

No Deforestation Task Force (NDTF)

Call # 11 (4th November 2020)

Meeting notes

Name	Organisation
Lee Kuan Yee (LKY)	KLK
Jenny Walther-Thoss (JWT)	WWF
Gan Lian Tiong (GLT)	Musim Mas
Gwendelynne Bulan Tanil (GT)	Genting
Lee Kuan Chun (KC)	P&G
Lim Sian Choo (LSC)	Bumitama
Michelle Desilets (MD)	OLT
<u>Invited Experts</u>	
Charlotte Opal (CO)	Earthworm
Darren Brown (DB)	HCSA
Ruth Silva (RS)	HCVRN
<u>Secretariat</u>	
Julia Majail	RSPO Secretariat
Amir Afham	RSPO Secretariat
Absent with apologies:	
Anne Rosenbarger	WRI
Cristina Cedillo Torres	Robeco
Emily Kunen	Nestle
Geetha Govindan	PT ANJ
Laure Gregoire	Alliance Forests
Laszlo Mathe	NBPOL
Natasha Schwarzbach	Pepsico
Olivier Tichit	Musim Mas
Yunita Widiastuti	Cargill

No	Item	Notes	Action/Decision points
1	Confirming last meeting minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The call notes for meeting #11 was accepted by the NDTF with no comments 	
2	Approval of HCSA pass/fail mechanism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NDTF reviewed the changes in draft 2 of the review template for standalone HCSA assessments. The group discussed the overall process of standalone HCSA assessment quality review by HCSA. Concern was raised regarding whether a company would be allowed to clarify inquiries raised by a reviewer post submission. HCSA responded that the review process already takes into consideration one clarification opportunity for companies. Once a standalone HCSA assessment is submitted to the HCSA, a pre-review is conducted by the reviewer after which comments are sent to the company for clarification/ additional document submission. The full review will start once the company has responded to the inquiries. It was discussed whether HCSA could allow for two resubmissions of HCSA Standalone assessment reports, to align with HCVRN-ALS procedure. HCSA said that will imply revising the fee Indicator 7.12.2(b) states that HCV areas and HCS forests are identified through the integrated HCV-HCSA assessments. However, the <i>“Interpretation of criterion 7.12 and Annex 5”</i> document only allows standalone HCSA assessments to be conducted in specific scenarios. The group discussed the consequences of a HCSA assessment failing the review. All members agreed that when a company fails the HCSA quality review, it would 	<p>[Decision Point] Companies with a standalone HCSA assessment that fails the HCSA quality review (forest identification section and/or classified as “resubmit assessment” for other sections) shall be required to conduct an integrated HCV-HCSA assessment</p>

		<p>be required to conduct an integrated HCV-HCSA assessment to align with the other scenarios within the document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern was raised that onsite scenarios are rarely straight forward and more complex issues that may require mitigation post assessment such as social issues would cause an influx of failed assessments. It was clarified that the pass/mechanism for the review template was only for forest identification sections. For other sections, the reviewer would classify the issue as either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resubmit assessment – For critical gaps causing clear non-compliance to the HCSA Toolkit and which cannot be resolved post assessment. • Submit verification documents and/or mitigation plan – Gaps that can be resolved post assessment, however, require documented evidence and/or mitigation plans submitted to the RSPO during NPP submission. • It was also suggested as an action point: adding to the NPP review template a section on “outstanding standalone review points” • A review would only be considered a “fail” if it does not pass the forest identification section and/or contain feedback classified as “resubmit assessment” for the other sections. • Other comments were added by members of the NDTF. The secretariat informed members that these comments shall be sent to the consultant for final revision. The 	<p>[Action point] Secretariat to discuss with NPPRS PIC for addition of section for outstanding standalone review points” within the NPP review template.</p> <p>[Action Point] RSPO Secretariat to send the additional comments to the consultant for final revision.</p>
--	--	---	--

		finalized document shall then be sent to HCSA for final approval.	
3	Sign off for HCS implementation guide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following the recent decision by the Standard Standing Committee (SSC) regarding the adoption of the HCSA toolkit, the guide in its current form would require further revision to ensure items decided by the NDTF through the review and integration procedure (item 4 below) would be included in the final document. • The additional scope is not a part of the contract with the consultant, as such the secretariat requested the consultant to complete the guidance following the latest requirements of HCSA at the time. • Any changes following the review and implementation activity by the NDTF would then require revision internally by the RSPO. • Secretariat proposed that the NDTF sign off the document for the purpose of processing the payment for the consultant considering the original terms of the contract had been met. The NDTF agreed to the proposal and for the final payment to be processed by the RSPO secretariat. 	<p>[Decision Point] NDTF agreed to sign-off the HCS implementation guide in its current form considering the original terms of the contract with the consultant have been met.</p> <p>[Action Point] RSPO secretariat to proceed to process the final payment for the consultant.</p>
4	Feedback on Draft 0 of HCS review and integration procedure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The secretariat provided a run through of draft 0 of the review and integration procedure and additional changes from the comments of the NDTF through email. • RS raised a point that advice notes circulated by the HCSA were not additional requirements, but clarifications to mitigate specific scenarios which HCVRN had experienced. It 	

		<p>was added that if advice notes would also be required to undergo this review process, HCVRN would have to fail these reports for the current submission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JWT agreed with the point and added that advice notes should not contain new requirements but only provide clarifications and advice for integrated HCV-HCSA assessments. In cases where new requirements were added, it should not be considered an advice note. • The NDTF agreed that advice notes should not be included in the scope of this review but added that any releases by the HCSA which introduced new requirements would fall under the scope of the review process. • It was discussed that a clear written statement was necessary that the integration procedure is not intended to revise what has been done or is being done while the procedure is being drafted. • DB added that he would provide the NDTF with a table containing the content of advice notes released by the HCSA, and the impact/effect it would have on assessments (if any). • The document shall be revised for discussion in the next meeting. 	<p>[Decision Point] Advice notes would be removed from the scope of the review and integration procedure</p> <p>[Action Point] HCSA secretariat to provide a table containing the content of advice notes released by the HCSA and how it would affect assessments.</p> <p>[Action Point] RSPO secretariat to revise the document based on the latest input by the NDTF and recirculate to the group for review.</p>
5	AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group agreed tentative period to hold the next meeting between the 1st and 2nd week of December. Members to vote on the most preferred dates through a doodle poll 	<p>[Action Point] RSPO secretariat to circulate a doodle poll for the 1st and 2nd week of December for the next meeting.</p>