

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF RSPO**  
**35<sup>th</sup> RSPO BHCVWG MEETING**

**Date: 8 and 10 August 2017**  
**Start time: 9.00 am**  
**Venue: Capri Hotel, Kuala Lumpur**

**Attendance:**

<b><u>Members and Alternates</u></b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Angga Rachmansah (FFI)</li><li>2. Audrey Lee (OLAM)</li><li>3. Azmariah Muhamed (FGV)</li><li>4. Benjamin Loh (WWF MY)</li><li>5. Bukti Bagja (WRI)</li><li>6. Edrin Moss (WILMAR)</li><li>7. Eleanor Slade (SEARPP)</li><li>8. Gan Lian Tiong (Musim Mas)</li><li>9. Ginny Ng (WILMAR)</li><li>10. Harjinder Kler (Hutan)</li><li>11. Izabella Delabre (ZSL)</li><li>12. John Payne (BORA)</li><li>13. Joss Lyons-White (HCVRN)</li><li>14. Laila Wilfred (OLAM)</li><li>15. Lanash Thanda (SEPA)</li><li>16. Lee Swee Yin (SIME)</li><li>17. Michael Brady (IFC)</li><li>18. Michal Zrust (Daemeter)</li><li>19. Norazam Abd Hameed (FGV)</li><li>20. Olivier Tichit (SIPEF)</li><li>21. Richard Kan (GAR)</li></ol>	<b><u>RSPO Secretariat</u></b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Dillon Sarim</li><li>2. Javin Tan</li><li>3. Khing Su Li</li><li>4. Aizat Affendi</li></ol> <b><u>Invited Speaker</u></b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Carolina Rosero (Conservation International)</li><li>2. Dharsono Hartono (PT Rimba Makmur Utama)</li><li>3. Roan McNab (WCS)</li></ol>
<b><u>Absent with Apologies</u></b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>22. Cahyo Nugroho (FFI)</li><li>23. Glen Reynolds (SEARRP)</li><li>24. Marcus Colchester (FFP)</li><li>25. Michelle Desilets (Orangutan Land Trust)</li></ol>	

## Table of Contents

1.0 Welcoming Remarks .....	3
2.0 Review & endorsement of the 34 <sup>th</sup> BHCVWG meeting minutes .....	3
3.0 Endorsement of the Simplified Riparian Management Guideline .....	5
4.0 Resolution 6dGA13 .....	6
5.0 RSPO P&C Review .....	7
6.0 RaCP Statistics update .....	8
7.0 Discussion on 'protected areas for compensation projects .....	11
8.0 ToR for Compensation Panel (review and update) .....	11
9.0 Update from HCVRN .....	12
10.0 HCV Management and Monitoring Project: Update & endorsement from the BHCVWG, and Proposal for Phase II of M&M .....	16
11.0 Compensation Project presentation .....	17
12.0 Updates from RSPO INA NI HCVTF .....	17
13.0 Updates on Resolutions (6hGA12 and 6fGA13) .....	18
14.0 Updates on the P&C review .....	20
15.0 Procedure for the 'review and update' of HCV assessment older than 3 years for NPP submission .....	20
16.0 Simplified HCV tool .....	21
17.0 Review of ToR for members of BHCVWG .....	22
18.0 RT15 Topics .....	23
19.0 AOB and Closing remarks .....	23

No	Description	Action points	Progress
1.0	<p><b>Opening Remarks</b> Ginny Ng welcomed everyone to the 35<sup>th</sup> BHCVWG meeting. Delegates were asked to make a round of introductions as there were new attendees in the room.</p>		
2.0	<p><b>Review &amp; endorsement of the 34<sup>th</sup> BHCVWG meeting minutes</b></p> <p>2.1 NPP Checklist. The RSPO Secretariat was to share the finalised NPP checklist with the BHCVWG that was submitted to ASI for review. To-date, there has been no response from ASI. The Secretariat will follow up with ASI in September 2017 at the upcoming CB workshop.</p> <p>2.2 Meeting minutes. Minutes of the 33<sup>rd</sup> BHCVWG meeting have been amended and uploaded onto the BHCVWG webpage on RSPO.</p> <p>2.3 Formatting of the meeting minutes. Javin Tan and Dillon Sarim adopted a new formatting standard for the 34<sup>th</sup> minutes including columns for actions points and progress to track status of work.</p> <p>2.4 LUCA non-submitters. The Secretariat has already drafted and sent out letter late July 2017 requesting non-submitters (7 members) to provide a timeline for LUCA submission. Only 1 response received (Industrial Ales S.A., indicating 60 days from 31 July 2017).</p> <p>2.5 LUCA reviewers and capacity. The Secretariat has set a timeline of 2 weeks for LUCA reviewers to seek clarifications or to submit a report on the review of LUCAs in order to expedite the review process. Olivier Tichit requested that the Secretariat makes reference to the number of working days instead of weeks to be consistent with RSPO documents.</p> <p>2.6 ToR for compensation plan evaluator. Announcement on the call for tenders for compensation plan evaluator has been published on RPSO web.</p> <p>2.7 LUCA guidance document. The new LUCA guidance was presented in the RaCP workshop, which was held in Jakarta on 22-23 May 2017. Minor issues were picked up and forwarded to the consultant to be clarified and/or amended (e.g. the formula for the Yamane-Toru statistics differed from the formula available on the web and that the base point for the contingency matrix should be November 2005). Dillon Sarim had also asked the consultant to provide calculation.</p> <p>2.8 Guidance for Map Submission for LUCA. This simplified LUCA guidance document for independent smallholders was to be tabled to the Taskforce for ISH RaCP. The members of this TF, selected from SHWG and BHCVWG, have not been able to identify a common date to convene a meeting.</p>	<p>RSPO Secretariat will follow up with ASI in September 2017 at the upcoming CB workshop.</p> <p>RSPO Secretariat to monitor and follow up with the other 6 members to get a proposed timeline from them.</p> <p>RSPO Secretariat to upload the finalised new LUCA guidance onto the web and make an announcement.</p> <p>RSPO Secretariat to continue communications to initiate a meeting.</p>	<p>Completed</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done. Feedback noted.</p> <p>Done</p>

	<p>2.9 Compensation Plan Evaluator. Dillon Sarim has shared the organisation profiles and CVs in the BHCVWG dropbox folder for BHCWG members to view and vote for candidates to be in the pool of evaluators. The announcement on the call for application to be compensation plan evaluators have been uploaded on the RSPO web. Voting members were reminded to excuse themselves from the voting process should they have a conflict of interest.</p> <p>2.10 Summary of concept note review decisions. An agreement was reached at the last BHCVWG meeting to have the Compensation Panels prepare a summary of concept note review decisions. Dillon Sarim has prepared a common reference for highlights on compensation panel discussions and the decisions made (particularly on new scenarios that may set a precedence for other cases).</p> <p>2.11 Budget for BHCVWG. Javin Tan updated the WG members that the RSPO Secretariat has approved the budget to develop social remediation guidelines, but did not approve the budget line for Phase II for Management and Monitoring study. Joss Lyons-White reiterated he was unable to provide and propose an estimate budget for Phase II at the previous meeting because the Phase I of the project was still ongoing and the analysis has yet to be completed at that time. Joss L-White added that HCVRN is now ready to start building a proposal and work plan for Phase II. Javin Tan informed that although the RSPO Secretariat has allocated more budget into the P&amp;C reviews processes this financial year, it does not prevent the BHCVWG from putting forth a request from the management to justify the need for specific projects.</p> <p>2.12 HCS Checklist. At the previous meeting, the WG agreed to provisionally endorse this document (in principal) but has requested the help of a WG member / invited experts for assistance in rewording to be consistent with RSPO terms. Michael Zrust has shared the revised version in the BHCVWG dropbox but no comments received to-date. The WG has agreed to park the HCS checklist on the RaCP webpage (refer to Resolution 6d) as a guidance to the Annex 6 – Project Criteria Guidance.</p> <p>On a related note to the Resolution 6d, Javin Tan highlighted that the intention to create a RaCP webpage on RSPO.org was to make publicly available the information on disclosure, liabilities and information on compensation projects, as required by the resolution.</p> <p>2.13 Indonesian HCV toolkit. The RSPO Secretariat was requested by Ginny Ng in the previous meeting to revert to the WG on the updates of the RSPO INA HCV TF led by RSPO Indonesia. Suli provided clarification that the RSPO INA HCV TF is working on the NI on the Common Guidance for HCV Management and Monitoring (2015). Cahyo Nugroho has requested his alternate (Angga Rachmanshah) to present updates and progress of the RSPO INA HCV TF on his behalf as he is unable to attend the meeting.</p>	<p>Dillon Sarim to share the document with the BHCVWG.</p> <p>WG members to discuss the information to be made publicly available as per the resolution.</p>	
--	---	--	--

