

MINUTES OF MEETING OF RSPO
43rd RSPO BHCVWG Meeting

Date: 1 November 2019 (Friday)

Time: 9.30 to 2.30 pm

Venue: Holiday Inn Bangkok Sukhumvit, Thailand

Attendance:

<p><u>Members and Alternates</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Harjinder Kler (HUTAN) 2. Lee Swee Yin (Sime Darby Plantations) 3. Ambang Wijjang (GAR) 4. Anne Rosenbarger (WRI) 5. Chin Sing Yun (WILMAR) 6. Dr. Gan Lian Tiong (Musim Mas) 7. Gotz Martin (GAR) 8. Erlangga Muhammad (FFI) 9. Fanny Roussel (SIPEF) 10. Laila Wilfred (OLAM) 11. Lanash Thanda (SEPA) 12. Lim Sian Choo (Bumitama) 13. Martin Mach (Bumitama) 14. Michael Guindon (ZSL) 15. Michelle Desilets (OLT) 16. Syahrial Anhar Harahap (Wilmar) 17. Tahirah Banu (WWF- MY) <p><u>Absent with Apologies</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 18. Audrey Lee (OLAM) 19. Arnina Hussin (Sime Darby Plantations) 20. Benjamin Loh (WWF) 21. Bukti Bagja (WRI) 22. Cahyo Nugroho (FFI) 23. Marcus Colchester (FPP) 24. Patrick Anderson (FPP) 25. Pedro Cerrate (Femexpalma) 	<p><u>Invited experts</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Jennifer Lucey (SEARRP) <p><u>RSPO Secretariat</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Khing Su Li
--	--

Table of Contents

1.0 Opening Remarks.....	3
2.0 Review & endorsement of the 42nd BHCVWG meeting minutes	3
3.0 BHCVWG representation	4
4.0 Social remediation guideline: Outline and preliminary draft	4
5.0 Self-disclosure of land clearing within HCV areas	6
6.0 Post-NPP/HCV monitoring.....	7
7.0 At risk Grassland Indicators	7
8.0 Closing remarks.....	8

No	Description	Action points	Progress
1	<p><u>Welcoming Remarks</u></p> <p>The co-chair, Harjinder Kler (HUTAN), welcomed all present to the meeting. As there were new members in the group, a round of introductions were conducted.</p> <p>The co-chair extended apologies on the late delivery of the meeting minutes and all relevant meeting materials. The co-chairs would be exploring options with the RSPO Secretariat to work around the workload issues, while the RSPO Secretariat looks into new hires.</p> <p>At the time of the meeting, the contract terms of the temporary hires for RaCP and database work under the Biodiversity Unit at the RSPO Secretariat were due by December 2019.</p> <p>In order to assist with scheduling, the co-chairs have identified dates in 2020 for the physical meetings for 2020. The proposed dates were presented.</p>	<p>RSPO Secretariat to send the 2020 planner and calendar invites for physical meetings and conference calls.</p>	<p>Done [Nov 2019]</p>
2	<p><u>Review and endorsement of meeting minutes</u></p> <p>A few items from the meeting minutes of the 42nd meeting was discussed:</p> <p>a) Standards Standing Committee</p> <p>In 2019, following the RSPO Governance Review for ‘Reorganisation of Standing Committees, Task Forces and Working Groups’, the Standard Setting Committee (SSC) was established to provide direction for RSPO standard settings, which may include, but not limited to, the development and/or revision of normative and relevant guidance documents for RSPO members. The discussions were still ongoing at the time of the meeting, and updates would be provided when available.</p> <p>b) Updates from RSPO: HCSA approach</p> <p>HCSA has submitted a formal letter to the RSPO BoG to seek a more systematic and collaborative way of engagement i.e. providing technical input and obtaining mandate for decision-making. With the exception of the No Deforestation Joint Steering Group (NDJSG), HCSA may only participate as invited experts the RSPO statues only allows for participation and voting rights for members. The BoG would be discussing on the formal position of HCSA.</p>		

