

# HIGH CARBON STOCK APPROACH

HCSA PEER REVIEW REPORT

*Company Name: Bumitama's subsidiary*  
*HCS Assessment Area: PT. Damai Agro Sejahtera*  
*Date Published: 3 April 2019*

## 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, Bias Berlio Pradyatma is a registered practitioner under the Registered Practitioner Organisation of Aksenta.

**b) Was the HCS Team Leader a Registered Practitioner?**

Yes, the HCS team leader - Bias Berlio Pradyatma is a Registered Practitioner.

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

Yes, both Bias Berlio Pradyatma and Ryan Karida Pratama are Registered Practitioners of Aksenta.

**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>).**

No, the report evaluation by Quality Panel is still underway. However, the assessor Pak Nandang Mulyana already has two (2) HCV reports with Satisfactory result status in HCVRN ALS.

## High Conservation Value PT Damai Agro Sejahtera, Kabupaten Ketapang – Provinsi Kalimantan Barat, Indonesia

Assessor: Nandang Mulyana

### General Info

Report Type: HCV Assessment  
Country: Indonesia  
Evaluation Status: On-track  
Organisation commissioning assessment: BGA Group  
Purpose of assessment: RSPO New Planting

### First Submission

Date of submission: June 6, 2018  
Date evaluation results sent to Assessor: December 6, 2018  
Submission evaluation result: Unsatisfactory

---

### First Re-Submission

Date received from assessor: January 29, 2019  
Date evaluation results sent to assessor: March 12, 2019  
Evaluation result:

## Questions for peer reviewers

*(Peer Review Panel: Neville Kemp)*

### 1. Peer Review Summary

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

##### **Finding:**

There are several significant findings that need to be corrected.

##### **Reviewers Recommendation:**

1. FPIC, tenure mapping and participatory mapping. The assessor needs to show the efforts by the company to engage, map tenure and areas that are clearly used / not used by the community. The HCS and HCV report state that the areas of forest and concessions to be developed were not used or owned but offer to evidence of this. Also, the assessors need to justify why sampling was done after FPIC with communities (not Prior).
2. Patch analysis needs to re-do following the steps as laid out in the toolkit. This may alter the RBA patches that need to be evaluated through a pre-RBA process (separate report should be provided if there are any potential RBA patches). This will also affect the final land use map.
3. Conservation Plan. Provide much more detail for conservation actions and priorities based on the final land use map.

##### **Company Responses:**

1. More comprehensive elaboration in the Section 3.1. will be provided.
2. Patch analysis will be redone accordingly with amendment of HCV Report during the evaluation process in the HCVRN.
3. Detailed recommendations on management and monitoring plan for the conservation area will be provided.

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

**Finding:**

HCS team leader in charge of patch analysis conducted the patch analysis incorrectly and cast shade on the relevant expertise of the HCS team. No information about the team's expertise is available in the report or SIA report. The HCV report contain some information about two members of the team but does not describe their capabilities in terms of HCS.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

Please insert short summaries of Team member's expertise in an Appendix including which HCS training the team members have attended on assessment that they have completed satisfactorily.

**Company Responses:**

Summary of team members in the HCSA Assessment has been provided.

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:**

Social Issues and Patch analysis.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

Please see comment throughout this review document.

## 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:**

Adequate for HCS report.

**Company Responses:**

It is acknowledged that the first version of the summary report and the full report does not provide documentation of the activities in the social study. Documentations of meetings, discussion, and participatory mapping will be provided in the summary report and full report.

**Final Reviewers Comments:**

The updated HCV and HCS reports (only summary checked in final peer review) detail the efforts the assessors went to engage communities and carry out participatory mapping. Results of this work have been included in the HCS results.

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

**Finding:**

Yes. Information on the Satlak was provided and GRTT used as confirmation of village level tenure.

**Company Responses:**

Company has conducted participatory mapping to identify and map community's land with a vetted process by special taskforce called Satlak. The Satlak (satuan pelaksana: implementation unit) comprised of representation of the community and village officials. More elaboration in the implementation of participatory mapping by Company and verification process by assessor will be provided.

**Final Reviewers Comments:**

No additional comment.

- 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:**

Participatory maps have been provided and evidence that they were used in the assessment.

**Final Reviewers Comments:**

No additional comment.

- 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:**

Some. The communities did not raise any objections.

