

Peer Review¹ of HCV Assessment for PT Andalas Merapi Timber, West Sumatra, Indonesia

By Daemeter Consulting
January 2009

Introduction

The Andalas Merapi Timber HCV assessment report was clearly written, making it easy to follow and review. Overall, quality of data collection, analysis and reasoning are very good, though in some cases this is under-reported in the main text. Strengths of the report were in its assessment of biological issues and ecosystem services, with weaknesses in the comprehensiveness and/or current presentation of social data. Maps supporting identification of HCVs 1-4 were generally very clear and useful, any exceptions were minor and described below. Biodiversity data were clear, detailed and well thought out, from identification through to management and monitoring. Implementation of reduced impact logging was a recurring management recommendation, which is fitting for many of the HCVs.

Weaknesses were mainly in the social section (HCV 5). A map of village locations and closer adherence to Toolkit methodology is recommended. Currently, documentation of HCV 5 identification in the report is weak, especially in comparison to other HCVs, and the HCVMA for HCV 5 was not clearly discussed or mapped. It should be emphasized that the HCV 5 section was strong in its documentation of use of NTFPs for cash income by local communities, but the link between these data and management recommendations needs to be strengthened. Public consultation, as documented in the current reports, must be improved, at the very least by holding another round of meetings with local communities to present preliminary findings and obtain feedback. Wider consultation with other local and outside stakeholders, if any, should also be documented.

In relation to HCVs 1-4, there were a few instances of either not using or referring adequately to guidelines in the Toolkit during HCV identification or formulation of management recommendations. These are noted in the report. There were also a few cases where management or monitoring recommendations were absent or needed to be stated more clearly.

Finally, it is recommended that, to the maximum extent possible, a map delineating HCVMA's for all HCVs be provided, as well as a short summary describing management prescriptions for these HCVMA's. There will likely be a fair amount of overlap between there (e.g. karst areas) and such a concluding section would be useful for AMT, to visualize the extent of the HCVMA's, especially 'no logging areas' if they occur.

¹ This peer review follows guidelines and template outlined by the HCV Network in *Reviewing High Conservation Value Reports: HCV Resource Network guidance for peer reviews of HCV assessment reports - Version 1- October 2008*.

Summary of Findings

Note: According to HCV Network Peer Review Guidelines, if one of the subcomponents is marked as major, then the rating for that overall component must also be major. In most cases, issues marked as major have more to do with insufficient documentation or explication of reasoning, rather than a failure to collect required data or implement the concept in accordance with Good Practice.

Document name :	Reviewer : (TP use only)	Date of review		
Description of document content		Issues identified		
1. Executive summary of the document				
Overall - executive summary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major	
2. Scope of the assessment				
Overall - scope	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major	
3. Wider landscape context and significance of the assessed area				
Overall - landscape context	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major	
4. HCV assessment process including consultation process				
Overall -HCV assessment process	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major	
4.1. Composition and qualifications of the assessment team	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major	
4.2. Data sources and data collection methodologies	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major	
4.3. Consultation processes	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major	
5. Identification, location and status of each HCV				
Overall - HCV identification	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major	
5.1. Data quality	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major	
5.2. Reference to HCV toolkits	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major	
5.3. Decision on HCV status	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major	
5.4. Mapping decisions	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major	
6. Management of HCVs				
Overall - HCV management	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major	
6.1. Assessment of threats or risks to each HCV	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major	
6.2. Are HCV management plans adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major	
7. Monitoring of HCVs				
Overall - HCV monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major	
7.1. Are monitoring plans clearly described?	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major	
7.2. Are monitoring plans adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major	
7.3. Are there plans for a regular review of data?	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major	

