group was briefed on the history of the resolution and the request by the RSPO BoG for the NDJSG to review the proposal and provide a recommendation to the RSPO BoG to facilitate its decision.</li> <li>• There was a request to get further clarification whether the proposal was still relevant as it was previously publicly announced by the proponent that the areas within the scope of the proposal were to be classified as conservation areas.</li> <li>• Several members raised concerns on the proposal and were of the view that the decisions from the voting in the GA should be maintained.</li> <li>• It was also raised that non-RSPO members within the NDJSG are not comfortable with providing a recommendation that would go against the GA vote as it may be seen as undermining the GA process.</li> <li>• It was pointed out that the 'adapted procedures' that the NDJSG is mandated to create was specifically for development by indigenous peoples and local communities and not for large scale development by corporations.</li> </ul>	<p>circulated to the NDJSG on 21<sup>st</sup> May with commenting period until 4<sup>th</sup> June 2020.</p>
4	<p><b>Stakeholder list</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group was shown the latest version of the stakeholder list. It was commented that there are gaps in the list on varying scales depending on country. Some stakeholder categories numbers were consistently small throughout the 6 HFCCs -e.g. commodity users.</li> <li>• Since the questionnaire also has questions on to provide contacts of any other relevant stakeholders within HFCCs, it was suggested that the stakeholder list be a 'live document' and updated with more stakeholders as and when received.</li> <li>• The UN &amp; IUCN maintains a list of NGOs operating within countries. The NDJSG was advised to look into that list for relevant stakeholders</li> <li>• It was also encouraged for the NGOs to share the <a href="#">stakeholder list questionnaire</a> with relevant contacts within their network.</li> <li>• JWT volunteered to assist adding more stakeholders for Myanmar</li> <li>• It was added that the circulation of the list might not need to be done concurrently, and that the group could specify the minimum number of stakeholders for a country and proceed with those first. Other countries would follow suit once they reached the minimum numbers.</li> <li>• A member raised concern that the group has not discussed the steps moving forward post the questionnaire being circulated and analysed. It was responded by another member that for steps moving forward on the socialisation aspects, the Socialisation subgroup would meet and discuss further on this.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Decision point:</b> The NDJSG agreed to maintain the list as a 'live document' which will be continuously updated with new stakeholder contacts. The NDJSG to agree on a standard minimum number of stakeholders for a country prior to deployment of the questionnaire.</p> <p><b>Action point:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. RSPO secretariat to look into the list of NGOs maintained by UN and IUCN.</li> <li>2. WWF to assist with the stakeholder list in Myanmar</li> </ol>

5	<p><b>Questionnaire: Current status update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only one expression of interest was received from Elevate regarding the ToR for revising and reviewing the initial questionnaire developed by the NDJSG</li> <li>• Members were asked on their experience working with the Elevate. Response from members with experience working with them was positive.</li> <li>• There was a suggestion that for some stakeholders, a <b>only</b> more direct approach would work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ However, with the current situation of the Covid-19 pandemic, telephone interviews might need to <b>be</b> replace face to face meetings. This would be challenging for the NDJSG to manage.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• It was proposed that the group explore the possibility to expand the scope of the consultancy work to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Translation of the questionnaire (French, Burmese)</li> <li>○ Deployment of questionnaire and analysis &amp; reporting of results.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• RSPO secretariat and JWT to have a call with Elevate to discuss the possibility and their capacity to provide the expanded services above and provide a revised proposal.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action point:</b> RSPO secretariat and JWT to have a call with Elevate to discuss possibilities of the expanded scope.</p>
6	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p><b>a. Forest definition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group questioned the need for a separate definition of ‘forest’ since an integrated HCV-HCSA assessment is required for identification of forests.</li> <li>• It was explained that the initial intent was for identification of HFCL within HFCCs. In the P&amp;C, the definition of HFCL is described as ‘Landscapes having &gt;80% forest cover’, but is not clear on the definition of ‘forest’ that should be used in order to identify the 80% forest cover for a landscape to qualify as HFCL.</li> <li>• A recommendation was made by a member for the NDJSG to use the HCS forest definition found in the HCSA toolkit.</li> <li>• It was proposed that the group look at the definition of forest used in the Proforest report which was prepared for RSPO for identification of HFCCs for the group to discuss further.</li> </ul> <p><b>b. NDJSG workplan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PA briefed members of the note received by both co-chairs from the Standards Standing Committee, requesting the NDJSG to provide the NDJSG workplan.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action point:</b> RSPO secretariat to provide the group with a snapshot of the forest definition found in the Proforest report. NDJSG to consider both HCSA HCS forest definition and the definition used in the RSPO HCS study by Proforest.</p> <p><b>Action point:</b> NDJSG to review the draft workplan and revert with their comments by <b>19<sup>th</sup> May 2020</b>.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The group agreed to review workplan and revert with their comments within <b>2 weeks (19<sup>th</sup> May 2020)</b>.</li><li>• The group was informed that both the milestones &amp; the timelines in the workplan can be commented/changed as the current document is still in draft and in view of the Covid-19 situation.</li></ul> <p><b>c. Next meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The group tentatively agreed to set the next meeting in either the 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> week of June. RSPO secretariat to send a doodle poll to get feasible dates for the next meeting.</li></ul>	<p><b>Action point:</b> RSPO secretariat to send out doodle poll with the agreed tentative meeting dates.</p>
--	---	---