



HCV Resource Network Technical Panel
Peer Review of
PT. Perkebunan Anak Negeri Pasaman
Oil Palm Estate
Landak District, West Kalimantan, Indonesia

3rd July 2009

Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Summary of findings	5
3. Full review	6

Disclaimer:

This review was conducted by the HCV Resource Network (HCV RN) Technical Panel, according to the guidelines set out and approved by the HCV RN, in line with the HCV RN Charter, and is conducted in good faith on the basis of information provided by the applicant (Daemeter Consulting, on behalf of Wilmar Group). The HCV RN Technical Panel and the HCV RN can take no responsibility for the accuracy of information provided by Daemeter Consulting and cannot be held liable in any way for any damage or loss resulting from the use or interpretation of this review by Daemeter Consulting, the Wilmar Group, or any third party. The opinions expressed in this review are those of the HCV RN Technical Panel and do not necessarily represent the views of the HCV RN or its Steering Group members.

1. Introduction

This report presents the findings of a HCV Resource Network Technical Panel (TP) Peer Review of the HCV assessment for PT Perkebunan Anak Negeri Pasaman (PT PANP). The assessment was carried out by Daemeter Consulting on behalf of the Wilmar Group.

Peer Review process

The operations under review involve the potential conversion of natural ecosystems and agricultural lands to an industrial-scale oil palm plantation. The HCV Resource Network therefore determined that this requires a 'Category 1' review ([Reviewing HCV assessment reports, October 2008](#)). The process for Peer Review was as follows:

- The Technical Panel was informed of the Peer Review request, and three Primary Peer Reviewers were selected and approved by the HCV Resource Network, based on their relevant experience, qualifications and absence of any conflict of interest.
- The Primary Reviewers independently reviewed the assessment, consulted with each other, and agreed upon a combined preliminary review.
- All impartial members of the wider TP were given an opportunity to review the findings and important issues that resulted from the combined preliminary review.
- Comments from the wider TP were incorporated into the preliminary review, and agreed by the wider TP as a consensus Technical Panel Peer Review
- This report was forwarded to the HCV Resource Network Steering Group's Quality Control sub-committee for review.
- The consensus report was then provided to the Peer Review applicant, Daemeter Consulting, to present to the Wilmar Group.

The report was submitted for Peer Review to the Resource Network on 28th April 2009, and the TP was notified on the same day. The Primary Review team was confirmed on 7th May 2009. Documents were received by the Primary Reviewers team by 6th June 2009, and the Technical Panel's review process was completed by July 3rd 2009.

Reviewers followed the following guidance to record their findings:

- "No issues" indicates that the information provided is adequate;
- "Minor issues" indicates that the section topic has been addressed but that there is scope for improvement e.g. in the use or interpretation of data;
- "Major issues" indicates that there has been a systematic failure to address the topic, or that the use or interpretation of data is wholly inadequate or inappropriate.

Overview of findings and recommendations of the Technical Panel

Overall this is an excellent example of an HCV assessment. The review finds no major issues. The main report and supporting documentation shows that a very thorough and comprehensive assessment has been carried out. The report is written with a direct style that gives enough technical information to be useful without completely burying the reader in detail. Minor issues have been identified (detailed below) but many of these are seeking clarification on specific issues rather than significant failings in the scope, methods, or findings of the assessment. In the Full Review (Section 3), notes have only been included in sections that need further work or clarification, and blank sections below indicate that there are no problems with that aspect of the HCV assessment.

Format of the HCV assessment report:

The format of the HCV report deserves comment. The authors are consultants making recommendations to the plantation company, which raises a concern that this HCV report could be a one time effort, designed to get over a certification reporting hurdle. If relevant sections of HCV reports are written from the vantage point of the manager, this can help to make the report more effective, ensure that recommendations are integrated into the management system, and provide some commitment to its implementation.

Content of the HCV assessment report:

The identification of Values is particularly exemplary.

Specific management and monitoring recommendations are adequate on the whole; in some instances the prescriptions are tentative (see Section 6.2), however the reviewers believe that the level of detail presented is appropriate to the current stage of the land use decision-making process.

There are several places where the authors refer to management prescriptions that are in preparation (e.g. riparian zone management, access control, several species-specific management recommendations). These are important to proper conservation, and some of these may be fairly significant tasks. The Report states that Standard Operating Procedures are being prepared for these management prescriptions.

The Technical Panel recommends that this HCV assessment and the Peer Review Report should be made public, and that the relevant SOPs (or a public summary) should be appended to the assessment document or otherwise made public.

