

Toba Pulp Lestari Tbk PT

Timber and pulp assessment

Total score:

32.9%

Latest update: July 2019

Next scheduled: July 2020

About this company:	Established in 1983, Toba Pulp Lestari is an Indonesian pulp and paper producer. Toba Pulp Lestari is a subsidiary of Pinnacle Company.
Parent company:	Pinnacle Company Limited
Landbank	239,850 hectares
Market cap:	55,240,807 USD
Thomson Reuters ticker:	INRU.JK
Bloomberg ticker:	INRU:IJ
ISIN:	ID1000094303
Activities:	Pulpwood production, pulp and paper production
Locations:	Indonesia (North Sumatra)
Headquarters:	Indonesia
Related companies:	PT Toba Pulp Lestari's mill is owned by Sukanto Tanoto, who controls the RGE group and is the CEO of APRIL
Website:	http://www.tobapulp.com Latest annual report (2016)

Total:	41.5 / 126	32.9%
---------------	-------------------	--------------



> Sustainability policy and leadership

4 / 11 36.4%

3 media reports

1. Sustainable forestry policy or commitment for all its operations? ✓ 1 / 1 [Source](#)

2. Sustainability policy or commitment applies to all sourcing? ✓ 1 / 1 [Source](#)

3. High-level position of responsibility for sustainability? P 0.5 / 1 [Source](#)
The company states it has an independent team to ensure the transparency and implementation of sustainability policies. However, no further details are given

4. One or more board members have responsibility for sustainability? ✗ 0 / 1 [Source](#)

5. Percentage or number of women board members? P 0.5 / 1 [Source](#)
1 (20%) - Only photos of board members are available

6. Percentage or number of women in senior management team? P 0.5 / 1 [Source](#)
0 (0%) - Only photos of board of commissioners available

7. Sustainability report published within last two years?

	X	0 / 1	Source
	X	0 / 1	Source
8. Member of multiple industry schemes or other external initiatives to improve forest management or transparency?			
	P	0.5 / 1	Source
9. Activities with government, NGOs or academic institutions to improve the sustainability of forest products? The company has worked with academic institutions and a foundation but these partnerships do not focus on improving sustainability of forest products			
	X	0 / 1	Source
10. Climate risks assessment available?			
	X	0 / 1	Source
11. Natural capital assessment available?			



> Landbank, mills and traceability

6 / 21 28.6%

13 media reports

	✓	1 / 1	Source
12. Lists countries and operations? Indonesia (forest concessions and mill)			
	✓	1 / 1	Source
13. Total area of natural forest designated for wood/wood fibre production (ha)? 185,016			
	✓	1 / 1	Source
14. Total area of forest plantation (ha)? 54,834			
	P	0.5 / 1	Source
15. Area of plantation/natural forest within outgrower schemes (ha)? 8,828 - The company's 2018 annual report states an area of 8,828 ha community plantations (PKR). However, it is unclear if the company's natural forest concessions include community forests			
	X	0 / 1	Source
16. Unplanted (areas designated for future development as plantation forest) (ha)?			
	X	0 / 1	Source
17. Conservation set-aside and/or HCV area (ha)?			
	X	0 / 1	Source
18. Area of Intact Forest Landscape (ha)?			
	X	0 / 1	Source
19. Number of Forest Management Units (FMUs)?			
	P	0.5 / 1	Source
20. Maps of forest management units (FMUs)? Maps are available for seven of the company's FMUs on Global Forest Watch			

