

**BHCVWG Call  
Meeting Minutes (24 to 26 February 2022)**

**Attendance list:**

<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent with apologies</b>
Lee Swee Yin (SDP)	Arnina Hussin (SDP)
Harjinder Kler (HUTAN)	Benjamin Loh (WWF)
Ambang Wijaya (GAR)	Bukti Bagja (WRI)
Anne Rosenbarger (WRI)	Mahendra Pimajati (FFI)
Budi Tri Prasetia (Musim Mas)	Marcus Colchester (FPP)
Cahyo Nugroho (FFI)	Patrick Anderson (FPP)
Chin Sing Yun (Wilmar)	Vivi Anita (Musim Mas)
Dita Galina (Musim Mas)	
Eleanor Spencer (ZSL)	
Fanny Roussel (SIPEF)	
Gotz Martin (GAR)	
Lanash Thanda (SEPA)	
Lim Sian Choo (Bumitama)	
Martin Mach (Bumitama)	
Michelle Desilets (OLT)	
Olivier Tichit (Musim Mas)	
Octyanto Bagus (WWF)	
Quentin Meunier (Olam)	
Syahrial Anhar (Wilmar)	

**Table of Content**

1. Opening remarks .....	2
2. Updates for the BHCVWG .....	2
3. Peat remediation guidelines from PLWG .....	3
4. NDJSG request to the BHCVWG on the criterion on eligibility of legacy procedure and RaCP ...	4
5. Simplified HCV approach for smallholders .....	5
6. Resolution GA18-2d (adopted on 2 December 2021) .....	6
7. HCVN: Updating information over time .....	7
8. Jurisdictional approach .....	8
9. Updates on the P&C 2023 review .....	9
10. NPP and post-NPP monitoring .....	10
11. Draft protocol of recertification and disclosure of liability .....	11
12. RaCP .....	14
13. HCV Management and Monitoring – study by Copenhagen Zoo .....	15
<b>14. BHCVWG strategic plan .....</b>	<b>15</b>

No.	Details	Action
1	<p><u>Opening remarks</u> The co-chairs welcomed all members to the meeting.</p> <p>The meeting also welcomed the new members of the BHCVWG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quentin Meunier – OLAM (replacing Audrey Lee and Laila Wilfred)</li> <li>• Mahendra Primajati – FFI</li> </ul> <p>The co-chairs also informed the BHCVWG that due to conflicting schedules, the both the Musim Mas representatives were not able to attend the meeting. After the review of a written request from Musim Mas for an exceptional arrangement, the co-chairs have agreed to allow Mrs. Dita Galina and Pak Budi Tri Prasetya to participate for 25 and 26 February 2022 only. Both have signed the code of conduct and the aim is to advance the meeting with members via the commitment from Musim Mas.</p>	
2	<p><u>Updates for the BHCVWG</u></p> <p><i>RSPO Secretariat restructure</i> The RSPO Secretariat presented the new structure and the roles/responsibilities of the departments and units related to BHCV work, following the restructuring in 2021.</p> <p>The restructuring is guided by the RSPO Secretariat Operational Plan 2021-2025. The development of the plan was led by former CEO and adopted by the RSPO BoG in Feb 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan prescribes different pillars (i.e. standard setting pillar, assurance pillar, stakeholder engagement, market transformation and impacts), roles and division of the Secretariat with the aim to improve member services, increase uptake of CSPO and address some of the gaps in current system.</li> <li>• The Operational Plan also recognized the organizational of manpower issue e.g. exponential membership growth from 2016 but the staff headcount did not increase commensurately.</li> <li>• Compliance operational work previously under Standards are to be transferred to Assurance Integrity Unit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Biodiversity Unit related work of review of NPP and HCV submission and processing of RaCP, LURI have been transferred to the Assurance Integrity Unit</li> <li>○ Annex 5 referring to the interpretation of the indicator 7.12.2 - LURI review and the RSPO non-ALS review – is still being managed under Biodiversity Unit with the tentative timeline for March 2022 handover.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>There is a stronger focus for Biodiversity Unit to get back on standard work but until tentative March 2022 handover, the Unit will still be doing compliance operation and juggling with standard work. Secretariat focal points:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BHCV standards – Khing Su Li</li> <li>• Compliance operations - Assurance Integrity Unit (headed by Wan Muqtadir), RaCP (Wan Muqtadir, Siti Joanni, Dharshanaa Chelliah, Kasih Puteri), Interpretation of 7.12.2 (after March 2022 – Wan Muqtadir, Indrawan Suryadi, Siti Joanni)</li> </ul> <p>A question was raised about potential staff or secretariat changes once the new CEO joins the Secretariat. The RSPO Secretariat could not comment on this at the time.</p>	