	<p>2.14 Guidelines for social remediation. RSPO Secretariat advertised the call for tenders on social remediation guidelines. The deadline for submission was set to 4 august 2017. Only 1 proposal was submitted for the call.</p> <p>John Payne noted that in the Progress column, a date of completion to be provided once the item is marked done. The WG agrees and endorses the 34<sup>th</sup> BHCVWG meeting minutes.</p>		
3.0	<p><b>Endorsement of the Simplified Riparian Management Guideline</b></p> <p>Jenifer Lucey has shared the final draft of the simplified riparian guidelines with the WG members. Olivier Tichit and Audrey Lee expressed that in addition to the highlighted benefits, riparian areas are also preferred habitats of non-beneficial species such as wild pigs and macaques and should include some management recommendation for companies. Audrey Lee added a few comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Illegal mining and its threat to riparian areas (for the ROW and in Kalimantan) is not addressed in this document. She stated that it would be good to add some guidelines on how growers can control illegal mining and what kind of actions need to be taken. Ginny NG highlighted that the simplified document is based on the full guidelines. Audrey Lee stated that she has previously brought up this issue during the development of the full guidelines, but it was not included.</li> <li>ii. Provide information on management prescription for land preparation on replanting on areas that has been converted into oil palm plantation and before replanting and restoring these areas into riparian areas. Ginny Ng mentioned that case studies could be added. Dillon Sarim clarified that the case studies are already available in the full guidelines and there is no need to add into this document.</li> </ol> <p>Eleanor Slade replied that the RERTA project in Sumatera, Indonesia is currently carrying out research to collect scientific data and build evidence to address questions on restoration, enrichment and land preparation for active replanting in established oil palm stands, and benefits in terms of pest management of pests like rhinoceros beetles.</p> <p>Ginny Ng replied that the BHCWG will need to work on another set of guidelines to address the issues on illegal mining, management prescriptions and pest management. Dillon Sarim said that these guidelines can be parked under Supplementary Document section on RSPO.org. To improve visibility, Eleanor Slade added that SEARRP is reworking on a new website and can add links to the documents.</p> <p>Harjinder Kler asked if the field booklet will be translated into Bahasa Malaysia and Bahasa Indonesia. RSPO Secretariat replied yes. She put forward suggestion on creating short videos. Ginny Ng said to proceed with translations first.</p> <p>The WG endorses the simplified riparian management guidelines and agrees to let RSPO Secretariat work on the design, layout and translations. Eleanor Slade said that Jen Lucey is happy to work with the Secretariat on producing graphics, and to make it into a nice field booklet that people can carry out into the field.</p>	<p>RSPO Secretariat to work on the design and layout of the simplified riparian field booklet and have it translated into Bahasa Malaysia and Bahasa Indonesia.</p>	<p>Infographics and design work ongoing</p>

<p>4.0</p>	<p><b>Resolution 6dGA13</b></p> <p>The resolution requires that i) information on the RaCP be made publicly available, and ii) put into place some form of monitoring mechanism on the implementation and implementation of the SOPs, and remediation and compensation plans.</p> <p>In order to meet the first part of the resolution, the Secretariat has proposed the idea of creating a RaCP webpage within RSPO.org where statistics on the aggregated non-compliant land clearance and final conservation liability by region and country will be displayed. The Secretariat presented the draft text and webpage layout to the BHCWG. The proposed webpage will feature a map with aggregated NCLC and FCL figures. Information on the RaCP procedures, guiding principles and links to the key RaCP documents will be provided on the webpage.</p> <p>The feedback from the WG members was that RSPO Secretariat needs to outline clearly the context on non-compliant land clearance as it makes reference to land clearance without prior HCV assessment according to the RSPO standards scheme and in no manner, implies that RSPO allows deforestation and/or clear-pay mechanism. It has to be noted that the non-compliance can stem from the result of land acquisition controlled by non-RSPO members. Audrey Lee suggested to also provide figures of total certified and HCV areas can be added to provide the positives of RSPO scheme. Javin Tan clarified that the background and context will be explained by the information on the RaCP.</p> <p>Michal Zrust highlighted that the webpage should also highlight the information captured in the figures e.g. FCI is only 10% of the total areas cleared without prior HCV assessment after Nov 2005, where it shows that <b>most of the land were cleared prior to 2007 and most of the land were cleared on non-forested land.</b></p> <p>Dr. Gan proposed that it would be good to also show the split between NCLC and FCL of current and new RSPO members after 9 May 2014. For current members, a lot of NCLC by members would be in the first category before 9 May 2014 and resolved over time through RaCP. New members would show appreciation.</p> <p>There was also a suggestion to display the analysis of the different coefficients and land use types to show the types of areas that were opened for development.</p> <p>After a detailed discussion, the WG have agreed to make these company aggregated information public:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. List of companies and the stage the companies of RaCP where the companies are at currently (can show progress over time).</li> <li>B. Company specific disclosure, the information endorsed by the WG to be made public are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Name of company (as per membership), group ownership.</li> <li>- Liability compensation (yes/no)?</li> <li>- Number of units with liability (aggregated)</li> <li>- Stage of process within the RaCP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LUCA submitted</li> <li>- LUCA approved</li> <li>- Concept Note submitted</li> <li>- Concept Note Approved</li> <li>- Proposal Submitted</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p>RSPO Secretariat to share with WG members the draft response letter to project proponent for comments.</p> <p>RSPO Secretariat to develop the webpage.</p>	
------------	---	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposal Approved by 3rd party evaluator (Option A or Option B proposed?)</li> <li>- Implementation started and project timeline</li> <li>- Project activities details, compliance with 4 criteria summary documents.</li> </ul> <p>Note: there was no agreement on the last point. WG members requested Secretariat to proceed with the draft first and revisit the last point later.</p> <p>RSPO Secretariat and BHCWG should aim to endorse this webpage latest in the next BHCVWG meeting, if not earlier. Olivier Tichit motioned he would be happy to have a webpage that could show at the very least the aggregated numbers, maps showing the different parts of the world with the voluntarily disclosed liabilities, total NCLC and FCL. Providing these numbers would build confidence in the transparency of RSPO procedures. The page can insert links to the respective members' page where the company level information can be captured in one page.</p> <p>In response to the second part of the resolution, Olivier Tichit added the Compensation desk does not have: 1) not enough information currently to be able to report and ii) does not have the capacity to monitor the implementation of compensation plans or to check SOPs.</p> <p>Olivier Tichit and Dr. Gan would like to remind all that the SIPEF and Musim Mas' compensation plans were submitted during the staged implementation of the RaCP and have been endorsed but not been evaluated, as they were submitted before the requirement for independent evaluation was added. Ginny Ng highlighted that the plans would have to be evaluated and the circumstances of their submission will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>WG members have asked RSPO Secretariat to respond to the project proponent that more information will be provided as time progresses and to make clarification of what specific information is required in terms of checking of SOPs. There was consensus in the WG that there is enough check and balances to ensure that the SOPs are followed (i.e. no new NCLC, compliance to conducting HCV assessment), otherwise members will be expelled.</p>		
5.0	<p><b>RSPO P&amp;C Review</b></p> <p>The RSPO P&amp;C (2013) is currently undergoing revision. The attempt to collate inputs from the BHCVWG for Draft Zero via email had very low response rate. Anne Rosenbarger has shared her thoughts on the key issues for BHCVWG inputs via email. Olivier Tichit shared that there were proposals in the P&amp;C review to try to simplify the P&amp;C and to reduce complex categories. An example would be to consider the minimum size of development for any kinds of growers and not just independent smallholder, to qualify for use of simplified tools for NPP. Simplified tools for HCV, HCS and SIA assessments have been developed. The interest of the BCVWG would be to look at the simplified HCV assessment and consider risk-based assessments instead of size alone. The current NPP starts with 1 ha. Adding a risk-bases system for small development will achieve more than having an NPP applicable from 1 ha. Olivier Tichit also added that, RSPO being a global standard, should not have so many categories of smallholders with many different interpretations with different treatment for different group types e.g. associated, scheme and independent smallholders. The idea is to use 50 ha for small development as the global standard</p>	<p>RSPO Secretariat would create a Doodle Poll for the meeting in September or October 2017.</p>	<p>BHCVWG P&amp;C Review Meeting was organised on 10 October 2017 at Aloft, KL.</p> <p>Responses were submitted on 30 October 2017.</p>

