

MINUTES OF MEETING 1st JA-BHCV SUBGROUP MEETING (VIRTUAL)

Date : 23 June 2022 (Thursday) 4pm to 6pm (MYT)

<p><u>Attendance:</u></p> <p><u>Subgroup members (JA)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Glyn Davies (WWF MY) 2. Marcus Colchester (FPP) 3. John Watts (INOBU) 4. Rob Nicholls (Musim Mas) <p><u>Subgroup members (BHCV)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lim Sian Choo (Bumitama) 2. Eleanor Spencer (Zoological Society London) <p><u>Absent with Apologies</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sander van den Ende (SIPEF) 2. Lee Kuan Chun (P&G) 3. Michelle Desilets (Orangutan Land Trust) 	<p><u>RSPO Secretariat</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Javin Tan 2. Khing Su Li 3. Daniel Liew <p><u>Speakers</u></p>
---	--

Agenda

Item	Time (MYT)	Duration (minutes)	Agenda	P.I.C
1 - Subgroup admin matters	1600 - 1605	5	1.1 - Opening	Secretariat
	1605 - 1615	10	1.2 - Formalisation of subgroup - members	
	1615 - 1630	15	1.3 - Subgroup terms of reference	
	1630 - 1640	10	1.4 - Subgroup meeting environment & procedures	
2 - Initial updates for members	1640 - 1650	10	2.1 - JA progress updates by JWG co-chair	Glyn Marcus
	1650 - 1700	10	2.2 - Status of HCVN and HCSA screening tools and planned revisions	
3. Open Discussion	1700 - 1730	30	3.1 - Subgroup discussion	Secretariat
	1730 - 1740	10	3.2 - Consolidation of issues discussed	
4 - Next steps	1740 - 1750	10	4.1 - Next meeting agenda - suggestions	Secretariat
	1750 - 1755	5	4.2 - Tentative next meeting date	
	1755 - 1800	5	4.3 - Any other business	

Minutes of Meeting:

Item	Description	Action
<p>1</p>	<p>Opening</p> <p>The meeting started at 4 pm Malaysian time with introduction of the subgroup members by the Secretariat.</p> <p>The Secretariat read through the objective, scope of work, output and timeline, as stipulated in the terms of reference of the subgroup.</p> <p>Special emphases were given to the timeline for work by subgroup, which is 6 months, from Jun22 to Dec22. Monthly 2-hour meetings are targeted for the next 6 months</p> <p>All subgroup members present agreed to adopt the Chatham House Rule and the decision-making process of consensus without sustained objection. It was also agreed that members are required to make the anti-trust and conflict of interest statement only once in this first meeting.</p> <p>Two members declared their affiliation with HCVN and one that his organization represents the interests of his work district. A third member highlighted that her organisation works on HCV mapping, and has some collaboration with HCVN.</p> <p>The above points were noted, and members decided that discussions would proceed. In future when decisions are taken that directly affects involvement of HCVN and HCSA, the relevant members would be asked to remind the group of their affiliations, and to recuse themselves from decision making, if necessary.</p> <p>Anti-trust declaration was read out by the Secretariat and accepted by members.</p>	
<p>2</p> <p>2.1</p>	<p>Initial updates for subgroup members</p> <p>Updates by JWG</p> <p>Referring to Annex 1 of the ToR for the subgroup, there were questions asked about implementing HCV/HCS mapping and RaCP in JA. These questions, the JWG co-chair explained, capture the conceptual framework of the work of this subgroup.</p> <p>Members from BHCV WG commented that some of the questions needs longer than the 6-month timeline of subgroup to resolve. So the subgroup must filter out issues that can be resolved within the 6-month period from those that cannot be resolved.</p> <p>Those issues that require longer time would be passed on to P&C for bigger, high-level decision making.</p> <p>A JWG member mentioned that the recommendations made by the subgroup only applicable to palm oil producers and therefore would limit the scope and slightly simplify the discussion</p>	

	<p>The Secretariat highlighted that the target should be to come up with a list of changes required in the existing process, to be endorsed by relevant stakeholders, even though the actual implementation of the changes might take longer than the 6-month timeline of the subgroup</p> <p>There is a comment from a BHCV WG member that we must recognise the need to involve the government. This is because involvement of various levels of govt is necessary to get HCV/HCS maps accepted.</p> <p>The member was also concerned about the impacts from other non-palm oil industries within the same jurisdictions and the implications of government change.</p> <p>The landscape / probability map within RSPO database was brought up during discussion. Subgroup members agreed that although the JA process should continue to build on existing database, we must also recognise the limitations that although such landscape maps are relatively strong for HCV 1-3, they are not for HCV 4-6.</p> <p>HCVN and HCSA updates by BHCV WG</p> <p>2.2 Important statement in HCVN screening guidance, “macro mapping does not substitute for local HCV mapping”. Screening estimates probability of HCV whereas assessment tries to confirm it. The HCVN has published a screening guidance and is in the process of reviewing it.</p> <p>As for HCSA, the BHCV WG member updated that HCSA is developing national biomass cover maps and to provide deforestation monitoring platform.</p> <p>HCSA and HCVN are collaborating on developing smallholder toolkits and joint project development and funding for developing digital smallholder applications.</p>	
<p>3</p> <p>3.1</p>	<p>Open discussions</p> <p>Top-down vs bottom-up mapping was mentioned in the presentation. A member pointed out that the bottom-up method for smaller jurisdiction would be more time effective than for bigger jurisdiction, but yet top-down method would not work for HCV 5 and 6.</p> <p>Another member responded that we could take on board HCVN and HCSA probability map. However, talking to communities at production area is still necessary for HCV 4-5-6.</p> <p>A member raised the possibilities for RSPO JA HCV 4-5-6 bottom-up mapping to focus only on existing and potential palm oil production area. It</p>	<p>Agenda point for 2nd subgroup meeting –</p>

