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This presentation

• Aidenvironment

• Experiences with using the New Planting Procedure:
  • Upsides
  • Areas for improvement

• Enriching the Complaints System with “Issue Filtering”
Pity the Complaints Panel

About Aidenvironment

Founded: Amsterdam, 1988
Mandate: Foundation
Offices: Netherlands, Indonesia and Malaysia
Work fields: Sustainable natural resource management, commodity trade & investment

Worked on palm oil since 1997
RSPO member since June 2014
Focus on RSPO’s “accountability mechanisms”

The P&C require robust Certification Systems

- Membership applications
- Partial certification
- Complaints and grievances
- DSF
- ASI
- Impact mapping
- Compensation and Remediation
- New Planting Procedure (NPP)

From compromise to level playing field

As RSPO adopts more, and more formal rules for governance, “amicable” resolution (compromise) becomes just one of the possible outcomes

Source: Stevens, 2013
RSPO’s New Planting Procedure

A procedure meant to pre-empt future conflict (or compromise)

• Three major comments filed since December 2013
• 107 NPPs reviewed (October 2010 – July 2014)
• Continuous monitoring

107 NPPs: 1,17 million hectares
Of this, 164,000 ha (14%) is identified as HCV
An average NPP covers 11,000 ha.
Range from 25 ha to 70,000 ha
Positive: compliance with NPP is on the rise

Positive: Stop Work Orders

Yes, SWO must be subject to fair rules
Positive: RSPO facilitated dialogue between parties

Positive: real change on the ground

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ata land</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lagep</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumanat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WaLaping</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
But,

There are still many inconsistencies and weaknesses in NPPs

One NPP, two statuses

Land development and planting of oil palm will begin in January 2014 following the procedures of the RSPO New Planting Procedures (NPP). This is part of an ongoing planting and this report is meant for notification only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>This is a completely new development and stakeholders may submit comments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is part of an ongoing planting and is meant for notification only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RSPO
Completely new development?

Completely new development?

Not NPP but HCV studies are considered as the “Go-Ahead”

But, when is an HCV assessment completed?

The date of completion of HCV assessment is essential for monitoring but only 10% of all NPPs clearly reported completion of HCV assessment

Source: Aidenvironment’s review of 107 NPP reports from 2010-July 2014
One NPP, two HCV maps

Planning and Management doc

NPP documentation doc

Orange: HCV

Green: cleared; blue: HCV

What happened to HCV site #25?

Changed NPP scope during public consultation

Original scope

Adjusted scope

Is this allowed?
Most NPPs offer grounds to file comments

But what causes weak NPPs?

- Plantation company?
- Certification Body?
- RSPO secretariat/Working Groups?
- The government?
- Communities

- RSPO facilitated dialogue can help to unravel these complex realities

RSPO has no “issue registar”

- What if RSPO itself is part of the problem?
  - E.g. NPP Template for CBs
  - Except for GA Resolutions or lobbying Working Group chairs, there are no mechanisms to put RSPO’s own problems on an agenda

- Perhaps, we should have a public logbook?
Conclusions

• NPP offers a valuable tool to prevent non-compliance

• However, there is a lot of non-compliance with NPP itself

• Rules are getting increasingly complicated

Conclusions

• Issue filtering to unravel complex problems

• Escalation to full complaint may be avoidable in many instances

• Especially so, if there are multiple outcomes possible
Thank you