

HIGH CARBON STOCK APPROACH

HCSA PEER REVIEW REPORT

Company Name: Koperasi Harapan Sejahtera Bersama
HCS Assessment Area: Kebun Kemitraan PT. Jabontara Eka Karsa
Date Published: 3 May 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, Remark Asia is a Registered Practitioner Organisation which lead the HCS assessment.

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

Yes, Cecep Saepulloh whom is the HCS Team Leader is a Registered Practitioner.

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

Yes, both Cecep Saepulloh and Dian Pratiwi 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>).**

The HCV report of PT. Jabontara Eka Karsa is currently at its First Re-Submission stage with HCVRN ALS. However, the HCV report is currently being reviewed by a licensed assessor (Cecep Saepulloh) (with at least two HCV reports rated as Satisfactory in HCVRN ALS), therefore we proceed with the HCSA peer review process (i.e. not have to wait for the results of HCVRN ALS).

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:

In general, the HCS assessment (including FPIC and HCV integration) was well implemented. A solid report with sufficient supporting and complementary data provided for conservation of HCS forests.

Reviewers Recommendation:

1. Data for the forest inventory (tree measurements and carbon calculations) and participatory mapping (shapefile) are needed for the review to be completed.
2. There are inconsistencies between HCS areas reported in the report and registration sheet.
3. The FPIC process and its' aims under this integrated assessment are unclear.

Company Responses:

1. The data have been provided.
2. Inconsistencies have been checked and corrected.
3. Information about FPIC process has been reviewed and add some information needed. Report of FPIC in detail is in separated report.

Final Reviewers Recommendation:

There is still a minor disparity between the HCV areas reported in the HCS report and HCV report available at the time of final review. This may be due to an updated HCV report that was unavailable to the review at final review. Note that no further changes are needed in the HCS report.

Tenure maps have not been provided.

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

Finding:

Yes.

Reviewers Recommendation:

No recommendation.

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 elements need to be completed, although the company could make available tenure maps as and when final. The HCS Assessment can be considered complete and the HCS conservation plan final.

Company Responses:

Data needed have been provided and uploaded to SharePoint.

Final Reviewers Recommendation:

No sections require to be re-done.

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.

Reviewers Recommendation:

The FPIC process of both company in identifying and engaging the community, and the assessor's engagement of community for the HCS (and HCV) was well described in the HCS report (including participatory mapping). The HCS report also mentions that Re-Mark verified FPIC (Tabel 2). However, the FPIC report provided describes the process of engaging the community and securing their consent for the oil palm plantation rather than the 'verification of the FPIC implemented by the company' or FPIC for HCV and HCS to proceed. Please provide some more clarify about the aims of the FPIC study. *{In my humble opinion, FPIC should not be tendered to a 3rd party. 3rd parties can be employed to verify whether it has been implemented properly}.*

The participatory maps only cover the southern block. The report states that this is still on-going by PT. KMA. Please provide further information on progress and why the northern block was not shown. If areas are under certificate (*hak milik*) please provide info (as well as examples of agreement by owners for oil palm development and the HCV-HCS assessment).

Company Responses:

1) Some information about FPIC process have been added to the report and detail FPIC report is in separated report (attached). Generally, the community has accepted the plan to develop palm oil plantation partnership PT JEK with KHSB, the people who own land in the prospective cooperative area have expressed their willingness to cooperate in opening oil palm plantations. The cooperation agreement agreed between the company and the community was established with the formation of the KHSB.

2) At the beginning of planning HCS assessment activities, in the north there were initially 2 blocks which were the object of HCS assessment. 1 block can be made and received approval from the community and in this report included in the AoI HCS assessment, while in the other block there was no HCS assessment because it received rejection from the surrounding community when the HCS assessment will be carried out and the status of the area still largely as Conversion Production Forest (HPK) with the existence of a peat ecosystem. Furthermore, the management of PT JEK decided to dispose of the 1 block in the AOI HCS assessment, while for 1 another block was included in the AOI HCS assessment.

Final Reviewers Recommendation:

No further comment.

