

Responses to questions and comments raised during peer review by the Technical Panel of the HCV Resource Network of HCV full assessment report for PT PANP oil palm estate, West Kalimantan, performed by Daemeter Consulting.

Section No.	Section Name	Response
Intro	Overview	<p>Can any of the SOPs referred to throughout the report be made public?</p> <p>This is being discussed with the company to explore whether SOPs related to key management issues, such as land acquisition (FPIC), or HCV 5 and 6 definitive mapping, can be made available with the report. If permitted, copies of these SOPs will be made available with publication of the full report, or via Wilmar on request.</p>
1	Executive summary of the document	<p><u>Minor Issue:</u> Reviewers suggest moving copy of Table 8 in Chapter 4 (summary of management recommendations) to the Executive Summary. Daemeter Consulting (DC) agrees and copy of Table has been added to Executive Summary.</p>
2	Scope of the assessment	<p><u>Minor Issue a:</u> The map in Figure 8 has been changed to show the location of Tengue, Sejuet and four RT that were determined to be physically and functionally independent from their dusun.</p> <p><u>Minor Issue b:</u> We agree that we could have provided more detail in the original report and map (Figure 8), including points for every dusun in all desa with possible land claims in the license area - irrespective of location outside the license area - as well as for every physically disjunct RT in every dusun. In the future, this will be done at the dusun level, meaning locations of all dusun in a desa will be mapped directly using GPS. For RT, in the future we will continue to map locations of any RT that are physically separated from the main residential area of a dusun, noting that in remote rural areas it can be overly time consuming and not always practical (or relevant) to map</p>

PT PANP Peer Review by HCV Resource Network - Daemeter responses

Section No.	Section Name	Response
		<p>locations of every RT in each dusun. Instead, the emphasis should be on disjunct settlements independent of the main dusun, as we have done here. In the present case of PANP, we have added to Figure 8 the missing RT as noted in the peer review. We have also added the physical location of Desa Tengue, but not that of Desa Sejuet, because this desa was far beyond the border of the license area and could not be accessed via motorbike during pre-assessment of full assessment field visits. The nearest dusun of Sejuet (Beranga pale), however, situated nearly 2 km outside the license area is shown was surveyed and its location is shown on the map. Overall, we feel very confident that communities with possible land holdings in the license area have been well represented during the assessment. Dusun Jangkak is the one exception to this, because, as discussed in the main report, we were not permitted by residents to survey this dusun, due to a collective decision to reject oil palm and anything perceived to be connected with it, including (in the present case) our surveys. A resident from Dusun Jangkak did, however, attend the December 2009 public consultation of results from our field surveys, making them aware of HCVs and Wilmar's commitment to their management. The resident did not provide any negative feedback during this consultation (see further explanation of Dusun Jangkak inputs during public consultation as described in full report, Chapter 3).</p> <p><u>Minor issue c:</u> A short profile of Wilmar operations in West Kalimantan has been added to Section 2.1.2.</p> <p><u>Minor issue d:</u> Compensation for cleared areas. First, a correction. In the report reviewed by the Technical Panel, the Executive Summary correctly reported the total area cleared prior to HCV assessment as 310 ha, but in Chapter 2 of that same report we incorrectly reported this area as 1424 ha. The correct area is 310 ha, and this inconsistency</p>

Section No.	Section Name	Response
		has been corrected in the report. Second, a clarification. Land cover in the cleared areas was likely to be a mix of ladang, rubber plantations, secondary re-growth and possibly remnant natural forest. Specific land cover types cleared have not been verified, and thus potential HCV losses resulting from the 310 ha have not been quantified. It should be noted that in qualitative terms, HCV losses resulting from clearing this land cover mix would be lower than if the entire cleared area had been natural forest. When the RSPO creates a credible mechanism for quantifying past HCV losses and compensating for them, Wilmar will apply these methods and seek appropriate compensation.
3	Wider landscape context and significance of the assessed area	
	Wider landscape context and significance of the assessed area	<p><u>Minor Issue a:</u> Map in Figure 8 has been changed to show relevant human settlements (RT and Desa Tengue), as described in Section 2 above.</p> <p><u>Minor Issue b:</u> A description of RT in relation to desa and dusun was added to the report. It was decided to avoid using the terms 'pemukiman' and 'kampung' because of their imprecise meaning, preferring instead to use the official <i>desa</i>, <i>dusun</i> and <i>RT</i> descriptors in line with the Indonesian administrative structure.</p>
4	HCV assessment process including consultation process	
	4.2. Data sources and data collection methodologies	<p><u>Minor Issue a.</u> A section was added in Chapter 1 (Section 1.2.6) stating more explicitly limitations of data collection methods.</p> <p><u>Minor issue 1:</u> A clear effort was made to ensure that all settlements of a dusun were represented in the dusun level FGDs. As mentioned in the report, if we found that a particular group of people was not sufficiently represented, individual interviews were sought with</p>