	<p>and get the NI to adapt the standard according to national regulations.</p> <p>Audrey Lee highlighted that the BHCVWG should use the opportunity of the review process to incorporate the RaCP into the P&amp;C.</p> <p>Olivier also added that “no deforestation” or equivalent may be included in the P&amp;C. The word “no deforestation” may not be used in the P&amp;C as different companies have made prior commitments of no deforestation but worded differently. Furthermore, available tools may not be named “no deforestation” but which achieve the same outcome. The P&amp;C may use another term for forest conservation. The term “landscape forest conservation” was used in the previous draft.</p> <p>Javin Tan highlighted that the public consultation for the P&amp;C review would be held from 1 September to 30 October 2017. Olivier Tichit suggested to wait for Draft One to be out and collect comments. Richard Kan asked for BHCVWG to convene a special meeting to look at the Draft 1 and collate their inputs. Ginny Ng agreed.</p>																																									
6.0	<p><b>RaCP Statistics update</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="178 925 821 1352"> <thead> <tr> <th>Country</th> <th>NCLC (Ha)</th> <th>FCL (Ha)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Indonesia</td> <td>588,557</td> <td>55,345</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Malaysia</td> <td>62,595</td> <td>8,997</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Colombia</td> <td>22,001</td> <td>1,871</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brazil</td> <td>87</td> <td>49</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Guatemala</td> <td>31,384</td> <td>514</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Honduras</td> <td>6,176</td> <td>185</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ecuador</td> <td>7,804</td> <td>594</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nigeria</td> <td>2,048</td> <td>88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ghana</td> <td>523</td> <td>86</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cote d'Ivoire</td> <td>1,887</td> <td>1,887</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dominican Republic</td> <td>773</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>723,835</b></td> <td><b>69,619</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Only 32% the LUCAs have been completely reviewed. At the decision of the WG members to remove the endorsement of the LUCA review results, the processing timelines for the approval of LUCAs were shortened, and more companies could proceed to the next step of the RaCP process of developing concept notes.</p> <p><i>LUCA non-submitters</i> The BHCVWG had decided in April 2017 that failure to submit proposed timelines for LUCA submission after 2 months upon the issuance of the letter of request will result in RSPO membership suspension. The Financial Institution Taskforce has made a request to publicly disclose the information of non-submitters so that as bankers, they can push the companies to complete the submission soonest. RSPO Secretariat has sent the letter on 21 July 2017 to the non-submitters. There was no objection to disclosing the list of non-submitter but must be on the RSPO.org. Richard Kan suggested to the Secretariat to send another letter a month before the deadline to remind them of the deadline and if there is no response, the RSPO Secretariat may suspend their membership in September 2017.</p>	Country	NCLC (Ha)	FCL (Ha)	Indonesia	588,557	55,345	Malaysia	62,595	8,997	Colombia	22,001	1,871	Brazil	87	49	Guatemala	31,384	514	Honduras	6,176	185	Ecuador	7,804	594	Nigeria	2,048	88	Ghana	523	86	Cote d'Ivoire	1,887	1,887	Dominican Republic	773	3	<b>Total</b>	<b>723,835</b>	<b>69,619</b>	RSPO Secretariat to send a letter of reminder a month before if no response is received.	Proposed timelines received. One members has resigned from RSPO.
Country	NCLC (Ha)	FCL (Ha)																																								
Indonesia	588,557	55,345																																								
Malaysia	62,595	8,997																																								
Colombia	22,001	1,871																																								
Brazil	87	49																																								
Guatemala	31,384	514																																								
Honduras	6,176	185																																								
Ecuador	7,804	594																																								
Nigeria	2,048	88																																								
Ghana	523	86																																								
Cote d'Ivoire	1,887	1,887																																								
Dominican Republic	773	3																																								
<b>Total</b>	<b>723,835</b>	<b>69,619</b>																																								



*LUCA reviewers*

RSPO Secretariat has expressed concerns that it may not have enough turnover of LUCA reviewers to undertake LUCA reviews, and have asked for assistance from the BHCWG members to share the ToR for LUCA reviewers with their contacts.

*Certified units with unresolved compensation cases*

Dillon Sarim highlighted that there were cases of certified units with unresolved compensation cases but did not have the numbers available at hand. Richard Kan explained that these could have occurred as a result of failure by the CB to identify the non-compliance in certification audit. Some cases could also refer to MUs with legacy issues – certified but has liability that has not been addressed. Richard Kan suggested that if the failure is due to the CB, the member should not be suspended, but should be allowed a certain time duration to implement corrective action. WG agrees to provide 1 year to close the non-compliance while continue to be certified.

*Concept note May 2017 Workshop feedback*

Dillon Sarim collated a number of key questions asked by the participants at the May 2017 concept note workshop. John Payne explained further to the WG that he thought that these questions were important to be presented to the WG for answers. The list of questions and answers from the WG members are listed below.

**Questions:**

Q1: If growers work with 3<sup>rd</sup> parties on a compensation project, who is responsible if the projects fails? Would the growers be penalised?

A1: Growers is responsible for the compensation projects that they have proposed and to ensure that the project is viable for 25 years. If fires, civil wars, political conflict or situations such as bad third party management (project implementers run off with money) affects the viability of the project, the grower needs to propose another project. The risk of failure over the next 25 years is quite high. Growers must ensure that there is enough due diligence performed, conduct sufficient monitoring that will highlight gaps/issues.

