

## HCSA Peer Review Report

### DSN Group – PT. Mitra Nusa Sarana (MNS)

#### Background information:

a) Did a Registered Practitioner Organisation lead the HCS assessment? If not, has the organization which led the assessment started the process of registration?

Yes, Ata Marie is a Registered Practitioner Organisation.

b) Was the HCS Team Leader a Registered Practitioner?

Yes, Alex Thorpe lead the assessment and is a registered practitioner.

c) Were at least 2 HCS team members Registered Practitioners?

Yes, the registered practitioners on the team include Alex Thorpe, George Kuru, Dadan Setiawan and Dadi Ardiansyah.

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>).

According to the HCVRN ALS website, the report evaluation by Quality Panel is underway.

|    |  |                      |          |   |            |                                   |
|----|--|----------------------|----------|---|------------|-----------------------------------|
| 79 | High Conservation Value (HCV) PT Mitra Nusa Sarana Sintang District West Kalimantan, Indonesia | PT Mitra Nusa Sarana | RSPO NPP | <a href="#">Sigit Bhudi Setyanto</a><br>Provisional | 28/09/2017 | E/R1<br>With ALS since 22/03/2018 |
|----|--|----------------------|----------|---|------------|-----------------------------------|

**Questions for peer reviewers**  
**(Peer Review Panel: Neville Kemp, Cynthia Chin)**

**1. Peer Review Summary**

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

**Finding:**

Overall a very reasonable report, and majority of initial findings have been resolved. The final product (ICLP) is not questioned is of high quality.

**Major Findings**

1.Information about a tenure study vetted by experts needs additional explanation in the participatory mapping section about how and when it will be done and what the aim of this step is in the context of a HSC study. The company have provided the following information was included regarding land tenure - Most land is controlled by individuals and family groups. A total of 1,293ha of communal forest land has been identified. Land tenure data was collected during various community engagement events, but has not been vetted.

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

**Finding:**

Yes. The Ata Marie Team have carried out HCSA as registered Practitioners and has held certification since 2015.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

The team has a lot of experience and that is evident when reading the report.

- 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:**

No steps need to be re-done. All initial findings have been resolved adequately to pass a HSC review, however, information on tenure is still noted.

## 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 objectives of the community engagement were clearly stated. Activities were planned to achieve the objectives and included planning, initial socialisation, phased field work, participatory mapping and focus groups on a set of target audiences that included local authorities, community leaders, youth, women, farmers and general community members. The initial site visits of both HCS and HCV assessments overlapped, so some of the initial socialisation was carried out together by both teams conducting the two assessments.

The sentiments of the participants were heard and people were given the opportunity to express their opinions. Descriptions of focus group discussions (FGDs) and participatory mapping were clear and detailed, with a caveat that MNS needs to develop further procedures for improving and updating the dataset.

A total of 2.2% of the population in the nine impacted villages attended the final consultation sessions. Consideration and effort were put into ensuring the presence of identified landowners.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

N/A

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

**Finding:**

Neither the HCS Summary nor the SIA report mentions the carrying out of a tenure study during the assessment period. Any mention of tenure is only with regards to MNS and the legality of the development.

However, some information was included regarding land tenure. Most land is controlled by individuals and family groups. A total of 1,293ha of communal forest land has been identified. Land tenure data was collected during various community engagement events, but has not been vetted.

**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:**

Yes. Participatory mapping approaches were clearly described, with full involvement of community representatives, and areas to be included/excluded as per requested by the communities. Community land use maps are provided as supplemental information.

**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:**

Communities appear to be well represented, from village elders/heads to youth, women, farmers and so forth. FPIC processes were obvious and present, and community viewpoints were heard. It was not stated whether communities nominated their own representatives, but in general, it is accepted that when village heads and elders are present, they are the accepted representatives of their communities.

Recommendations from the findings also point towards active engagement with communities, focussing on plasma (partnership) programmes, and support for cultural and other social-themed programmes.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

N/A

- 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:**

Yes. Community views were considered and reflects in the recommendations, with considerations also from the SIA report. No specific reference was made with regards to customary owners being made aware that they can disagree with the development and have the right to independent legal representation. Communities were also made aware of their right to not release land if they so choose.

**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:**

Overall, this section is clear and well written, with good descriptions of engagement, perspectives and recommendations. FPIC processes were clearly implemented and due thought was given to the overall social context of the development.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

Beyond what has been recommended above, the reviewer has no further additions to this section.

### 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.** The HCV assessment was carried out by PT Remark Asia, who has delivered a final draft report that is currently undergoing peer review under the ALS system.

The report identified a total HCV area of 2,233ha, allowing for overlaps between individual HCVs. A summary of these is listed in Table 7. All HCVs were assessed to be present except for HCV 2. HCV 6 is potentially present.

The HCV report is still being peer reviewed. The final draft HCV report has been through one round of peer review in late 2017 (result - unsatisfactory) and was edited and resubmitted to HCVRN in January 2018.

A summary of HCV results is presented. Would be enhanced if a table of recommendations could be inserted – but not mandatory.