	<p>c) RaCP Statistics It was expressed that the RSPO Secretariat has been worked fastidiously on the RaCP statistics to be presented during meetings. However, as there was ongoing database update work for RaCP records at the RSPO Secretariat and that the statistics would continue to change according to case progress, it was proposed that the reporting of the RaCP statistics to be presented only on the website and not the minutes of the meeting. There being no objection, the RSPO Secretariat would be editing the meeting minutes.</p> <p>d) Annex 9 reporting template The draft template has been further revised after the pilot testing by Musim Mas. The BHCVWG formally accepts the reporting template but reminded the RSPO Secretariat that it should monitor the user-friendliness of the template, and prompt necessary revision (if needed).</p> <p>There being no further issues, the minutes of the 42nd BHCVWG meeting was endorsed.</p>	RSPO Secretariat to make the necessary reporting edits in the minutes of the meeting.	Done.
3	<p><u>BHCVWG representation</u> Updates on the status of the members were presented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wilmar introduced Syahrial Anhar Harahap as alternate to Chin Sing Yun. Pak Syahrial would replace Edrin Moss as the representative. • Financial institution – The co-chairs and the RSPO Secretariat are in ongoing discussion with the RSPO FITF for representation. The FITF is currently limited in the number of representatives available to participate in all the various WGs/TFs, but are mindful of the potential CoI that some FI members may have in the various processes. 		
4	<p><u>Social remediation guideline: Outline and preliminary draft</u> Based on the proposal by the BHCVWG in the 42nd meeting in September 2020, the RSPO Secretariat to develop a draft in-house gleaning information from: i) Cases lodged within the Complaints mechanism that have issues related to social HCVs and collate the</p>		

	<p>resolution mechanism i.e. identification process of issue, resolution e.g. mediation, and the outcomes.</p> <p>ii) Other literature information from commodities including from the desktop scoping report produced by AidEnvironment.</p> <p>The draft document was presented to the BHCVWG. A key reference documents is the remediation guidelines from coal mining. The outline of the draft as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objective 2. Minimum requirements of key action and items to define and assess relevant social liability and social impact: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Historic information/baselines b) Current land use c) Scoping studies and/or field observations d) Local concerns and needs d) Informal current land use 3. Indicators for social HCV loss 4. Decision support framework <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Step 1: Problem definition b) Step 2: Shortlisting of options c) Step 3: Development of remediation strategies d) Step 4: Monitoring program 5. References <p>The BHCVWG raised a few key points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It must be clearly stated in the guidelines that social remediation guidelines is only applicable to past land clearing. 2. There may be a need to discuss on cut-off dates for acquisition. There are still companies conducting FPIC to address ongoing conflicts due to past acquisition. 3. Not to impose retrospective application. It must be clear that the guidelines can be referred to if companies need to obtain guidance for outstanding social liability and remediation. 4. The document should be a practical document. The BHCVWG agreed in principal to adopt the style of the stepwise approach similar to the simplified guide on riparian management and rehabilitation. 5. Must be clear that this document does not provide the impression that it is another standard of RaCP or FPIC. 	<p>KSL to check with the HRS team.</p>	<p>The draft social remediation guideline has been submitted to the HRS unit for their discussion with consultants who would be hired to review and revise the FPIC guidance. A modular toolkit was suggested to the HRS team.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cross-reference with the FPIC in difference sections. - Subset of the FPIC to do social HCV remediation - Only applicable if you fall into the RaCP situation <p>6. A member pointed out that the Human Rights WG is looking into revising the FPIC guidance. It was suggested that the social remediation guidelines be synergized with the revised requirements of the FPIC, and be published as part of the FPIC guidelines as a subsection to avoid the potential confusion of point (5).</p>		
5	<p><u>Self-disclosure of land clearing within HCV areas</u> The RSPO Secretariat presented to the BHCVWG the self-reporting form that has been developed with the purpose of collating the relevant information e.g. HCV hectarage lost, HCV values loss to determine the threshold to finalise the self-disclosure framework for further discussions with the ASC and relevant supporting bodies at the RSPO.</p> <p>The RSPO Secretariat provided a deadline of November 2019 for affected companies to revert with the information.</p> <p>A BHCVWG members have asked if the form could also be used for the positive monitoring of HCVs e.g. HCV increase, supported by Secretariat, bearing in mind that there may be adjustment to HCV – value, location, extent. It was a possibility to explore. The current focus is to collate information from cases that have voluntarily disclosed HCV loss.</p> <p>There was a general opinion within the WG to encourage disclosure, recognizing that there are situations of HCV loss, including the change in the survey / monitoring methodology.</p> <p>The consideration of the threshold would be made on HCV value and/or hectarages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If hectarages, a member asked if it meant that a 0.2 ha loss should be reported to the RSPO Secretariat ? It was clarified that the concern is on contractor clearing that may result in major loss. - If the loss of functions were to have occurred, the HCV management and monitoring plan would also be a crucial consideration. 	RSPO Secretariat to collate information.	A few affected operations that reverted with information.