Q2: What happens after 25 years?

A2: Dr. Gan explained that in Indonesia, the HGU only expires after 30 years and the companies will need to apply for continuation of the second cycle of HGU. This means that the set aside area will continue to exist and the HCV will be protected provided if it is retained by the same company. Dr. Gan expressed his concern that the ecosystem restoration project may or may not continue.

Q3: Some companies have proceeded with the implementation of the compensation plan activities although it has not been endorsed. Is this agreeable by the BHCVWG?

A3: There is no objection if the company would like to start remediation works while waiting for the compensation plan to be endorsed. However, growers are reminded that the decision to approve the compensation project will still be dependent on the evaluator's results and approval by the Compensation Panel. If the compensation project is not approved, growers will need to resubmit another concept note for approval before designing the compensation project.

<p>Q4: Is species conservation project an acceptable compensation project?  A4: Species conservation is a valid compensation plan. The question is whether the target species is suitable for compensation project. It needs to be evaluated based on the 4 criteria and whether it is a useful project or not. Growers must ensure that due diligence to be exercised when choosing a project.</p> <p><i>Compensation Plan Evaluator</i>  <b>Selection of the pool of evaluators.</b> Dillon Sarim rounded up the voting results for the February and June 2017 applicants. Only Erik Meijard and Josh Van Vianen were shortlisted into the pool of evaluators. Ginny Ng requested all to go to the dropbox to view the CVs of the other candidates and to vote in the excel sheet. As a minimum requirement, candidates must get more than 50% of the votes to qualify, and must gain 2/3 of the total votes to be selected.</p> <p><b>Contracting terms.</b> This was discussed at length by the WG members because the evaluation of the compensation plan involved contractual agreements with the grower (as outlined in the RaCP where a grower hires a compensation plan evaluator). Joss L-White presented a draft Code of Conduct (CoC) for the evaluator and Lanash Thanda helped to clarify the wordings. However, it is not legally binding and does not help to ensure the impartiality of the process.</p> <p>Joss L-White and Lanash Thanda asked RSPO Secretariat to check if there is a possibility of Secretariat to undertake the payment from growers to disburse the payment to the evaluator upon satisfactory completion of the evaluation work (emulating the Complaints mechanism for third party verification).</p> <p>If the mechanism proposed above is not agreeable by the RSPO Secretariat, this would mean that the evaluators will still have to sign the CoC and submit to RSPO, even though the said person has signed a contract with grower. Joss L-White could add a clause, "Evaluators who fail to adhere to the COC will be blacklisted by RSPO" into the CoC. Ginny Ng mentioned that RSPO Secretariat could test this system out and review after 1 year. Michal Zrust highlighted that growers must insert the ToR for compensation plan evaluator in the contract.</p> <p><b>RaCP appeals mechanism.</b> The Secretariat highlighted that this was briefly discussed in the last meeting, and there were companies bringing problems to the Secretariat to bring to the BHCVWG. Each Compensation Panel, selected from 2 growers and 2 NGOs members of the BHCVWG, has been mandated to make decision on the concept notes. The decision made by the CP are also bound by the RaCP procedure. Compensation Panel members may also seek clarification information from others who have more knowledge on a certain region.</p> <p>Dr. Gan asked if a process to allow growers to seek clarification from the CP and the CP can decide to communicate directly with the company could be established. Dillon Sarim responded that growers have the clarification period to discuss decisions made and to ask for clarification.</p> <p>The WG agreed that the BHCWG would not take up appeals.</p>	<p>RSPO Secretariat to notify BHCVWG members to vote for new applicants (ongoing).</p> <p>RSPO Secretariat to send check with the Finance Unit.</p>	<p>Finance Unit agreeable. RSPO Secretariat initiated the evaluation process with 2 growers. Service agreement and undertaking of payment agreements as per the RSPO contract.</p>
--	---	--

7.0	<p><b>Discussion on ‘protected areas for compensation projects’</b> John Payne would like to get a formal endorsement on using protected areas (e.g. national parks, state parks) for compensation projects.</p> <p>The WG reiterated that there would not be any objection as long as the project meets the 4 criteria. Audrey Lee pointed out that protected areas are recognised and is the highest preference within the RaCP guidance document as a potential compensation option.</p> <p>Dr. Gan emphasized that compensation projects go beyond the area, and should also look into the management. Growers should develop KPIs and programmes to monitor and track the performance of the KPIs. Some of the activities within compensation project could look at rehabilitation, training of local communities and providing job e.g. tree nurseries and pay to protect the area.</p> <p>Glen Reynolds, Jen Lucey and Izabela Delabre agreed that providing additionality is a must. Jen wanted to highlight that it is important to document case history, what has happened before, and what the government is doing in that area important to ensure additionality.</p> <p>MZ has offered his assistance to compile the FAQ to this and the 4 questions from the RaCP workshop. The draft text will be shared with the BHCVWG members. John Payne agreed with this idea.</p>		
8.0	<p><b>ToR for Compensation Panel (review and update)</b> Ginny Ng reminded the WG members that they were to revisit the ToR and update the scope of work, taking into account that some of the roles have been removed.</p> <p>The changes made to the ToR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conference call can be called by the RSPO Secretariat without the need of chairs</li> <li>• Compensation Panel are selected from members of the BHCVWG</li> <li>• Compensation Panel does not need to review and endorse the results of the LUCAs</li> <li>• Compensation Panel assigns the compensation plan evaluator</li> </ul> <p>Azmariah Muhamed opined that growers should be given the freedom to choose the evaluator. Richard Kan responded saying that growers will look for the cheapest option. The current process agreed is that the BHCVWG members will select the candidates that goes into a pool of evaluators. The Secretariat will identify if there are conflicts of interest between the grower and the compensation plan project with the evaluator. The names of those without conflict of interest will be presented to the compensation panel to choose and assign to a particular compensation plan. This removes the conflict of interest arising from the selection of evaluator by Secretariat and selection by growers.</p> <p>Other RSPO members can be invited to be a part of the compensation panel by the BHCVWG. If no quorum is achieved, co-chairs shall be consulted to approve the participation of another RSPO member, external to the BHCVWG, to make up the quorum. CP needs a quorum of 3 out of 4. If only two CP members are available, does not meet quorum and the Secretariat will reschedule meeting.</p>		

Bukit Bagja asked for clarification what if there was split voting in a panel of 4 members. Richard Kan answered that the majority will be three and if it is a deadlock, then it would be brought to the BHCVWG.

Dr. Gan asked for a point of clarification if the Compensation Panel needs to maintain the same ratio, 2:2. The WG members answered yes.

Michal Zrust reiterated the RaCP guidance document, which states that **“The co-chairs of the BHCVWG will review all conflicts of interest and replace members(s) as necessary to achieving balance and expertise. The new member(s) of a panel, are RSPo members, proposed by RSPo Secretariat and approved by the co-chairs of the BHCVWG”**.

Ginny Ng discussed that there should be a penalty (in the form of replacement) if member do not respond in a timely manner for 3 times. Richard Kan countered that by doing so, new members may not be able to contribute effectively to the discussions as they do not have prior background knowledge.

The WG however agreed to add this into the TOR. The WG decided to add this under the bracket of “unable to perform”. The WG decided to set the timeline to 2 weeks for the Compensation to deliberate and come to a decision. WG endorses the document, subject to the cleaning up of the TOR document.

9.0 **Update from HCVRN**  
Joss co-presented with Ruth (who was connected via Skype).