**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:**

Please see findings and recommendations under 3.1 (above). A brief review of the HCV assessment draft report was done. Site descriptions appear adequate, with supporting good resolution maps and photos. However, Kalimantan is not an island but is an Indonesian state on the island of Borneo (P. 9 of HCV report). More detail could be added on the regional context, especially with reference to biodiversity hotspots, IUCN significance and important bird areas, if possible. This was mentioned in the introductory part of the report but not in the section for regional and national context. The area is near to the Heart of Borneo and intact forest landscape, although not technically inside. All HCVs were deemed present except for HCV 2 (and 6 was potentially present). In the case of HCV 2, the area was deemed too degraded and outside of key biodiversity areas and did not have signs of previously present species such as orangutans.

**Reviewers Recommendation (for additional steps):**

- Correct the statement that PT MNS is on 'Pulau Kalimantan' (P.9).
- On regional context, add on significant biodiversity and bird areas.
- For the absence of HCV 2, a caveat should be considered, where any occurrence or signs of endangered species such as orangutans were to be found, the area should be re-evaluated for HCVs and managed as part of a multiple use larger landscape.

These are meant for the HCV consultants. The company will redirect the above points to them accordingly.

- 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:**

Patch analysis based on Chapter 6 of the HCS toolkit was carried out and findings reflected that 372ha in the project area where Pre-RBA assessment was carried out is recommended for conservation due to its proximity to rivers, streams and swamp areas. After re-stratification, a total of 1,907ha was recommended for conservation. The procedure for the patch analysis done is deemed adequate.

**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:**

A conservation and management plan was recommended to be developed and implemented. This is key to maintaining HCS and HCV areas. Deforestation as a risk was considered as well for management and mitigation potential. The goal to maintain and where needed, enhance, areas for conservation is a good one, especially for carbon stock maintenance. Participatory management and monitoring approaches were also recommended. This is important for the inclusion of local communities and garnering their support and involvement as management partner.

**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 and Reviewers Recommendation:**

The toolkit recommends an area of at least 1km outside of the concession to be taken into account. The report now includes imagery of the landscape surrounding the concession in Section 5.5. There is only very limited connectivity to forest areas bordering MNS. Large forest areas are all located 3km or more from the MNS boundary. Forest areas to the south are the closest, but they are separated from MNS by a large area of palm oil plantation. This is unlikely not affect any smaller patches of forest inside the concession that are linked to these areas and should be conserved.

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

**Finding:** Yes.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

No issues with date of acquisition, resolution or quality.

- 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:** Yes.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

A map of the initial draft land cover has been included in Section 5.5 along with the final map. Area by vegetation class before field assessment has been added to area table in Section 6.6.

This looks accurate from a cursory check on vegetation classes. No obvious error encountered.

## 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:** Yes.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

A very reasonable spread of samples locations were chosen that effectively represented the 5 land use classes (open land, Small holders, Scrub, YRF and Forest). These were measured properly and adequately.

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

**Finding:** Yes.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

No issues with carbon inventory team.

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

**Finding:** Yes.

**Reviewers Recommendation:** No recommendations.

- 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:**

Yes.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

The assessors and company have answered all initial comments satisfactorily.

**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:** Yes.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

A map of the initial draft land cover has now been included in Section 5.5 along with the final map and shapefiles.

It was accepted the changes made from the initial map to the pre Pre-RBA map were made based on both inventory results and Participatory Mapping field checks. Changes were made across most land cover strata. The assessor states that the major change was 8700 ha being moved from Mixed Agriculture into open land and scrub that had no impact on HCS.

Changes made from the pre Pre-RBA map to the final (post Pre-RBA map) were made based on Pre-RBA field check findings (see separate Pre RBA report submitted on SharePoint). These changes were mostly from YRF/Forest into Mixed Agriculture and tembawang.

- 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:**

Yes

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

Community lands incorporated properly, including Tembawang and areas for food security but see comment on patch / Tembawang below 6.3.

- 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:**

Yes

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

Note to the HCSA SC. Reports would benefit from map of all stages in the decision tree being shown to show the progression of exclusion of patches from HCS. This has been included in shapefiles but for accessibility in the report would benefit non-GIS proficient readers and increase understanding of the process of patch analysis.

Ata Marie have chosen to include HCV in the initial stages of the patch analysis which is useful.



The results in the Patch Analysis Results Prior to Pre-RBA and RBA (2,242 ha) exceeds the potential area identified in the initial vegetation classification (section 6.6; Table 9 = 1,907 hectares). The inclusion of the initial vegetation analysis and field work shows there has been calibration and capture of all HCS areas and correct application of the patch analysis process.

The RBA identified areas for conservation and those used by the community. There was no need for a RBA. One patch checked in the report (ID 130) was included in Tembawang under the HCS summary report but included as Non HCS (Rekomendasi Pengembangan). This area should not be developed as oil palm as it is clearly used by the community. Yes, not a HCS, but also not for development. Need to make sure of consistency between the two reports.

- 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:** Yes.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

The ICLP presented the optimal pattern for land use in this highly fragmented landscape. The areas identified between HCS and GCV are complementary that gives rise the maximum possible ecological viability under current (and rapidly changing) circumstances in the land use plan. The social work has identified areas for future development that include large areas of forest / YRF as well as existing tembawang and rice fields, as well as the already extensive smallholder areas (mostly rubber and some pepper). There is no evidence for final ground verification per se. but the assessors have carried out extensive social work, ground truthing and carbon stock sampling, Pre-RBAs analysis and consultations of the final ICLP that is considered adequate by the assessors.