Full Review

Project name : ATP	Reviewer : DAEMETER	Date of review : Jan 2009	
Description of document content		Issues identified	
1. Executive summary of the document			
Overall - executive summary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
Guidance: a) Are the key findings clearly presented and summarized? b) Does the summary accurately reflect the findings and recommendations of the main document? c) If no summary exists, is it still possible to use the document easily?			
1. Reviewer comments: a) Yes, key findings summarized clearly in the summary. b) Yes c) Document is nicely laid out and very easily used.			
2. Scope of the assessment			
Overall - scope	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
Guidance: a) Is the assessment area and surrounding landscape clearly defined? b) Is there a basic summary of the company and its operations in the area? c) Are the impact and scale of proposed operations adequately described? d) Did exploitation of any kind (especially clearance) take place prior to the assessment, and if so, how are such areas treated? e) Is the purpose of the HCV assessment clear?			
2. Reviewer comments: a) Yes b) Yes c) Yes and No - trees per ha to be felled is given, but extent is not. d) Trial area clearing strips. Beyond that no mention. We assume such areas are included in the assessment, as we can imagine no reason for their exclusion, unless the areas were clear felled, which seems unlikely. e) Yes			
3. Wider landscape context and significance of the assessed area			
Overall - landscape context	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
Guidance: a) Is the wider landscape convincingly and adequately described? b) Are the key social and biological features of the wider landscape clearly described? Such features include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protected areas (existing or in process of gazettelement) • Regional or sub-regional biogeography (is the assessment area part of a distinct and/or 			

narrowly restricted biogeographic region?)

- Location and status of areas of natural vegetation (including a description of ecosystem types, size, quality)
- Occurrence of known populations of species of global concern
- Major landforms, watersheds and rivers, geology and soils
- Human settlements and infrastructure, agricultural areas
- Social context (ethnicity, major social trends and land use activities)
- History of land use and development trends, including future plans (e.g. spatial planning maps, development initiatives and existing/proposed commercial exploitation licenses)

3. Reviewer comments:

Landscape context is described very well. There were a few minor issues in the social section, which are marked on the report.

4. HCV assessment process including consultation process

Overall -HCV assessment process	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major
---------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---

For *each* of the sub-topics, was the process or effort proportionate and adequate relative to the likely impact and scale of operations?

4.1. Composition and qualifications of the assessment team	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
--	-------------------------------	---	--------------------------------

Guidance:

Did the team include or have adequate access to relevant expertise to assess biological and social values?

4.1. Reviewer comments:

Biological values. Yes, seemed adequate; time available for survey seemed to be more of a restriction than qualifications.

Social values. Seems that team had necessary skills, with one individual with 13 years experience in social assessments, but bios not given for others, so difficult to judge. Again, time seemed to be the major restriction on amount of data collection.

4.2. Data sources and data collection methodologies	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major
---	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---

Guidance:

a) Are data sources and data collection methodologies clearly described or referenced and summarised (and presented in annexes if appropriate), and are they adequate to identify HCVs? This section should cover:

- Background and desk research
- Field data collection, if any (including dates and itineraries). *NB: are aims of any fieldwork clearly stated relative to specific HCVs?*

b) Were reasonable efforts made to fill gaps in the data, proportionate to the impact and scale of the operations?

4.2. Reviewer comments:

HCV 1: Solid. Only data on presence of rhino questioned.

HCV 2: a) Methodologies not clearly described for 2.2. b) Gaps, if any, not discussed for 2.1 & 2.2, but gaps filled in for 2.3

HCV 3: Yes

HCV 4: Yes

HCV 5: a) No, not clearly described. Very limited information provided on background and field data collection; b) yes, through WARSI report, but for the scale of operations, Good Practices would recommend that each village should be surveyed individually.

HCV 6: No, not described. Needs to be added to report.

4.3. Consultation processes	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---

Guidance:

Was there an appropriate consultation process for

- a) Identification of HCVs
- b) Management of HCVs
- c) Monitoring of HCVs,

In each case:

- Were relevant stakeholders appropriately consulted?
- Is this documented in a verifiable manner?
- Were their views or the information they provided incorporated into the relevant process?
- Were conclusions fed back to consultees as appropriate?

- d) Were appropriate existing initiatives engaged wherever possible (including existing local or international social, ecological or biological conservation initiatives)?