*Impacts of ALS*

<b>ALS impacts January 2015 – August 2017</b>	
<b>Total reports received *</b>	<b>68</b>
Reports reviewed and passed as satisfactory	36
Reports reviewed and deemed unsatisfactory	7
Total area assessed	481,559 ha
Total HCV management area identified for conservation	123,426 ha
Proportion of assessed areas identified as HCV	25.6%
Countries where assessments have taken place	15

<b>Reports reviewed January 2015 – August 2017 (n=62)*</b>	
Reviewed and passed as satisfactory at first submission	15 (24%)
Reviewed and required improvements to achieve 'Satisfactory' status (problems with Key Issues)	40 (65%)
Reviewed and deemed unsatisfactory (final result)	7 (11%)
Reports currently under review	25
Unsatisfactory at first review; returned to assessor for improvement	19 (76%)

The ALS became a mandatory requirement of the NPP in Jan 2015. In the last 6 months, the demand for ALS increased. ALS is performing its roles by raising the quality of assessment. All the report reviewed to August 2017, out of those 25 under review, 19 have returned for improvement.

Ruth Silva stated that the highest number of submission came from SEA but in general, SEA perform to a lower level compared to Latin American and African regions. In the past only one resubmission allowed, if deemed unsatisfactory. Rules have been changed to allow 2 resubmission that will help assessors improve reporting. Failing to achieve a satisfactory result will result in the revocation of licence.

Another change was that the peer review system for Tier 1 reports is time consuming and not done to sufficiently high standards. Therefore, the updated system merged the peer review and Quality Panel review into one single step. Resulting from this, the fee structure changed. In the past, peer review (if required) costed USD 2,000 and report evaluation fee costed USD 2,000 or USD 900.

Under the new system, all reports now have the same review fees, and will be tied to the assessor licence type and previous performance. A fully licensed assessor with good track record will be eligible for a lowest review - USD 1,600. A provisional licensed assessor who has never submitted a satisfactory report will not be eligible for the lower review costs. HCRVN has also introduced the point system reward that can be redeemed against the report fees. Training courses are provided for assessors. All HCV assessment reports must now be submitted for ALS evaluation.

Ginny Ng asked that assuming a grower has a plasma meaning to do NPP and HCV assessments, does they grower need to submit HCV report to HCVRN that even though it is an internal HCV with licensed assessors and will the costs be the same for smallholders? Joss L-White said yes, to which Olivier Tichit small groups of small holders will be putting up an NPP for 100 ha and will have to pay a steep cost. Any small developments would have to be pushed back because the cost now is escalating. Audrey Lee pointed out that perhaps RSPO needs to look into the NPP procedures.

Joss L-White mentioned that risk-based procedures should be applicable for all expansion situations. Richard Kan posted a question to clarify how internal licenced assessor for a grower would acquire points. Joss replied that points can be awarded based on participation in trainings and webinars. Ruth Silva understood that companies may engage their own staff to be licensed assessor how she urged companies to review its need and the capacity needed to support the work required to assess cost efficiency. All licensed assessors must be active in order not to lose license after 2 years. The intention of the rule change is to ensure assessors are achieving high standards.

Lanash Thanda then posted the question of what are the common weakness of assessors (especially those in SEA). Ruth Silva replied that the key issues were:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of understanding in how integrate the common guidance with the national toolkit</li> <li>• Methodology not well presented and not well designed</li> <li>• Tendency in general to not carry out field assessment beyond area that would be protected in ways e.g. riparian areas. The thinking is that HCV areas only refer to riparian areas and do not consider the landscape approach.</li> <li>• Weak stakeholder consultation</li> </ul> <p>The problems could have stemmed previous practice prior to engagement with the ALS system. Also, Ruth Silva added that HCV assessors may also conduct work for other standards schemes outside the ALS systems that does not requires the rigor of RSPO standards.</p> <p>Ginny Ng thanked HCVRN for the analysis, but asked if the figures are referenced to oil palm or other commodities. Ruth Silva replied that almost all were OP but only recently included other commodities due to the requirement of needing provisional licensed assessor to submit all HCV assessments.</p> <p><i>HCV mapping</i>  HCVRN has indicated that they are looking to publish HCV maps submitted in shapefiles by the assessors on the GFW public platform. Ginny Ng and Olivier Tichit questioned the motive and responded that it was counterproductive because sensitive information on location of endangered species will be available publicly. Joss replied that the maps could indicate the HCV attribute number 1, which presents a lower risk of RTE identification.</p> <p>Olivier Tichit further explained that the maps obtained from HCV assessments are not conclusive. Growers may have not acquired the land rights for the entire area and HCV areas may have been lost between the time of assessment and time of management control. Also, a lot of issue that growers face is linked to the poor-quality maps. Joss explained that there would be a buffer time between HCV assessment and maps being published. HCV shpfile submitted and will be published only at the very least 3 months after the submitted. Olivier Tichit reiterated that growers cannot be made responsible for maps that have not been updated.</p> <p>Audrey Lee proposed the idea of engaging with a certain body to do the monitoring rather than just publishing HCV maps on GFW. Olivier Tichit agreed with this proposition. Swee Yin added that the project also contradicts with RPSO P&amp;C where examples of disclosure could result in potential negative environmental and social outcomes include info on sites of RTE.</p> <p>Joss explained that the maps are already available as pdf maps in public domain in HCV ALS reports. HCVRN has received GFW small grants fund to develop a protocol to responding or dealing with any alerts that may be triggered with HCV areas.</p> <p>Ginny Ng asked if a particular area has HCV 5 or 6 and the communities do not wish to publish the maps, would there be an FPIC exercise conducted.</p> <p>Olivier Tichit cautioned that it is very easy to criticise the companies and the RSPO scheme due to a loss of HCV. Ginny Ng suggested that HCVRN may want to consider i) Monitoring HCV areas by</p>		
---	--	--

<p>using satellite monitoring, 2) demonstrate RSPO and HCV approach by showing the size of management area and conservation under the RSO Scheme.</p> <p>Michal Zrust highlighted that a lot of these HCV areas have been identified and lost; audits for P&amp;C have not been good, and some companies have expressed that HCV areas have been lost due to encroachment. Furthermore, alerts may be inaccurate, and there is a need for field verification.</p> <p>There was a general consensus that if RSPO needs to monitor for compliance, information can be put onto private rather than public domain.</p> <p><i>HCVRN Complaints Procedure</i>  HCVRN have been getting comments that assessors are not performing, quality assurance is working but the performance of assessors may need to be improved. Since it was established, ALS received 2 complaints, none of which were about assessment reports published as satisfactory. 46 licensed have never submitted work to ALS, out there doing work but claiming to the ALS licensed assessors and HCVRN has no control over what they are doing (may not be assessing in OP commodity).</p> <p>ALS cannot process complaints prior to ALS scheme. ALS only had received 2 formal complaints of unprofessional quality of assessor reports and quality of assessments. HCVRN is also concerned that provisional licensed assessor may be using their license to sell their services but are not submitting to the ALS system. Michal Zrust enquired if the provisional licensed assessor who have not been submitting reports to ALS could be removed from the system ? Although Ginny Ng suggested that a cooling period can be introduced into the system to prevent re-application, it is not as simple as it seemed because Richard Kan pointed out that some companies have many provisional licensed assessor with the intention to save cost and these staff only conduct internal assessments and won't appear active on the ALS system.</p> <p>Richard Kan asked about the validity of HCV reports. Joss explained that as long as a report is conducted by an ALS assessor at the time of reporting, and it is still a valid document to be submitted to the NPP process (provided it is less than 3 years old). Ginny Ng asked if a company decides to send their old HCV assessment reports (less than 1 year) for peer review, is this acceptable ? Joss replied that he needed to check and will get back to WG.</p> <p>Michal Zrust requested at the last meeting the assistance of RSPO Indonesia in addressing the lack of engagement by Jaringan NKT with HCVRN while using the HCV toolkits to integrate with national legislation. Ginny Ng requested that RSPO and HCVRN to address this issue.</p> <p><i>HCS-HCVRN</i>  HCVRN has been working with the HSCA group on the integrated HCV-HCS assessment, which was shared to collect comments on the draft manual. Globally, feedback revealed has a lot of confusion about how it works. HCS terms have been used in different ways and for different purposes. RSPO GHG assessment</p>		
--	--	--