<p>21. Forest management plans available for all FMUs?</p>	<p>✘ 0 / 1 Source</p>
<p>22. Monitoring of forest management plan implementation?</p>	<p>✘ 0 / 1 Source</p>
<p>23. Company has provided valid legal documents to Open Timber Portal on use rights (at the time of SPOTT assessments)? This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it doesn't operate in a geography currently covered by Open Timber Portal. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this</p>	
<p>24. Company has provided valid legal documents to Open Timber Portal on forest management (at the time of SPOTT assessments)? This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it doesn't operate in a geography currently covered by Open Timber Portal. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this</p>	
<p>25. Company has provided valid legal documents to Open Timber Portal on timber harvesting (at the time of SPOTT assessments)? This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it doesn't operate in a geography currently covered by Open Timber Portal. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this</p>	
<p>26. Number of company owned pulp and paper mills? 1</p>	<p>✓ 1 / 1 Source</p>
<p>27. Maps or addresses of company owned pulp and paper mills?</p>	<p>✘ 0 / 1 Source</p>
<p>28. Number of company owned sawmills? This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it doesn't own sawmills. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this</p>	
<p>29. Maps or addresses of company owned sawmills? This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it doesn't own sawmills. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this</p>	
<p>30. Number of supplier mills?</p>	<p>✘ 0 / 1 Source</p>
<p>31. Maps or addresses of supplier mills?</p>	<p>✘ 0 / 1 Source</p>
<p>32. Procedures to trace raw materials to country of harvest? The company states that it has a process to trace wood to the mill and forest levels but no details are given on the process. The company's mill has PEFC CoC certification, but it only covers traceability for the certified portion of its supply</p>	<p>P 0.5 / 1 Source</p>
<p>33. Procedures to trace raw materials to FMU level? The company states that it has a process to trace wood to the mill and forest levels but no details are given on the process. The company's mill has PEFC CoC certification, but it only covers traceability for the certified portion of its supply</p>	<p>P 0.5 / 1 Source</p>

	✘	0 / 2	Source
34. Percentage of supply traceable to country level (above 80%)? The company states that it has strict chain of custody system to ensure that all incoming wood can be traced to its source. However, it does not provide data on percentage traced			
	✘	0 / 2	Source
35. Percentage of supply traceable to FMU level (above 75%)? The company states that it has strict chain of custody system to ensure that all incoming wood can be traced to its source. However, it does not provide data on percentage traced			



> Deforestation and biodiversity

25 / 12	20.8%		
15 media reports			
	✘	0 / 1	Source
36. Commitment to zero conversion of natural forest? The company only commits to eliminate deforestation from its supply chains			
	✓	1 / 1	Source
37. Zero conversion commitment applies to all sourcing? The company only commits to eliminate deforestation from its supply chains			
	✘	0 / 1	Source
38. Commitment to minimise the impact of logging roads?			
	✘	0 / 1	Source
39. Commitment to protect forest areas from illegal activities?			
	✘	0 / 1	Source
40. Evidence of monitoring deforestation?			
	✘	0 / 1	Source
41. Amount of deforestation recorded?			
	✓	1 / 1	Source
42. Commitment to biodiversity conservation?			
	✘	0 / 1	Source
43. Examples of species and/or habitat conservation management?			
	P	0.5 / 1	Source
44. Implementing a landscape-level approach to biodiversity conservation? The company has a commitment to conservation of ecosystem within the landscape. No evidence of implementation could be identified			
	✘	0 / 1	Source
45. Identified species of conservation concern referencing international or national system of species classification?			
	✘	0 / 1	Source
46. Commitment to sustainably manage the use of non-timber forest products (NTFPs)?			
	✘	0 / 1	Source
47. Commitment not to use genetically modified organisms?			



> HCV, HCS and impact assessments

1 / 9 44.4%

2 media reports

48. Commitment to conduct High Conservation Value (HCV) assessments?	✓	1 / 1	Source
49. HCV commitment applies to all sourcing?	✓	1 / 1	Source
50. Commitment to only use licensed High Conservation Value (HCV) assessors accredited by the HCV Resource Network's Assessor Licensing Scheme (ALS)?	✓	1 / 1	Source
51. High Conservation Value (HCV) assessments available?	✗	0 / 1	Source
52. High Conservation Value (HCV) management and monitoring plans available?	✗	0 / 1	Source
53. Commitment to the High Carbon Stock (HCS) Approach?	✓	1 / 1	Source
54. High Carbon Stock (HCS) assessments available?	✗	0 / 1	Source
55. Commitment to conduct social and environmental impact assessments (SEIAs)?	✗	0 / 1	Source
56. Social and environmental impact assessments (SEIAs) available?	✗	0 / 1	Source
57. Company has provided valid legal documents to Open Timber Portal on impact assessments (at the time of SPOTT assessments)?			
This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it doesn't operate in a geography currently covered by Open Timber Portal. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this			



