

HCSA Peer Review Report

PT. Gemilang Makmur Subur (PT. GMS)

Background information:

- a) Did a Registered Practitioner Organisation lead the HCS assessment? If not, has the organisation which led the assessment started the process of registration?
Yes, Aksenta is a Registered Practitioner Organisation.
- b) Was the HCS Team Leader a Registered Practitioner?
Yes, Bias Berlio Pradyatma was the HCS Team Leader and a Registered Practitioner.
- c) Were at least 2 HCS team members Registered Practitioners?
Yes, Bias Berlio Pradyatma, Resit Sozer and Risa D Syarif are registered practitioners.
- d) Was the HCV assessment judged 'satisfactory' (highest rating) by the HCV Resource Network (HCVRN) Assessor Licensing Scheme (ALS)? (See <https://www.hcvnetwork.org/als/public-summaries>).
Yes: **Satisfactory 1** - Report has been found to be satisfactory at first submission, the case is closed and the Public Summary is available.

34	PT Gemilang Makmur Subur - Kecamatan Matan Hilir Utara, Kabupaten Ketapang, Kalimantan Barat, Indonesia	PT Gemilang Makmur Subur, PT GMS	RSPO NPP	Resit Sozer Fully licensed	15/09/2016	Satisfactory 1	Click here	25/10/2016
----	---	----------------------------------	----------	---	------------	----------------	----------------------------	------------

Questions for peer reviewers
(Peer Review Panel: Ihwan Rafina, Cynthia Chin)

1. Peer Review Summary

1.1. What are the major findings and recommendations from the peer review?

Finding:

Report structure – Final report structure already represents right content for each section.

Project descriptions – Descriptions already adequate.

Social Issues – The summary provides straight-to-the-point positive and negative impacts for the two villages relevant to the project area – Dusun Nek Dusun Doyan and Sepahan. The carrying out of FPIC processes has revealed that no conflict in land use exists in the project area. In addition, FPIC SOP were used based on RSPO.

Ecological and Conservation Values – Five HCVs were identified and assessed as present (HCVs 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6). However, no specifics were given as to why HCV 2 was not deemed present. Nor were there any mention of main threats to the HCVs or a summary of key management prescriptions.

Landcover Analysis – Landcover analysis methodology already adequate. Clarification regarding used dataset and detail methodology as additional information can be used for future HCS assessment.

HCS - Estimation of average carbon value lower than other relevant HCS study in the region (West Kalimantan), mainly for YRF and LDF carbon value. Company already provided additional clarification for carbon value classification that can be used for future HCS assessment.

Patch Analysis – Patch Analysis steps already represents the requirements of the with the toolkit.

Indicative Land Use Plan - Final land use plan already provided for further development, with information from FPIC and GRTT documentation, also with manageable action plan recommendation.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

1.2. Did the HCS assessment team include or have adequate access to relevant expertise to undertake the HCS assessment?

Finding:

Yes, the HCS assessment was conducted by an adequate team from Aksenta (registered HCS assessor organizations).

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

1.3. What elements of the HCS Approach still need to be completed in order to create a final land use and conservation plan? Are there aspects which you feel need to be re-done?

Finding:

With lack of information from community land use right through Participatory Mapping (PM) activity, the final land use and conservation plan still needs to be completed.

However, in the final summary report the company has already provided additional manageable action plan timeline and the proposed final land use plan considered completed based on information from HCV/HCS assessment including additional information from FPIC and GRTT documentation.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

2. *Social Issues*

2.1. Does the summary provided in Section 3.1 adequately represent and explain the community engagement, FPIC processes, and participatory mapping activities carried out?

Finding:

Yes. The summary provided straight-to-the-point of positive and negative impacts for the two villages relevant to the project area – Dusun Nek Dusun Doyan and Sepahan. A plantation partnership existed between the company and Nek Doyan, and had provided income to a significant portion of the community. A short description of the nature of the partnership between the communities and the company was also provided for clarification and background. The company provided employment to villagers in the area. In addition to that, local communities had been identified to interact closely with the land, using forest products and cultivating the land for basic needs. The only risk was from a few villagers who did not approve of the company’s operations and closing of operations, which affected 488 temporary workers and posed a great loss to their income. The carrying out of FPIC processes revealed that no conflict in land use existed in the project area. In addition, FPIC SOP were used based on RSPO.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

2.2. Has a tenure study been completed and has it been vetted by independent social experts?

Finding:

The SIA report did not mention carrying out a tenure study during the assessment period per se, though the reason why was mentioned. However, the need for reviewing and monitoring the history of tenureship was listed as a part of recommendation No. 9. The SIA report also included a section on the legal categories of the plantation area and the plantation partnership with local communities.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

2.3. Is there a participatory land use map and does it contain the key components of community land use including the minimum requirement of 0.5 ha per person for future garden areas?