	<p>procedures for NPP says that development must be designed to minimise GHG emission that takes into account high carbon stocks.</p> <p>The HCS approach is not about offsetting carbon emission, but it is about biodiversity and FPIC, governed by the HCS steering group, and it is not part of the RSPO P&amp;C. Some of the members of the HCSA is mooting for the inclusion of HCSA in the RSPO P&amp;C.</p> <p>The integrated HCV-HCS manual is intended to improve cost and time efficiencies when both assessment are conducted. ALS will provide quality assurance systems for HCV assessment part of the combined HCS-HCV. Once the manual is launched, there is no provision for HCS only assessment. Olivier Tichit sought to get clarification for the next steps in terms of HCSA. RSPO does not have the requirement. Joss replied that they are only supporting the HCSA group by providing support only for the pre-assessment and assessment phase. Ginny Ng noted that this topic is beyond the remit of BHCWG.</p> <p>A questions raised on how companies would conduct the HCS assessment only for new acquisition that has already conducted HCV assessment but not HCS assessment.</p> <p>Audrey Lee asked the next steps for the manual. Joss replied that Proforest is currently compiling the comments and next stage is to publish. Richard Kan cautioned Joss to ensure that there is a 2<sup>nd</sup> public consultation for the final draft.</p>		
10.0	<p><b>HCV Management and Monitoring Project: Update &amp; endorsement from the BHCVWG, and Proposal for Phase II of M&amp;M</b></p> <p>Joss L-White has shared the HCV Management &amp; Monitoring report draft to all WG members for feedback. He thanked everyone for their contribution. Artwork will be completed soon. He reiterated that the project concerns the challenges of HCV management and monitoring. Current state, current barriers and potential strategies to address the challenges. It was a qualitative study, employing literature review, company survey semi-structured interview. The project team conducted an interview with 16 representatives from 10 different countries, and community surveys using semi-structure stakeholder interview with participants from the communities of estates in South Sumatera and South Kalimantan. The HCV management and monitoring were generally similar between countries and regions; consisted of patrols, signage, staff/ community education, demarcation of buffer zones, hunting and zero burning bans, monitoring activities e.g. water quality monitoring and patrols. Size specific activities were discussed generally for RTE species. Limited management &amp; monitoring for HCV 5 – 6, where HCV 5 were mostly identified as riparian zones.</p> <p>The study came up with 4 categories of challenges: technical (size and capacity), economic, collaboration and social community engagement.</p> <p>Ginny Ng asked who is HCVRN talking to when it comes to community benefits of HCV management and monitoring, and Joss L-White clarified that they conducted the study with 2 companies. Olivier Tichit asked about what is the added value of the second phase of management and monitoring. Michal Zrust answered that</p>		



	<p>it would address the issue of the lack of management and monitoring works of the HCVs in oil palm plantations.</p> <p>The WG endorsed the report, but not the proposals.</p>		
11.0	<p><b>Compensation Project presentation</b></p> <p>Four projects were presented to the BHCWVG for consideration to be recognised as compensation project options. Each presenter had 20 minutes to pitch their projects and present how each of the project meets the 4 criteria of the compensation project. The projects were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation International, Socio Bosque Project (Ecuador) presented by Carolina Resero (via Skype)</li> <li>• Wildlife Conservation Society, Conservation Project (Guatemala) presented by Roan McNab (via Skype)</li> <li>• RaCP Turnkey Solution: Sustainable Commodities Compensation Mechanism presented by Lestari Capital</li> <li>• PT. Rimba Makmur Utama, Ecosystem Restoration Project (Kalimantan) presented by Dharsono Hartono</li> </ul> <p>The co-chairs thanked all presenters. Richard Kan proposed that the WG members review each project and decide if any or all projects meet the 4 criteria. The feedback from the floor were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects did not outline clearly how the additionality criteria will be met</li> <li>• All four projects will be eligible to be considered by the Compensation Panel as hectare to dollar compensation projects</li> </ul> <p>The WG members did not object to the projects.</p> <p>Lanash Thanda stressed that the Secretariat must also ensure that the compensation plan evaluators must not be affiliated with the projects, when asking the evaluators to declare if they have any conflict of interest with grower project proponent.</p>	<p>RSPO Secretariat to inform the project proponents that their projects are recognised by the BHCWVG as compensation options for growers.</p>	<p>Done</p>
12.0	<p><b>Updates from RSPO INA NI HCVTF</b></p> <p>Angga Rachmanshah provided the updates of the RSPO INA NI HCVTF on behalf of Cahyo Nugroho. He explained that the objective of the TF is to develop an addendum to the national interpretations for growers and millers to comply to the RPSO P&amp;C requirement and with the national and international regulations, which relates to the avoidance clearing of primary forest to new planting, and of HCV management and monitoring. The output will be a document that provides for HCV management and monitoring for oil palm in Indonesia.</p> <p>The members of the TF are made up of growers, environmental and social NGOs, supply chain institution, smallholder, and financial institution. Co-chaired by Pak Ismu from PT Smart and Cahyo from FFI. Two members resigned from the TF - First Resources and Musim Mas (reclassified as processor/trader), and the seats are open for replacement. The first meeting of the TF commenced in April 2017 and has convened 4 times to map out the issues and to revise the guidelines according to the Common Guidance of HCV Management &amp; Monitoring.</p> <p>The TF has submitted a few questions to seek technical clarification from BHCWVG. Questions below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who will be the judge to verify and to make the decision when there are disputes on HCV assessments ?</li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What happens when there HCV areas have been wrongly identified ?</li> <li>• How would non-corporate (government) development of infrastructure e.g. roads and bridges on HCV areas be offset?</li> <li>• How would the common guidance developed by HCVRN be applied to smallholders ? One of the clarifications needed in relation to this concern was the need for clarity of riparian terms identification, state, width of river and how to identify riparian for smallholders.</li> </ul> <p>Michal Zrust emphasized that the guidance document should always refer to both the RSPO requirements and the national guidelines.</p> <p>Richard Kan provided a response to the question on riparian zones. He said that the guidance should follow the national Indonesian legislation, where a buffer of 100 m needs to be established for wide rivers and 50 m for small rivers. Richard highlighted that these figures referred to road and infrastructure development activities. The Jaringan NKT would need to address this issue as the prescription is not oil palm or agricultural lands specific.</p> <p>Olivier Tichit explained that on the question of offset and non-corporate clearance of HCV areas, the TF should refer to the RaCP guidance document as it has been clarified in the document are if HCV were lost because due to governmental activities, there is no need for compensation, but the caveat for this provision is that as long as the infrastructure or bridges is not built to directly benefit the company.</p> <p>Ginny Ng motioned that due to time constraint, these specific technical questions can be discussed offline. Ginny Ng proposed that the WG could revisit the questions to get better clarity on the issues to be raised. This is because Angga is only representing FFI and is not directly involved in the TF. Ginny Ng also put forth the suggestion to get in touch with SEARRP and HCVRN if they need more details of riparian reserves.</p> <p>Joss L-White from the HCVRN stated that HCVRN has not seen the questions before, asked that the TF email the questions to HCVRN. The TF should ideally also refer to the Jaringan NKT for the Nation Interpretations.</p> <p>Richard Kan added that Angga should check on Principle 2 on legislation vs guidelines. Through his experience, he has always tried to address all these issues to follow what is practical in the RSPO guidelines vs the legal requirements in Indonesia.</p>		
13.0	<p><b>Updates on Resolutions (6hGA12 and 6fGA13)</b></p> <p>Javin Tan explained that she would presenting some of the key slides on the updates of the resolution on behalf of Salahudin Yaacob. Salahudin sent apologies and JT presented updates from the Assurance TF and NPP for SH.</p> <p><i>Resolution 6h GA 12: Quality, independence and credibility of RSPO assurance system and RSPO's system of supervision</i></p> <p>The Assurance Taskforce is made up of the technical managers from the RSPO Secretariat. The aim of the ATF is to ensure that the action points for the resolution 6h GA12 are met.</p>		