3	<p><u>Peat remediation guidelines from PLWG</u></p> <p>The RSPO Secretariat presented the recommendation from the PLWG on remediation for peat to obtain confirmation and acceptance of the recommendations. The recommendations have been circulated via email communications previously.</p> <p>The aim was to clarify and align the understanding of the requirements of remediation on peat for RaCP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The requirements on remediation for riparian buffer zone and excessive slope is clear. However, the remediation requirements for peat is less clear and subject to different interpretation.</li> <li>• Reference is made to Section 4 from the RaCP reads <i>‘in cases where riparian buffers where not retained, and/or steep slopes cleared and planted, remediation will be necessary (in most cases this will involve ending cultivation of palms and returning these areas to natural vegetation cover by under-planting with native tree species). Remediation and modifications to management practices might also be necessary within the body of the plantation in order to mitigate impacts on, for example, fragile or peat soils, or re-establish important connectivity’</i>. This in the last paragraph, it is not very clear that peat and fragile soil, what that ask in terms of remediation.</li> <li>• This matter was raised in previous BHCVWG meeting (in 2021) and the outcome was to refer to the PLWG who are the technical expert group for the subject matter.</li> </ul> <p>The recommendations from PLWG has been tabulated in accordance to the conservation liability timeline of RaCP based on the feedback from a member and there were 2 questions to be directed to the BHCVWG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question 1: There is no recommendation on peat remediation from the period of November 2005 to November 2007. Can the guidelines stated for 2007-2013 be adopted in this period (i.e. RSPO BMP Volume 1 (Peat Audit Guidance): Subsidence of peat soils shall be minimised and monitored; Water table should be maintained at an average of 50cm (40-60cm) below ground surface for existing plantings on peat; Drainability assessments to be conducted for plantations planted on peat, at least five years prior to replanting; Fire prevention measures) ?</li> <li>• Question 2: The peat remediation guidelines (November 2013 – November 2018) for non-member are simpler as compared to</li> </ul>	

	<p>member. Member is required to comply with the on-site management within 100 ha extent and also beyond the 100 ha extent (based on before and after the implementation of NI). Is the BHCVWG agreeable?</p> <p>Decision from the BHCVWG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question 1: It is agreeable to adopt the guidelines in 2007-2013 to November 2005 to November 2007.</li> <li>• Question 2: Agreed to proceed with the recommendations.</li> <li>• Where there are differences in the RSPO requirements and the national regulations and/or NI, members are required to follow the RSPO BMPs and/or NI of the country, whichever is stricter. The NI for peat remediation requirement is similar to the recommendations presented in the table.</li> </ul> <p>Information on peat requirements of Indonesia was also recorded i.e.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• peat function consists of protected and cultivation function, which is indicative. This indicative classification will be updated by KLHK once detailed survey (known as Survey 13 parameters) has been accomplished.</li> <li>• The Forestry ministry in Indonesia is currently working with companies and farmers to reconfirm land zoning for livelihood as the indicative maps used have certain level of inconsistencies in reflecting the ground data.</li> </ul> <p>A query was raised whether other countries' NIs on peat remediation requirement that need to be added in the table, besides the listed three countries (INA, MY, PNG).</p>	<p>KSL to check other NIs on peat remediation requirement</p>
4	<p><u>NDJSG request to the BHCVWG on the criterion on eligibility of legacy procedure and RaCP</u></p> <p>The RSPO Secretariat provided a recap of the context for this request i.e. The RSPO Legacy Procedure is a procedure currently in discussion within the No Deforestation Joint Steering Group (NDJSG), following Indicator 7.12.3 of the P&amp;C 2018, which states:</p> <p><i>“In High Forest Cover Landscapes (HFCLs) within HFCCs, a <b>specific procedure will apply for legacy cases</b> and development by indigenous peoples and local communities with legal or customary rights, taking into consideration regional and national multi-stakeholder processes. Until this procedure is developed and endorsed, 7.12.2 applies.”</i></p> <p>The NDJSG is discussing the eligibility criteria for companies with legacy cases within HFC countries. i.e., whether established companies, who have existing contracts with the government or communities in HFC countries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be allowed to proceed with limited development based on agreed terms, and the</li> </ul>	<p>KSL to communicate decision to NDJSG via Secretariat focal point</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What would be the qualifying criteria to allow companies to proceed with the development.</li> </ul> <p>The NDJSG submitted the following questions to the BHCVWG :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can companies who have conducted land clearing without prior HCV - HCS assessment and have completed RaCP process (i.e. approved remediation and compensation plan) qualify for legacy cases?