The FPIC process of both company in identifying and engaging the community, and the assessor's engagement of community for the HCS (and HCV) was well described in the HCS report (including participatory mapping). The HCS report also summarizes verification of FPIC carried out by PT KEK / KHSB and agreement been developed with the consenting communities. (Tabel 2).

Participatory maps were developed for Southern block and already existed for the northern block (under certificate (*hak milik*)).

After careful inspection of maps and names of rivers, as well as clarification from assessors about the area known as *Sunggalit*, it is now understood to be outside of the AOI. As the owners were going to plant and HCS & HCV not surveyed, there may be a potential for PT JEK to source CPO from HCV and HCS areas although this is outside of the scope of this review and the HCS / HCV reports.

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

Finding:

Improved but could be improved further.

Reviewers Recommendation:

Provide maps of hak milik and higher resolution participatory maps (polygons, not points).

Company Responses:

Data/maps have been provided with higher resolution participatory maps and upload to SharePoint.

Final Reviewers Recommendation:

Participatory maps are not necessarily tenure maps. The reviewer only found land cover attributes under the GIS file:

Pemetaan_Partisipatif_HCS_KHSB.shp. No judgement could be made as to whether the community as “tenure” over this land such as could be indicated through a GRTT map produced by the company.

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:

Acceptable.

Company Responses:

Data/maps have been provided and uploaded to SharePoint.

Final Reviewers Recommendation:

The participatory map contains HCS classes that area assumed to have been cross checked with the community and can suffice as “non-forest” classifications that should be excluded from the HCS patch analysis etc. There is sufficient area to satisfy 0.5 ha per person in the concession / landscape.

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.

Reviewers Recommendation:

Please provide additional information about the group that declined to have their area surveyed for HCS, information about community representatives.

Company Responses:

Data and information have been explained on the report.

Final Reviewers Recommendation:

No more comment.

- 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:

View addressed, ownership respected, and representation established during study. Prior Informed test thought to be met.

Reviewers Recommendation:

The HCS summary and FPIC reports need more detail about groups that were consulted and conclusions about which groups agreed and those that declined (a table would suffice). Include information about whether the assessors stated that groups could decline development or HCS / HCV (indicating areas on the map for the group that declined) and whether communities stated they wanted / decline legal representation.

Company Responses:

Details about the groups consulted will be included in the revision report. The community does not want legal representation because they want the plantation development process to take place immediately.

Final Reviewers Recommendation:

No further comment.

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

Finding:

Process of FPIC is still ongoing.

Reviewers Recommendation:

Complete FPIC process and provide Tenure Map of areas agreed under FPIC agreements in future.

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. However, see Final Reviewers Recommendation below.

Reviewers Recommendation:

Areas of HCVA between report supplied, HCS report and summary HCS Assessment registration form do not match.

Company Responses:

The data between documents and report have been corrected.

Final Reviewers Recommendation:

The HCV report available (01_HCV_KHSB_Compilation_revIC_200818) has a different HCV area reported (**511.17 ha HCVA**) to that of the HCS report (**571.18 ha "Netto NKT"**). This is likely due to an updated HCVA not available at the time of Final review. However, the company and assessors do not need to update the HCS report.

- 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:

Overall, a well-written and professionally report.

Reviewers Recommendation:

Determination of HCV2 could be reviewed. There is a significant area of non-forest identified as HCV Area. IMHO, this could be an HCV Management Area rather than an HCV Area as there is no longer forest in this “ecosystem”. As this was identified from secondary data (indicative maps) from the Governor’s decree, the team should have verified whether this was indeed a Karst area that has an important function for maintaining the ecosystem. If identified as an HCV Management Area, non-forests could be managed to maintain HCV of blocks that do contain a function ecosystem. However, if the Peraturan Gubernur 67/2012 states that no development of oil palm can be implemented in these indicative areas the HCV2 should stand as is.

Company Responses:

HCV 2 in the assessment area remains valid and is included in terms of management and monitoring in HCS summary. The HCV map has been revised according to what the reviewer needs.

Final Reviewers Recommendation:

The HCS peer review does not require changes to be made (and changes to maps could not be detected as the file was the same as in initial review). I was merely noting that the determination of HCV2 could be reviewed again as there is a significant area of non-forest karst landscape areas identified as HCV Area.