<p>The portions of the Resolution 6h GA12 relevant to the BHVWG were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving the quality of the ALS assessor - completed. Details as per Joss L-White's presentation on the changes of the ALS scheme.</li> <li>• Minimum requirement for HCV assessment - HCVRN has always provided a checklist for assessors to understand the key recruitments for all their HCV assessment and prepared key documents e.g. HCV assessment manuals to ensure consistency and quality of assessment is maintained.</li> <li>• List of all the licensed assessor on the web – completed. HCVRN registry on HCVRN's website.</li> <li>• Monitoring of NPP areas – RSPO Secretariat are in discussion with HCVRN to conduct internal monitoring of NPP and HCV areas. The intention is to know if there has been changes on the ground e.g. boundaries of NPP and HCV areas.</li> <li>• Provide relevant training to the CBs and auditors in terms of look at how they check and look at a few key things e.g. GHG, SEIA, HCV. ERWG has provided a reasonable number of trainings; social training on FPIC done. Secretariat is working with HCVRN to provide training for all CBs and auditors on what to check in terms of verifying HCV assessment.</li> </ul> <p><i>Resolution 6f GA13: Review and amendment of the updated NPP process applied to smallholders</i></p> <p>There has been efforts to develop simplified guidances and tools to assist smallholders in the NPP process. The list include:  Draft Interim Guidance for the Smallholder and CBs – on RSPO.org  Simplified NPP guidance for smallholder with threshold – developed with Proforest and the finalized draft would undergo public consultation with smallholders, SHWG and relevant RSPO members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LUCA guidance – only the Guidance for Map Submission for LUCA is available. The Taskforce on ISH RaCP will be looking into the details of the document.</li> <li>• Simplified HCV tool – the maps provided by the app has issues regarding accuracies. Would require the submission of maps to conduct a more accurate LUCA.</li> <li>• Simplified guidance – ERWG has developed the GHG guidance and awaiting response from SHWG.</li> </ul> <p>Olivier Tichit pointed out that the reprieve for NPP submission by smallholders was to end on 7 August 2017. During the reprieve, the smallholders were required to only submit a declaration with supporting documents. The BoG have decided to extend the reprieve to the end of the year before GA 17 to allow more time to complete the various tools. Olivier Tichit added that the P&amp;C review may consider extending these tools to areas of small development, based on risk assessment. Simplified NPP based on risk - less risk triggers the use of simplified tools; and high risk triggers the use full tools.</p> <p>Olivier Tichit asked when the public consultation on NPP for smallholders would be held, to which Javin Tan was unable to provide as it depended upon the completion on the draft by the Smallholder unit.</p>		
---	--	--

<p>14.0</p>	<p><b>Updates on the P&amp;C Review</b></p> <p>Javin Tan briefed the members on the updates of the P&amp;C review. The first TF meeting was held in Subang in May 2017. The Preparatory report prepared by the consultants took into consideration recommendations of the WGs and TF and data from ASI and training. A major concern was raised on making RSPO more inclusive of smallholders. The suggestions were: i) consider a stepwise approach, and ii) single standard with certain minimum requirements to be considered as RSPO compliant.</p> <p>Olivier Tichit added that a few voices in the P&amp;C review said that the P&amp;C should be applicable to plantation and smallholder at the same time. Dr. Gan suggested to review what has been working in order to make a decision on the next steps.</p> <p>The TF has 5 subgroups to look into the different issues e.g. deforestation, peat, HCV; workforce and human rights; gender quality and community, GHG; traceability and land scape approach to provide recommendations into Draft One. RSPO will share the Draft One for a 60-day public consultation beginning from 1 Sep to 30 October 2017.</p> <p>Richard Kan expressed that one of the main issues that the TF faced is the RSPO's Theory of Change. The Secretariat is unable to provide any further updates on the progress.</p>		
<p>15.0</p>	<p><b>Procedure for the 'review and update' of HCV assessment older than 3 years for NPP submission</b></p> <p>In the requirements of the NPP, there is a requirement that HCV assessment reports older than 3 years must be reviewed and updated by ALS- HCV assessor. HCVRN has been asked to help develop guidance as to how growers would implement this.</p> <p>Joss L-White asked BHCVWG for the rationale of using the 3-year threshold and highlighted that it is a bit arbitrary. The assumption that it may be the number of years vegetation takes to regenerate in moist tropical conditions.</p> <p>HCVRN posited that a guidance for review is only needed if the HCV assessments pre-dates ALS (1/1/2015) and more than 3 years. The general idea will be that HCVRN appoint an ALS-assessor to review reports that will also incur report fee. Assessment post-2015 will not need any reviews even after 3 years because they have already been assessed through ALS standards. HCVRN will appoint the ALS-assessor to review the reports. The reports will not go through the Quality Panel. HCVRN was on the understanding that it needed to provide a mandatory template for all ALS assessor, the assessment must be submitted to the new template and then it will be reviewed in the same way ALS reports satisfactory and unsatisfactory (under the review of ALS assessor but not Quality Panel. The grower will be responsible for collating the report using the template. HCVRN has not figured out the procedure to review and publish these reports on the website.</p> <p>Ginny Ng clarified that under the current system, companies are allowed to hire their own ALS assessors to review HCV that is more 3 years old. There is currently no formal process to update maps (e.g. HGU and IUP changes). Richard Kan provided the insight that at the consultation of the NPP (2015), the purpose of the review is to look at the management and monitoring plan and review the</p>	<p>Joss to revert with a review process that provide for the updates of the HCV assessment</p>	