</li> <li>• Do companies with ongoing RaCP, who have agreements for further development in HFC countries, qualify for such development?</li> </ul> <p>Decision from the BHCVWG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Past non-compliant land clearing shall not disqualify companies who have existing contracts with the government or communities in HFC countries to qualify for legacy procedure, and shall be allowed to proceed with limited development based on agreed terms.</li> <li>• In order to proceed with new land clearing under the legacy procedure, companies with past non-compliant land clearing must have an approved remediation and compensation project concept note.</li> </ul>	
5	<p><u>Simplified HCV approach for smallholders</u></p> <p>The Secretariat provided updates to the BHCVWG on the 2 matters below:</p> <p>A) Update of documents and pathways to align with RSPO NPP (2021)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The revised RSPO NPP (2021) included some key changes related to smallholders for new planting requirements. The scope of NPP is now extended to scheme smallholders and the risk-based assessment tools, previously developed for independent smallholders, is now also extended in its applicability to be used as an initial screening tool for smallholders to decide which assessments and if the ALS full assessment is required (i.e. low risk vs risk areas). The requirements have been aligned with the intention of the Annex 5 interpretation 7.12.2.</li> <li>• The RSPO Secretariat has initiated the review and amendments of the related guidance documents and the mobile RSPO HCV app (Android only): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ RSPO HCV guidance documents – Amendment required for three guidance documents i.e. flowcharts, terminologies and indicator referencing to the latest P&amp;C (2018), RISS (2019), NPP (2021). More graphics were also included to make it more user friendly.</li> <li>○ RSPO HCV mobile app – Enhancements are also being made into the backend to update the flow,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<p>terminologies and other related content referring to the RSPO NPP and required pathways.</p> <p>b) Upcoming HCV probability map development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RSPO Secretariat has commissioned HCVN-Proforest to develop additional maps to add to the current map database. The countries for this cycle – Cameroon, Nigeria, Uganda, Costa Rica and Peru. The RSPO Secretariat is also exploring potential partners to initiate develop of HCV probability maps for India, particularly for the areas that the government of India has prospected for oil palm development - northeast region like Assam and Arunachal Pradesh, and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. The Telangana area has less risk of new planting as the area has existing plantations.</li> </ul> <p>Queries were also made from the members if the information on these available RSPO resources / facilities are made known to smallholders. The RSPO Secretariat responded that this information would be covered in the onboarding materials for members, and will ensure that the information is conveyed.</p>	
6	<p><u>Resolution GA18-2d (adopted on 2 December 2021)</u></p> <p>The resolution calls for a review of the application of scheme smallholder due to the following considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regardless of the status of smallholder because we have scheme, associated and independent, it should be considered the same smallholder;</li> <li>The plantation company, as a partner of the scheme smallholder, is responsible for facilitating the development of the plasma plantation, managing it as agreed by the two parties, meaning that the smallholder and the company and buying in agreed prices according to the government regulation.</li> <li>The costs of development, management, and RaCP implementation of plasma plantations would be borne by the scheme smallholders (esp. if the monetary compensation USD2,500/ha option is used); consequently, affecting farmers income and the reduction of production areas (location of the smallholdings that falls into the remediation category for conservation areas).</li> <li>The RaCP mechanism for smallholders should cover both scheme, associated or independent.</li> </ul> <p>The RSPO Secretariat has proposed the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Publish an announcement of the reprieve</li> <li>Commission a quick study to understand what the reprieve means to current processes and what are the elements of the RaCP that would be applicable to the scheme smallholders.</li> </ul>	

	<p>Actions and decisions from the BHCVWG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Announcement amended for clarity and publication to proceed</li> <li>• Terms of reference for the quick study refined and to commence the study</li> <li>• The mechanics of the reprieve will also have to clarify the certification process for scheme smallholders that are under reprieve and the models of certified output.</li> <li>• Follow up on the implementation mechanics in Q2, 2022.</li> </ul>	