Finding:

No participatory land use map was provided in the SIA nor the mention of 0.5ha for future garden areas. However the reason why was mentioned in the executive summary (p. 34). There was only mention of partnership benefits and an approximate 0.3ha of oil palm per pax developed so far under the current partnership. The report mentioned that the FPIC process was carried out, along with dialogue and participatory engagement with local communities.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

- 2.4. Is there a record of consultation with affected communities and FPIC processes on the proposed development, the HCS Approach and issues/concerns they raised? Did the community nominate their own representatives?

Finding:

Yes. FPIC and consultation were done with the two villages identified in the project site, using RSPO and ISPO guidances. Various approaches were used, including from existing literature and secondary data, dialogues, field observation, in-depth interviews and triangulation of the different approaches to verify the issues, opinions and ideas emerging from the processes.

Reviewers Recommendation:

Sections relevant to 2.4 were clearly iterated. No foreseeable improvements needed.

- 2.5. Were their views addressed and reflected in the plans and implementation of the plantation? Is there specific reference to the customary owners being made aware that they can say no to the development and they have the right to independent legal representation with regard to their agreements before they sign (to meet the 'prior informed' test)?

Finding:

Syntheses of the different forms of engagement were discussed and reviewed in various forms, including the benefits, risks and threats of the plantation from the social perspective. It can be devised that without the use of this information, it would not be possible to develop the final recommendations.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

- 2.6. What recommendations do you have for any improvements regarding community consultation and negotiation of Free, Prior and Informed Consent?

Finding:

FPIC and the guidances used to apply the process were clearly mentioned in the report. There was no indication as to whether the use of FPIC came across any problems or challenges when implemented on the ground. FPIC documentation and the documentation of consent was provided in the HCS Identification Report.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

3. Ecological and Conservation Values

- 3.1. Does the summary provided in Section 4.1 of the Summary Report adequately represent the findings of the HCV study?

Finding:

Somewhat lacking in a few clarifying details initially. Five HCVs were identified and assessed as present (HCVs 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6). However, no specifics were given as to why HCV 2 was not deemed present. Nor were there any mention of main threats to the HCVs or a summary of key management prescriptions. The section makes reference to Figure 3.2. However, this figure number is not in the summary.

However, elaboration on the result of the HCV assessment is provided in the summary report, with reason why HCV 2 was not deemed present, main threats and key management prescriptions (Page 12).

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

- 3.2. If the HCV assessment was not judged satisfactory (highest rating) by the ALS scheme of the HCVRN (as noted in the introductory information from the HCS Secretariat – please see page one of this document), please do a cursory review of the HCV report as it relates to HCVs 1-4. Do you have any general comments on the quality of the site description, the analysis of the landscape and national or regional context, or the methods used to undertake the HCV study? Were the determinations of the absence/presence and extent of HCVs 1-4 well-justified? Are the HCV management and monitoring maps accurate?

Finding:

This HCV assessment was judged satisfactory (Satisfactory 1) by the HCVRN, and the public summary has been made available.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

- 3.3. Please review Section 9.2 of the Summary Report. Was the methodology used for the Pre-RBA and the Rapid Biodiversity Assessments (if any) satisfactory? Did the RBA(s) reveal any significant biodiversity values that should have been captured in either the HCV assessment but were not, or warrant protection?

Finding:

The pre-RBA and RBA were based on the HCV findings. The summary states that the methods were detailed in the full report. However, there still needs to be a simplified mention of methods used in the summary. Further, while it mentions that most of the conservation regions cover water or river areas and floodplains, it fails to mention the presence (or absence) of species listed in IUCN's Red List or any other species of national or local importance. The reviewer assumed that both pre-RBA and RBA were done based on Section 9.2. However, recommendations

to beef up this section with more information on the methods has been taken up by the company and will be elaborated further in the final amended version.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

3.4. Are the forest conservation management and monitoring activities outlined in Section 10.3 adequate? Do they take into account forests and protected areas outside the concession?

Finding:

Yes, forest conservation management and monitoring activities are outlined in the elaboration of RBA assessments in the Summary Report, including mentioning that RBA would be used to identify important wildlife species and conducted through integration with conservation areas management and monitoring by both the company and communities.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

4. Image Analysis

4.1. Please review Section 6.1 of the Summary Report. Was the Area of Interest correctly identified?

Finding:

Yes. AOI has identified 1km buffer outside concessions boundary.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

4.2. Please review Section 6.2 of the Summary Report. Were the images used of adequate quality, including resolution and date?

Finding:

Landsat imagery mainly used to conduct vegetation analysis with adequate quality, although based on summary report and full HCS report there is a difference in terms of Landsat date acquisition (September 2016 and September 2015). It also mentioned the use of high resolution images from Google Earth database, although there is no exact date and Hi-res imagery information. Also mentioned in the summary report is the use of UAV imagery captured from November 2016 (in Northern part of concessions) to add more details on vegetations classifications. Combination of those imageries is a good option in order to have more accurate classifications. But, it's not clearly mentioned in the report regarding the methodology on how to use the combination of those imageries.