- 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:

No RBA was necessary. All LPP patches connected to HPP and “conserved”.

Reviewers Recommendation:

None.

- 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, adequate taking into account areas outside, such as connectivity.

Reviewers Recommendation:

As well as the 5 points stated in Section 10.3, please refer to HCV management prescriptions. This was an integrated study so the management of HCV forests and HCV area will be similar. This could be especially important for the protection of HCV 2 in karst areas and replanting to connect and protect forest areas outside of the concession area.

Company Responses:

Integrated management of HCV 2 monitoring has been included in the HCS report, especially in point 10.3.

Final Reviewers Recommendation:

The HCV report is rich with management prescriptions. In the reviewer opinion, the management of HCS is ideally reported, the HCV report where integrated assessments are carried out and therefore the HCS report does not need to go into a high amount of detail in this case.

4. Image Analysis

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

Finding:

Yes.

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:

Yes.

Reviewers Recommendation:

No correction required.

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:

No recommendation.

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:

Good plot selection and sufficient inventory sampling.

Reviewers Recommendation:

The report states that according to Walker method 102 plots were required. 38 were sampled. Were the remainder in non-HCS strata not sampled? If so, provide a summary table of estimated number of plots per strata.

Please explain why only 15 points are visible on the shapefile. These are different again to the samples for the carbon analysis work (See *Gambar 1 Peta sebaran titik sampling di areal kajian KHSB - 05_CSA_KHSB_Report_rev01_210718.doc*).

Explain why no samples were taken in the northern block according to Gambar 8 HSC report.

Company Responses:

The report states that the plot calculation is based on a winrock calculator, and indeed there are errors, not 102, but 120 points, 40 points for HCS studies and 20 additional points for KAPPA Accuracy, all of which have been included in the report consistently including excel data, winrock and table calculations excel carbon calculation. Shapefile points are the same as those in the report, namely 40 HCS points, and 20 KAPPA points. The sample in the north has been included in the report, as a KAPPA test, there was an export error in the SHP point when uploaded to the previous SharePoint and now the data is complete.

Final Reviewers Recommendation:

No further comment.

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:

Yes.

Reviewers Recommendation:

No comment.

- 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 error was noted.

Reviewers Recommendation:

Please share all sample data for each plot so a re-calculation can be carried out.

Company Responses:

The sample data have been provided and will upload to SharePoint.

Final Reviewers Recommendation:

No obvious errors. Results seem accurate for region.

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:

The initial vegetation classification map has been calibrated using results from the sampling to provide an accurate final HCS patch map.

Reviewers Recommendation:

Supply all data needed as per requested.

Company Responses:

The sample data have been provided and will upload to SharePoint.

Final Reviewers Recommendation:

No further comment.

- 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:

Patch analysis carried out properly and incorporate PM. No issues.

Reviewers Recommendation:

However, please see the comments in the FPIC section. Participatory maps are inadequate and not available in shapefiles – therefore not sure whether they were used in the Patch analysis. Unlikely not be necessary given the location but for completeness sake, this step should be done.

Provide PM data and maps needed.

Company Responses:

Participatory mapping data is available, and the maps have been included in the report, the analysis patch used has been integrated with PM data and will be uploaded to the shapefile data deposit.

Final Reviewers Recommendation:

No further comment.

- 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:

Correctly applied.

Reviewers Recommendation:

Please see Section 6.1 above.

Company Responses:

Patch analysis has been adapted to a sampling plot for re-identification of land cover and has been made based on toolkit 2's decision tree.

Final Reviewers Recommendation:

No further comment.

- 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. The HCS and HCV integration has provided a very conservative land use plan.

Reviewers Recommendation:

Please integrate the recommendation of the HCV / NKT for areas of HCS.

Also, please indicate what kind of management is allowed on the large areas of HCV that are not HCS – i.e. HCV2 identified as protected karst ecosystems (even though this are likely not ‘karst areas’ and do not have any forest on them).

Company Responses:

Integrated management and monitoring have been included in the report.

Final Reviewers Recommendation:

No further comment.