

HCSA Peer Review Report

Korindo - PT. Tunas Sawaerma (POP A) (PT. TSE)

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, BIOREF is a Registered Practitioner Organisation.
- b) Was the HCS Team Leader a Registered Practitioner?
 Yes, Ahmad Faisal Siregar led the assessment and is a registered practitioner.
- c) Were at least 2 HCS team members Registered Practitioners?
 Yes, Arif Prasetyo, M. is also a registered practitioner on the team.
- 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>).
 As of 26 January 2018, the HCV report is under the status **E/R1** – First resubmission being evaluated by the Quality Panel.

44	High Conservation Values in the area PT Tunas Sawa Erma (POP-A), Boven Digoel Regency – Papua Province, Indonesia	PT Tunas Sawa Erma POP-A	RSPO	Ahmad Faisal Siregar Provisional	23/05/2017	E/R1 With ALS since 15/1/2017
----	---	-----------------------------	------	---	------------	----------------------------------

Questions for peer reviewers
(Peer Review Panel: Michael Pescott, Mark Leighton)

1. Peer Review Summary

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

Finding and Recommendations:

- a) Further clarification of community village and use areas, particularly the two indigenous communities and the hunting areas. These are to be included in an integrated land use plan (with community agreements where necessary).
- b) The land cover class terms 'Scrub' and 'YRF' are used interchangeably without a clear rationale for whether HCS or not. It appears Scrub is more accurate than YRF, consistent with this area not being considered in the Patch Analysis - so this likely more a matter of clarification than major issue.

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

Finding and Recommendations:

Further details about the qualifications of each assessor are recommended, such as education, training and experience.

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 and Recommendations:

The recommendations in Section 10.3 and 10.4 are consistent with HCSA guidance for developing a final land use and conservation plan covering the key activities. The recommendations in this peer review should be addressed in developing the integrated land use and conservation plan.

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 and Recommendations:

Most of the FPIC process was conducted 10-20 years ago and appears to be adequate, in general. Mapped (Fig 8, Sec 3.2) location of two indigenous communities and lands (Bupitiri & Asiki) ‘adjacent’ (spelling correction from ‘adjected’) to the concession, and village Naga (Table 6), is recommended. Further clarity on the relationship between the clan ownership and “indigenous peoples” in table 2 (pg. 10) is also recommended in the integrated conservation land use plan.

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

Finding and Recommendations:

Tenure from 10-20 years since the plantation areas were established was explained. It’s recommended the report clarify if clan members maintain hunting rights within the concession in the integrated conservation land use plan.

- 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 and Recommendations:

It is recommended that village use areas within the concession area are clarified on a map. Figure 2 maps the planted areas and contains unplanted areas, both embedded within this planted block and in the northwest sector. Have these areas remained under management by the communities? HCV management areas are shown in Fig. 16, but surrounding these patches are additional unplanted areas - what is the status of these, and all the unplanted areas shown in Figure 11? Can these be used for hunting by clan members or nearby communities, for instance? Further clarification of this in the text and maps is recommended in the integrated conservation and land use plan.

- 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 and Recommendations:

Clarify if hunting of endangered species would be prohibited in these HCV1, 2 areas (section 10.3 could add a bullet point between points 7-8). Necessary management, monitoring and community agreements should be detailed in integrated conservation land use plan.

- 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 and Recommendations:

If the recommendations for 2.2-2.4 are addressed, this will be satisfied.

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

Finding and Recommendations:

No recommendation.

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 and Recommendations:

Table 7 could include the area (hectare) of each specific HCV location (all 14 in Table 6 of original summary report) and each could be identified on Map 9.

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 and Recommendations:

No recommendation.

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 and Recommendations:

Note that section 9.2 is titled “Comments on Decision Tree Outcome” and doesn’t address RBA assessments. However, examining these elements (referring to pg. 86 of the Toolkit) in the Public Summary, the reference documents consulted (pg. 5 & 6) and methods of conducting these were adequate, given this context: the remaining natural vegetation blocks and ecosystem elements (e.g., streams and wetlands) are relatively insignificant compared to large remaining blocks of these ecosystem and habitat mosaics elsewhere in the bioregion. The report then correctly indicates that although there are some HCV1 species occurring, these are not endemics limited to this specific area.

If this concession contained a more significant block of habitat, I would then argue that the report should provide a fuller list of HCV1 species, invoking the precautionary principle that many of these might occur even though not encountered in animal or plant samples or other data gathering (i.e., interviews).

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 and Recommendations:

For a summary this is adequate, given the full range of management activities need not be listed and explained, given the detail provided in the linked Public Summary document. Because these are either streamside HCV4 buffers or isolated blocks of habitat within the concession, and because protected areas or other likely important HCV areas are not adjacent to the concession, the latter question need not be addressed.

4. *Image Analysis*

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

Finding and Recommendations:

Yes, a georeferenced map with land cover type provided.

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

Finding and Recommendations:

Landsat 8 is the minimum level of resolution recommended and image date was within 12 months of the pre-assessment, although greater than 12 months for full assessment. No significant land cover change was reported between image dates. For future assessments aim for the image date to be within 12 months of the full assessment.

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 and Recommendations:

The area of Scrub in Table 8 (953ha) appears too high – if this includes all the area between plantation (e.g. roads) then these should be changed to plantation or open land. This could be an automation error.

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 and Recommendations:

Plots were 'purposefully' assigned rather than random or systematic. 14 plots were carried out which proved likely sufficient although in general additional plots are likely recommended to improve accuracy. Species information with 'Latin' name missing for many species.

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

Finding and Recommendations:

Yes. No recommendation.

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

Finding and Recommendations:

Kettering 2001 allometric was used which can be sufficient. Chave et al 2014 is often preferred in part because it can utilize height data collected. No recommendation.

- 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 and Recommendations:

Statistical analysis appears correct. 90% confidence limits obtained. Table does not report any Young Regenerating Forest (YRF) however Table 10 and 11 does, which I assume are meant to be Scrub rather than YRF. Table 11 description of land cover class could provide more information about species composition and ecological condition.

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 and Recommendations:

There is inconsistency in land cover classification between YRF, Scrub and Belukar. The light green in Figure 11 is Belukar while Table 10 and 11 does not include Scrub. In Figure 14 this light green area is called YRF, then non-HCS for patch analysis. Clarification and consistency of classification is recommended.

- 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 and Recommendations:

The YRF area identified in Figure 14 was not included in Patch Analysis and company/assessor feedback suggests this is considered non-HCS, which could be case (carbon value 27.6/ha), although further rational could be provided such as in Table 11 (YRF is a HCS class to be included in Patch Analysis according to the Toolkit if found).

- 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 and Recommendations:

No recommendation other than 6.2.

- 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 and Recommendations:

HCS patches were considered during the HCV study and will be conserved. No separate RBA was conducted.