7	<p><u>HCVN: Updating information over time</u></p> <p>Ellen Watson from the HCVN presented a draft working paper on developing a process for changing HCV values. The HCVN has received seed funding for this work and the intention is to create a transparent and credible process – for how land managers/ companies can update HCV information, how local communities can request changes to HCV status, how social and environmental NGOs can request changes and see what the reasons are for those changes (legitimate or not).</p> <p>Changes to HCV could arise due to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changing environment and natural disturbances, disease, climate change which has a long effect, political and social reasons</li> <li>• Needs or priorities of communities that may change over time and that could change whether or not something would really be consider HCV or may be the community doesn't consider that anymore</li> <li>• Mapping techniques are that are now more accurate now so the buffer or actual areas of HCV which is in the report is different from on the ground</li> </ul> <p>HCVN has circulated the working paper to collate feedback from HCV network members and grower companies on HCVN's contact list. Feedback has been received from growers, and HCVN is seeking for additional feedback from the BHCVWG.</p> <p>The members shared the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expressed agreement with HCVN to keep the update process simple and not to create additional processes / procedures.</li> <li>• Within the current context of certified units, the auditors will also look into HCV areas. If there are any changes or degradation of HCV areas, it will be picked up by the auditors and the company will be requested to provide explanation and/or the plan for restoration. Surveillance audits are conducted annually.</li> <li>• The challenge that growers face more commonly is the use of old maps at the point of HCV assessment and when there are surveillance or resurvey, there will be changes to the HCV area. The change in this situation is not poor management but because of mapping issues.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the older reports suffer from mapping issues. However, because it is a public document, there is an expectation that the HCV values recorded remain present in its indicated location based on the report, while it no longer persists on the ground. Example: streams that have been wrongly mapped (due to poor quality satellite images, or have dried out over time).</li> <li>• The consideration by HCVN should focus on re-assessment of values rather than conducting full assessment on already existing plantation, and could be in a form of a rapid assessment</li> <li>• However, this requirement should be discussed between members and RSPO Secretariat first to understand the audit process and assess how it fits within the context of this issue.</li> </ul> <p>HCVN clarified that the HCVN was responding to feedback from growers to develop a guidance or process that can support growers on what happen if there is a change and how do show that that is the reason for the change, especially to present information during audits. The window for feedback closed the day before the meeting, but Ellen would still be accepting additional feedback for 1-2 weeks from members.</p>	
8	<p><u>Jurisdictional approach</u></p> <p>Javin Tan (Secretariat) and Sander van den Ende from the Jurisdictional Working Group (JWG) presented the RSPO jurisdictional approach framework to the BHCVWG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The jurisdictional approach framework was launched in September 2021. It provides overarching requirements for the formation of jurisdictional entities and the certification requirements at landscape level.</li> <li>• There are two key gaps (out of five) that are relevant to the BHCVWG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ HCV and HCS identification, mapping and management elements, and the</li> <li>○ Remediation and compensation mechanism that applies on the landscape level.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Three JA pilots - Ecuador, Sabah (state of Malaysia) and also Surian (regency of Central Kalimantan in Indonesia).</li> </ul> <p>Sander van den Ende informed that the process of producing the jurisdictional approach framework took about three years which involved members of working groups from all sectors (incl. NGOs and industries). There is limited participation from the government, but there are three pilot studies to produce practical experience. The experience will play a role because it is one of the elements that makes the jurisdictional approach unique, where it delegates compliance and monitoring responsibility to the government (assumption for the pilot projects are being carried out)</p> <p>Javin Tan informed that the feedback and challenges from the pilot studies have yet to be fully documented. In particular, the challenges or questions that are to be resolved for JA are:</p>	<p>Javin Tan will list out the feedback and challenges</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirements for landscape HCV-HCS assessment, how to address HCVs 5 and 6 that have to be assessed on the ground level Requirements of the RaCP at landscape level.