	<p>was also highlighted that this method would risk other non-oil palm areas to be opened up without proper assessment within the same jurisdiction.</p> <p>The discussion then focused on if HCVN and HCSA should be included in future discussions of JA-BHCV subgroup meeting.</p> <p>The Secretariat suggested that the subgroup to first decide whether we want to develop new methodology for mapping HCV/HCS for JA or merely to clarify how existing mapping data is to be use in JA.</p> <p>If it is the former, then the involvement by HCVN and HCSA must be now. If the latter, then it might be a bit premature to involve them now.</p> <p>At the 16th minute into the second hour of discussion, with the recusal by the member with HCVN and HCSA affiliation, the 4 remaining members decided that HCVN would be involved in technical discussions but not the decision-making process of the subgroup.</p> <p>As for HCSA, it was decided that for now they would not yet be involved due to the following reasons : i) the HCVN has ownership of the assessment and the review process of HCV standalone assessment and the integrated HCV-HCSA assessment, so there is no role yet for HCSA and ii) involvement of HCSA could lead to friction with RSPO and delay the process.</p> <p>It was also decided that HCSA would be involved when high forest cover country (HFCC), which is not applicable to the 3 current pilots, becomes a more prominent issue in JA context.</p> <p>The decision was informed accordingly to the member who recused from the decision, and he will report back to HCVN and HCSA.</p>	<p>To decide - bottom up with specific palm oil focus ?</p> <p>Agenda point for 2nd subgroup meeting – To decide – totally new mapping method or update existing process for JA</p> <p>The Secretariat would reach out to HCVN once the date and agenda for the next meeting is fixed.</p>
<p>4</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p>	<p>Next steps</p> <p>Tentative next meeting dates</p> <p>A member reminded members that considering holiday season and other work commitments, we must get members to commit to the workings of the subgroup</p> <p>AOB</p> <p>A member brought up the concerns of achieving quorum for following meetings, taking into considerations of holiday season and other working arrangements.</p>	<p>The Secretariat to block off tentative meeting dates for the remaining 5 meetings</p>

	<p>The member suggested to keep the meeting going, letting other subgroup members who miss the meeting to catch up via notes and minutes.</p> <p>The Secretariat agreed as outcomes from the subgroup would still need to be approved by the main WG of JA and BHCV, so achieving quorum for subgroup meetings would not be of utmost importance.</p> <p>Subgroup members agreed with the suggestion and would adopt this approach and push ahead for future meetings.</p> <p>A member asked if remediation procedures would be part of the subgroup discussions. The Secretariat confirmed that it would.</p> <p>But another member pointed out that the existing procedures was not functioning very well even at concession level and that we need to work out how to upgrade it to work at jurisdiction level.</p> <p>The Secretariat updated the subgroup that the problem identified with existing RaCP was the identification of social liability and small liability and that the Secretariat is working on improving the system.</p> <p>The BHCV and compensation task force is working on improving the RaCP for concession level. They would consider including JA in the improvement process once the scope of work at jurisdiction level has been defined</p> <p>The subgroup also decided that it is not necessary to share every meeting minutes with the main JA and BHCV WG. The main WGs would be kept updated when there are more solid ideas and recommendations coming from the subgroup or when the main WG's inputs are needed</p> <p>The meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm.</p>	<p>BHCV WG to share the findings report of the independent studies of RaCP - <u>done</u></p> <p>The Secretariat to update work progress on RaCP for JA</p>

Annex 1

Questions and challenges of implementing JA based on existing RSPO standards

1. Landscape map for JE
2. Should landscape mapping be done HCV assessors ?
3. Available assessors for jurisdictional level assessment
4. Mechanism for landscape level HCV/HCS identification
5. Aligning RSPO requirements with national legal requirements
6. Sources of acceptable data for JA – government, HCVN/HCSA or international data
7. How can RSPO jurisdiction maps support management unit level mapping ?
8. Applicability of existing RaCP for JA
9. Needs for environmental protection vs needs for local and national economic developments
10. No development zone set aside for HCV 1, 2 and 3
11. Can development happen outside totally protected area (TPA) ?
12. If the jurisdiction HCV 1-2-3 maps are established, do companies still need to observe HCV no development in own production area ?
13. How to identify, monitor and manage HCV 4-5-6 areas ?
14. Can TPA based on HCV map within a jurisdiction offset other development elsewhere in the jurisdiction ?