Whether these management procedures actually achieve their management objectives can only be fully assessed as part of an on-the-ground audit of operations, and are beyond the scope of this Peer Review of the assessment document. However, auditors should use this report to verify whether management prescriptions have been developed as recommended, whether they have been implemented, and whether they have been effective in safeguarding the values identified.

2. Summary of findings

Document name:	Reviewer: (TP use only)	Date of review:	
PT PANP	HCV Technical Panel	3 rd July 2009	
Description of document content		Issues identified	
1. Executive summary of the document			
Overall – executive summary	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
2. Scope of the assessment			
Overall – scope	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
3. Wider landscape context and significance of the assessed area			
Overall – landscape context	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
4. HCV assessment process including consultation process			
Overall –HCV assessment process	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
4.1. Composition and qualifications of the assessment team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
4.2. Data sources and data collection methodologies	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
4.3. Consultation processes	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
7. Monitoring of HCVs			
Overall – HCV monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
7.3. Are there plans for a regular review of data?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major

3. Full review

Project name: PT PANP	Reviewer: (TP use only) HCV Technical Panel	Date of review: 3 rd July 2009	
Description of document content:		Issues identified	
1. Executive summary of the document			
Overall – executive summary	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
<p>Guidance:</p> <p>a) Are the key findings clearly presented and summarised?</p> <p>b) Does the summary accurately reflect the findings and recommendations of the main document?</p> <p>c) If no summary exists, is it still possible to use the document easily?</p>			
<p>1. Reviewer comments:</p> <p>Executive summary is clearly presented at the beginning of the report, and accurately represents the findings and recommendations of the report and supporting documents.</p> <p>Minor issue: The report is very thorough and long. Most people will only read the summary. Therefore we suggest copying table 8 from the synthesis to the executive summary. This table summarises nicely the proposed management objectives and actions, and will be of keen interest to many readers</p> <p>A comment on the map is covered below in part 5.4</p>			
2. Scope of the assessment			
Overall – scope	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
<p>Guidance:</p> <p>a) Is the assessment area and surrounding landscape clearly defined?</p> <p>b) Is there a basic summary of the company and its operations in the area?</p> <p>c) Are the impact and scale of proposed operations adequately described?</p> <p>d) Did exploitation of any kind (especially clearance) take place prior to the assessment, and if so, how are such areas treated?</p> <p>e) Is the purpose of the HCV assessment clear?</p>			
<p>2. Reviewer comments:</p> <p>Minor Issue: A good map of the plantation area being assessed is provided at the District/Regency (kabupaten) scale, showing other oil palm plantation license areas and protected areas in the District (fig 4). Additionally a more detailed map of the</p>			

plantation area with villages and dusun, rivers and roads, are provided in Figure 8. However, all the villages and dusun mentioned in the report are not shown on the map. Significantly, the locations of 2 of the 4 villages with land in the license area, Tegue & Sejuet, are not shown on the map and many of the dusun within these 4 villages are also not shown. It would be helpful to see the locations of all the overlapping villages and dusun within these villages to assess the auditors' claims that some dusun were too far from the license area to include in the sample. It would also be helpful to see the locations of settlements within each Dusun to understand the degree of isolation between settlements.

Minor issue: A little more information on the Wilmar Group globally would be of interest. Of greater importance is a clearer description of the Wilmar Group's operation in West Kalimantan. Other management units are shown on maps, and mentioned in the text and footnotes, but there is no summary of the operations, for example number of units, size of the area under their management and the current stage of operations in other units

The impact and scale of the proposed operations is adequately defined.

The report includes a good description of activities that have already happened including clear assessment of implications of this and appropriate actions. Prior to the assessment 1,424 ha were already cleared. These areas will be excluded from any RSPO certification. Due to the level of variance in land uses in the area, it was impossible to know what the pre-existing land use on the cleared area was. Criterion 7.3 of RSPO will likely require Wilmar to implement a credible mechanism for compensating for potential HCVF areas that were cleared as part of the 1,424 ha cleared.