> Soils, fire and GHGs

3 / 4 75%

7 media reports

58. Commitment to best management practices for soils and/or peat?	✗	0 / 1	Source
59. Commitment to reduced impact logging?	P	0.5 / 1	Source
The company commits to implement low impact logging but no details on the practices are provided			
60. Commitment to no planting on peat of any depth?	P	0.5 / 1	Source
The company has a commitment to no new development that applies to forested peatland only. Non-forested peatlands			

are not fully covered by the peatlands commitments			
61. Commitment on peatland planting applies to all sourcing? The company's peatland commitments are passed onto their suppliers and subcontractors. However, these commitments do not fully cover non-forested peatlands	P	0.5 / 1	Source
62. Landbank or planted area on peat (ha)?	✗	0 / 1	Source
63. Evidence of best management practices for soils and/or peat?	✗	0 / 1	Source
64. Commitment to zero burning?	✓	1 / 1	Source
65. Commitment to zero burning applies to all sourcing?	✓	1 / 1	Source
66. Evidence of management and monitoring fires? The company states it is improving its fire protection system and conducts fire safety training but this only relates to the company's mill operation	✗	0 / 1	Source
67. Details/number of hotspots/fires in FMUs controlled by the company?	✗	0 / 1	Source
68. Time-bound commitment to reduce GHG emissions intensity? The company only states that it will monitor and reduce its overall emissions, without setting a specific time-bound target or mentioning GHG emissions explicitly	✗	0 / 1	Source
69. Progress towards reducing GHG emission intensity?	✗	0 / 1	Source
70. Report GHG emissions from land use change?	✗	0 / 1	Source
71. Methodology used to calculate GHG emissions?	✗	0 / 1	Source



> Water, chemical and waste management

25 / 12 20.8%

⚠ 7 media reports

72. Time-bound commitment to improve water quality (BOD and COD)? The company states that BOD and COD levels are below the limits set by the government	✓	1 / 1	Source
73. Progress towards commitment on water quality (BOD and COD)? The company only reports a COD reduction of 43.2% in 2017 compared with 2016	P	0.5 / 1	Source

74. Commitment to protection of natural waterways through buffer zones?	✗	0 / 1	Source
75. Evidence of treatment of pulp and paper mill effluent? The company states to treat waste water but does not mention pulp and paper production explicitly	P	0.5 / 1	Source
76. Evidence of sawmill run-off containment and wastewater treatment? This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it doesn't own sawmills. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this			
77. Time-bound commitment to improve water use intensity? The company has a commitment to water conservation but it is not time-bound and does not refer to water use intensity	P	0.5 / 1	Source
78. Progress towards commitment on water use intensity?	✗	0 / 1	Source
79. Commitment to eliminate chlorine and chlorine compounds for bleaching?	✗	0 / 1	Source
80. Commitment to minimise the use of chemicals, including pesticides and chemical fertilisers?	✗	0 / 1	Source
81. No use of World Health Organisation (WHO) Class 1A and 1B pesticides?	✗	0 / 1	Source
82. No use of chemicals listed under the Stockholm Convention and Rotterdam Convention?	✗	0 / 1	Source
83. Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approach?	✗	0 / 1	Source
84. Chemical usage per ha or list of chemicals used?	✗	0 / 1	Source



> Community, land and labour rights

11 5 / 22 52 3%

⚠ 33 media reports

85. Commitment to human rights, referencing the UN Declaration on Human Rights or UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights?	✓	1 / 1	Source
86. Commitment to human rights applies to all sourcing?	✓	1 / 1	Source
87. Commitment to respect indigenous and local communities' rights? The company commits to respect indigenous rights but no reference to UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples or ILO Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention (no. 169) given	P	0.5 / 1	Source

88. Commitment to respect legal and customary property rights?	✓	1 / 1	Source
89. Commitment to free, prior and informed consent (FPIC)?	✓	1 / 1	Source
90. FPIC commitment applies to independent suppliers?	✓	1 / 1	Source
91. Details of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) process available?	✓	1 / 1	Source
92. Examples of local stakeholder engagement to prevent conflicts?	✗	0 / 1	Source
93. Details of process for addressing land conflicts available?	✓	1 / 1	Source
94. Commitment to support the inclusion of women across forestry operations, including addressing barriers faced?	✗	0 / 1	Source
95. Commitment to provide essential community services and facilities?	✓	1 / 1	Source
96. Company has provided valid legal documents to Open Timber Portal on population rights (at the time of SPOTT assessments)? This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it doesn't operate in a geography currently covered by Open Timber Portal. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this			
97. Commitment to respect all workers' rights? The company states that it respects the International Labor Organization's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work	✓	1 / 1	Source
98. Reference to Fundamental ILO Conventions? The company does not refer to minimum age (No. 138), equal remuneration (No. 100), or the right to organise and collective bargaining (No. 98)	P	0.5 / 1	Source
99. Commitment to eliminate gender related discrimination with regards to employment and occupation?	✗	0 / 1	Source
100. Company has provided valid legal documents to Open Timber Portal on labour regulations (at the time of SPOTT assessments)? This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it doesn't operate in a geography currently covered by Open Timber Portal. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this			
101. Percentage or number of temporary employees?	✗	0 / 1	Source
102. Percentage or number of women employees?	✗	0 / 1	Source
103. Payment of minimum wage?			