PT PANP Peer Review by HCV Resource Network - Daemeter responses

Section No.	Section Name	Response
		<p>people in these groups to gather additional HCV5 and 6 data. It is also emphasized here, as throughout the report, that HCV 5 & 6 mapping are indicative, with clear instructions that the company will undertake definitive mapping of management areas for these HCVs using participatory methods, following a company SOP, which they have already been trained to use. The company SOPs outlining procedures for definitive mapping, as well as for land acquisition, should guard against unintentional conversion of HCV 5 & 6 areas that may have been missed by the assessment team during indicative mapping.</p> <p><u>Minor issue 2.</u> All dusun surveyed were located inside or adjacent to the license area, except one, as described in Attachment 6, because it refused being surveyed. These dusun were selected for survey based on (i) a map of the license area, (ii) information obtained from a field visit prior to full assessment, (iii) consultation with direct stakeholders during pre-assessment, and (iv) ground reconnaissance of a settlement map produced by Daemeter using aerial photography provided by wilmar. Direct stakeholders consulted during pre-assessment included the desa and dusun heads (kepala desa and dusun, respectively). The final decision on which villages outside the license areas to survey was made during primary data collection. Interviews were held with a village located on or near the border, and the next closest settlement outside of the license area, asking both if the more distant dusun owned or used land or other resources in the license area. Based on this final input, it was decided whether or not to do a full survey of a dusun outside of the license area. A description of this decision making process was added to the report in Section 1.2.5.</p> <p>In the interest of making this more explicit, the following villages are located outside of the license area but were surveyed by the assessment team: dusun Nabo (part of Desa Ampadi), dusun Berangan</p>

PT PANP Peer Review by HCV Resource Network - Daemeter responses

Section No.	Section Name	Response
		Pale (part of Sejuet), and dusun Singaraja and Tandil (part of Tengue). After surveying these dusun, the decision was made not to survey dusun further a field from the border, as these villages were determined to be too 'far' from the license area to have agricultural fields, communal property or land rights within the license area.
	4.3. Consultation processes	<u>Minor issue a:</u> As described above, individual interviews were held to supplement incomplete FGD data. On a few occasions, like dusun Padang Berangan and dusun Aja, it was difficult for some people from outer parts of a dusun to attend the FGD, because of heavy rain and steep, slippery, muddy roads. In these situations, where an FGD had limited attendance, data collected during the FGD were confirmed and clarified with individual interviews of other respondents whilst taking GPS points of HCV 5 and 6 locations the following day (for indicative mapping). In the areas surveyed for this assessment, people in one dusun know very well about locations of HCV 5 & 6 sites important not only for residents of their own dusun, but also for sites of other dusun in their desa, and even neighboring desa. So, the location names provided by the attendees was sufficient to take the survey team to these locations and interview other local residents at the same time, giving opportunity for identification of any missed sites. This rarely occurred, however, as local residents know the landscape very well, including what sites or (e.g.) tembawang belong to whom, and the status of different blocks of land.
5	Identification, location and status of each HCV	
	5.1. Data quality	<u>Minor issue a:</u> Jangkak One person from Jangkak attended the public consultation, and was in turn disappointed that the dusun did not accept the original offer to participate in the HCV assessment. The representative from Jangkak was enthusiastic about the approach, accepting it as a mechanism to

PT PANP Peer Review by HCV Resource Network - Daemeter responses

Section No.	Section Name	Response
		<p>protect their natural resources. During the public consultation HCV 5 & 6 locations for Jangkak were provided by name, but GPS coordinates were not taken. Wilmar has an SOP for participatory mapping and it is recommended in the report that Wilmar undertake definitive mapping all HCV 5 & 6 management areas with local communities prior to leasing any land or operating in an area. This would also hold true for Jangkak. A specific note has been added to the report requesting that Wilmar conduct indicative mapping in Jangkak as soon as possible if the community is willing to have such mapping conducted.</p> <p><u>Minor issue b:</u> An example of a sketch map has been added to the report in Chapter 3 (Figure 20).</p> <p><u>Minor issue c:</u> Additional village protected areas brought to attention of the assessment team during public consultation, or that could not be visited directly during the field survey (as listed in Appendix 3), will need to be mapped definitively by Wilmar, and added an HCVMA map. This recommendation is added to the management portion of Section 3.6.</p>