3. Wider landscape context and significance of the assessed area

Overall - landscape context	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" 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:
 - 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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) 				
<p>3. Reviewer comments:</p> <p>For HCVs 1-4 all of these issues are comprehensively covered. The supporting attachments provide especially thorough information</p> <p>Minor Issue: The wider landscape is convincingly and adequately described, with the one exception mentioned above that some village and dusun locations are not shown on the maps. Additionally, it would have been useful to explain in the landscape description that some of the dusun are also divided into separate settlements (pemukiman/kampung/RT) that can be very far apart and have little interaction. A map of the settlement locations would be useful in evaluating social sampling.</p>				
<p>4. HCV assessment process including consultation process</p>				
<p>Overall –HCV assessment process</p>		<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
<p>For <i>each</i> of the sub-topics, was the process or effort proportionate and adequate relative to the likely impact and scale of operations?</p>				
<p>4.1. Composition and qualifications of the assessment team</p>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
<p>Guidance:</p> <p>Did the team include or have adequate access to relevant expertise to assess biological and social values?</p>				
<p>4.1. Reviewer comments:</p> <p>The composition of the assessment team is very good. The team is one of the best that could be compiled for completing a review of this kind</p>				
<p>4.2. Data sources and data collection methodologies</p>		<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
<p>Guidance:</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background and desk research • Field data collection, if any (including dates and itineraries). <i>NB: are aims of any fieldwork clearly stated relative to specific HCVs?</i> <p>b) Were reasonable efforts made to fill gaps in the data, proportionate to the impact and scale of the operations?</p>				
<p>4.2. Reviewer comments:</p>				

Generally methods are clearly described, and adequate.

Minor issue: It would be improved with a section in Part 1 of the main report that outlines known limitations with the data collection methods. Most of the attachments acknowledge methodological limitations with the rapid survey techniques used. These should also be presented in the main report. Specific examples include: the choice of taxa that were assessed, or perhaps more importantly why other taxa were not surveyed; the problems of having to rely on local knowledge for presence of many vertebrate species; and any problems with the collection of data on social values

Minor Issue : there were two aspects of the social team's methodology, however, which should be clarified:

1. When focus group discussion's took place in a Dusun made up of multiple settlements in or near the PT PANP license area, did the team ensure that representatives from each settlement were present?
2. There were 10 of 23 Dusun that were part of the 4 villages overlapping with the PT PANP area, but not included in the assessment since they were 'far' from the area. However, there is no explanation of how the determination of 'too far away to be sampled' was made, and no map of all the dusun is provided, so it is difficult to know what methodology was used to decide if a Dusun would be included or excluded from the assessment. Given the high presence of HCV 5 & 6 found in all 13 Dusun sampled (both within and outside the PT PANP area), at least some of the Dusuns that were 'far' from the area should be sampled to ensure that the people living farther away do not rely on any forest area within the PT PANP license area.

4.3. Consultation processes

None

Minor

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:

Relevant stakeholders were consulted at each major stage in the HCVF Assessment process. Government, international, national and local organisations, company and community leaders were all consulted during the pre-assessment stage through opportunities to comment and informal interviews. Feedback provided by stakeholders in the pre-assessment stage is well-documented in Appendix 2 of the report.

One minor concern is that it's not clear if representatives from each settlement within a Dusun were present at the Dusun-level FGD's. However, since this only applies to a few dusun, it's not a major issue.

Stakeholders were also consulted regarding preliminary results of the HCV identification and management & monitoring recommendations through a meeting in which community, government, company and NGO leaders attended, following the field work. However, meeting minutes and comments from stakeholders during the meeting were not specifically provided in the report or attachments. That said, some comments are referenced in the report, which implies that comments from this meeting were indeed incorporated into the final report.

More importantly, many of the management and monitoring recommendations involve ongoing consultation and engagement with local stakeholders. These ongoing activities of collaboration and engagement will ensure that local communities are involved in management and monitoring of HCV's on an ongoing basis

5. Identification, location and status of each HCV

Overall – HCV identification

None

Minor

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

None

Minor

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:

With one exception there are no problems with the data quality used in this report.

It is sufficient to inform decision on the Values and their management. Situations where further data gathering is required have been identified and recommendations made on how to fill the gaps

HCV1:

HCV2:

HCV3:

HCV4:

HCV5: Minor Issue: One issue, however, that was not addressed was how the one village (Dusun Jangkak) which did not want to participate in the HCV Assessment process should be handled in regard to identification of HCVs? The precautionary principle suggests that all land under the Dusun's control should be considered to potentially have HCVs. However, the report did not specifically address this issue.

Another suggestion: The report said that sketch maps of HCV sites were also produced, but no example of such a map was provided. It would be useful to see at least one example of such a map to understand how helpful it is in carrying out later management prescriptions such as participatory mapping

HCV6: Minor Issue : The existence of additional village protected areas not included in the original field data collection was raised at the stakeholder consultation for initial findings (p33). Although these are mentioned in Appendix 3, they should also be mapped and included in Figure 12 and Attachment 6.