</li> <li>• Indicative HCV maps and the HCS zoning and their elements in the JA mapping process</li> <li>• Considerations or trade-offs between conservation and development.</li> </ul> <p>The intention of this session was to discuss the way forward to collaboration with the BHCVWG in order to address the challenges and to look into the matter of mapping, remediation and compensation at landscape level.</p> <p>Feedback from the BHCVWG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BHCVWG will need time to formalise the process before going into the details of technicalities.</li> <li>• Outcomes / findings from the JA pilot studies needs to be shared.</li> <li>• Proposed to set up a sub-group between BHCVWG and JWG to start off with.</li> </ul> <p>On the proposal for the sub-group formation, it is expected that there are monthly meetings conducted for 6 to 9 months to develop the draft requirements.</p> <p>A concern was raised on whether this jurisdictional approach would be endorsed/recognised by governments. Sander van den Ende responded that it is a valid concern and can be discussed further in the sub-group.</p>	<p>and will share with the BHCVWG.</p> <p>Javin and Sander will come up with ToR for the sub-group and share with the BHCVWG</p>
9	<p><u>Updates on P&amp;C 2023 review</u></p> <p>Javin Tan informed the BHCVWG that the ToR for the next P&amp;C review process has just been endorsed by the BoG early of this month (February 2022).</p> <p>The focus of this review cycle would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To look at the implement ability of some of the standards and indicators.</li> <li>• To explore the potential of risk-based and outcome-based indicators to better monitor and measure impact of RSPO.</li> </ul> <p>The governance for the review process was informed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To establish task force (TF) that is the key body in making decisions for the whole review process.</li> <li>• To establish three technical committees (TCs). The arrangement of the TCs, their focus will be determined by the first TF meeting. The members of TCs are not necessary to be an RSPO member, they can be external stakeholders.</li> <li>• To establish a steering group and the members shall not sit on the task force to avoid any duplication of debates or any potential conflict of interest.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The announcements for the calling for nominations for TF and the calling for express of interests of TC members are anticipated in early of March.</li> <li>• Facilitation team will be engaged to facilitate all discussions for the task force and technical committee levels.</li> </ul> <p>In preparing a report for the first task force meeting, the RSPO Secretariat will conduct a member survey on the P&amp;C 2018. An announcement regarding the survey is targeted in the early or the mid of March 2022.</p> <p>The BHCVWG is encouraged to send in comments, recommendations or findings to Javin Tan, Julia Majail or Khing Su Li by 31 March 2022.</p> <p>Alongside the review of P&amp;C, the review of the independent smallholder standard would be looked into as well.</p> <p>Questions from the BHCVWG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation in the review process and the TF/TCs.</li> <li>• Call for participation for TF members.</li> </ul> <p>Responses from Secretariat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RSPO Secretariat will make announcement and stakeholders can express their interest by defining their skills and technical background as a reference to for the TF to form the TCs.</li> <li>• Announcements are targeted to be published in the week of 7<sup>th</sup> March 2022.</li> </ul>	
10	<p><u>NPP and post-NPP monitoring</u></p> <p>The Assurance Integrity Unit introduced themselves to the BHCVWG. The unit is divided into 3 divisions and the overview of the roles are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrity – review NPP submission, PalmGHG, implementation of ASC activities</li> <li>• Specialist – RaCP, drainability assessment, peat inventory and non-ALS HCV review</li> <li>• GIS – LUCA, NPP, LURI, environmental monitoring</li> </ul> <p>A) <i>Land clearing monitoring</i></p> <p>The objective and scope are to monitor that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No land conversion into oil palm outside of NPP approved area for certified and non-certified units.</li> <li>• Land clearing does not cause deforestation or damage any area required to protect or enhance High Conservation Value (HCVs) area.</li> </ul> <p>The scope of this procedure covers between active monitoring by GIS desk and decision-making by Assurance Division, and CEO. FYI the land clearing definition here is referred as per RSPO P&amp;C2018. Land clearing is the conversion of land from one land use to another. Clearing actively managed oil palm plantation to replant oil palm is</p>	