**Company Responses:**

It is acknowledged that the list of meetings (in order to FPIC) presented in the report is limited to the formal meeting, which was held in the middle of the assessment period.

Communities and village officials have been met prior to the field survey to inform the visit of the assessment team, introduce the team and to inform about the assessment. The initial engagements were also intended to deliver the formal invitation for the communities and village officials to the formal meeting (which is listed in the report).

It is acknowledged the whole process and FPIC for the assessment is not well documented in the report. However, attendance and participation show that the attendee accepts the assessments and willing to contribute in the consultation process.

More detailed documentation of the engagements with the community will be provided.

**Final Reviewers Comments:**

The updated report details the community engagement process, and though to be adequate for HCS assessments.

- 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:**

Adequate.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

Some community views about development are stated – where they were generally in favour. The views of land owners that have developed their own Oil Palm have been heard and excluded from HCS and OP Development.

There was no information regarding the presence of legal representation, nor the communities waiving of that right.

**Company Responses:**

More comprehensive elaboration and documentations explaining the FPIC process conducted by company and its verification by assessor will be provided.

**Final Reviewers Comments:**

From the information provided, the prior informed consent of communities can be stated with 100% certainty although no objections were raised. The process is thought to be adequate for FPIC for conservation areas delineated through HCS approach.

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

**Finding:**

Addressed.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

No further comment.

### 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:**

Yes.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

No recommendations beyond including data / summaries when the final HCV document has been approved by the ALS QP.

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:**

HCV Report MUCH IMPROVED and satisfactory in my humble opinion.

**Company Responses:**

More comprehensive elaboration and justification of the decision in the HCV assessment will be provided along with the amendment as per the recent version of the HCV report.

**Final Reviewers Comments:**

HCV Findings, Maps and recommendation complement fully the HCS assessment and results. Nice HCV report.



- 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:**

RBA for patches was not needed as the potential HCS patches identified were connected to high priority patches of HCS.

**Company Responses:**

Patch analysis has been redone accordingly with the recent HCV Report, causing there is no remaining medium and low priority patches which would require Pre-RBA and RBA.

Amendment to the patch analysis process and discussion of the patch analysis will be made.

**Final Reviewers Comments:**

The patch analysis was carried out very well and resulted in no need for RBA analysis.

- 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, and HCV recommendation take into account the areas outside the concession.

**Company Responses:**

More detailed recommendations on conservation management and monitoring plans will be provided as per the amendment of the decisions from the patch analysis.

**Final Reviewers Comments:**

Integration between HSC and HCV has been accomplished with very clear and reasonable conservation recommendations set forth.

#### 4. Image Analysis

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

**Finding:**

The AOI was well identified.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

None.

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

**Finding:**

Good. Images were up-to-date and of good quality.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

None.

- 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:**

Very Good.

**Company Responses:**

Gambar 8 shows initial classification before sampling was conducted. Table 5 shows the refined classification (after sampling) which correspond to map on Gambar 9. It is acknowledged that the presentation is not in well flowing process. More elaboration of the land cover classification process will be provided.

**Final Reviewers Comments:**

No Comment. Very good analysis of initial vegetation classes.

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:**

All issues resolved. Good forest inventory design.

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

**Finding:**

Yes.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

None.

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

**Finding:**

Very well justified.

**Company Responses:**

Justification of selection of allometric equation will be provided.

**Final Reviewers Comments:**

No more comment. Good justification and understanding of issues with allometric equations.

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:**

No obvious errors / no red flags identified. The results of the classification of forest from field sampling are well aligned and consistent with initial vegetation classifications. The carbon stock does seem to be low in general, although this may be a characteristic of the area.

**Reviewers Recommendation:**

None.

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.

**Company Responses:**

Shapefile of the initial classification will be provided.

**Final Reviewers Comments:**

The final land cover map is calibrated very well.

- 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:**

Very Good.

**Company Responses:**

Patch analysis has been redone in corporation with the updates of the HCV report.

**Final Reviewers Comments:**

The patch analysis has been correctly, taking into account the community areas, core areas and connectivity.

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:**

Good.

**Company Responses:**

Attributes for each step of the decision tree will be provided.

**Final Reviewers Comments:**

The patch analysis has been correctly, and all patches identified for conservation as per toolkit.

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:**

Very clear.

**Company Responses:**

Both documents will be amended correspondingly in corporation with all updates and revisions.

**Final Reviewers Comments:**

Excellent integration between HSC and HCV. The two approaches complement and support one another.