Section No.	Section Name	Response
	5.2. Reference to HCV toolkits	<p><u>Minor issue a:</u> Determining HCV, based on 50% threshold alone, or also including sustainability?</p> <p>Assigning a percentage of dependency with a community is a very tricky task. To promote consistent, in the present case a ten seed approach was used. The percentage shown in the main report reflects the level of dependency of people on <u>forest and other natural ecosystems</u> as well as on other sources for meeting basic needs. That is, if respondents said that 50% of a basic need was derived from forests, the remaining percentage (50%) implies the occurrence of one or more alternatives or substitutes. If they reported 100% dependency, this suggests they have only one source to meet that basic need. Evaluation of sustainability and availability of alternatives were also during data collection, with communities identifying trends in the resource availability. For example, timber harvest for building materials seemed to be sustainable, being harvested for local use and from large areas (Figure 9) with no large scale extraction within the license area. Wild caught meat was a different story. It was clear that populations of most species were in rapid decline and that the hunting rate is likely not sustainable. Protein from the forest was still considered to be HCV 5, however, because communities relied heavily on wild meat. Pending further data, it was decided as a precautionary measure to remain HCV5.</p> <p><u>Minor issue b:</u> Where is reference in Toolkit defining natural forest only as HCV5?</p> <p>Answer: Section 8.5.4 Mapping</p> <p>“It is important to emphasize that agricultural areas, such as rice fields and vegetable gardens, are not formally included as part of HCV</p>

Section No.	Section Name	Response
		<p>5. This said, the assessor is responsible for mapping not only HCVA 5 but also agricultural areas, because these areas are extremely important for meeting basic needs of local communities. They are not considered HCV 5 because such areas do not represent forest or other natural ecosystems as intended by HCV. Strictly speaking: An area mapped as community agricultural land does not constitute an HCV 5 area as defined in the Toolkit, but it is no less important for meeting basic needs than areas identified as HCV 5 and must also be accommodated in spatial planning by the MU.”</p> <p>In this assessment, agricultural areas are depicted in land cover maps as all non-forest areas (Figure 9), representing a combination of active and fallow (regenerating) land areas that are part of the swidden agricultural system used by locals residents, plus an unquantifiable portion of mapped secondary forest areas, which include rubber gardens and mature fallow. As a precautionary measure, one might assume all areas within the license that are not mapped as mature forest represent some form of agricultural land.</p>
	<p>5.3. Decision on HCV status</p>	<p>HCV 1 - Restricted range: For birds, a species with a historical breeding range of 50,000 km² or less (following Birdlife International’s definition). For mammals and other vertebrate, restricted range was defined as species endemic to the island of Borneo. For plants, species are considered restricted range first, if they are endemic to the Biogeographic sub-region of the assessment area, and secondarily if they are endemic to Borneo. This information is discussed in the attachments.</p> <p>HCV 5 - Further define <i>dependence</i> and percentages given? Discussed above in section 5.2. A stated dependency of 50% on forests means that on average residents of a given dusun (or RT if surveyed separately) derives 50% of their basic needs from the forest. Domestic</p>

Section No.	Section Name	Response
		animals/livestock raised in villages? Pigs and chicken were present as domestic livestock in these villages, but supplies from these sources were deemed insufficient for basic consumption, due to poor growth, low survivorship and theft.
	5.4. Mapping decisions	<p><u>Minor issue a:</u> Legend in Figure 20 has been changed.</p> <p><u>Minor issue b:</u> A note was added in legend in Figure 20 stating that HCV 5 and 6 areas surrounding Jangkak were not mapped.</p>
6	Management of HCVs	
	6.1 Assessment of threats or risks to each HCV within the landscape context	<p><u>Minor issue a:</u> A short description of targets for planting has been added in Section 2.1.2.</p> <p><u>Minor issue b:</u> No external threats to the HCVs present in the assessment area, beyond those implied by an oil palm license to the southeast (Figure 4), were discovered by the assessment team. The remote location and poorly accessible conditions of the area place it at lower risk for major development plans. For example: no large scale mining gas, oil or coal deposits are found in the area; and no major infrastructure developments are planned.</p>
	6.2 Are HCV management plans adequate?	<p><u>Minor issue a:</u> HCV 1.3. Agree that recommendations should prohibit all hunting of Sunda Pangolin and Straw-headed bulbul. Added to main report.</p> <p><u>Minor issue b:</u> HCV 4.2. The assessment team agrees that, in principle, to protect rivers and aquatic wildlife from erosion, it would be preferable for Wilmar to seek proactively to control erosion impacts of not only its own operations but also those resulting from shifting cultivation. The risk that passive protection address only one threat (Wilmar) and not the other (local communities) was noted by the</p>