	<p>not considered land clearing. Within existing certified units, clearing less than 10 ha is not considered as new land clearing.</p> <p>Summary of the process: RSPO Secretariat receives Global Land Analysis and Discovery (GLAD) alerts from GFW/Geo-RSPO. When the alert is received, full investigation is initiated using higher resolution imagery from PLANET. The information is cross-checked against other information within the RSPO Salesforce database e.g. membership status, NPP submission, HCV/HCS information and other supporting documents (RaCP etc). If the verification shows that there is no signs of clearing based on high-res satellite imagery, the alert will be nullified. For false positive no action will be taken and the alert will be deemed as invalid. For 'verified' alerts where there are observation of land clearing on high-res satellite imagery, a brief report will be prepared. GIS desk will then communicate with the member to request for clarification. For clearing of more than 10 ha, GIS unit will inform the Risk unit for further action and then members will be given 7 days to respond via email. In absence of response, a reminder will be sent. If there is still no response, the case will be referred to the Assurance Director. Any findings or non-compliance will be referred to the Head of Integrity unit to evaluate for an advisory note.</p> <p>A question on the percentage of false detection was raised. The GIS unit responded that all GLAD alerts will be verified using higher resolution satellite imagery from PLANET.</p> <p>It was also raised that member companies have their own monitoring system and do not necessarily used GLAD. RSPO member companies also receive external verification requests on potential alerts of land clearing. This is additional requirement on resourcing, example, 5 staff are hired specifically to focus on NPP verification for different organizations. A question was then asked if RSPO is considering to align with other organizations that are also monitoring land clearing matters. RSPO Secretariat responded that it is a valid concern and will include this in consideration for future improvement.</p> <p>WRI pointed out that GFW has included updated features and has added PLANET mosaics directly into the platform. Hence, RSPO can access PLANET imagery directly from GFW now. WRI also supported the idea of synchronizing efforts for monitoring and would be happy to support further discussions.</p> <p>In response to a query, GIS unit clarified that concession shapefiles can be downloaded from GEO-RSPO except for Indonesia due to legal restrictions.</p>	
11	<p><u>Draft protocol of recertification and disclosure of liability</u> The RSPO Secretariat provided a recap on the context of the development of this protocol:</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emerging issue that there is a mismatch between disclosure information and the public audit announcement for recertification that are processed by RSPO Secretariat; cases of information that are lacking in terms of name of estate, name of management unit or names would have changed or instances where management unit size would have changed but is not updated in at least RSPO Secretariat records.</li> <li>• Mismatch in records affected some of the timelines for grower's recertification processes.</li> <li>• The interest was to also make sure that for growers who have completed their RaCP and is aiming for initial certification audit, do not encounter the same circumstance when they are also trying to start the audit process.</li> </ul> <p>The BHCVWG subgroup (SIPEF, Wilmar, Bumitama, Musim Mas, HUTAN, WWF) has already drafted the protocol (September to November 2021) and the document has been circulated to the wider group for review and acceptance. The draft has also been circulated to the RSPO Secretariat (December 2021 to January 2022) for review and inputs to existing processes.</p> <p>There are 3 scenarios:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scenario 1: all records match, unit of certification previously certify and there is no change in liability or record matches then there is no issue to proceed with certification.</li> <li>• Scenario 2: inconsistency or information doesn't match or it could be there is potential undeclared liability within the certified unit for various reason, the SSC requested BHCVWG in mid 2021 to develop a protocol in which a clear mechanism can be set up for all grower members and manage expectation of affected parties like RSPO Secretariat in terms of administrative process</li> <li>• Scenario 3: previously in 2014, growers disclosed a certain area and now coming to current year there is added scope and is not yet certified. They can proceed with the recertification on the condition that the added areas to be excluded from the scope of certification until the RaCP process for the added area is completed.