4.3. Reviewer comments:

In general, it seems that the consultation process, as described, did not follow the Toolkit guidelines for consultation. This may reflect documentation in the report more than actual fact, but if so then this must be added to the report. For example, social data relied on some surveys from WARSI, who was also engaged in the assessment, which is a solid, positive form of consultation. But surveys should have been more comprehensive and inclusive of more stakeholders. They may well have been, but this needs to be described better in a more comprehensive Appendix/Attachment. Recommendations for management and monitoring was presented for some HCVs, but not others. Management and monitoring was discussed for only a few dimensions of HCV 5. Feedback of information to consultees, if undertaken, was not discussed. Clearly, this is more a problem of documentation than actual practice.

5. Identification, location and status of each HCV

Overall - HCV identification	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
------------------------------	-------------------------------	---	--------------------------------

For *each* HCV, are the following points addressed, and was the process or effort proportionate and adequate relative to the likely impact and scale of operations?

5.1. Data quality	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
-------------------	-------------------------------	---	--------------------------------

Guidance:

- a) Are data detailed, recent and complete enough to make informed decisions on presence/status/location of the HCV? (*NB: particular care to be taken with quality, analysis and use of remote sensing data*)
- b) Is the precautionary principle appropriately invoked in the use of data?
- c) Were maps, reports and other previously existing data up to date and adequate?

- d) Is there an understanding of the spatial accuracy of the data used?
 e) Should further data be collected before decisions are made?

5.1. Reviewer comments:

HCV1

- 1.1- a) yes, b) yes, identifying all of concession as HCV 1.1, c) yes, adequate d) ?, e) no
 1.2- a) data on Sumatran ground cuckoo incomplete. Would like to see more complete data on Sumatran rhino before removing it from the assessment; could retain it as potentially present. Precautionary principal needs to be employed for management of both species, until data deemed sufficient to conclude not present. Info on tiger sufficient when combined with management plan. Dipterocarps may want to get a more complete survey of species present.
 1.3- a) yes, data sufficient, b) not well enough with regard to some species (e.g. serow) noted in report, c) yes, d) yes, e) not necessarily. Management decisions can be made with current info that will provide protection to species where info is incomplete.
 1.4- Possibly need more data to determine if important ecotones are present.

HCV2

a) need to use more recent land cover data for HCV 2.1 analysis, b) yes, c) no- see a, d) yes, e) further mapping and analysis, rather than further data collection.

HCV3

Yes, all good and clear.

HCV4

Agreed that further data on karst ecosystems necessary. For 4.1 there were two other karst areas mentioned earlier in the report, but that appeared to be dropped out here. Should be discussed why these were not mentioned further here.

HCV5

Did not see a map of village locations (or are all displayed in Fig 15?), which would have been helpful. Some data from WARSI social surveys were relied upon as the exclusive source, rather than collecting primary data, at least to verify key findings. Think they should have gone to each village to collect some primary data -- especially those with least market access -- and verify data from WARSI. Findings probably relatively accurate, but may be missing dependencies of certain community subgroups on forest. With data available, it's clear that water, building materials, and certain NTFPs for cash income were very important in meeting basic needs for communities.

HCV6

As presented, data are inadequate to convince reader that HCV 6 not present in the area. Should show methodology of interviews, questions asked, number of people and villages where interviews held.

5.2. Reference to HCV toolkits

None

Minor

Major

Guidance:

- a) Has a National Interpretation of HCVs been used, or (in the absence of a National Interpretation), have the generic HCVF Toolkit guidelines been appropriately interpreted?

b) Are decisions to apply National Interpretation definitions/thresholds, or to deviate from its recommendations, adequately explained and justified?

5.2. Reviewer comments:

HCV1

HCV 1.1. Yes. Yes.

HCV 1.2 Yes. n/a.

HCV 1.3 Yes. Except for use of the precautionary principle. Felt that the proxy of 30 individuals or more overrode the p.p. in situations where it was close and should have been the opposite. Also, Toolkit states that need to map this HCV throughout the landscape (MU + surrounding areas). Looks like viability was assessed on MU size alone from looking at appendix. B) n/a. In revisions, the question of a landscape population must be addressed for large, far ranging mammals.