	✗	0 / 1	Source
104. Reporting of salary by gender?	✗	0 / 1	Source
105. Commitment to address occupational health and safety, referencing the ILO Code of Practice on Safety and Health in Forestry Work? The company's commitment does not reference ILO Code of Practice on Safety and Health in Forestry Work	P	0.5 / 1	Source
106. Time lost due to work-based injuries? The company reports the number of accidents recorded each year (34 in 2018, 31, in 2017), but does not provide data on time lost due to work-based injuries	✗	0 / 1	Source
107. Number of fatalities as a result of work-based accidents?	✗	0 / 1	Source
108. Provision of personal protective equipment and related training?	✓	1 / 1	Source



> Certification standards

3.5 / 14 25%

⚠ 1 media report

109. Time-bound plan for achieving 100% third-party legality verification of FMUs or achieved? 100% - SVLK	✓	1 / 1	Source
110. Time-bound plan to source only wood/wood fibre that is in legal compliance verified by a third party?	✗	0 / 1	Source
111. Percentage area (ha) verified as being in legal compliance by a third party? 100% - SVLK	✓	1 / 1	Source
112. Percentage of all wood/wood fibre supply traded/processed verified as being in legal compliance by a third party?	✗	0 / 1	Source
113. Time-bound plan for achieving 100% FSC FM certification of FMUs or achieved 100% FSC-certification of FMUs?	✗	0 / 1	Source
114. Commitment to source only wood/wood fibre that meets FSC Controlled Wood requirements?	✗	0 / 1	Source
115. Percentage area (ha) FSC FM certified?	✗	0 / 2	Source
116. Percentage of wood/wood fibre supply from outgrower scheme and/or independent suppliers that is FSC FM certified?	✗	0 / 2	Source
117. Percentage of all wood/wood fibre supply traded/processed that are FSC certified (above 75%)?			

	✘	0 / 2	Source
118. Percentage area (ha) PEFC certified (excluding FSC certified area)? 177,448 (74%) - 117,448 ha (74%)	P	1.5 / 2	Source



> Smallholders and suppliers

1 / 5	20%		
⚠ 3 media reports			
119. Programme to support outgrower scheme smallholders?	✘	0 / 1	Source
120. Percentage of outgrower scheme smallholders involved in programme?	✘	0 / 1	Source
121. Process used to prioritise, assess and/or engage suppliers on compliance with company's policy and/or legal requirements?	✘	0 / 1	Source
122. The company has a Due Diligence System (DDS)? This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it does not trade wood/wood fibre. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this			
123. Suspension or exclusion criteria for suppliers? The company states in its Sustainability Policy that it 'will source our raw material only through suppliers or subcontractors that abide by this policy and are transparent and provide a traceable supply (e.g. SVLK)'	✓	1 / 1	Source
124. Percentage of suppliers assessed and/or engaged on compliance with company requirements?	✘	0 / 1	Source



> Governance and grievances

3 / 6	50%		
⚠ 3 media reports			
125. Commitment to ethical conduct and prohibition of corruption?	✓	1 / 1	Source
126. Company has provided valid legal documents to Open Timber Portal on legal registration (at the time of SPOTT assessments)? This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it doesn't operate in a geography currently covered by Open Timber Portal. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this			
127. Disclosure of the company's management approach to tax and payments to governments?	✘	0 / 1	Source
128. Company has provided valid legal documents to Open Timber Portal on taxes, fees and royalties (at the time of SPOTT assessments)? This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it doesn't operate in a geography currently			

covered by Open Timber Portal. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this

129. Whistleblowing procedure?	✓	1 / 1	Source
130. Own grievance or complaints system open to all stakeholders?	✓	1 / 1	Source
131. Details of grievances disclosed?	✗	0 / 2	Source