</li> </ul> <p>The focus of the protocol concerns scenario 2 only. It was also reminded that ASC has also requested BHCVWG previously to develop interim measure for Scenario 2 and the decision was that recertification can proceed with the condition that the liability must be addressed and once a clear protocol to address those liability is available. For CB, they should only raise opportunities for improvement.</p> <p>Feedback from the BHCVWG and the relevant amendments to be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCV report date - Articulated what HCV report date is i.e.</li> </ul>	
--	--

	<p>The HCV report date is the date when the HCV report is complete and the findings, including the stakeholder consultation, is finalized and confirmed. For the purpose of the disclosure of liability, the HCV report date is not related to the review process of the HCV report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disclosure applicability for non-members and not under management control in the supply base - Added note i.e. Note: For situations where the smallholder groups and outgrowers are non-members and do not want to be under the management control of the mill, there is no obligation for these parties to undergo disclosure and RaCP. In this matter, the mill and the CB must ensure that the right certification model is selected i.e. mass balance</li> <li>• Update of disclosure – clarify timing and scenario. The intention for prescribing a specific window is that the update of disclosure should precede audits. The dates of audits are variable i.e. no set fixed date of audit. If RSPO was to prescribe a specific month, then it may be post- audit and may undermine the proactive approach that the annual updates are to achieve. The 6 months after acquisition follows the RaCP document.</li> </ul> <p>The section now reads as follow (page 5): Any changes to the member’s assets and/or the unit of certification shall be informed to the RSPO, and it is the company’s responsibility to ensure that disclosure(s) are updated and submitted to the RSPO Secretariat.</p> <p>The schedule for annual updates of disclosures, if applicable, is described as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Six (6) months preceding the recertification and/or annual surveillance audits:-       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Changes in the structure of unit of certification (e.g. mill or supply bases)</li> <li>b. Addition of supply bases (under the management control of the reporting party) and its location</li> <li>c. Hectarage of the supply bases</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Six (6) months after mergers, acquisition or sale of assets:-       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Acquisitions of new asset(s)</li> <li>b. Concessions sold and subsequently acquired by another RSPO member.</li> </ol> <p>(Note: The buyer would be responsible to ensure that the acquisition is updated with the RSPO Secretariat and that all compensation processes for all non-compliant clearance identified are completed).</p> </li> </ol> <p>Disclaimer: This listing may not be exhaustive. In the case where there are circumstances that do not fit with the categories listed above, please contact the RSPO Secretariat at <a href="mailto:rspocompensation@rspo.org">rspocompensation@rspo.org</a> for more details.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Where there has been land clearing after 2005 without prior HCV assessments, the company is to enter into compensation processes for all non-compliant clearance identified.</p>	
<p>12</p>	<p><u>RaCP</u></p> <p>The Compensation Team introduced themselves. The team was represented by Dr. Dharshanaa Chelliah. Dr Dharshanaa provided summary statistics of RaCP cases from July 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Active cases (July 2021): 819 cases</li> <li>• Active cases (Feb 2022): 726 cases</li> <li>• The majority of the cases are from Indonesia and Malaysia</li> <li>• New entries are coming from Indonesia and Thailand (particularly new membership application of ISH)</li> </ul> <p>There are currently 3 staff at the Secretariat working on RaCP with 1 staff dedicated to Indonesian cases.</p> <p>The Compensation Team presented a proposal (previously discussed with the Co-chairs) to organise a workshop for Compensation Panel with the aim to have refresher / introduction to new members on the Compensation Panel, the review process and to recalibrate requirements for reviews. The proposed timing for the workshop is March 2022. The BHCVWG agreed and a Doodle Poll will be circulated to organise the workshop.