5.2. Reference to HCV toolkits	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> 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:

HCV2:

HCV3:

HCV4:

HCV5: The HCVF Revised Toolkit for Indonesia is referenced and many of the recommended tables and methodologies in the toolkit are used in HCV 5. The threshold level for basic needs of 50% or above coming from the natural forest qualifying as an HCV is followed.

However, some of the specific questions that the toolkit recommends considering in regard to assigning HCV 5 status, such as the availability of substitutes and evaluation of whether or not communities are sustainably managing the basic need, are not always clearly and consistently considered when assigning HCV 5 status. In general, the body of the report (Section 3.5) does mention trends in availability and the presence or absence of substitutes, however it's not clear that consideration of these aspects influenced the conclusion of 'presence or non-presence'. Instead, the 50% threshold seemed to be the primary determinant. This could be because the sustainability and substitute availability were difficult to gauge, so the auditors were invoking the precautionary approach, but this is not clearly stated or explained.

Also, the report mentions that according to the HCVF Revised Toolkit for Indonesia, a basic need only qualifies as an HCV 5 if it comes from a natural forest, and not an anthropogenic forest. Please include more clear reference to the appropriate section in the toolkit (the review team could not find it).

HCV6:

5.3. Decision on HCV status	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> 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:

Generally the determination of which HCVs are present has been very well explained in the main report and particularly in the supporting documents.

HCV1: Minor Issue: Very limited information is provided on restricted-range (RR) species. These are defined as a component of HCV 1.3 in the Indonesia toolkit, but not specifically covered in the report. Attachments 3 and 4 (on higher vertebrates) mention some RR species in the text, but are not covered separately. There is no mention of them in the main report. Tables 3 and 4 of the main report list IUCN Red List, GoI protected, and CITES listed species, but not RR ones. These need to be more clearly identified. Or if they are not included then a thorough justification needs to be given as to why they are excluded. [note this is considered a minor issue, as it is not believed that their inclusion will make a difference to any of the management or monitoring recommendations, but they need to be included to complete the assessment]

HCV2:

HCV3:

HCV4:

HCV5: Minor Issue: Please provide clarification on ‘dependence’ for those who maybe do not have access to toolkit (this could simply be as a footnote). What does the percentage mean? (eg table 6) For example does “100% from forest” mean 100% of volume of the product used, 100% of the people in the settlement use it, 100% households?

A specific issue: is there really no raising of domestic livestock? The report mentions the use of pigs during important ceremonies, are these purchased, or do some households raise livestock. If no households in no villages raise livestock this should be made explicitly clear

HCV6:

5.4. Mapping decisions	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
------------------------	-------------------------------	---	--------------------------------

Guidance:

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

5.4 Reviewer comments:

Minor issue: The main map that is presented in the Executive Summary and Fig. 20 should be made clearer. This is probably the single most important map in the entire assessment, many people look at only this map. The presentation of the information on the map is fine, but the Legends is unclear/inconsistent.

The map is showing the HCVMA's, but without reading the body of the report the legend implies that the map only shows HCVMA's for Values 4.2 and 3. Other important issues are shown (cultural sites, and erosion issues) but it is not clear that these are management areas, or just areas of interest. It should be made clear that the area currently labelled as HCMA 3 also the HCVMA for value 1 and some of 5. HCVMA's for Value 4 could be clustered under a single sub-heading, clarifying the area which is a no-go zone (currently listed only as HCVMA 4.2), and those which require other management - river buffers and erosion areas (perhaps with a note acknowledging that river buffers are also Value 1.1). All mapped cultural sites could be under a sub-heading for HCV6.

Finally to make it easier for people less familiar with the HCV framework, as well as including the HCV number, also include a short description, eg “Areas important for the prevention of erosion - HCVMA 4.2

HCV1:

HCV2:

HCV3:

HCV4:

HCV5: See comments in Section 3 (Scope). And note on providing and example sketch map, section 5.1.

It should be noted that one dusun within the license area, (Dusun Jangkak, Desa Parek) declined to participate in the assessment, so although there may be HCV areas surrounding that dusun, they were not mapped. This should be acknowledged.

HCV6:

6. Management of HCVs

Overall – HCV management	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input 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 within the landscape context	<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:

There is no specific section that outlines the threats, but threats are described in the sections on individual values, and in the attached supporting documents.

Minor Issue: The report needs to be more explicit in the actual proposed scale of operations and development plan. eg does the company have any targets for numbers ha to clear, production deadlines etc. (this could also be covered in section 2.1.2 of the main report).