HCV 1.4 No. Permanent swiftlet and bat caves and ecotones need to be included and the HCV determined as present. Not essential to map them here, but a management prescription (e.g., buffer) should be made. Also, not sure where the regionally and globally significant populations came into the interpretation. From the global Toolkit? Not explained.

HCV2

Only real issue is with HCV 2.1- explained in the report, using comments. Toolkit incorrect, but assessment didn't follow anyway. Suggestion of revised interpretation given in doc.

HCV3

Management in toolkit requires buffer of 1km in which specified mgnt prescriptions will be implemented, if ecosystem identified not in core zone. This not mentioned in doc. Otherwise, process for identifying followed toolkit well.

HCV4

Yes

HCV5

Methods outlined in Toolkit may not have been followed, at least as described. Missed cash income as an HCV. And didn't go through full process of identifying subgroups, their dependence level on a basic need, and the availability and sustainability of alternatives. This level of detail could go in an attachment and be referred to in the main report. If it has not been done, then consider this as a follow up study in prep for FSC audit.

HCV6

Did not give any reference to toolkit or any methodology used to do HCV 6 assessment

5.3. Decision on HCV status

None

Minor

Major

a) Is the HCV present, potentially present or absent in the assessed area?

b) Has the presence of the HCV in the wider landscape and nationally, regionally or globally been addressed?

c) Is the HCV (and its components) clearly defined and described?

- d) Is the description sufficient for responsible parties reliably to identify the HCV?
 e) Was the precautionary principle appropriately invoked in making the decision on HCV status?

5.3. Reviewer comments:

HCV1

HCV 1.1 a) present, b) Addressed in regard to the local landscape (neighbouring HL and potential interaction with neighbouring TN), c) yes, d) yes, e) yes

HCV 1.2 a) present, b) yes, c) yes, d) need more data on a few species. E) would argue not in the case of rhino and Sumatran ground cuckoo

HCV 1.3 a) yes, b) For some species, c) yes, but they don't show CITES I and II listings or species endemic to Sumatra. Therefore, some species that qualify for this HCV missing (e.g. long tailed macaque and banded linsang). d) biodiversity surrogates mentioned, but list and explanation of choices not provided (should be in appendix 3, but this appendix not yet available). Would like to see surrogates linked to likelihood of other species that should be present e) no (for some species)

HCV 1.4 a) Assessed as absent, but think it should be considered possibly present. B) yes, c) yes, except not for potentially important corridors, ecotones or migration routes, d) yes, e) possibly not with regard to serow

HCV2

a) Yes, present for all. B) Was not put into a regional or broader context

HCV3

Identification process fine, but needs to be mapped with buffer accurately enough for MU to manage

HCV4

Fine for both, again, except for 2 karst fragments mentioned in HCV3

HCV5

Looking at appendix and report, it is not clear which dusun had a dependency >50% for each basic need. Although a good overview is given of what is used, it needs to be brought down to a dusun level, or even subgroup thereof, and areas identified for each dusun (e.g. names of locations) and, if possible, mapped at least indicatively. If not possible at this stage, the company should endeavor to do so over time, in preparation for FSC audit. Also, no trend analysis given for the basic needs.

HCV6

Described as absent, but too little information is presented to make assessment of this judgment. If no information is available, then precautionary principle not used.

5.4. Mapping decisions

None

Minor

Major

Guidance:

a) Are maps of HCV occurrence clear, accurate and useful?

5.4. Reviewer comments:

HCV1

1.1 - yes, 1.2 & 1.3- yes, 1.4- yes

HCV2

2.1 need a map with the core zone and buffer delineated. 2.2- although described these should be delineated on a map and labeled as to what they are (e.g. transition from montane to submontane) 2.3. If HCVMA not mapped, then need to describe referring to other maps presented in the report.