</p> <p>A member raised a concern on the long turnaround time for review (e.g. 5 months), but the growers are requested to revert with clarification in a short response time (e.g. 7 days). In order to meet this, growers will need to re-allocate resources to recall the case and work on the clarification / responses. The improvements will have to be truncated into the respective processes and assess how the respective processes can be optimised to close cases. Based on the presentation of the statistics, a backlog of 700+ ongoing cases is not an acceptable figure as most of these have been ongoing for many years. A proposal must be submitted to the RSPO Secretariat to clear cases within a certain timeframe e.g. 6 months and additional manpower must be added to focus specifically on RaCP case processing. In addition, there should be added manpower to process Indonesian cases where the backlog is most at. Temporary staff on contract basis can be hired for a year or 2 just to clear cases and reduce case numbers.</p> <p>It was also expressed that BHCVWG will need to ensure that the action on staffing at Secretariat to process cases will need to be addressed as a priority. There has been inaction over the past years and it is now more crucial to address the issue.</p> <p>It was decided that BHCVWG will submit a formal request to the Secretariat to add manpower to clear the case backlog within a certain timeframe (e.g. 6 months) and to reduce drastically the turnaround time for each case. The Co-chairs of the BHCVWG will prepare a letter to the Secretariat.</p>	

8	<p><u>HCV Management and Monitoring – study by Copenhagen Zoo</u>  BHCVWG commissioned this study with the aim to develop a framework with common indicators for HCV management and monitoring.</p> <p>The authors carried out reviews of RSPO HCV reports from 2010 to 2019.</p> <p>In the study, the authors reported of the poor quality of the HCV reports. Owing to this, the authors were unable to give further in-depth recommendations on HCV management and monitoring.</p> <p>Payment for the study has been disbursed as the RSPO Secretariat needs to close the financial year.</p> <p>Feedback from the BHCVWG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of an HCV report is to identify the HCV area in a concession area following the HCV toolkit and develop management activities based on the recommendations from the HCV assessment report.</li> <li>• It is acknowledged that the HCV assessment process is a one-off study and will not be able to capture all information at the particular point of assessment.</li> <li>• There will be inconsistencies between the ground data and desktop maps.</li> <li>• RSPO conducts annual audit on the HCV management and monitoring to ensure that the HCV areas identified are managed accordingly.</li> <li>• The study has not been able to provide any clear recommendations on management and monitoring.</li> <li>• This study has also deviated from the initial objective and scope, because it only reviewed HCV reports and did not conduct a literature review of management activities, particularly on co-management with local communities.</li> <li>• It was agreed that rapid assessment and faster review process are needed to shorten the time consumed and reduce the money spent.</li> <li>• There is useful point in the draft report where faster mechanism can be explored.</li> <li>• Conversation may be established between RSPO Secretariat and HCVN on the report findings to improve the quality of the HCV-ALS reports.</li> <li>• BHCVWG requests to put forth the feedback to the authors. RSPO Secretariat to assist in asking for further specific recommendations (if possible) as stated in the ToR of this study in order to align with the initial objective and scope of the study.</li> </ul>	KSL to revert to authors
9	<p><u>BHCVWG strategic plan</u>  The RSPO Secretariat presented the idea of establishing an BHCVWG strategic plan.</p>	

	<p>The rationale is to provide a clearer direction for the RSPO on managing HCV and related issues, measure efficacy of our standards / guidances and set an informed-basis for improvement. This plan would also be very helpful for the BioD unit at the RSPO Secretariat to allocate adequate resources and support to the BHCVWG to carry out activities.</p> <p>Responses from the BHCVWG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growers are looking for efficient and effective HCV assessment and review process to ensure HCV areas are protected in the course of development.</li> <li>• The effort of RSPO Secretariat and growers in conserving HCV areas is being jeopardized by external pressure. E.g., government degazetted forest reserves.</li> <li>• Can include more technical inputs.</li> <li>• The idea of establishing a strategic plan is supported by the WG and suggested to create a sub-group for further discussion as a way forward. Discussion includes brainstorming for broad base ideas, thought process, long term or short term and etc.</li> <li>• Also highlighted the need to look at the impacts as a whole to fit into the strategic framework.</li> </ul>	
10	End of meeting	