Minor Issue: the report needs a more thorough analysis of external threats to the values that may be outside of the control of the company, or local residents. eg other competing development plans. If none exist, this should be noted.

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

Management recommendations are given, and within reason are clearly described. At this time there is very little information available on appropriate management recommendations in the context of conversion to Oil Palm. Given this global lack of knowledge the management prescriptions given appear to be appropriate. The report states on several occasions that more complete descriptions of management (and monitoring) systems are being developed as Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs). The quality of these is beyond the scope of an HCV assessment review, but it is important that these are reviewed critically as part of any field audit of operations (eg an RSPO audit).

The consultation work on management is exemplary. All management recommendations were presented to stakeholders at a meeting held in December 2008, and stakeholder feedback was incorporated into the report. Additionally, many of the management recommendations include ongoing stakeholder consultation and collaborations on management, such as recommendations for HCV 1.3, 4, 5 & 6

Specific issues:

HCV 1.3: A recommendation should be made that all hunting of Sunda Pangolin and Straw-headed Bulbul should be prohibited, even for subsistence. These two species in particular are globally threatened due to collection and trade and need high levels of protection. This may lead to a clash with Value 5, but there is doubt that these species can ever be harvested sustainably.

HCV 4: Management recommendations for HCV 4 recommend passive management for steep slopes (i.e. they recommend that Wilmar not gain management rights to steep slope areas, but leave the rights under local people). This management recommendation fails to take into account the threat that agriculture from local communities may present to areas not under Wilmar management. For this reason, an active management prescription would be more appropriate

HCV 5&6: Management guidelines for the one Dusun not included in the sample (Dusun Jangkak) are missing, and the precautionary principle should be invoked there. Some guidance should also be provided for Wilmar staff in dealing with this dusun. Should Dusun Jangkak agree to negotiate with Wilmar staff on land acquisition agreements, it should first be assessed for the presence of HCV 5 & 6

7. Monitoring of HCVs			
Overall – HCV monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
For each HCV, <i>either</i> individually <i>or</i> 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
<p>Guidance:</p> <p>a) Are monitoring objectives clearly described and appropriate?</p> <p>b) Are methodologies clearly described and appropriate to meet stated objectives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodologies for data collection • Methodologies for data analysis 			
<p>7.1 Reviewer comments:</p> <p>As with management recommendations, monitoring plans are appropriate given the stage of operations. They will be developed further as SOPs and need to be assessed as part of an operational audit.</p>			
7.2 Are monitoring plans adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Major
<p>Guidance:</p> <p>Does the monitoring plan adequately deal with significant changes arising from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed land management operations • Known or likely external threats/risks to HCVs 			
<p>7.2 Reviewer comments:</p> <p>Minor issue: Monitoring values 1.2 & 1.3. None of the monitoring methods describe are actually monitoring the populations of important species. The report should differentiate between different types of monitoring: process monitoring (whether the recommendations are implemented), impact monitoring (whether threats are reduced) and target condition monitoring (whether populations are stable, increasing or decreasing). The latter is the most important, but also in most cases extremely hard, and costly, to complete. If no attempt will be made to directly monitor populations then this should at least be acknowledged, and the reasons for not doing it explained.</p> <p>Minor Issue: HCV 5: The report doesn't provide guidance on who in a community should be interviewed for monitoring. This is an important aspect of the monitoring methodology. An SOP on monitoring HCV 5 & 6 would likely be useful to ensure that monitoring is carried out appropriately</p> <p>Minor Issue: HCV 6: The report recommends monitoring HCV 6 by getting periodic reassurance from communities that they feel their HCV 6 areas are being adequately</p>			

protected. However, it doesn't explain who in the communities Wilmar will need to consult to get this reassurance, or how they should go about doing the consultation. It would be helpful if the authors provided more specific guidance on this point (possibly via an SOP).

No mention of how analysis of the monitoring data should be done was provided, if this will be presented in a later SOP, this should be noted.

7.3 Are plans for a regular review of data built in to the management and monitoring plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor	<input type="checkbox"/> 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:

Recommendations are made (section 4.2 of the main report) that support the process of reviewing data, and many of the individual monitoring methods include a review process. The report could perhaps be more explicit in stating the need for adaptive management.

Section 4.2 also explains the administrative structure for implementing the HCV management and monitoring recommendations. This division itself could undergo some process monitoring to track the resources needed to implement this plan in such a complex social and ecological environment. Such monitoring could use indicators such as budget, staff, trainings etc. This monitoring provides a proof of commitment to the issues which will be of interest to auditors.