HCV3

Needs to be mapped more accurately

HCV4

Yes

HCV5

No, none given. Should have villages mapped. Especialyl location of the two in the AMT concession

HCV6

None given

6. Management of HCVs

Overall - HCV management	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major
--------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---

For each HCV, *either* individually *or* collectively, were the following points addressed?

6.1. Assessment of threats or risks to each HCV	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
---	-------------------------------	---	--------------------------------

Guidance:

- a) Are threats or risks from current or planned management activities to each HCV within the assessment area identified?
- b) Are threats from external factors to each HCV within the assessment area identified?
- c) Are aspects which might help to preserve the HCVs outside the assessment area identified (e.g. protected areas, inaccessible areas, favourable land use, active conservation programmes etc)?
- d) Are aspects which would tend to threaten the HCVs outside the assessment area identified (e.g. unfavourable land use, hunting pressures etc.)

6.1 Reviewer comments:

HCV1.1- a) yes, fragmentation, hunting and illegal logging all acknowledged. (Hunting needs to be put in terms of increased risk by the company's presence and illegal logging access also improved with company presence). b) yes, external focused on more than internal, c) no, does not identify aspects outside the assessment area that may help preserve the HCV. d) yes, hunting and illegal logging.

HCV 1.2 a) yes, with exception of 2 spp. Questioned, as noted above. b) yes, c) no, outside aspects not discussed, d) only hunting and human conflict for tigers.

HCV 1.3- a) pretty well, but think the risk of fragmenting populations through disturbance, or restricting access to seasonally important areas should be considered in spatial planning. (In addition to RIL), b) yes, c) not discussed, d) yes

HCV 1.4- a) yes for swiftlets, no for bats and serow, and no for corridors or migration routes. b) Yes with swiftlets, c) no, d) yes with swiftlets .

HCV 2. Yes. Identified and discussed.

HCV 3. Not discussed other than selective logging and RIL on granite should not be a problem

HCV 4. Yes, identified and discussed. 4.1 All rivers should be given a buffer, not just the major rivers.

HCV 5. Threats and risks to these basic needs based on AMT planned activities not discussed, with exception of water.

HCV 6. Not given, because seen as not present.

6.2. Are HCV management plans adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major
---	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---

Guidance:

- a) Are management objectives clearly described and appropriate?
- b) Are management prescriptions clearly described and appropriate to meet stated objectives?
 - Does management take into account the presence and status of HCVs?
 - Does management effectively mitigate threats or risks to HCVs?
 - Is the precautionary principle appropriately invoked in management prescriptions?
 - Have stakeholders been consulted on the proposed management and given the opportunity for direct input as appropriate?
 - Was the management plan developed in a consultative manner and/or endorsed by outside stakeholders?

6.2. Reviewer comments:

HCV 1.1- a) Described quite general terms, relying on reducing fragmentation through RIL and reduced hunting pressure, with few specific details, but objectives are appropriate. B) good to have a better description of how fragmentation will be prevented (esp. as in relation to the protected area outside the FMU with illegal logging activities which are currently light, but may increase). The threat of access not given specific attention, suggesting not adequately considered. How should the company work to prevent additional illegal logging through company access road and hunting by both company employees and contractors and access to the area through their activities.

HCV 1.2- a) yes, but with suggested additions in text (e.g. prey protection for tiger) b) yes to all except not clear what stakeholder input went into proposed management.

HCV 1.3- yes, but would be nice to have an overall description of management elements that are the same for many species, including more spatial planning elements for management (in addition to RIL). Stakeholder consultation for management recommendations appears not to have been undertaken. Will be good to get feedback from local communities on approaches to and likelihood of controlling hunting in the area.

HCV 1.4- no, because the HCV identified as absent, but note that caves should be given consideration, as mentioned above.

HCV 2: Management should be considered and described in greater detail. Esp. 2.1 as a large part of the core area for the landscape will be in the concession. The emphasis should be on what AMT needs to do, not on what other groups are, or should, be doing.

HCV 3. Mgmt recommendations need to describe how the HCVA and buffer will be managed as compared to the rest of the MU (because the entire concession is being

recommended for RIL. Anything more specific in these areas? Diminished road construction, prevent harvesting of certain species of known importance for frugivores, etc?