PT PANP Peer Review by HCV Resource Network - Daemeter responses

Section No.	Section Name	Response
		<p>assessment team during the development of management recommendations. However, we opted for passive protection rather than active protection of these areas in recognition that Wilmar management will have limitations on how much they can control the spatial pattern of swidden agriculture. Also, seeking land use rights for such a large area (HCVA 4.2 = c. 4860 ha) would not only be excessively costly but also impossible to enforce. We have added a statement in Section 3.4.2 that to the maximum extent possible, as part of plans for broader community engagement, Wilmar should advise communities to avoid swidden agriculture on steep slopes and other areas deemed to have excessively high erosion risk.</p> <p><u>Minor issue c:</u> HCV 5 and 6 in Jangkak. guidance for company and precautionary principle. Added to management recommendations in Section 3.5 and 3.6 of the report.</p>
7	Monitoring of HCVs	
	7.2 Are monitoring plans adequate?	<p><u>Minor issue a:</u> As noted by the peer reviewer, recommended monitoring of HCVs 1.2 and 1.3 currently focus primarily on what the reviewer calls ‘process’ monitoring (implementation) and a loose combination of ‘impact’ and ‘condition’ monitoring. Main threats to HCV 1.2 plants are habitat loss, and to HCV 1.3 plants and animals are habitat loss and excessive hunting. So far, management recommendations address primarily habitat protection, and secondarily efforts to control hunting. Since, in the short term, it is unrealistic to imagine oil palm companies (including Wilmar) to develop the capacity for all forms of monitoring, we have recommended that Wilmar begin with monitoring activities to ensure implementation of habitat protection measures and measure the impact of these measures to protect habitat (i.e. monitor forest loss in areas delineated as HCVMA 1.2 and 1.3. In the medium term (12-18 months), we agree it is reasonable to expect Wilmar to develop a</p>

PT PANP Peer Review by HCV Resource Network - Daemeter responses

Section No.	Section Name	Response
		<p>capacity for more sophisticated target based monitoring of populations, but we see this as lower priority in the short term than the more daunting and urgent task of implementing management steps to protect these areas from continue further conversion by slash and burn and from excessive hunting. We have inserted the following paragraph in the report. “Over time, as Wilmar develops capacity and commitment to take one more challenging monitoring activities, it is recommended that Wilmar choose focal vertebrate species (and perhaps also plants) to experiment with alternative approaches for population level monitoring of target HCV1.3 species. This can use a combination of spatially explicit presence absence monitoring, as well as more sophisticated sampling techniques, commensurate with the human resources and data required. A reasonable target for developing such a program might be 12-18 months.”</p> <p><u>Minor issue b/c:</u> For both HCV 5 and HCV 6, an SOP has been developed which requires the Kepala Desa and Kepala Adat of each desa to host a village-based Focal Group Discussion, co-lea with Wilmar, to determine how these HCVs will be monitored and to identify the appropriate people to have involved in the monitoring. This has been made explicit in the report.</p> <p><u>Minor issue c:</u> The assessment team will recommend to Wilmar to include explicit directions for how to analyze results of monitoring activities in relation to each HCV. Such SOPs are still under development</p>
	<p>7.3 Are plans for a regular review of data built in to the management and monitoring plan?</p>	<p>The peer review recommends development of a monitoring protocol to evaluate growth and sufficiency of Wilmar’s administrative structure tasked with managing and monitoring HCVs at PANP. The assessment team agrees this is a very useful means for monitoring Wilmar’s commitment to developing capacity. It will be passed along to the</p>

PT PANP Peer Review by HCV Resource Network - Daemeter responses

Section No.	Section Name	Response
		company.