	<p>current landscape. If there was to be a new NPP for that particular area, grower must engage an ALS person to look at landscape, review management and monitoring plans and then submit to the NPP process. Assuming this process has been achieved and on the fact that an external HCV assessor has been hired to review and update, HCVRN would already remit to review reports.</p> <p>Richard Kan asked what is the actual objective of the review if the ALS assessors have been hired to review old assessments? Joss answered that for the HCV assessment before the ALS introduction, there is no guarantee that the reports are of good quality, so a review of the HCV is needed. NPP can go to any licensed assessor but without a review process, ALS cannot ensure the quality.</p> <p>Dr Gan said it is agreeable. ALS already a quality control system, but cautioned that is this procedure must be thought through better before endorsement as it will affect the pre-ALS reports conducted by RSPO approved assessors. If it is not of good quality then RSPO will be at fault. Ginny Ng said that these are issues with the NPP procedures, so WG need to sit down with RSPO.</p> <p>Michal Zrust asked if the proposed review process would also mean updating map boundaries.</p> <p>Swee Yin stated that growers need to be made very clear about the outcome of the review, was done many years ago. If outcome of the review if unsatisfactory, growers may be penalized for engaging an RSPO assessor. Michal Zrust notes this because many complaints cases have been due to poor quality pre-ALS assessments. Michal Zrust also wanted clarification on the process if a report is unsatisfactory, can it be revised?</p> <p>The proposed procedure is meant to provide a review to gauge the quality of reports. Joss would send around the procedure proposed and send feedback and revise the procedure. GN need to note that it is an NPP discussion that we need to have with the Secretariat in general, particularly to address pre-ALS assessor issue.</p> <p>The members decided that they would need to focus on the P&amp;C review first before commenting on the NPP document.</p>		
16.0	<p><b>Simplified HCV tool</b></p> <p>Mike Senior shared the progress on developing the simplified HCV tool. Scope of the work: HCV approach for ISH primarily for new planting but looking to streamline all other processes into one document. He has worked to develop a mobile app and dashboard to generate a standardized report. Survey 7.3 approach is a risk-based approach based on the risk of damaging potential HCV – low, medium and high. Done by group manager. If plots are low risk, the group can proceed to prepare the land for expansion, medium requires an independent review by HCVRN, if high risk then ALS will be triggered.</p> <p>Olivier Tichit asked for the cost of review. Joss replied that HCVRN will be approaching RSPO to cover medium risk review costs. HCVRN will prepare proposal. High risk is that the groups can use RSSF funding. Mike worked with a developer –Alphapod, and used the beta version June 2017 for field test. The app caters to English, Bahasa, Spanish, Thai, French and covers the 5 countries where we develop the probability maps. Test led by members of the</p>		

	<p>Taskforce - Solidaridad (Honduras and Ghana), Inobu (Indonesia), RSPO (Thailand) and FELDA (Malaysia).</p> <p>Main problem encountered are technical issues of inaccuracies in mapping plots and stability of the app.</p> <p>Mike Senior asked if the WG could defer the mandate to make decision to the TF. Ginny Ng said that the approving panel will now be the TF (on behalf of the BHCVWG) now that WG has agreed to defer them to the TF.</p> <p><i>LUCA for smallholders – Challenges</i>  Secretariat has already conducted LUCAs for independent smallholders and the liabilities were very small 0.2 ha. Dillon Sarim has expressed that it was a concern for him to communicate to independent smallholders that they can get certified but when the RaCP for SH is endorsed, you need to compensate for 0.2 ha. Although it is recognised that this was not directly under the remit of BHCWG, the TF for ISH has not been formed and would like to get an idea on how to move forward. Ginny Ng agreed with the sentiments expressed by Olivier Tichit about grouping small companies, not just smallholders, outgrower and medium-sized company. Michal Zrust suggested turning the liability into a dollar hectare option and aggregate the funding for a compensation project. If the independent smallholder are under a supply chain member, someone can take up the cost as long as there is an agreement. Ginny Ng expressed the concern of incurring cost designing compensation plan and monitoring. The CBs has to note it in their surveillance audit and select legacy issues to note it is minor and the scale of liability.</p>		
17.0	<p><b>Review of ToR for members of BHCVWG</b>  [WG core members stayed back to discuss BHCVWG membership]</p> <p>John Payne announced that he will be stepping down as the co-chair starting from early next year. Ginny Ng also indicated that she may consider stepping down. Decision was made to retain 1 seat for grower and 1 seat for NGO.</p> <p>Azmariah Muhamed announced that she and Norazam may be leaving the WG and a FELDA representative will replace them.</p> <p>There were proposals to do housekeeping and to only bring in experts for important and specific slots. These invited experts are not required to stay throughout the whole meeting. The WG has to also redefine the numbers of growers, NGOs and other sectors in the group. In the interest of keeping to time, a proposal was made to form breakout sessions on a particular topic that may require more lengthy discussion.</p> <p>WG core members discussed the composition of current members. A suggestion was made to eliminate the requirement to have substantive and alternate members from the same organization, whereby the alternate can be from a different organisation from the same region. A request was made to RSPO Secretariat to check with members to see if they are still interested to be part of the WG.</p> <p>A consensus was reached to discuss the ToR for membership (amongst core members only). A proposal was made to review the role of the BHCVWG to set its objectives and subsequently, to provide a guide of which parts in the ToR needs to be reviewed.</p>		

18.0	<p><b>RT15 Topics</b>  Theme: Inclusivity and Accountability  Venue: Bali  Date: 28 Nov 2017-11-23</p> <p>RSPO Secretariat explained that the BHCVWG only gets 1 prep cluster, and there is no world café this year.  List of potential topics;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCS areas, mammals and birds within oil palm areas</li> <li>• Benefits of riparian areas, by Lombok Consortium</li> <li>• Riparian management  HCV Management and Monitoring study  HCV mapping exercise on a jurisdictional level (Sabah)</li> <li>• PONGO study about 10k orang utans in non-RSPO areas  Smallholders Simplified HCV Guidelines – if the BHCV were to take this, then it should not be in the agenda for the smallholders group</li> </ul> <p>Dillon proposed to hold a meeting for the concept note workshop to share with the LatAm and African growers, and to showcase poster presentation of endorsed of concept notes during the RT.</p> <p>WG agreed to workshop and the poster presentations.</p>	RSPO Secretariat to contact speakers	Done (Oct - Nov 2017)
19.0	<p><b>AOB</b>  <i>Social remediation guidelines</i>  The social remediation proposal by AidEnvironment was reviewed. Ginny Ng said the high pricing is because the proponent is pitching to do a full analysis which is redundant. The proponents' perimeter will be the cases that are disclosed by the companies. The consultant will work with 4 growers, selected by the BHCVWG, to develop ways to compensate for social liabilities. Ginny suggested to reopen the tender but communicate to the first proponent, the fact that there will be reopening just to demonstrate that there was a robust tendering process. Deadline to be extended for another month.</p> <p><b>Closing remarks</b>  There being no other matters, the co-chairs thanked everyone for the participation and perseverance.</p>	Secretariat to communicate to the project proponent and extend the deadline for submissions	Deadline extended. Two proposals received by 18 September 2017.

**35th Meeting of RSPO BHCVWG  
8 – 9 August 2017  
Capri by Fraser, Kuala Lumpur**

No	Name	Organisation	Signature 8 August 2017	Signature 9 August 2017
1	Angga Rachmansah	FFI		
2	Azmariah Muhamed	FGVPMSB		
3	Benjamin Loh Min Lee	WWF-MY		
4	Bukti Bagja	WRI		
5	Dr Gan Lian Tiong	Musim Mas		
6	Dwi R. Muhtaman	Remark Asia		
7	Edrin Moss	Wilmar		
8	Eleanor Slade	SEARRP		
9	Ginny Ng Siew Ling	Wilmar		
10	Izabela Delabre	ZSL		
11	John Payne	BORA		
12	Joss Lyons-White	HCVRN		
13	Laila Wilfred	OLAM		
14	Lanash Thanda	SEPA		
15	Lee Swee Yin	Sime Darby		
16	Michael Brady	IFC		
17	Michal Zrust	Daemeter		
18	Olivier Tichit	SIPEF		
19	Richard Kan	GAR		
20	Harjinder Kler	HUTAN		
21	Andrey Lee	OLAM		
22	Norizam	FGV		
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				