

No Deforestation Task Force (NDTF)

Call 10 (9th October 2020)

Meeting notes

Name	Organisation
Lee Kuan Yee (LKY)	KLK
Jenny Walther-Thoss (JWT)	WWF
Geetha Govindan	PT ANJ
Gan Lian Tiong (GLT)	Musim Mas
Gwendelynne Bulan Tanil (GT)	Genting
Laszlo Mathe (LM)	NBPOL
Laure Gregoire (LG)	Alliance Forets
Lee Kuan Chun (KC)	P&G
Lim Sian Choo (LSC)	Bumitama
Absent with apologies:	
Cristina Cedilo Torres	Robeco
Emily Kunen	Nestle
Michelle Desilets	OLT
Olivier Tichit	Musim Mas
Natasha Schwarzbach	Pepsico
Yunita Widiastuti	Cargill

No	Item	Notes	Action/Decision points
1	Confirming last meeting minutes	The call notes for meeting #9 accepted by the group without any further feedback.	
2	Updates from SSC decision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDTF extension • HCSA review and implementation procedure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat briefed the group on the SSC decision for items related to the NDTF being extension of the group till 31st Dec 2020 and decision on HCSA toolkit adoption within P&C 2018 • Secretariat also briefed on completed and ongoing works of the NDTF. 	[Decision point] It was agreed that the NDTF would develop the review and integration procedure and proceed to review the 1 st gap analysis done by PT Hijau Daun. The group

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interpretation of 7.12.2 and Annex 5 document ○ Generic auditor checklist for 7.12.2 • Ongoing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Gap analysis on HCSA toolkit vs RSPO P&C 2018 and existing processes ○ HCS review and integration procedure ○ 1st batch review of gap analysis ○ RSPO HCS implementation guide ○ Standalone HCSA reviewer's template • RSPO secretariat added for the standalone HCSA reviewer's template, the final approval would be from HCSA as this would be used within their process, and not RSPOs. 	<p>would then proceed to revise the HCS implementation guidance as per the decisions of this review. It was mentioned this may need further extension of the NDTF after 31 Dec 2020 to complete this.</p> <p>[Decision point] Any new requirements/ documents post this activity would require a more long-term WG as opposed to a TF as reviews would be continuous process as-and-when new requirements or documents are introduced by the HCSA. SSC would discuss and decide which group would be required to review this in the future</p>
3	Approval of Gap Analysis (40 min) [Decision required]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat briefed the group on the final draft of the gap analysis. It was highlighted that in light of the addition of the review and integration procedure, all identified gaps would be further discussed by the NDTF and as such it would be more efficient to only highlight critical red flags (if any) and approve the document. • Secretariat also added that the document is only for internal use. Any circulation externally would require the NDTFs approval. 	<p>[Decision point] The NDTF agreed to approve the document, however requested the Secretariat to highlight the recent changes done in the document for easier reference.</p> <p>[Action point] Secretariat to clean and highlight the most recent changes to the gap analysis and circulate to the NDTF</p>
4	Concept note HCSA review and integration procedure (40 min)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat briefed the group on the concept and proposal for the review and integration procedure. 	<p>[Action point] The secretariat to translate the concept note into an SOP format as the initial draft of the HCS review and integration</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group was agreeable to the overall concept, however requested clarity on the process flow specifically on misalignments and/or overlaps which would require modification. • The secretariat clarified that the overall intent is to avoid duplication of work and conflicting requirements which would cause confusion among RSPO members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overlaps – To ensure any overlaps would be streamlined (if possible) in a single activity/step. This may require modification of the RSPO or HCSA process steps, however the original element and intent of the modified item would be achieved. ○ Misalignments – Similar to the above, however any identified process/ steps/ requirements which is misaligned with RSPO principles and its processes will need to be modified or integrated if considered as adding value to RSPO processes. • The group provided the following input to the overall concept: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To ensure applicability and transition periods are outlined in the procedure ○ Criteria for adoption is to be made clear, any additions leading to clarity for implementation may be adopted immediately, however any changes in the requirements or steps within an assessment would require adoption every 5-years during the P&C review. ○ Clear guidance on public consultation periods. Secretariat added that in general, the public consultation period would be 2months for new documents and 1month for revisions. ○ To ensure alignment with currently reviewed NPP. ○ Specific mention within process to align interpretations /definitions with HCSA toolkit and other RSPO documents. • There was also a mention for the need to add guidance and scenarios in the implementation guide on: 	<p>procedure taking into consideration the comments provided by the NDTF.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Food security ○ Steps in cases of rejection by community on conservation of HCS 	
5	<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● HCVRN alternative checklist update ● Land Use Risk Identification (LURI) case reviews [Decision required] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The group was updated with recent discussion on with HCVRN on checklist specific to RSPO integrated HCV-HCSA assessments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In general, HCVRN is open to the request of a checklist for RSPO members due to the alignment activity ○ HCVRN highlighted that any issues or clarifications required would be discussed between RSPO and HCSA ● Secretariat requested the NDTF to allow the secretariat to decide on land classification issues within LURI. These decisions required refer to land cover which are not specifically mentioned in LURI as low risk, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Actively managed SH farms with secondary growth due to poor field maintenance ○ Ex-mining areas ○ Sporting fields etc. 	<p>[Decision point] NDTF agreed to allow secretariat to decide on these issues, - i.e. area classification based on its best judgement. The group requested the secretariat to provide a table highlighting what the specific scenarios are to be decided by RSPO and NDTF</p> <p>[Action point] RSPO secretariat to prepare decision table providing which scenarios will be decided by secretariat and which by NDTF.</p>