However, in the final summary report the company already expanded information regarding image analysis methodology.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

4.3. Please do a quality check using the images provided in 6.3. Was the initial vegetation classification done properly? Do the land cover areas in the tables in Section 6 look reasonable? Are there any obvious errors in classification?

Finding:

The information seemed to be different between initial vegetation shared in spatial database (landcover shp) and the information in the report, more clarifications and additional appropriate dataset are needed to conduct more reviews. Although the visual classification and the imagery has already captured adequate delineation for each different stratification.

However, based on updated provide dataset in the final report, the initial vegetation already captures adequate classification.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

5. Forest Inventory

- 5.1. Please review Sections 7.1 and 7.2 of the Summary Report. Were the sample plots selected, set up, and measured properly? Please check the inventory plot layout for adequacy.

Finding:

Sample plot selected with stratified random sampling and adjust with condition in the field. It is a common practice that expert usually done in order to capture more proportional locations. Number plot already set up properly according to size of area for each class vegetations. But, looking on the plot locations there are several plots located near in the edge of the patch. It will affect the carbon value measurement. *However, the company has already re-checked plot information for further others HCS assessment in the future.*

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

- 5.2. Please review Section 7.3 of the Summary Report. Was the forest inventory team qualified?

Finding:

Generally, this HCS assessment is conducted with adequate expertise. But in section 7.3 it did not initially mention the forest inventory team composition and role for each inventory personnel. *However, the company has already elaborated the role of forest inventory team in the updated report.*

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

5.3. Please review Section 7.4 of the Summary Report. Was the allometric chosen adequate?

Finding:

In section 7.4, it does not mention regarding the chosen allometric for carbon estimations, but rather describes the methodology for forest sampling inventory. However, in HCS Full Report it is known that allometric equation is chosen based on specific species found in the inventory, there is also no further information to show each allometric uses for calculation.

However, the company has already expanded information for chosen allometric in the updated Summary Report.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

5.4. Please review Sections 7.5, 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 of the Summary Report, and do a cursory review of the forestry data and statistical analysis. Are there any obvious errors in the raw forestry data? Are there any flags where a result does not seem consistent with your rough interpretation of the land cover image? Do the final carbon classes seem accurate given what is known about other forests in the region?

Finding:

Section 7.5 only describes the carbon stock calculation based on IPCC ration.

Section 7.6 shows documentation for each class vegetation (LDF, YRF, S, OL).

Section 7.7 describes carbon estimation based on Brown (1997) and IPCC factor.

Section 7.8 shows summary statistic average carbon value for HCS classes, it's found that the estimation of average carbon value lower than other relevant HCS study in the region (West Kalimantan).

However, the company had already provided additional information in final Summary Report.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

6. Land use planning

- 6.1. Please review Section 8.1 of the Summary Report. Was the initial vegetation classification map adequately calibrated and adjusted to take into account forest inventory results?

Finding:

Section 8.1 only initially showed the re-defined vegetation classes without further information on how and where the adjustment occurs based on field survey and carbon value estimations.

However, the company has expanded information for adequate calibration between vegetation classification and forest inventory result.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

- 6.2. Please review Section 9 of the Summary Report. Was participatory mapping data used in step one to identify community lands that should be enclaved? Were patches merged correctly? Was the core area correctly identified? Was the connectivity analysis done correctly?

Finding:

Section 9 shows recapitulation table for patch analysis process for each patch, it identifies core area and connectivity between patches but no information regarding community land use was included in the initial report.

However, additional information has now been provided regarding community lands used for patch analysis from FPIC process and GRTT documentation.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.

- 6.3. Please review Section 9 of the Summary Report, and select a few sample patches to test that the Decision Tree was used correctly. Were the patches correctly identified as High, Medium, or Low Priority? Was the Patch Analysis done according to the HCS Approach Decision Tree?

Finding:

Based on random review on patch analysis spatial datasets, it is known that the major step in the HCS toolkit is followed.

Reviewers Recommendation:

No further recommendation, except if the vegetation class changes due to adjustment, as of section 6.1 recommendation, then the company needs to re-do the patch analysis process.

- 6.4. Please review Sections 10.1 and 10.2 of the Summary Report. Were the final integrated conservation and land use planning steps completed to maximize the ecological and social viability of the conservation areas (HCV, HCS, peatland, riparian zones, customary forest, etc)? Were the results of the final ground verification (if any) adequately incorporated into the land use plan and final HCS map?

Finding:

Section 10.1 does not show detailed information regarding the integration between HCV, HCS and other aspect. It also contains map showing the conservation and potential development. Ground verification has not been conducted yet. However, it mentions that the final land use map will overview in further discussion with community after compensation process is completed, and company and community will collaborate to make proper land use plan in the future.

However during the final review, additional information regarding integration of conservation area was already been provided in summary report.

Reviewers Recommendation:

N/A.