	A request was made to include the scenario of HCV loss to fire.		
6	<p>Post-NPP/HCV monitoring</p> <p>The process of monitoring to be revisited after the BoG has reviewed the HCSA collaboration, as HCSA are also monitoring HCSA areas within concessions and have been actively looking at various monitoring platforms and mechanisms.</p> <p>A WG members highlighted that due to the legal complexities of Indonesia, legal boundaries may change including boundaries of HCV areas that have been identified during the Izin Lokasi / IUP stages. The consequence of this legal implication is that the NPPs that have been posted previously may no longer reflect the up-to-date boundaries for new development. Thus, growers would need time to publish updated maps including HCV area change.</p> <p>The RSPO Secretariat to also revisit the shapefiles that have been digitized and determine if there were any shapefiles that are usable i.e. correct projections and mapping.</p> <p>Laila suggested in the last meeting for growers to self-disclose boundaries and add boundaries of HCV. (add HCV4-6)</p> <p>Update from RSPO Secretariat whether the shapefile all unusable, some usable.</p> <p>The BHCVWG strongly request for the systems integration at RSPO Secretariat (i.e. Data Taskforce) and progress to be updated.</p>		A temporary hire/intern in Q2 (2020) to look into this work.
7	<p>At risk Grassland Indicators</p> <p>A study on tropical grassy biomes, led by University of Oxford was presented to the BHCVWG. The aim was to seek feedback on developing indicators for grasslands as conservation set asides.</p> <p>a) Introduction to tropical grassy biomes</p> <p>Key points from the presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ecosystems with a continuous grassy understorey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Tropical moist forest o Tropical grassy biome o Tropical dry forest 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Majority of low carbon natural habitat suitable for oil palm is tropical grassy biomes - Two key factors of grassland biomes maintenance are fire and managed grazing. - Boundaries of grasslands can shift depending on grazing, fires <p>b) Unintended impacts of RSPO no-deforestation standards</p> <p>Key points from the presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New integrated HCV-HCSA approach has stringent definitions for “forests” and quite degraded forests - Forest degradation be easily identified by looking at structural vegetation characteristics - The HCSA approach may displace planting to less carbon stock biomes i.e. grassy biomes - Moist (i.e. high rainfall) biodiverse grasslands are your most suitable grasslands for oil palm development - Identification of degraded or secondary grassland from ancient grassland is not possible with remote sensing. - Identification of ancient grassland relies on indicators e.g. presence of key plant species <p>Discussion points</p> <p>Within the RSPO system, there are 2 approaches of protecting ancient grasslands / grassland with significant values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HCV approach. Indicators for identification is already included in the training of assessors already included. However, the issue of the correct application of theory to field work still remains. - Any peat grassland would be protected under no new land clearing on peat principle - Threats to grassland biomes- it was highlighted to the researcher to provide stronger evidence to link oil palm development as a threat to grassland as currently, in South America the threat to grasslands is soybean oil cultivation <p>Additional protection for ancient grassland biomes can be incorporated into the NI processes to look into defining the areas for conservation, review identification methods and provide the relevant tools</p>		
--	---	--	--

	and guidance. Frontier regions for expansion are currently in Africa and LatAm, regions where grasslands prevail.		
8	Closing remarks The next meeting is in February 2020. There being no other matters, the co-chairs thanked everyone for the participation.		