HCV 4. 4.1 Karst should already have the 1 km buffer from HCV 3 management. Describe difference in management for the 1 km buffer, vs. the recommended 100m. Where does 100m come from? River buffer? Toolkit has springs as 200m buffers. Report clearly states no logging in the 100m buffer for one watershed. In the karst, in the others? This needs clarification.

4.2 Management not given. Typo makes it unclear to where reader is referred. But mapped clearly.

HCV 5: Management objectives and prescriptions not given for most basic needs identified.

HCV 6. Not given, because seen as not present.

7. Monitoring of HCVs

Overall - HCV monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major
--------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---

For each HCV, *either* individually *or* collectively, were the following points addressed?

7.1. Are monitoring plans clearly described?	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
--	-------------------------------	---	--------------------------------

Guidance:

- a) Are monitoring objectives clearly described and appropriate?
- b) Are methodologies clearly described and appropriate to meet stated objectives?
 - Methodologies for data collection
 - Methodologies for data analysis

7.1 Reviewer comments:

HCV 1.1. a) Yes, for land cover change and fragmentation issues, no for illegal logging and hunting issues. b) Methodology not described in detail for mapping or at all for illegal logging and hunting.

HCV 1.2. yes, yes

HCV 1.3- Yes

HCV 1.4- no, because the HCV identified as absent

HCV 2. Monitoring needs to be added for 2.1. It is clear for 2.2 and 2.3.

HCV 3. Yes, clear, through satellite imagery

HCV 4. - 4.1 Clear, just need to define whether monitoring will take place at any other watersheds, rivers than the Kandi. 4.2 Monitoring not given. Typo makes it unclear where referred to.

HCV 5: No monitoring plans given.

HCV 6. Not given, because seen as not present.

7.2. Are monitoring plans adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---

Guidance:

Does the monitoring plan adequately deal with significant changes arising from:

- Proposed land management operations
- Known or likely external threats/risks to HCVs

7.2 Reviewer comments:

HCV 1.1. Yes, for major land use cover changes, but no for the illegal logging and hunting threats.

HCV 1.2- yes

HCV 1.3- no with regard to hunting. Would be good to have some system of monitoring hunting pressure and encroachment from illegal logging in areas near the MU.

HCV 1.4- no because the HCV identified as absent, but see comments above.

HCV 2. No for 2.1, ok for 2.2, good for 2.3

HCV 3. Not discussed, other than mentioning that one of the HCV3 areas is also an important social area, presumably for NTFP collection.

HCV 4. Yes.

HCV 5: No monitoring plans given.

HCV 6. Not given, because seen as not present.

7.3. Are there plans for a regular review of data?

None

Minor

Major

Guidance:

a) Is there a clear line of responsibility

b) Is the monitoring system review process adequate for capturing effects of likely threats/risks to HCVs?

7.3 Reviewer comments:

HCV 1.1. No, a) no clear line of responsibility. B) not discussed

HCV 1.2. Yes. a) no, b) no monitoring review system described

HCV 1.3 Yes, referred to through adaptive management or studies in some of the individual species or taxon recommendations a) no, b) no monitoring review system described

HCV 1.4- no because the HCV identified as absent (but see above)

HCV 2. Yes, except 2.1 a) No clear line of responsibility, b) not discussed

HCV 3. Yes, annual satellite monitoring

HCV 4. Yes, through routine monitoring.

HCV 5: Not discussed

HCV 6. HCV 6. Not given, because seen as not present.

DISCLAIMER

This review was conducted by Daemeter Consulting according to guidelines set out and approved by the HCV Resource Network (HCV RN) Technical Panel (www.hcvnetwork.org). It was conducted in good faith on the basis of

information provided by Tropical Forest Trust (TFT) and Forest Carbon (FC). Daemeter takes no responsibility for the accuracy of information provided by TFT/FC and cannot be held liable for damage or loss resulting from the use or interpretation of this review by TFT/FC or any third party.